

---o0o---

1

2

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

3

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

4

TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

5

TUESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2000

6

CASA DE LA VISTA

7

TREASURE ISLAND

8

---o0o---

9

10

COPY

11

12

13

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MARY HILLABRAND, INC. (415) 255-1994

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

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

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

SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR'S OFFICE:

MARTHA WALTERS (SFRA)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

NATHAN BRENNAN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)

TETRA TECH EM, INC.:

CINDY -----

RINA -----

JERRY WICKHAM

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI)

MICHAEL STONE

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE -----

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, welcome to our
2 November Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

3 This is the first meeting where we are trying a
4 new format, as we discussed at our October meeting, that
5 we would make every other meeting a technical oriented
6 meeting that was optional for all the community members
7 to attend.

8 And then on the second, on the opposite month,
9 we would have a general meeting where we would provide
10 more of an overview of the program for all the community
11 members.

12 So Nathan is, as well as our co-chair, he is on
13 our technical committee. So at least we have Nathan as
14 an audience.

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think one thing we may do
16 is put the "technical subcommittee meeting" so people
17 don't, so they don't think it's somebody else's
18 technical meeting.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess I was trying to
20 differentiate between some other subcommittee meeting,

1 because we sort have had meetings outside of the regular
2 meeting.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I was just looking for
4 something to try to remind people to show up.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we have an agenda for
6 tonight that's really just focused on the technical
7 issues.

8 Steve had offered to talk a little bit about
9 the focus groups as they are being used at the Alameda
10 RAB. They have broken out their technical group into a
11 number of technical groups focusing on different areas.

12 STEVE: Yes.

13 In Alameda, we have, I think, about 10 or 12
14 subcommittees which we call focus groups. We set up a
15 meeting and we have a solid wall on either side of the
16 room, and we put up the sheet each time for every
17 subcommittee. It has a community member as the lead
18 that's highlighted. And down at the bottom, it has the
19 Navy RPM, or technical lead from the Navy, with a phone
20 number with who they could contact. And then we have

1 people raise their hands, because at Alameda, we have
2 usually a dozen or so community members or so who show
3 up to the meeting.

4 And there are new people we have actually all
5 the time. So we have new people coming in and out, and
6 so the names are continually changing.

7 And then those subcommittees meet on varying
8 periodic schedules. Some every month, some twice a
9 month, depending on the activity.

10 There is one subcommittee for just RAB
11 membership, and they do things. The community
12 proactively goes to town hall meetings and places and
13 have RAB fliers and things for people to sign up. And
14 then there is the subcommittees who gets together, the
15 technical committees, more technical committees get
16 together to review documents when they get published.

17 And they decide they can convince the RAB
18 whether or not it's wise to come up with a grant, two
19 TAPP grants -- three actually, at Alameda, where we have
20 gotten external money to fund people to help review the

1 documentation and then provide reports, usually at whole
2 RAB meetings.

3 And, let's see. At each meeting, we allow
4 about 20 minutes for what we call focus groups. We go
5 around the table, is what we call it, and each of the
6 committee chairs, focus group chairs, provides a report
7 of what's happened since the last RAB meeting.

8 Usually, there is some kind of a report going
9 on. It really brings the RAB membership more into the
10 fold of what is going on with the RAB and gives them
11 more ownership and responsibility.

12 And then they feel kind of obligated to report
13 to their fellow RAB members what has happened.

14 It's something we started about two co-chairs
15 ago. We had a retired guy from the EPA, who was the
16 co-chair, and he thought of it. It turned out to be
17 really well-received.

18 And then the energy level is high, and the
19 membership, it seems to inspire them more. And when
20 they have something to present, they are part of the

1 meeting, not just listed to the Navy and consultants and
2 the regular stock. So it's been fruitful for us.

3 Any questions about it?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the sheets that are up
5 in the room, is that just listing --

6 STEVE: GPI maintains those. Michael down
7 there does them for us, and he updates them.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is that just basically
9 listing kind of a poster board for the committee, who is
10 on it?

11 STEVE: Yes, so all the RAB members can see,
12 okay, well, so and so is on there.

13 And what they do is, they try and solicit
14 membership on the subcommittees.

15 And they will say, you know, we only have two
16 people here on this one focus group. We need some help.
17 Is there anybody else that's interested in the landfill,
18 or in radiological removal, or in the fuel line
19 projects?

20 And then people can sign up and write their

1 name on the list. And they stay up there until they
2 decide they don't want to be on that one any more, or
3 until some of them get completed. We had one for
4 petroleum with the fuel line project. It was a two-year
5 committee, and then it got completed. So we took that
6 one down.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: And then how do you set up
8 the committee, is that just in the general meeting?

9 STEVE: Yes. And somebody will say, here's a
10 new topic. It just came up.

11 As something comes up, you can develop Site 12.
12 We don't have a committee on Site 12. Is there interest
13 in Site 12? Do we have somebody who would be interested
14 in being a focus group chair for Site 12? Are there
15 other RAB members? Or let all the other RAB members
16 sign up and they can choose their own focus group chair.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then documents,
18 somebody on the Navy side funnels the documents to focus
19 groups?

20 STEVE: Typically, what we do with

1 documentation, our co-chair gets a copy of everything,
2 and then the co-chair, the community co-chair funnels
3 out the documentation to whatever focus group needs it.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So then over the 20
5 minutes, really, each focus group only needs to prepare
6 a couple of minute update on what they are doing.

7 STEVE: Yes.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it's not as if they have
9 to prepare a big presentation.

10 STEVE: We have a big radiological project at
11 Alameda, and one of the co-chairs or focus group chairs
12 for that would communicate by e-mail with the Navy RPM.
13 And the Navy RPM, before each RAB meeting, would feed
14 this RAB person with all the information. And then the
15 RAB person would give the presentation.

16 The Navy focus would have the information as
17 well. It's copied to us. So we knew what he was going
18 to say. But, yes, that was one way to do it, telephone
19 calls.

20 And another way to do it, try to build a

1 rapport between whichever RPM is involved with a given
2 operational unit or IR site, or whatever it might be.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So you say there is about 10
4 to 12 subcommittees, but only 10 to 12 people are
5 showing up in the general meeting?

6 STEVE: Yes, that's true.

7 And there are a lot of similar names as focus
8 group chairs.

9 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So there are a lot of people
10 on more than one?

11 STEVE: Absolutely, absolutely.

12 How many do we have, Michael, do you remember?

13 MR. STONE: The groups?

14 STEVE: How many groups?

15 MR. STONE: It would have to be at least, I
16 would say, nine.

17 STEVE: Nine.

18 MR. STONE: Yes, eight or nine.

19 STEVE: And that goes up or down over time.

20 And some of the committees are much more active than

1 others.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe, hopefully, like the
3 January meeting, if we have more attendance, more
4 regulars coming to that, we can talk about this again.

5 Nathan and I can talk about it at the interim
6 meeting, and maybe try one focus group and see if we can
7 try and get something going.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It would be nice.

9 STEVE: It was really a way to get more people
10 interested in the process, more involved, you know, with
11 some responsibility.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe that would help.

13 Right now, we have a technical subcommittee and
14 everything is going to them. Maybe by breaking it up,
15 then people won't feel maybe as overwhelmed or have to
16 review as many documents, and focus on certain things.

17 STEVE: And maybe it's something you could
18 choose at your technical, every other month technical
19 meeting as a starter and see if it fits into the broader
20 spectrum of the RAB.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, thank you,
2 Steve.

3 MR. STONE: I want to note something.

4 I do believe it does work really well, the
5 focus groups. I attend a lot of the RABs, and the
6 Alameda community members seem more involved than the
7 RAB members.

8 I mean, I'm not saying the RAB members aren't
9 involved, but they seem more involved. And I think it
10 has a lot to do with the focus groups.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our next item is, I kept
12 the public comment item in here because this was still,
13 you know, all of our RAB meetings are open to the
14 public, regardless of whether it's a technical meeting
15 or general meeting.

16 But there being no members of the general
17 public here, outside of Nathan as a RAB member, we will
18 move into the BRAC cleanup process.

19 Rina, are you covering for Cindy?

20 RINA: No. She must be stuck in traffic.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Then we will flip
2 to, so we wanted to cover a couple of topics tonight
3 where we have documents out, and so Cindy, when she
4 arrives, will provide us an update on the Site 13
5 offshore investigation.

6 But in the meantime, I will ask Jerry to talk
7 about the Site 12 soil gas sampling investigation.

8 MR. WICKHAM: Okay, Jim. I don't have a formal
9 presentation on the soil gas, but what I will do is give
10 you a brief overview of the status of it right now.

11 I will just point out, we do have a document
12 that's in draft stage right now. I will kind of refer
13 to that document, because that's the document in review
14 right now.

15 What we originally conducted was, I think I
16 will just lay out the soil gas map for Site 12. I will
17 lay it out in the middle there.

18 And the original investigation that we did
19 here, the first phase of the investigation, we
20 collected, we sampled 70 points across Site 12. The

1 locations were within four areas of concern. And the
2 areas of concern that were selected, they were based on
3 the fact that, one, we either knew that there was an
4 area of concern due to previous investigation in the
5 area, such as previous debris disposal areas, or we have
6 borings throughout Site 12.

7 And so we looked at the boring data because we
8 have health and safety monitoring that goes on during
9 those borings. Therefore, we have monitoring that goes
10 on with a PID and FID. And these two instruments would
11 help us identify vapors that occurred during the
12 drilling.

13 So we looked at that information and that
14 covered all of Site 12.

15 So, basically, we had a pretty comprehensive
16 look that allowed us to focus on four areas. That was
17 the basis we took those 70 locations, put a grid across
18 those areas where we had targets, and we are looking at
19 those areas.

20 It covered a pretty good section of Site 12.

1 So that was the first phase. And what you have here are
2 the results of that.

3 So this particular document, called Soil Gas
4 Investigation Results and Proposed Step-Out Sampling,
5 this came out October 30th in draft form. So it
6 includes a table with all the results. And the types of
7 sampling that we did here for soil gas, we are doing a
8 probe. A temporary probe goes down just above the water
9 table. We are limited by a shallow water table at
10 Treasure Island, so you are not going to the typical
11 depth that you might do at another site.

12 And then those soil gasses are analyzed in a
13 laboratory for volatile organic compounds -- methane,
14 and in some cases, we also looked at sulfur compounds --
15 to try to help identify vapors that might come from
16 natural gas.

17 So we took all that data, and when you look at
18 volatile organic compounds, you have many compounds that
19 you are looking at. And we took all those compounds and
20 went through a screening process to identify what point

1 would warrant further examination, and also to
2 determine, well, we have some detections. There are
3 several volatile organic compounds. So what does it
4 mean? So we went through the screening process
5 realizing that this was a residential area. So we took
6 the data -- first of all, we did a comparison to first
7 screen, which is the (inaudible). Obviously, we have
8 soil gas (inaudible). Obviously, we are not going to
9 worry about that. Next, we took and used a vapor
10 intrusion model into the building. And we calculated
11 what concentrations would give us certain levels of
12 risk. We screen the data against that.

13 And with some of the compounds, we were able to
14 do that. Most of the compounds we were able to do that.
15 Actually, I should say all the compounds that turned out
16 to be of concern, we used that vapor intrusion model for
17 our screening purposes.

18 After we screened all the data down using those
19 particular methods, we came up with several points that
20 still, in our table, you will find Table 4 kind of a

1 summary of the human health risk. (Inaudible), and then
2 using this, the model (inaudible), we used those
3 concentrations we detected in soil vapors, kind of back
4 calculated them, and then came up with the cancer risk.
5 And from that, we plotted that on the map to see what
6 points we may have that are not bounded by surrounding
7 sample points.

8 It turned out that we have one sample point in
9 here, SG38, 12SG38, which had some TCE, some 1122
10 tetrachloroethane. This is the far south end of the
11 disposal area A, adjacent to Building 13.3.

12 So this was the point that -- really, the
13 southern end of our grid covers the disposal area A
14 (inaudible). So this document that came out on October
15 30th summarizes these tables and results and discusses
16 some of the proposed step-out sampling locations.

17 So we are going to go back to around SG38 and
18 propose to put in an additional five sampling locations
19 around Building 1323, due to the elevated detections in
20 SG38.

1 And, also, that's based on the VOC detections
2 in SG38. The methane data was also reviewed. Of
3 course, methane is not toxic. It's not the type of
4 thing you would run through a model like that. The
5 methane, we really have no model for determining
6 criteria, but, obviously, it's something that you
7 compare to a percentage of (inaudible).

8 We did have some elevated detections of methane
9 in the debris disposal area A, about four locations
10 (inaudible). So we do have two additional locations
11 proposed on the east from SG30.

12 So it's really in this southern debris disposal
13 area A where we are proposing to do our Phase II
14 sampling.

15 The other areas on the north shore, Site 12,
16 the North Point area, 1207-1209, and Mariner Drive area,
17 the detections that we have volatile organic compounds
18 screened out, we did not have elevated methane in those
19 areas. So we are going to concentrate on this portion
20 of the debris disposal area A.

1 One thing I didn't mention, the model helps us
2 go from soil gas to (inaudible).

3 We also checked, and in conjunction with this,
4 we did indoor air sampling also in several buildings.
5 We took 11 indoor ambient air samplings.

6 And just to kind of go back to SG38, this
7 particular sample is located immediately west of unit
8 1323. We actually have an indoor air sample which we
9 did not detect.

10 But, again, until we bound it, we won't know if
11 we have the maximum concentration in that area. So
12 that's it briefly.

13 If you have questions?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So our next document out
15 is?

16 MR. WICKHAM: What we are waiting for now is
17 comments on this for those proposed step-out sampling
18 locations. As soon as we have comments on that, the
19 rest of the comments on step-out sampling locations,
20 then we will go out and do Phase II of the soil gas.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So that's a document
2 out for review right now, correct?

3 MR. WICKHAM: Yes. The document is out for
4 review.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, Cindy is here.
6 So we have asked Cindy _____, who is our project
7 manager at Tetrattech for the offshore program, to give
8 us an update on the Site 12 investigation.

9 We do have a document out for that. We have a
10 draft work plan for additional offshore investigation.

11 CINDY: Okay. I have a handout, and I will
12 pass those around.

13 I guess everybody, the field sampling plan went
14 out on November the 8th, so everybody has a copy of the
15 field sampling plan.

16 So what I would like to do during this
17 presentation is just briefly summarize the work plan for
18 the additional offshore investigation, and then present
19 the schedule for completing the RI.

20 So the problem is that there was regulatory

1 concern that debris from this area had been pushed off,
2 pushed offshore, resulting in the bulge that you see
3 (indicating).

4 I think everybody probably has a copy of the
5 map. Is it the last page of the handout?

6 So this land protrusion is the area of concern,
7 what we are calling the offshore area of concern. High
8 concentrations of lead were detected onshore adjacent to
9 this area, so that is what raised the issue of concern.

10 And then the sampling density offshore was not
11 really high enough to determine that there was not a
12 problem with lead, even though you could see what we
13 have, where we have sampled, the lead concentrations are
14 not elevated.

15 The sampling locations, the squares are
16 locations that were sampled previously during previous
17 offshore investigations. However, if lead count
18 concentrations are found to be elevated, then it may
19 pose a risk to ecological receptors.

20 So the sampling objectives for this additional

1 investigation are to determine whether or not lead
2 concentrations in the Site 12 offshore area,
3 investigation area, are elevated above screening values,
4 and do the sediment dynamics in this area favor
5 deposition or erosion?

6 This is important, because if lead
7 concentrations are not elevated, then perhaps it's
8 because it's an area of deposition which limits the
9 exposure.

10 And if lead concentrations are not elevated and
11 it's found to be an erosional area, it's possible if
12 there was debris pushed offshore, it's no longer there.
13 It's gone.

14 So just knowing more about the sediment dynamic
15 in that area will help us, will help the Navy decide
16 what to do if, just provide more information.

17 So that's one of the study questions that is
18 being addressed in the investigation. How do we propose
19 to find out this information? Well, we are going to
20 collect sediment and then compare it to toxicity based

1 screening values for lead. Specifically, the effects
2 range medium value; collect cores and do geologic
3 description of sediment cores; do the radioisotope
4 profiles which will help us determine whether or not the
5 area is depositional or erosional and grain sized
6 analysis.

7 The last three, the geologic description of the
8 cores, the radioisotope profiles, and the grain size are
9 all ways of looking at, different ways of looking at
10 what the sediment dynamics of the area are.

11 So where you can see on your sampling map, this
12 is the investigation area, this rectangular area is
13 about 300-by-500 feet. We are proposing 24 sampling
14 locations, and we will do the -- for lead analysis --
15 and we will do the radioisotope profiling at three
16 locations. And those are shown as the triangles
17 directly adjacent to the shoreline.

18 So the data interpretation is a
19 characterization of the area. We don't really plan on
20 using these data in the risk assessment itself; so in

1 order to determine whether or not sediment, compared to
2 sediment concentrations to the ERM, and if
3 concentrations below the ERM are at 85 percent or more
4 of the samples, there will be no additional action.

5 This area will be no action.

6 If that's not the case, there will be further
7 evaluation which could lead to no action, additional
8 sampling, or an FS or removal action.

9 And that's how we will look at and evaluate the
10 sediment for the lead analysis.

11 In determining whether or not we have the
12 sediment dynamics of the area, we will look at grain
13 size as well as the radioisotope depth profiles.

14 If a fine grain sediment sample is greater than
15 50 percent, and the radioisotope depth profile provides
16 evidence of deposition, and accumulation of sediment, an
17 accumulation rate will be estimated for the area.

18 If the fine grain sediment in a sample is less
19 than 50 percent, and the radioisotope data do not
20 support sedimentation, we will assume that it's an

1 erosional environment.

2 But we will use the radioisotope, the grain
3 size, and the geologic profiles in combination to make
4 this determination of the accumulation or erosion.

5 So that's the proposal. It's a pretty small
6 field of investigation. The document went out -- and I
7 will talk about the schedule -- the document went out,
8 actually, on November the 8th. The review comments are
9 due back to the Navy by December the 8th.

10 We will incorporate, respond to the agency, to
11 comments, and then hope to, and then have the draft
12 final out by January the 15th, and, hopefully, have all
13 the issues resolved by that time.

14 So the draft final can go final and we can get
15 out in the field in mid February.

16 We will put out a tech memo summarizing the
17 results of this field investigation. The final tech
18 memo will be June the 29th, and then the final RI will
19 incorporate the results of this as well as other issues
20 that have been resolved between the draft final and the

1 final.

2 And the final RI is scheduled to go out August
3 the 31st.

4 Any questions? Anything? That's about all I
5 have.

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Is there any reason why they
7 just didn't try some shore samples first just to see?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Consideration with the
9 riprap and, in fact, the seawall had been re-rocked in
10 about 1983 when we had big storms back then.

11 So we looked at trying to get through the
12 riprap.

13 CINDY: This area, it's not really, it's just
14 not real accessible.

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Considering that we are
16 going to mobilize to do this, can we check around? The
17 other samples never really covered that.

18 When I made that comment before, it was kind of
19 like, well, that is a permitted outfall so there
20 shouldn't be anything. But it wasn't always --

1 CINDY: What outfall are you referring to?

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: The treatment plant, which
3 is just on the other side of the breakwater.

4 We only had like two samples in that corner as
5 I understand.

6 CINDY: And then there was also the SS01. A
7 sample was collected at that location as well.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm not sure of the exact
9 configuration of the outfall.

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think we need to address
11 that.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What's that?

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: (Inaudible.) It was
14 mandated to come up with that. There is also PCBs,
15 lead, copper, that also contributed. So they need to be
16 addressed also.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So you think we may not
18 have sufficient --

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yeah. I don't think we
20 checked the sediments close enough to the outfall.

1 I don't think the answer really addressed
2 whether the sediments were clean or not, because I don't
3 think we really know.

4 CINDY: We didn't find anything at those two
5 locations. There was nothing --

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Just compare them on the map
7 where the outfall is to where these samples are, because
8 I'm not really sure either. It's 100 and something feet
9 out.

10 CINDY: You can only get within 100 feet of the
11 shoreline.

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: The outfall goes out more
13 than 100 feet, so it will be somewhere on the outside of
14 that. We don't want you to hold the outfall.

15 CINDY: Well, I think in the previous sampling
16 event, we did try to get as close to the outfall as
17 possible. I know that the outfall --

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: When I made that comment,
19 that wasn't the response. We don't need to test was the
20 comment.

1 That's why I'm wondering whether we could do it
2 now.

3 CINDY: We will look back and see.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think we should
5 look, verify the location of the outfall and where we
6 took, where we have taken the samples to date.

7 CINDY: In the 1992 sampling event, that was
8 part of the stormwater sampling. Samples were collected
9 at the outfalls in the 1992, which was the FS zero one
10 sample location.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, but I guess the
12 question is whether or not the, because Nathan is
13 referring to the sewage treatment plant outfall which is
14 separate.

15 CINDY: That's separate from the storm.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The storm outfall
17 really runs to the end of the seawall.

18 But the sanitary treatment plant outfall runs
19 out approximately --

20 CINDY: So there are two different outfalls

1 here at this location.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Correct.

3 Well, there is only one sewage treatment plant
4 outfall. That runs out 100 feet; and then everything
5 else is just a storm sewer outfall that essentially
6 exits at the seawall at various locations at about 40
7 different locations around both islands.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think if you're
9 going to go to this level of mobilization, it would be
10 nice to get a couple of samples.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: if that was a permanent
12 facility, wouldn't there have been regular sampling?

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, but it wasn't always a
14 permanent facility.

15 For one thing, federal facility didn't fall
16 under EPA for a long, long time. They didn't have to do
17 reports or anything. And when they did, then there
18 would be a record.

19 But there would be a time when there was no
20 record.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But the time when there
2 was a record, it would be more recent.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I'm not concerned
4 about recent. I think things are more in control now.
5 We are just trying to close the history, is there a
6 problem there or not?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think we should look
8 to see where we have sampled in relationship to the
9 sanitary outfall. We could provide that back to Nathan
10 and take a look at what that is telling us.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Cindy, did you explain
12 about the radioisotopes and how they (inaudible)?

13 CINDY: No, I didn't.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What you're testing
15 there is an event that happened?

16 CINDY: Yes: Cesium, it was 1963, and the lead
17 19, the early '70s, I believe.

18 So there is a signature that we are looking for
19 that's the fallout. If we find those isotopes, we can
20 then date the sediment to those.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Probably deposition on
2 that.

3 CINDY: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's interesting.

5 CINDY: Yes, it should be interesting, but
6 there should also be a lot of vertical mixing because
7 that's what you see a lot of, the tide going in and out.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, in essence, I mean,
9 what this sampling event is leading us to is the
10 completion of the RI.

11 CINDY: It is.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Of the overall RI.

13 CINDY: Of the overall RI, yes.

14 So that's the schedule, and everything will be
15 incorporated into the final RI, which is now scheduled
16 for August.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm wondering whether we
18 need a BCT meeting earlier before we get too close to
19 the finalization of the document.

20 CINDY: Yes, yes. I mean, there is a BCT

1 meeting to discuss the tech memo, and at that time, I
2 hope to discuss the RI and just everything that kind of
3 summarizes the meetings that we have gone through.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

5 CINDY: And the issues and how they have been
6 resolved.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right.

8 So rather than just a tech memo meeting, it
9 would really be focusing back on the whole document and
10 how we are proceeding.

11 CINDY: And how we are proceeding, yes.

12 So there is this BCT meeting the 15th of May,
13 and it should probably be, the focus should be the
14 offshore so we can just go back and summarize all of the
15 issues and everything.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But the earlier meeting,
17 actually, it's printed out kind of microscopically on
18 here.

19 CINDY: Okay. Which earlier meeting, the one
20 on the 14th? We already had that.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But then there is another
2 meeting just to discuss the tech memo.

3 CINDY: That's May 15th.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So that's right.
5 That would be after the sampling of that.

6 So that would be the next opportunity to have
7 an overall discussion with the offshore document.

8 CINDY: Yes. And at that time is when we plan
9 to have the overall discussion.

10 Actually, we may need to schedule another
11 meeting in there between May and August, if that's
12 necessary.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I will go ahead and put
15 these up, some overheads. I will go through the
16 history. I think we went through that before.

17 I will bring you up quickly to that and give
18 you a status update as to where we stand right now with
19 the storage.

20 As you recall, there was an investigation

1 conducted of the former storage yard. The investigation
2 focused on an area that had been identified previously
3 as having been used as a storage yard.

4 Our investigation covered the outline of that
5 area that was identified from the photo. The
6 investigation was conducted in several phases with more
7 than 250 soil samples collected at more than 100
8 locations. That focused us down to this particular
9 area, Haliburton Court.

10 Very simple color scheme here.

11 The primary contaminant here was the PCBs. The red is
12 greater than what was determined to be an action level
13 of one part per million for PCBs. Then the green is
14 less than that.

15 So from that investigation, a significant
16 number of samples was used. It was determined that a
17 removal would be conducted, and the removal which has
18 already taken place in that area. This particular
19 example shows Bigelow Court, Haliburton Court. The red
20 was the removal down to four feet. The yellow, greenish

1 yellow here, the removal went down to two feet.

2 The decision to do that was based on
3 confirmation and screening samples collected during the
4 removal. There was a considerable amount of soil
5 sampling conducted during the removal to make that
6 determination.

7 There were 850, approximately, mobile soil
8 samples run through a mobile lab for screening purposes
9 to make that determination. 53 floor samples consisted
10 of composite of four different samples collected in
11 sites. 53 floor samples and 84 wall samples were
12 collected during the removal.

13 So that kind of gives you an idea of the
14 database. About 16,000 tons of soil was removed during
15 this. That was completed in that area. One large area
16 contiguous, two small features identified previously in
17 the investigation. That removal has been completed.

18 From that removal, the next -- I'm going to go
19 there quickly. That's been discussed before. I will
20 move quickly into where we stand right now.

1 Based on those concentrations we found during
2 the investigation, primarily, and also during sampling
3 of the floor excavation, it was determined that, we
4 looked at what these concentrations might look like if
5 you, again, went back and did some, used the same vapor
6 intrusion model we used in the soil gas.

7 We tried to apply that here, because the
8 removal of floors moved everything around the buildings,
9 but the soil, without taking the buildings down, the
10 soil remained in place below the building.

11 So we looked at the maximum concentrations that
12 were detected in the investigation. And we took the
13 investigation data, took the highest concentration
14 adjacent to any building, ran it through the vapor
15 intrusion model, and determined whether or not it could
16 pose a potential for concern.

17 We made very conservative assumptions in that.
18 And based on that, we looked at Building 1100, which was
19 the area where the highest concentrations were found in
20 the soil. We weren't quite sure what we would find with

1 PCBs, because one thing about PCBs, it's not one
2 compound. It's actually about 280 different compounds
3 that make up the family of PCBs. They have a range, a
4 wide range of physical properties. So you can't just
5 say this is the -- it's not like benzene. This is a
6 wide range.

7 Some of the physical properties of PCBs will
8 vary by several orders of magnitude. And the other
9 confusing thing about PCBs is, sometimes you talk about
10 the whole family of PCBs. And sometimes you talk about
11 the particular chemical compound, which are called
12 congeners (phonetic). There are 280 of them. Sometimes
13 you talk about the trade name, Aerocor (phonetic).

14 So a lot of times you hear people talk about,
15 particularly soil data, we talk about Aerocor 1254 or
16 1242 or 1260. Aerocor is a trade name for the Monsanto
17 Company. They made PCBs up until 1977. The Aerocor is
18 a mixture of compounds. It's not one particular
19 compound. It's a mixture. And there is -- you can look
20 at the tables to see what percentage may be in certain

1 ranges, but, again, you're looking at many different
2 chemical compounds.

3 1260 is actually, the number stands for, the 12
4 stands for the biphenyl structure of the PCBs. And then
5 the last two digits, the 60 or 42, actually, is the
6 percent of weight. So when you talk about soils,
7 sometimes you say Aerocor. For example, most of our
8 data, we looked at that pattern for the PCBs, and they
9 said Aerocor 1260, most of it. We have a little 1242,
10 but most of it was 1260.

11 And the pattern matched what you would get for
12 a mixture of compounds that the Monsanto Company would
13 make as 1260. Now, that's what we measure the soil
14 reported in the Aerocors.

15 When we went to air, the data comes out, we
16 need to get down to much lower detections. And they
17 are, in order to get down to the level that we needed to
18 be reasonably comfortable with the air, we had to look
19 at individual compounds.

20 And for our analysis, the laboratory reports

1 are over 50 different compounds in PCBs, 50 different
2 congeners. So the theory was, we would go in here with
3 the highest concentration, sample within the buildings,
4 indoor air.

5 The protocol was to select the most
6 conservative location in the building, which turns out
7 to be the bathrooms where the pipes come through. There
8 are openings in the floor slab. We had a protocol for
9 opening the buildings up, make any exchange of air,
10 closing the buildings back up, allow it to come back to
11 equilibrium, go in and disturb as little as possible,
12 and collect a low flow sample.

13 Again, we don't want to distort the natural
14 environment. We will use the low flow sampler for the
15 air. Run it for eight hours. Come back and take that.
16 Basically, it's a (inaudible) cartridge. We take that
17 back to the laboratory, analyze it and see how much PCBs
18 we have collected.

19 Knowing the flow rate, we can determine from
20 how much samples, how much PCBs we have collected and

1 what the approximate concentration was in the air.

2 We did that in every unit in Building 1100, all
3 six units. We used the same procedure in Building 1103.
4 That's outside the area of the removal, outside the area
5 that we know PCBs are in the soil.

6 This was to do as a control, because if you
7 look at the literature for PCBs for indoor air, you
8 either get the impression you're going to detect a lot
9 of it or you're not going to detect anything.

10 There are some things, cases, like the new
11 Bedford Harbor case in Massachusetts, one of the famous
12 removals for PCBs. That was a dredging operation.
13 (Inaudible.) They had a fairly good database for about
14 35 residents that they looked at PCBs. So they had
15 outdoor air data and they had indoor air data.

16 And so we were pretty interested in that to see
17 what they were getting in that particular study.

18 And that study showed that the actual, they did
19 some sampling in the neighborhoods closest to the
20 removal and some further away from the removal, and

1 there was a difference. It wasn't as big as you would
2 expect.

3 And it also showed that the indoor
4 concentrations were higher than they measured in the
5 outdoor. So there was actually some contribution from
6 something in the building. And so we were very weary
7 that we might be looking at part of the control sample
8 and we may be getting -- we knew there was a possibility
9 we would get detections in these units from something
10 other than the soil gas. We wanted to get, find out
11 what the soil gas was.

12 We weren't interested in, necessarily, any
13 mastics or adhesives that might have contained small
14 quantities of PCBs. We wanted to get into the soil
15 gases.

16 And then we also had the outdoor air. We had
17 two outdoors. Obviously, getting the outdoor, that
18 could affect our results. We wanted to control
19 everything that could affect our results as much as
20 possible, but with the realization that we could get

1 something unusual here.

2 As it turned out, it really didn't turn out.
3 It wasn't that unusual. The fact this soil sample here
4 had the highest concentration by far than any soil
5 samples we collected in the area, this unit where we
6 detected the PCBs in the indoor air.

7 Now, again, we are looking at congenors, and so
8 it's not a straightforward value. There is no criteria
9 that says this is the level of PCBs that you could have
10 in indoor air.

11 What we thought would happen, we would see some
12 concentrations in the more toxic congenors, and, in
13 general, there is a correlation between the congenors
14 with (inaudible) are generally more toxic.

15 It's a rule of thumb they are more toxic than
16 the lighter congenors. We thought we would see more,
17 based on what we saw in the soil, we thought we would
18 see more in the heavier end, and that you would be able
19 to use toxicity data because there is toxicity data
20 available for the heavier congenors.

1 As it turns out, most of the higher percentage
2 of the PCBs was in the lighter, more volatile congenors,
3 for which there is no toxicity data to make the
4 correlation. And, therefore, we are going through the
5 process of using EPA protocol which basically lumps
6 things together. There is no document yet available on
7 that.

8 We do have a first, an internal draft of that
9 which we will go through a review and maybe incorporate
10 it at a later date with a technical memorandum.

11 As I said, the results are going to be
12 evaluated again. It's kind of a, not an easy issue to
13 deal with when you deal with this many large number of
14 different congenors, and the various possibilities of
15 trying to determine how toxic or nontoxic it is, but we
16 are in the process of going through that analysis right
17 now.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we have a draft,
19 internal draft technical memo on the sampling results
20 that the Navy is reviewing right now.

1 We will finish our review and provide that to
2 the agencies, the city, and the technical committee of
3 the RAB next week.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

5 Let me add, as part of the air results, I guess
6 to finish that off, we did detect it in this Unit 11
7 (inaudible), a very low concentration. And then we
8 detected something (inaudible). The rest of our results
9 were nondetects.

10 We didn't detect the spurious sources or indoor
11 sources they had, not to say they are not there. PCBs
12 are ubiquitous. They are found pretty much throughout.
13 There are studies that have been done in pristine
14 places, and there are, they get the detects (inaudible).

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Then the results will be put
16 in this document?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, yes. Really, I
18 think the issue is going to be to determine . . .

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: If that's a help.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, because when you

1 have something like, we can take the heavier congenors
2 and say what the toxicity will be. They are probably
3 not even carcinogenic, but there hasn't been enough
4 scientific research to truly demonstrate that. So you
5 are in a quandary.

6 I don't have enough scientific data to
7 determine that for those particular congenors. The only
8 criteria that I ran across in terms of regulations, EPA
9 has a protocol that assigns factors that, again, is
10 based on (inaudible).

11 Germany actually has a criteria for indoor air,
12 PCBs indoor air, and they choose six indicator
13 congenors. They take an average and compare that to a
14 value.

15 Actually, I tried that for ours, and we
16 actually had all those congenors they used in their
17 study. If you take those congenors, we are below the
18 level, even in our highest concentrations, we are below
19 that criteria. But, again, that's not a widely accepted
20 criteria.

1 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So you haven't run the EPA
2 (inaudible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have.

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Okay. What does it show?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, we are probably in
6 between.

7 What it shows, it shows three tiers, and,
8 again, they are trying to back into the fact that you,
9 when you have different exposure pathways, you are
10 probably looking at different congenors.

11 So when you have ingestion, you have the
12 potential for looking at the heavier stuff. Vapors like
13 this, you are probably looking at something lighter.
14 You are not going to see the heavy, the very heavy
15 congenors, the multiple (inaudible) chlorine congenors.

16 And then you have the lowest for this level. I
17 think the cutoff is half of a percent. If it's less
18 than half a percent, it has more than (inaudible)
19 chlorine, then it goes into the lower percent. We are
20 just about there. We have a little more than half a

1 percent in the 1100 sample. A little more than half a
2 percent has more than (inaudible) chlorine. So we are
3 beyond that. We are somewhere in between.

4 We are probably closer to the lower risk. We
5 are in between the two. So the risk, if you ran the
6 lowest, would be about 3 times 10 to the minus 6; and if
7 you ran the intermediate, using an intermediate
8 (inaudible), it would about 1 times 10 to the minus 5
9 cancer risk for this particular detection.

10 The other detection (inaudible) would be less
11 than that. It wouldn't show.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we may also be
13 collecting some additional air samples.

14 We may rerun the air samples at 1100,
15 particularly the one high one, high value, as Jerry
16 pointed out, which is like an order of magnitude above
17 the other detections.

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Does it migrate? Can you
19 seal the floor or anything to lower the intrusion?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you cut off the

1 pathway, you probably could use some technique, because
2 you're really just dealing with a bigger intrusion.

3 And if you were able to seal off the cracks,
4 use your ventilation more effectively, there is no
5 reason you couldn't decrease the concentration that
6 would get in.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we need to work through
8 the process of whether or not there is a risk even where
9 we see the highest value, and is that highest value we
10 see, is that something that can be replicated?

11 And then all of the other buildings in the
12 area, we have less concentrations of PCBs, less quantity
13 of concentration of PCBs. So we would expect to see
14 lower or nondetects in air.

15 It's likely that we will go out and collect air
16 samples from additional buildings. Right now, all we
17 have is the one control building, 1103, where we had the
18 nondetects. And so if we collect samples from the
19 additional buildings, we could be seeing nondetects in
20 other locations, too.

1 So that's one of the issues. This air issue we
2 need to close out before we can close out that PCB
3 removal process.

4 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Was there any follow-up on
5 the public relations side? There was talk of doing
6 that.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we had, as part of
8 the overall project with most of the field work, it was
9 conducted in the June, July, and August time frame. We
10 had a number of meetings with the residents. We had a
11 focused meeting with the two buildings that were nearest
12 the project area, 1108 and 1110, and we had a general
13 meeting where we invited all the island residents to
14 attend.

15 And then the result of that meeting and
16 discussion with them as to what they would want for
17 ongoing feedback, we had a series of weekly meetings
18 where the project was progressing. We were available to
19 residents who wanted an update, and we were available
20 for a request and to answer their questions.

1 And so we had several of those meetings. And
2 we got to the point where the project field work was
3 ending, the level of interest and questions was going
4 down, so we ended having those meetings.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think that would be
6 available for in the future (inaudible).

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think --

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: You probably use part of
9 that now, right?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we learned, I mean,
11 we learn things from everything we do.

12 It worked out pretty successfully to have a
13 meeting with the residents ahead of the start of the
14 project.

15 And then had a series of ongoing progress
16 meetings as the work continued to address their
17 questions and concerns.

18 Next, I put in an item for other technical
19 items. I didn't know whether there was anything else
20 you wanted to bring up, Nathan, or any of the other

1 committee members.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Well, are the TAPP grants
3 moving?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. Right now there is no,
5 basically, since Marcello left, there has been nobody
6 working on them. So that needs to be resurrected again.

7 Relative to that, we do have, I do have a
8 summary list of upcoming documents, and these are the
9 upcoming CERCLA documents. So this is the same document
10 tracking sheet.

11 We have changed the formats a little bit. This
12 is a replacement for the multipage sheet that we handed
13 out at previous meetings. So this is the same document
14 tracking sheet we use at the monthly BCT meeting.

15 So as far as upcoming documents, the next
16 upcoming document would be an action memo for interim
17 actions in Site 12; and following that, after the first
18 of the year, is a series of work plans for additional
19 investigations at various IR sites. We are still
20 working on a revision of our overall project schedules

1 for all of the IR sites.

2 We have been having a series of working
3 meetings with the agencies and city over the last couple
4 of months.

5 We have another version of the schedules that
6 are going out, actually, I think tonight or tomorrow.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The working draft went
8 out tonight. We're hoping to finalize it in the next
9 month.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we, I think we would be
11 in a position to come to the RAB at the December meeting
12 for schedules.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It would depend on the
14 agreement we get.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Depending on our next
16 discussion with the agencies and the city.

17 But we would still be coming back to the RAB
18 for RAB comments.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So, Martha, is the city
20 still moving to try to get the Clipper Cove area?

1 MS. WALTERS: I guess so.

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That would be first in the
3 transfer.

4 MS. WALTERS: Right.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So you have . . .

6 MS. WALTERS: Treasure Island Enterprises
7 (inaudible).

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: What's 25?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Site 25 is the seaplane
10 maintenance area. That's a petroleum site.

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So most of these are in the
12 first group.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, everything on
14 here, these are the CERCLA sites. Those are all the
15 CERCLA sites.

16 So we will be doing, what these work plans,
17 (inaudible), they are additional investigation at a
18 number of the CERCLA sites in order to fill data gaps in
19 preparation for completion of the onshore remedial
20 investigation report.

1 So the actual, what I think we will see in the
2 schedule next month, the actual, the next versions of
3 the remedial investigation report would follow at some
4 later period after this additional sampling was
5 conducted.

6 So I guess, in terms of the TAPP, it would be
7 whether you wanted to use that for evaluation of these
8 additional work plans.

9 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think the way to split up
10 one of the three would be useful for that, one for
11 petroleum to split it out. It would be nice.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we can come back to
13 the RAB next month, the December general meeting.

14 I guess that maybe brings us to kind of how we
15 want to structure the next month.

16 I guess one question is whether or not we want
17 to have a -- well, right now, we would have a scheduled
18 general meeting on December 19th.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Nobody cringed.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Which is actually the week

1 before Christmas.

2 And then, but then the question of whether we
3 want, whether you want to have an interim meeting that
4 month.

5 One alternative is, since I can set up 1-800
6 calls, I wonder if we want to try a 1-800 conference
7 call. If we set a date and time, I could put out a
8 notice to the community members with a 1-800 number so
9 we wouldn't have to try to physically meet anywhere.

10 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That sounds like a good
11 idea.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe that would generate a
13 little more participation.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. People could at least
15 call in.

16 I mean, I think the technical meeting would be
17 of limited value. I mean, this document is due on the
18 8th. I mean, I can give Lou a call and ask him. I
19 don't know if any other people commented on that one.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we could set the interim

1 call in, either the first or the second week in
2 December. And we kind have gone between Mondays and
3 Wednesdays. I think we did Monday nights before, but
4 I'm open to whatever nights the community members would
5 like to have it.

6 I can take the first Monday or the second
7 Monday of the month. If it was the first Monday, it
8 would still be before --

9 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: The second Monday, the
10 C.A.C. is going to meet.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh, is that their meeting
12 dates now?

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: That's just for December.
14 And then they will move to the third Thursday.

15 So they will start their Thursdays in January.
16 That will be January 11th will be the first regular
17 meeting. They had one organizational meeting. This
18 will be the second.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The second.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Second week.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Which would be?

2 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: 11th.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 11th.

4 So we could have a call in on Monday the 4th.

5 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. Why don't you try
6 that?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So I will put out a notice
8 to the community members for Monday, the 4th of
9 December, which would be a week from this coming Monday.
10 And I will provide a 1-800 number.

11 Then as far as the December meeting, I don't
12 know whether we were considering having it at the Nimitz
13 like we did last year, but I'm almost wondering. People
14 were having trouble getting to the Casa. They might
15 have more trouble getting to the Nimitz House.

16 I'm wondering whether or not that would be
17 detrimental to have it at the Nimitz House in December.

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Maybe you can put that on
19 the question to be answered on the 4th.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you put a map in

1 there, Jim?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, and that's what I did
3 last year.

4 MS. WALTERS: Make sure it's open that night,
5 though.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I talked to Laurie.
7 So as long as the Pottery Barn isn't using it. Right
8 now, it's open.

9 MS. WALTERS: Go for it.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So as long as it's
11 open, then I will make plans for that, for the 19th.
12 Maybe we can attract more people for the meeting.

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Maybe say members can bring
14 guests.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think we did that
16 last year.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think we did.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm almost thinking, too,
19 in terms of like the January meeting, whether the
20 January meeting should go back to another technical

1 meeting, or maybe we should start off the year with a
2 general meeting.

3 And I'm wondering whether or not a mailer, or
4 some promotion out to the island residents, have the
5 general meeting maybe a little more of an open house.
6 It might be more of a useful way to start off, to start
7 off the new year.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. I think we need to do
9 something. I feel a little bit outnumbered here.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So that would be one option
11 is to try to create more of an open house for the
12 January meeting with some publicity that would attract a
13 larger number of people.

14 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: (Inaudible.)

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, what we would have to
16 do, at the latest, we would have to do a mailer in early
17 January, a mass mailer, plus use any other means of
18 communication.

19 The alternative would be to make an open house
20 in February, have a general meeting on the 16th with our

1 existing membership, and to talk about what we were
2 planning for the February, for our February open house.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Considering it's so early in
4 January, I think it would be really hard to catch
5 people's interest after the holidays.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, maybe the January
7 meeting would be another technical meeting.

8 MR. STONE: I was curious: Is Treasure Island
9 restricted in any way as far as development, other than
10 maybe restricted more so than other places?

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes. Treasure Island is
12 restricted.

13 MR. STONE: More so than other bases in the Bay
14 Area?

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Completely restricted, yes,
16 much more.

17 MS. WALTERS: What do you mean by "restricted"?

18 MR. STONE: As far as the type of development
19 that can happen here.

20 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Currently under the

1 Tidelands Trust, it has to be a public use. You can't
2 have private use.

3 So you couldn't have a house. You could have a
4 hotel, but you couldn't have a house.

5 You couldn't have a store -- well, a person
6 could have a lease unit.

7 MR. STONE: So that the regular community
8 probably wouldn't be interested in the development of
9 Treasure Island because they are not private.

10 MS. WALTERS: Well, part of the island is
11 subject to the Tidelands Trust, not the whole island.

12 The same thing with Mare Island. I'm not sure
13 about Alameda.

14 But I know that you can go to the State Lands
15 Commission and get a variance. That happens a lot where
16 they shift it to another part of San Francisco
17 (inaudible). It has to be shifted over to another part
18 of San Francisco for that purpose.

19 MR. STONE: The reason I ask, it seems like we
20 have a very difficult time getting community members to

1 attend the meetings.

2 And I know the other meetings are well
3 attended. I just can't understand why the community
4 wouldn't be interested in Treasure Island.

5 MS. WALTERS: I think it's a combination of
6 things.

7 Historically, it really didn't have a strong
8 community base to begin with. Now that you have people
9 moved in, the residents, some residents are interested.

10 But, historically, you have people from San
11 Francisco, from the East Bay, from Marin who are very
12 interested, and they are primarily professionals. So
13 they had more of a curiosity more than anything else.
14 But that's diminished over time.

15 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: You have a lot of interest
16 for the C.A.C. where people will be directly involved in
17 the reuse.

18 And a lot of residents also applied for that,
19 which two or three did get on. I guess maybe more, four
20 or five.

1 So it's one where you get more public interest
2 because they will be more involved in what's going to
3 happen. Some people get a little bored when they look
4 through --

5 MS. WALTERS: Well (inaudible).

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: You get back to the tables
7 and go, yeah, this is cool.

8 MR. STONE: And that leads me to the question,
9 for some of the other bases, GPI does a newsletter, more
10 community oriented. It would be really good.

11 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: We talked about the
12 newsletter a lot of times.

13 We need to work with the Navy and get something
14 off the ground.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I got a letter from DTSC.
16 And they have offered some recommendations to us for our
17 community relations program. So we are going to look at
18 those.

19 MS. WALTERS: I don't know about Alameda, but I
20 know when I was on the Presidio project, it was more the

1 controversy between the Army and the Park Service and
2 the Army not doing the right thing.

3 That galvanized the city, and a lot of
4 environmental and nonprofits to support what the Park
5 Service was trying to do. It really raised the ante in
6 San Francisco in terms of the Presidio, and it's still
7 very, very strong, the RAB there.

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Also, no matter what we do
9 here, we are not going to impact the parking of
10 Telegraph Hill.

11 MS. WALTERS: That's true.

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Which the Presidio
13 considered would impact those neighborhoods.

14 So there is a lot more involvement. They want
15 to be sure they are very involved with what happens so
16 it doesn't impact the neighborhood adversely.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What is the total
18 membership on the C.A.C.?

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: It's supposed to be 25, but
20 it's already dropped to 23.

1 MS. WALTERS: (Inaudible) previously to the,
2 before the Development Authority was organized or
3 developed, it was under the San Francisco Redevelopment
4 Agency. There were about 30 or 35 people of the C.A.C.
5 I know that was July of '94?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: '96.

7 MS. WALTERS: '96.

8 So there was definitely a lot of public
9 participation. It dropped.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dropped off?

11 MS. WALTERS: Considerably. Until what, two
12 months ago, something like that.

13 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: This last year, there were
14 only two of us, so it's been kind of wavering since
15 then.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Kind of the last year.

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

18 And we had a stall in the documents. We had a
19 real heavy rush.

20 MS. WALTERS: So you have to look at the

1 historical context.

2 MR. STONE: Okay.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So I will set up a
4 conference call for the RAB members on Monday the 4th of
5 December.

6 I wonder if I should switch that to 7:00
7 instead of 6:30 to give people time to get home?

8 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will make it 7:00 p.m.,
10 Monday, the 4th of December.

11 We will have the regular meeting, regular
12 meeting slash social on the 19th of December at the
13 Nimitz House, and, hopefully, we can get more of our
14 existing membership to attend that meeting.

15 And then because it looks like the January
16 meeting is going to be a little early in the month, then
17 we will target February for the meeting slash open
18 house.

19 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Maybe one of the things we
20 could discuss in the 12-4 meeting is tell people we need

1 their comments on the meeting, the technical meeting.

2 MS. WALTERS: When is the C.A.C. Meeting?

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: The next C.A.C. meeting is
4 December, that Monday, December 11th, I think.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

6 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Yes, the 11th.

7 It's going to be at 6:00 in the Department of
8 Labor building. As they say, the only accessible
9 building on campus.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So all C.A.C. meetings will
11 be conducted on base?

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Right.

13 At this moment, they will all be in the DOL
14 Building. That's building --

15 MS. WALTERS: Why not this building, this
16 building is accessible?

17 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: I think, also, the
18 Department of Labor (inaudible). So he's the host.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's the medical dental
20 building, or the old medical dental building. It's the

1 newest building, so it probably meets all the
2 requirements.

3 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: We will meet on the second
4 floor, and there is an elevator.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And those meetings are open
6 to the public.

7 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: Open to the public.

8 We had one member of the public at the first
9 meeting.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, I guess with
11 that, if there isn't anything else?

12 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: So put your announcement,
13 you should put in when this meeting is because Richard
14 Hansen was interested.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For the?

16 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: C.A.C. meeting.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What time?

18 CO-CHAIR BRENNAN: 6:00 p.m.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. With that, if there
20 isn't anything else, we will adjourn.

1 There is food and drink at the table. Please
2 help yourself.

3 Everyone have a great Thanksgiving weekend.

4 MS. WALTERS: You, too, Jim.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

6 (The meeting adjourned.)

7 ---o0o---

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

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