

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

COPY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

19 DECEMBER 1995

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 17

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR #1268

461

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

ATTENDANTS

U.S. NAVY:

LT. NANNETTE ROBERTS (NAVSTA TI)

JIM SULLIVAN (BEC AND NAVY CO-CHAIR)

ERNIE GALANG (RPM)

CINDI FLEMMING (COMNAVBASE)

HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

SHARON TOBIAS

TIMO ALLISON

STACEY LUPTON

REGULATORY AGENCIES

MARY ROSE CASSA (DTSC)

GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)

RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)

MARTHA WATERS (SFDPH)

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

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

- JOSEPH ALCEDO
- JAMES ALDRICH
- JOHN ALLMAN
- CHRIS SHIRLEY (ARC ECOLOGY)
- WILLIAM FOSTER
- RICHARD HANSEN
- PAUL HEHN (COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
- GARY JENSEN
- CHLOE JUE
- CLINTON LOFTMAN
- DANIEL MC DONALD
- HENRY ONGERTH
- DALE SMITH
- THOMAS THOMPSON

GUESTS:

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

DAVID B. PEASE

CHERYL PEASE

(7:00 p.m.)

---oOo---

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our
December '95 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting.

The first order of business is the
agenda for tonight. Everyone should have received
a copy in the mail; or, if not, there are some
additional copies at the back of the room.

First, are there any comments with
regard to tonight's agenda?

I have a few changes to tonight's
agenda. Brad Wong had asked me to put under
organizational business selection of RAB Community
Co-Chair. He wanted to open the discussion, since
we are at the one-year point since the election
last year; however, he's unable to be with us
tonight, due to illness.

After talking with Paul, we would

1 like to recommend deferring that until January, so
2 we will strike that item, "Selection of RAB
3 Community Co-Chair," and defer it until January.

4 Then, I think, under "Citizens Reuse
5 Committee Workshop," the very last item on the
6 second page, Laurie Glass has told me they were
7 initially looking at the 27th of January; and now
8 I understand that date does not work for them; so
9 there will be an alternate date for a Reuse
10 Workshop that will probably be sometime in
11 February. So just strike 27 January.

12 With that, with no other comments, we
13 will approve tonight's agenda.

14 The next item is the minutes.

15 Due to the shortness between the last
16 meeting and this, we were unable to get the
17 minutes out ahead of time, so we are making them
18 available at this meeting, and we can defer
19 comments on the November meeting minutes until the
20 January meeting.

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

There are copies of the November meeting minutes on the back table, so everyone should have a copy of them.

I will move into the "Public Comment," and Amy Brownell has an announcement to make.

MS. BROWNELL: I'm very pleased to say that we have hired someone -- Martha Walters -- to take over and do what I was doing and a lot more for Treasure Island. Also, she is going to be working on The Presidio project.

Martha is very, very qualified for this position. Most recently, she was working for the US EPA, and she was on detail with The Presidio project, working for the Park Service as their Environmental Manager.

So she has done this job, before at The Presidio, at a different angle. She's very familiar with the issues that come up, and I know she will come up to speed very fast and help you

1 out.

2 I'm happy to have her. She's going
3 to be coming to all the Treasure Island meetings,
4 and I have to go to The Presidio meeting, because
5 it is meeting right now.

6 Please call her. Her phone number is
7 554-2794. Of course, you can still get in touch
8 with me if you need any help.

9 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Amy, thank you for
10 all your help and efforts. And welcome, Martha.

11 MS. BROWNELL: Thank you.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is our
13 Public Comment Period that we have at the
14 beginning of each meeting, to allow any member of
15 the general public, other than community members,
16 to make any comments.

17 Are there any public comments?

18 Okay, with that, because we did not
19 get the minutes out, we won't be able to review
20 the action items from last month; so we can defer

1 that also until the January meeting.

2 Next we will move into Organizational
3 Business, and I will turn it over to Paul.

4 CO-CHAIR HEHN: We have had an
5 interim RAB Committee meeting on the 12th of
6 December, primarily to talk about the two
7 documents which were available for review at this
8 particular point -- the Draft Final Phase II
9 Ecological Risk Assessment Work Plan and also the
10 Pre-final UST Investigation and Corrective
11 Measures Study.

12 We did get a chance to review quite a
13 bit in detail the Ecological Risk Assessment and
14 got a lot of comments on that. Part of that as
15 the result, we put together those comments in a
16 document which has been submitted to the Navy,
17 along with attachments which I had submitted to me
18 from Chloe Jue, William Foster, and John Allman.
19 Also, it has some additional comments tonight from
20 Chris Shirley for more detail on the Ecological

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

Risk Assessment.

I think everybody got copies of those in your handout. If you have not, I have got more here.

There was a very lively discussion on that, and that is also going to be a part of our general discussion this evening for technical issues.

After about an hour of discussion on that particular document, we then continued for another two hours and met with Byron Rhett, who is with the City of San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; and I think we have started a really good dialogue with the Agency to working more cooperatively between our two groups and making sure that we can get comments to them, have a lot of interaction with them, so they know what we are focusing on and vice versa.

We need to just put that together and continue to build that relationship between the

1 two groups and also CRC to make it a more
2 cooperative effort, so we know where everybody is
3 going and work together on that.

4 That is something we will probably
5 try to do, and I'm not sure what the Reuse
6 Committee Workshop is going to be. Is that going
7 to be for the general public?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Laurie wanted to
9 let the community RAB members know, the Reuse
10 Committee Workshop is a public meeting, so it is a
11 forum for both the Citizens Reuse Committee
12 members as well as the public at large to discuss
13 reuse issues.

14 I think the last one they had was in
15 the summer, so we wanted to invite the Restoration
16 Advisory Board members, and it sounds like it will
17 be sometime in February.

18 That should be a kind of solicitation
19 of commentary, presentation and solicitation of
20 commentary from the public.

1 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Okay, we did not get
2 a chance to really discuss the UST Corrective
3 Measures Study. We kind of ran out of time by the
4 time we got done with the first two items; and so,
5 fortunately, that particular comment period has
6 been continued to a later date; and Jim will be
7 talking about that a little bit.

8 So that will also give us the
9 opportunity to spend a little more time with that
10 document, if we so desire, and to get comments put
11 together for that; and hopefully we will have a
12 chance to have another interim RAB meeting prior
13 to the due date for the comments on that study so
14 we can put those comments together.

15 Anybody that is interested in
16 reviewing that, we can try to get you a copy; or
17 if you have reviewed it already, I would like to
18 know so I can look for comments from those people;
19 and we can put it together in the same manner we
20 have done for the Ecological Risk Assessment.

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

MR. ALLMAN: Which documents?

CO-CHAIR HEHN: The UST Corrective Measures Study.

MR. ALLMAN: I already have a copy of that.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The upcoming Environmental Report Review schedule, as Paul was mentioning, we have extended the comments on the UST Report; and I think, after some further discussion with EFA West and our consultant, the comments are due the 15th of January. I think we can further extend that to the next RAB meeting on the 23rd of January.

So for UST Investigation, the comments are due 15 January; but that can be changed to 23 January.

And then the comment period on the Ecological Risk Assessment, which we will be discussing a little later, is also now extended until this week, the 21st of December, for any

1 additional comments you may have after tonight's
2 meeting.

3 We have also added two new items,
4 although the dates may be subject to a little bit
5 of a change. We are getting ready to revise the
6 BRAC Cleanup Plan, which you received last March
7 or April; and this is really the key document to
8 the whole cleanup. It is the only document that
9 summarizes all of the cleanup program in one
10 binder. That is the one document that we
11 automatically sent out to all the existing RAB
12 members and also the new community members who
13 joined us.

14 So what we would like to do is, just
15 for the next meeting, for the 23 January meeting,
16 to solicit any comments you may have, either
17 general or specific, on the existing BRAC Cleanup
18 Plan; and that will help us in our draft for our
19 revision to the plan. That will be 23rd January.

20 The 1996 revisions will probably be

1 available sometime in February. We're not sure
2 what format that may take. We're probably going
3 to be just issuing changed pages to the 1995 plan
4 in order to update it. So it will be sometime in
5 February.

6 Unfortunately, because of the need to
7 get into ultimately Congress for the next year's
8 budget cycle, we are under both the Navy and a
9 time constraint; so the time period is going to be
10 very short; but we will mail anything out to all
11 of the community members.

12 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Any possibility that
13 come out any sooner than February 13th?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably not, any
15 1996 changes.

16 MS. TOBIAS: It actually might,
17 because the new schedule had a shorter deadline.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it might be
19 earlier in February, but probably no earlier than
20 the beginning of February?

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

MS. TOBIAS: Correct.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Anything that can help on that, because it is a very short comment time.

MS. TOBIAS: Right.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It sounds that during the month of February, we will be involved with the revisions to the BRAC Cleanup Plan.

And, then, lastly, there is an update, updated schedule document for 1996. Right now this only includes the CERCLA documents. I still need to include the compliance documents, although there is not very much coming up.

This was on the back table, and this will be part of the minutes, too, for this meeting.

Are there any questions or comments as far as document review?

MS. SHIRLEY: Thanks for the chart. It is very helpful.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I need to add the
2 intent was to add the compliance to that, too; so
3 we want to make it all-inclusive for both the IR
4 and the compliance.

5 We will move on to the program
6 updates.

7 First, Gina will present the BRAC
8 Cleanup Team efforts during the last month.

9 MS. KATHURIA: I am Gina. I'm going
10 to go briefly over what we did the last month.

11 We only had one meeting. It was on
12 December 13th, and it was one of our standard RPM
13 meetings, where we discussed the EBS Sampling Plan
14 a little bit; and we talked about air sampling --
15 we wanted to evaluate the volatilization pathway
16 for the human risk assessment.

17 We also embarked on a new project to
18 try to develop the ph cleanup levels and transport
19 models, and we sort of touched on that for a
20 little while.

1 We also reviewed and brainstormed how
2 we could accelerate the dates a little faster than
3 what was proposed at the meeting.

4 That's basically what we talked
5 about.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, thank you.

7 Dan, would you like to talk about the
8 External Affairs and the last CRC meeting?

9 Let me interject: Laurie Glass was
10 here earlier, and she's going to get copies of the
11 Alternatives Report out to all of the RAB members.
12 She has not been able to get copies yet. I did
13 make 10 or so, and I put them on the back table
14 for anyone who wanted them tonight.

15 MR. MC DONALD: At the last interim
16 RAB meeting for citizen members, we had Byron
17 Rhett, who is one of the senior managers of the
18 Office of Military Base Conversion, come to speak
19 to us about the reuse process.

20 He described the methodology and the

1 logistics of the current reuse program, and then
2 we engaged in a question and answer session and a
3 discussion about how the reuse process and the
4 Restoration Advisory Board could interact more
5 closely.

6 I think it was considered to be a
7 very useful discussion. There were about a dozen
8 RAB members there.

9 For the Reuse Committee, the
10 committee is now looking at the four alternatives
11 as examples of the four possible directions that
12 the reuse process could take. There is going to
13 be a great deal of discussion in the next month to
14 sharpen up some of the alternatives.

15 There will be an interim meeting in
16 early January that I will be at, and then there
17 will be a full CRC meeting, I believe, on January
18 8th or 9th. It is in our schedule.

19 At that time there will be a great
20 deal of discussion about which of the alternatives

1 of the four, which two of the four will be chosen
2 as the two likely ones to continue pursuit and
3 discussion on.

4 By the end of the second quarter, I
5 believe, they plan to have one final alternative
6 ready for approval; so the CRC has a great deal of
7 work; and the Office of Military Base Conversion
8 has quite a bit of work to do to make the final
9 alternative choice in the next six months.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And Laurie had
11 faxed me earlier this week -- I mentioned it a
12 little earlier -- there will be another public
13 workshop held. Originally, they thought it would
14 be in late January. They're not sure of the date
15 now, but it sounds like it will be sometime in
16 early February. That would be an opportunity for
17 Restoration Advisory Board members as well as the
18 community at large to get a briefing on all of the
19 alternatives and have an opportunity to make
20 comments.

1 MR. MC DONALD: That must have just
2 been scheduled, because it was not announced at
3 the last CRC meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

5 Now we will move into the technical
6 portion of the agenda, and the first item is the
7 Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment Work Plan.

8 What we would like to do is, the Navy
9 has a few things to say on that; and then we will
10 turn it over to Paul for the Technical
11 Subcommittee report; and then we will have some
12 discussion before our break.

13 Let me say we would like to have a
14 special workshop for the Ecological Risk
15 Assessment Work Plan, and that would allow us to
16 have more time for making technical presentations
17 and also to answer more detailed questions than we
18 can answer in a RAB meeting.

19 So as we close out the section on the
20 Ecological Risk Assessment, we would like to try

1 to find a date and time to have that workshop.

2 MS. SMITH: Why would we need to have
3 a workshop, seeing how our comments are no longer
4 significant and you have already made your
5 decision?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have not.

7 MS. SMITH: Comments were due the
8 21st. After that, you and the regulators make
9 your decision; and we have no more input into the
10 process at all.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because of the
12 workshop, there is really going to be more
13 opportunity for comments. The initial comment
14 period was just the initial review of the
15 document.

16 But let's go into the discussion, and
17 I think we can close the loop on that at the end.

18 First I would like to ask Timo to
19 make a brief presentation. We did get the
20 comments yesterday, so we have had the last 24

1 hours to take a look at them and get some initial
2 reaction.

3 MR. ALLISON: I didn't have a lot of
4 time to review the comments; because as Jim said,
5 we just got them yesterday.

6 First of all, we thank everyone to
7 take the time to review the document and taking
8 the time for this. We really appreciate it. If
9 we work together, we can make the document
10 something we're all happy with.

11 A couple of major concerns I saw,
12 reviewing the summary of the Technical
13 Subcommittee:

14 There is some misconception when
15 field work is going to begin on this project. We
16 had a Work Plan that said November '95. That is
17 definitely not the case. Obviously, we have not
18 been out there secretly; work for this is not even
19 funded for the majority of the sampling.

20 The only funding we have right now is

1 for doing a characterization and skeet range
2 sampling. We're going to go forward as quickly as
3 possible on the skeet range sampling, as we are
4 under order by the Water Board to clean that up as
5 quickly as possible. So hopefully that will
6 relieve some of the anxiety I sense from the
7 review.

8 The other thing is, like Jim said,
9 what has worked very well at other sites,
10 specifically Mare Island, we had a Technical
11 meeting with all those interested. Perhaps the
12 Technical Subcommittee would be interested in
13 meeting and discussing the approach of the Work
14 Plan and discussing some of the areas that are
15 still a little vague, and things that we're
16 working on to help us meet a little closer and
17 discussing specific comments, rather than taking
18 the whole RAB's time up and delaying the other
19 issues we need to talk about.

20 Another thing that is important to

1 understand and that we tried to put into the
2 document -- we did not make it clear enough --
3 this is a regional approach. This is not
4 something that is just going to be used at
5 Treasure Island. It is an approach the Navy is
6 wanting to put consistency throughout the Bay,
7 specifically in the sampling area. They want to
8 be consistent at Mare Island, they want to be
9 consistent at Treasure Island, and they want to be
10 consistent at Alameda Annex and Alameda.

11 Every site, we would like to have the
12 same approach so it will be very similar. This
13 approach is not going to be developed by the Navy
14 in a vacuum; the regulators are very much involved
15 with it.

16 We mentioned the BTAG, the Biological
17 Technical Assistance Group, which consists of
18 several regulatory agencies which regulate our
19 sites. They are working with us to develop the
20 screening criteria, what approaches, and how we're

1 going to assess the different areas to make
2 certain decision points.

3 Another thing I would like to stress
4 is that this Ecological Risk Assessment is being
5 done under the IR Program. Some of the comments
6 refer to areas that, while they are Navy property,
7 are not specifically under the IR Program. And
8 because of that, we're not obligated to look at
9 those. We're not saying that they may not be
10 important ecologically -- they're just not within
11 our funding to look at as far as contamination at
12 those areas.

13 We are looking at receptors from
14 those areas, possibly using the IR sites; but
15 we're not necessarily sampling those areas for any
16 soil or that type of contamination.

17 There are some issues concerning the
18 Quality Assurance Plan being pulled out. We have
19 given the Quality Assurance Plans for Hunters
20 Point Annex. We are currently doing the sampling

1 and following that Quality Assurance Plan.

2 To those who are interested this
3 evening, we invite you to review it; and
4 hopefully, by the time we have a Technical
5 meeting, you can come prepared, if you have
6 comments about that.

7 There are some points, just reviewing
8 the general summary of clarification that I'm
9 going to write up and send a letter to Paul about;
10 so when we do get a chance to meet, I can make
11 sure I am prepared fully to answer those
12 questions; because there are some things I need a
13 little more direction on so I can answer them.

14 I think that is the main points. I
15 am not sure if that does help you or not, and I'm
16 sorry I can't be more specific on a point-by-point
17 issue, but I will try to; if you have general
18 questions for me this evening that I can answer, I
19 will. If not, I encourage everyone to attend the
20 Technical Subcommittee that we will be having. I

1 think it will be a good thing for everyone.

2 MS. KATHURIA: Do you have a
3 tentative date?

4 MR. ALLISON: Yes, I think we're
5 tentatively scheduled for January 30th.

6 CO-CHAIR HEHN: The date when you're
7 actually starting the field work is when?

8 MR. ALLISON: We're still waiting for
9 funding, so that is undetermined at this time.

10 MS. SMITH: Would you start the work
11 without authorization from this document?

12 MR. ALLISON: We cannot do that. We
13 need it. For us to begin work, we need a final
14 work plan approved by the regulatory agencies.

15 MS. SMITH: You still have not done
16 the terrestrial stuff; and that was in the first,
17 or second, or third, or fourth draft that has
18 already been done; and there has still been no
19 buyout.

20 MR. ALLISON: And we have not started

1 the terrestrial assessment as yet. We are still
2 waiting for regulatory review comment.

3 MS. SMITH: The last plan does not
4 have terrestrial in it, to speak of.

5 MR. ALLISON: We have a Section 8
6 that deals very detailed with the terrestrial
7 assessment, as well as how we plan doing other
8 sites.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: This is a regional
10 approach. Would it be possible for you to supply
11 a summary of the kinds of comments that were
12 received at Mare Island and some of the other
13 RABs?

14 MR. ALLISON: I can talk to the Navy
15 and see if we can supply comments that were
16 received from other sites.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: Just the issues. They
18 don't have to be the details.

19 MS. SMITH: Also the methodology. My
20 complaint was that you were using Mare Island

1 methodology, which apparently, from talking to
2 them, has not been fully developed yet; and we're
3 supposed to say, "Oh, this is cool; we can use
4 whatever happens at Mare Island;" but we don't get
5 any of that; and Sharon tonight told me, "Oh, no,
6 Mare Island has nothing to do with this; it is all
7 Hunters Point."

8 MR. ALLISON: Hunters Point is the
9 regional approach that Mare Island uses, and we
10 want to use it at all the sites.

11 MS. SMITH: You're developing it,
12 right?

13 MS. KATHURIA: I am the project
14 manager for Mare Island, and the TI Work Plan is
15 very similar to the Mare Island Work Plan.

16 MS. SMITH: Then why can't we look at
17 it?

18 MS. KATHURIA: The Mare Island Work
19 Plan?

20 MS. SMITH: Yes.

1 MS. KATHURIA: You can look at the
2 Mare Island Plan.

3 MS. SMITH: Because we get the
4 referring to Mare Island, but we don't get to see
5 the Work Plan.

6 MR. ALLISON: I don't think we have
7 actually mentioned Mare Island in our Work Plan.
8 But if you would like to have a copy of the Mare
9 Island Work Plan, we can see if that can be
10 arranged.

11 MS. KATHURIA: The Work Plan is very
12 much alike, and you're more than welcome to
13 compare them.

14 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One of the major
15 points -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Dale and
16 Chris -- if it is a regional approach and it has
17 not been fully developed yet, how can you assess
18 the Work Plan that is proposed without knowing
19 what the methodology is going to be?

20 MR. ALLISON: The methodology is well

1 developed. There is certain holes in methodology
2 that are being developed, like the screening
3 criteria is being developed. The concepts, I
4 believe, can be reviewed with what the Work Plan
5 has right now; and if we can get buy-in on the
6 concept and then work out the details, then that
7 is what we're looking for at this point.

8 We're not looking for approval of
9 this Work Plan and go out into the field next week
10 and start sampling. We're looking for approval of
11 methodology; and then, together with the
12 regulatory agencies, we will develop the main
13 points of the decision.

14 MS. KATHURIA: Working out the
15 details at Mare Island, we have documents
16 generated, like several technical memos, and that
17 will be circulated to the RAB and the regulatory
18 agencies, so any details that are made on the
19 approach, everyone has buy-in and will be informed
20 on the decisions being made.

1 MS. WATERS: When do you anticipate
2 that the Navy will be provided funding for this
3 sampling?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Unless there is
5 additional funding made available in '96, we won't
6 have the funding until fiscal year '97. So it may
7 be next fall until we can get out into the field,
8 unless there is an unexpected windfall sometime in
9 '96.

10 MS. WATERS: There is a lot of time
11 for discussion to take place.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It appears,
13 because of the funding, there is going to be more
14 time than we originally anticipated.

15 CO-CHAIR HEHN: That is one of the
16 things which are not taking place imminently. If
17 there is not any work proposed or starting, we
18 have time to work issues out; but at this point we
19 are under a misconception.

20 MR. ALLISON: I understand completely

1 the misconception. I'm sorry that happened.

2 The only work that is tentatively
3 scheduled and funded is for the skeet range
4 assessment and the terrestrial assessment, as far
5 as the approach for doing the Treasure Island
6 sites.

7 MR. FOSTER: A real quick comment:

8 It is really not that uncommon in
9 terms of especially when a consultant is doing
10 work plans on sites in areas that are very similar
11 to use a regional approach.

12 From my own personal experience,
13 working on several Air Force bases in the Central
14 Valley, they were very much in the same type of
15 regional concept; but before one can just go out
16 and do field work, you have to spend a lot of time
17 getting the actual methodologies and conceptual
18 concepts down, and get that all approved before
19 you actually go down to the specific details of
20 each particular phase or area.

1 Like I said, that type of thing takes
2 time to do. You frequently can't go out and just
3 start working, based on a conceptual approach;
4 because even if you use a regional approach,
5 because when you get down to the actual individual
6 sites and bases, they are obviously going to be
7 different.

8 That is where you start generating
9 more technical memos and things like that, and
10 that has been kind of my experience from that
11 point of view.

12 But it is confusing. You say "This
13 is the Work Plan we're going to do; this is how we
14 think we're going to do it; but we have to kind of
15 fill in a lot of the details as we go."

16 MR. MC DONALD: Once funding is
17 secured, how quickly would the work take place if
18 there is supplemental funding in '96 or if it is
19 postponed until fiscal year '97? Once it takes
20 place, how long do you envision that it would take

1 to complete this phase of the project?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Ernie, I think
3 basically, as far as the work goes, that is
4 probably already the scope of the work. It is
5 pretty well defined. I think, once funding is
6 turned on, the work can be turned out.

7 You may want to elaborate a little
8 more -- when it will start out; how long will it
9 take?

10 MR. MC DONALD: If during fiscal '96
11 supplemental funding in a sufficient amount is
12 available, would you envision that the work would
13 commence within 30 days, 60 days, 90 days?

14 MR. GALANG: Thirty days, because of
15 the contract.

16 MR. MC DONALD: What is your sense of
17 the time frame, once the work commences, to
18 complete the work and have the final reports done?

19 MR. GALANG: That probably depends on
20 the amount of funding we get. That directly

1 correlates with the amount of samples taken from
2 the pile.

3 MR. ALLISON: If we were fully
4 funded, the sampling just for the offshore area
5 would take approximately about 20 days in the
6 field. Then we have a 35-day turnaround time for
7 tests and analysis, and then we would have to
8 prepare the report based on that. So I'm not sure
9 how long.

10 MS. TOBIAS: It is approximately six
11 months, determining what bioassays get done.

12 MR. ALLMAN: My question is
13 concerning the installation and restoration sites
14 versus the other ones, compliance sets, as
15 distinguished from the documents.

16 Could you go into a little more
17 detail which commences reference sites which would
18 not be IR sites?

19 MR. ALLISON: I have not reviewed
20 them really specifically, but a few comments

1 concerning some areas of YBI that are not part of
2 the restoration installation program.

3 And the receptors there, or the
4 contamination, potential contamination, has not
5 been sampled under the restoration program, and we
6 would not be doing that as far as the Ecological
7 Risk Assessment.

8 We only have a few IR sites over
9 there at YBI. Some areas north of Treasure Island
10 as well.

11 MR. ALLMAN: So you are saying, when
12 you are studying the impacts, you are not
13 considering those areas?

14 MR. ALLISON: We don't have any
15 information as far as contamination for these
16 areas; and under this program, we would consider
17 any receptors that may wander over the IR sites as
18 potential receptors.

19 MR. ALLMAN: What about as far as
20 looking at the impacts of dredging operations and

1 any kind of remediation work that might affect,
2 for example, a haul-out site?

3 MS. SMITH: It is part of the Basin
4 Plan.

5 MR. ALLMAN: Is it covered under the
6 Marine Sanctuary?

7 MS. SMITH: The Basin Plan is for
8 determining benthic organisms.

9 MR. ALLISON: All that stuff comes up
10 in the feasibility study aspect once we determine
11 remediation is necessary.

12 MR. ALLMAN: It does not have to be
13 considered under this work?

14 MR. ALLISON: No. Once we determine
15 remediation, we have a feasibility study and
16 prepare another report.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Are you going to do
18 operations below?

19 MR. ALLISON: That's all part whether
20 remediation is the best thing to do or whether you

1 are causing more damage than you're doing good for
2 the environment, so the things will be addressed.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: My question is, since
4 you're taking a regional approach and there are
5 still six or eight large areas that are left
6 undefined, what is the timeline for the other
7 areas? In other words, even though we don't start
8 our work in a year, the other areas may be
9 starting up sooner; and therefore the decisions in
10 those areas can be made quicker.

11 And the second part of that question
12 is, will all of the RABs have an opportunity to
13 review those criteria before they are settled?

14 MR. ALLISON: As Gina said, what will
15 happen, the sites that we are going to be sampling
16 soonest will be the ones that push the schedule
17 for that regional approach.

18 There will be technical memorandums
19 come out in the areas we still need to determine.
20 Those will be submitted to the RABs at those

1 sites.

2 We can discuss with the Navy whether
3 we want to put that out to other people on every
4 signup sheet.

5 MS. SMITH: Because this document
6 does state that you're going to use criteria
7 developed at Mare Island, and we don't have a
8 right to talk on those issues. Only Mary Rose
9 Cassa has a right to talk on those issues.

10 MS. KATHURIA: This is the regional
11 approach, the same screening method levels will be
12 used at Treasure Island.

13 MS. SMITH: But we're not happy with
14 some of the screening levels that are being
15 reviewed.

16 MS. KATHURIA: They have not been
17 developed yet; and once we have a level of what
18 the values are going to be, we expect a tech memo
19 from the Navy, which everyone will have an
20 opportunity to comment on.

1 It is probably in the best interests
2 of the Navy to circulate those RAB-wide, since it
3 is going to be a regional approach.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: I would support that.

5 MS. SMITH: Otherwise we're just a
6 rubber stamp; we're going to come here and waste
7 our time here; and you are going to make decisions
8 at other sites that have a timeline before ours;
9 and you say, "Oh, it's regional;" and we don't
10 have any right to comment, just going to
11 rubber-stamp you.

12 MS. SHIRLEY: I support sharing those
13 documents as early as possible with the other
14 RABs.

15 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I think the question
16 is, wherever you go to the regional approach, to
17 the site-specific approach, dealing with those,
18 and that is really a critical issue.

19 Does this document stay at a draft
20 final until those particular levels are

1 established?

2 MR. ALLISON: No, I'm not sure how
3 that is going to work out; but the main thing is
4 that we are site-specific about things like
5 sampling locations; and that is the primary
6 thing -- the rest is going to be pretty much
7 standardized in the regional approach.

8 We do not see changing the Work Plan
9 unless there is comments, and we have decided to
10 change that.

11 MR. ALLMAN: The biology is going to
12 be drastically different between TI and Hunters
13 Point.

14 MR. ALLISON: But, actually, the
15 biology is not driving our sampling location. It
16 is the site-specific contamination that is driving
17 our sampling location. Stormwater outfalls.

18 MR. ALLMAN: As far as receptors?

19 MR. ALLISON: The Bay Area receptors,
20 as far as the types of tests you can run

1 bioassays, there are regional species that are
2 very good throughout the regional areas; and we
3 provide a table on that.

4 MS. KATHURIA: The Water Board has
5 been doing testing throughout the Bay, and there
6 are a few tests that we find you can reproduce --
7 they are standard; they're good indicators of
8 toxic effects and also reproducible. If you do
9 the same test a couple of times, you get the same
10 answer.

11 MR. ALLMAN: And there is large
12 data --

13 MS. SMITH: But your first document
14 completely ignored that whole set of literature.

15 You were going to bring in laboratory
16 animals from Puget Sound, and you were going to
17 use them instead.

18 That is why I am having a problem
19 with regional approach and our lack of input into
20 it, because we are behind all the other agencies.

1 MR. ALLISON: I'm sorry, I don't
2 quite understand that comment; but there is
3 sections in this report and the first report that
4 specify what types of bioassays we will be using,
5 why the species are chosen, and what makes them
6 good bioassays.

7 MS. SMITH: I would strongly disagree
8 with that; and if you like, I will write a letter
9 to that effect.

10 The second document is completely
11 different from the first document in that respect.

12 CO-CHAIR HEHN: You might want to do
13 that, Dale, if you have some specific comments on
14 that to address, to make sure they do get
15 addressed.

16 MS. SMITH: I am concerned we are
17 spinning our wheels and wasting our time, that
18 they're going to sit in their little BRAC Cleanup
19 Team meetings and make decisions at other sites;
20 and we won't get to really have any input to what

1 happens here.

2 CO-CHAIR HEHN: That is what we're
3 trying to get out tonight, review those, and find
4 out how that process is going to be handled.

5 MR. ALLMAN: The comment period that
6 we had Thursday, my impression was that is for
7 that purpose, if there is something in the
8 regional approach that is not being addressed that
9 we think is important here. I don't see any
10 reason why it can't be made site-specific in that
11 respect. I thought now was the time that we are
12 making the comments to that effect, what was
13 insufficient in the Ecological Risk Assessment;
14 and I guess I'm not quite clear on where we are
15 not getting the opportunity to input.

16 MS. SMITH: Methodology and levels of
17 contamination and cleanup levels, that is all in
18 the document; and they're going to use Mare Island
19 as their jumping-off point; and we won't get to
20 comment on Mare Island.

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

MR. ALLMAN: We can in several places we have that we want more specifics in these areas.

MS. SMITH: But we're not going to get it, probably.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Gina is talking about the ones that we need to review that are more site specific, is that correct, that we can talk about the screen levels for Treasure Island?

Those are regional, but at least there will be some kind of screen level that we can address versus the general comment about that.

MS. KATHURIA: The variation is where you take your sample, but the rest will be standardized, which is a very good thing, because it makes decisions easier to take in the Bay Area for the health of the Bay.

MS. SHIRLEY: I wonder, if you're taking a regional approach, if it would be possible to have regional workshops, instead of

1 doing the workshops site specifically, if they
2 were held a more open-invitation type of thing?

3 MS. SMITH: This is regional. We
4 should not be site specific.

5 MR. ALLISON: I agree.

6 MS. KATHURIA: That is a good idea.
7 We're trying to accelerate the work plans for
8 different sites. When we have reports, we like
9 the smaller group. The more interaction we can
10 have, again, it is a regional approach; and that
11 is a good idea.

12 MR. ALLISON: As it is now, it has
13 been somewhat regional in the sense that it is the
14 same regulatory team, the same people.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: The same RAB members
16 are not -- so you're saying -- I wonder if it
17 might not be more efficient if the RAB members got
18 invitations or notification of the other
19 workshops, so we can get in on it a little bit
20 earlier?

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

MR. ONGERTH: Does not get ARC Ecology attend all of these?

MS. SHIRLEY: Well, we go to all of them. I am only ARC Ecology; I am not -- there is a person from the office that goes to Mare Island.

MS. SMITH: There is a lot of different sites and a lot of different issues; and if they're going to get together and make a regional decision and chop us up into site-specifics, I'm saying it makes it real easy for you to override our concerns.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Well, it's still a matter that we have the opportunity to comment on, Dale; and that is the important part, that we want to make sure that we have the opportunity to address those issues and those particular screen levels, or whatever those are, as they are specific to Treasure Island.

If we don't agree with the screening levels that are presented on a regional level for

1 Treasure Island, we need to express that in our
2 comments; and that is what it comes down to.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: I think we need to get
4 involved early in understanding what those levels
5 are and how they're being developed.

6 CO-CHAIR HEHN: And I think that is
7 why we do count on a lot of you folks that have
8 this type of expertise. I don't, and I don't
9 understand it at all. People like Dale and you,
10 Chris, that have that type of expertise, that
11 understand that much better, and the more
12 documents that we get that are part of that plan,
13 the better you will have a chance to respond to
14 those. We might need ongoing dialogue.

15 MR. ALLISON: I think that the main
16 issue is the regional approach to the areas that
17 are still under question, and you want to be
18 involved in helping determine in the early
19 process.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: Not so much determine,

1 but have an opportunity to comment on them and
2 understand them; so by the time they come around
3 here, we understand how it fits into the regional
4 approach.

5 MS. SMITH: Why you came to a
6 particular decision.

7 MR. ALLISON: A couple of things
8 here:

9 I can see your point on that.

10 The other thing is, if we have a
11 Technical Subcommittee meeting, where we really go
12 through the work plan and discuss it a little more
13 what is site specific and what is regional, I
14 think that helps everyone understand a little bit
15 more, too; and I don't think there is time here to
16 do it tonight.

17 MS. KATHURIA: Mare Island Eco
18 Workshop, we looked at data to derive the
19 screening level to get into more thinking, how are
20 we going to do this? Where are we looking and

1 getting the data that would be interesting to get
2 a preview of what we're working on?

3 MR. MC DONALD: Which specific site
4 is first to have this work plan completed? Is
5 Mare Island leading the region?

6 MR. ALLISON: Currently Mare Island
7 is leading the way, I think.

8 MR. MC DONALD: And when is its work
9 plan scheduled to commence? Where are you in that
10 process?

11 MR. ALLISON: The work plan has been
12 submitted and been reviewed, and I forget when the
13 actual date is.

14 MS. KATHURIA: We're looking at
15 February, March.

16 CO-CHAIR HEHN: For approval of the
17 work plan or review of the work plan?

18 MS. KATHURIA: To go into the field.

19 MS. SMITH: So the work plan has been
20 approved?

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

MS. KATHURIA: We are meeting in
January to go over our comments.

MR. MC DONALD: Are there aspects of
that work plan that, once finalized, will be used
on this regional basis for Treasure Island and
maybe Alameda and other places that would,
perhaps, include further discussion on it?

Are these regional approaches going
to, in effect, be cast in concrete?

MR. ALLISON: As far as that work
plan stands now, there are no criteria proposed,
that have been agreed upon, that would be applied
to this site.

The thing that is going to be applied
to the site and has been in this work plan is the
approach. Once the approach has been agreed upon,
it will be most likely applied to other sites.

MR. MC DONALD: The broad approach is
consistent, but specific data set is not?

MR. ALLISON: Has not been developed.

1 MS. SMITH: You have not developed
2 human hazard levels? You have not developed any
3 kind of threshold for contamination that creates
4 problems for humans at Mare Island?

5 MR. ALLISON: This is an ecological
6 risk assessment. We are not looking at human
7 health right now.

8 MS. SMITH: Have you addressed those
9 thresholds?

10 MR. ALLISON: Those are the screening
11 criteria that will be developed by the regulatory
12 agencies.

13 MS. SMITH: So that part has not been
14 done?

15 MR. ALLISON: Correct. Those are
16 issues we are talking about, submitting to various
17 RABs to review.

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Let me ask you a
19 quick question on one of the issues here:

20 Timo, you mentioned earlier about the

1 Regional Water Quality Control Board was driving
2 the process for the cleanup of skeet range
3 control?

4 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

5 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Can you give us a
6 little more information where that particular
7 issue is? Is it under a Cleanup Abatement Order?

8 MS. KATHURIA: Correct. It was
9 adopted in 1993.

10 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Give us a brief
11 rundown of where we are at with that particular
12 site. What is your proposal?

13 MS. KATHURIA: Sediment biological
14 characterization and based on data obtained
15 through those characterizations, we will decide
16 how to remedy the problem, if there is one.

17 Basically that is what the order
18 said. We have been preparing the tasks and the
19 work plan presented, and they seem very
20 consistent.

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

CO-CHAIR HEHN: We are at the sediment sampling stage. I got the impression you were talking about cleanup.

MR. ALLISON: No.

MS. KATHURIA: We have not obtained samples yet.

MR. ALLISON: Part of the reasons we are pushing the skeet range, we're currently doing field work at other sites; and we have the capability of sampling at the end of those projects very quickly, save the Navy a little money by doing that in concurrence.

That is the only offshore sampling that has been funded and that we are proposing doing before.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Do you know if any of the other offshore skeet range issues have been finalized? Have they decided how those are going to be addressed or what is the general consensus at that point?

1 MS. KATHURIA: I am not sure exactly.

2 There were approximately 20 sites that the order
3 went out to, and most of them have been cleaned up
4 to some degree by now, but I'm not sure.

5 Basically they did a lot of lead removal, real
6 lead pieces, dredging.

7 I'm not familiar with some of the
8 projects, but I can update at the Eco Workshop
9 what happened at Richmond skeet range and others.

10 MR. ALLMAN: What are the typical
11 lead levels in the sediments?

12 MS. KATHURIA: I don't know off the
13 top of my head.

14 MR. ALLISON: We reviewed some of the
15 other skeet range assessments.

16 MS. KATHURIA: Another site was at AS
17 Alameda. They were under order to do that.

18 MR. ALLISON: That is being proposed
19 in the next one.

20 MR. ONGERTH: Paul, I'm puzzling over

1 what may be labeled as a procedural issue but may
2 be broader than that.

3 These things we're talking about are
4 all subject to compliance with the regulatory
5 agencies. They have in their operations set
6 goals, standards, objectives -- all of the
7 criteria that are relevant to an issue being
8 considered, as I understand it.

9 What is being suggested here in this
10 discussion by some is that perhaps the regulatory
11 agencies are not covering all the bases
12 adequately, if I could use a label that they might
13 consider perjorative, not adequately covering the
14 basis.

15 Then, is the issue one for us to
16 discuss in this RAB process here, or is the issue
17 with each of the regulatory agencies, their
18 governing groups, with relation to a possible
19 challenge of what standards they're setting?

20 To what extent does RAB go out on its

1 own to tackle these things, and at what point does
2 it make more sense to be challenging the
3 regulatory agencies, not with the genius that
4 appear here, but with the policymakers, especially
5 the Regional Board, in this case, that ultimately
6 sets all of these standards?

7 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Let me address that.

8 One, I don't think that we have
9 really seen any of the comments from the
10 regulatory agencies on the particular documents,
11 so we don't know where they stand on these
12 particular issues.

13 But all we can do as a public
14 response committee is to offer our comments and
15 our concerns and our issues that we see in
16 reviewing those documents to this process, so that
17 those issues hopefully will be addressed or at
18 least answered.

19 And that's basically our role, which
20 is to bring those issues up; and if they're

1 covered by regulatory agencies, great. But all we
2 want to do is make sure that the issues and the
3 concerns that we have are brought up in a public
4 forum so that we get that kind of feedback.

5 I can't speak for the regulators, but
6 that is sort of our role. What we are doing is
7 expressing our concerns and our comments on the
8 same document.

9 MR. ONGERTH: What impact will we
10 have on what ultimately occurs in these cases,
11 any?

12 MS. CASSA: I would like to take a
13 stab at this.

14 I think that the way a lot of the
15 regulatory literature is put forth is that the
16 desired end point is set forth, but how that point
17 is achieved is flexible. I think that allows for
18 developing technology. You don't have to change
19 the laws every year to get that done.

20 So what is required is that the

1 regulatory agencies need to agree with the
2 responsible party that the methods to achieve
3 those end goals are appropriate, whether it is
4 policy analysis or pure water assay, things like
5 that. That is the question that is being asked
6 here: Are the approaches to the desired end point
7 appropriate?

8 That is exactly where an organization
9 like the RAB fits in, because you people have
10 knowledge and expertise that contribute to the
11 existing body of expertise among the regulators
12 and, in this case, the Navy and their consultants.

13 So if you people hearing reports know
14 that X process did not work 25 times down at that
15 site, that is useful information that we might not
16 be aware of. I think it is very important for the
17 community and the RAB to comment on this, and that
18 is an important role you play.

19 Now, the question is the end point
20 that is set by the regulators; is it appropriate?

1 That has to be addressed at a higher level, but
2 we're basically operating with the assumption that
3 the objective of looking at impacts to the aquatic
4 environment is pretty well defined, but how we
5 determine those impacts is what is being addressed
6 in this work plan.

7 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I think one of the
8 biggest problems that I perceive here, there seems
9 to be a general lack of understanding of how this
10 whole process is going to take part; and I think
11 that the questions that we're getting in our
12 Technical Subcommittee and also that are being
13 expressed tonight are sort of the same issue. We
14 don't understand how the whole process is going to
15 take place.

16 That's what we're struggling with,
17 and we're trying to understand how you will make
18 that happen, and we want to be sure that that
19 understanding is complete and that we at least
20 know how you are going about it, and have the

1 opportunity to respond to that.

2 I think that's one of the things that
3 stuck out in my mind when we had the Technical
4 Subcommittee meeting. There were a lot of
5 questions, "How is it going to be done?" They
6 were not addressed to the work plan, so those are
7 the issues we're bringing up now, and we want to
8 make sure they are being addressed.

9 MR. ALLISON: That's why I stressed
10 the importance to have an Eco Workshop at Mare
11 Island, because the RAB presented very much the
12 same issues, and we got together, and we were very
13 focused in answering a lot of those concerns, and
14 I think it helped a lot.

15 CO-CHAIR HEHN: How do the people on
16 the Technical Subcommittee feel about having an
17 additional workshop on the Ecological Risk
18 Assessment, maybe in January?

19 MR. FOSTER: I would be opposed to
20 that.

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

The whole purpose of the RAB-
commentary-type of process is that the more people
who are making reasonable comments into things,
the less likely is the chance that something is
going to be missed or overlooked.

But, of course, at the same time,
whether you're coming at a regional issue or
you're coming specifically at types of
site-specific issues, certain methodologies, like,
for instance, dealing with skeet ranges and stuff
like that, are much more defined; and there is
more experience in dealing with those type of
things, for instance.

That is why some sites get moved
along faster than others, which involve more
contamination and harder processes to investigate
them; and that is, in fact, why they are in the
process of actually developing screening criteria,
because it is such a long, drawn-out process,
simply because you can't use the nationwide EPA

1 criteria because of the fact that it is not
2 regionally specific; and in order to establish
3 those things, you have to use good site methods
4 and procedures that have to be approved; and then
5 the agencies have to agree with those procedures;
6 and you have to run the test, and the samples, and
7 things to do that.

8 Basically, I think, from what I have
9 seen in the work plan, I think the approach is
10 fine; but I know, just from my own experience,
11 that many times you have to kind of find out how
12 you can develop the regional and specific criteria
13 that you need to actually start doing the numbers
14 on, actual values that you're going to go out and
15 collect.

16 That is where you have to turn to the
17 regional boards and the federal agencies, who are
18 the ones that are trying to develop that.

19 Sometimes it takes more time than you have. In
20 the meantime, all you can refer to is, "Well, we

1 are developing the criteria."

2 That doesn't mean people can't
3 comment once we come up with some sort of number.

4 MR. ALLMAN: A workshop is if
5 somebody want to be educated further on what the
6 plan is about. I think that should be available,
7 because people have different areas of expertise.
8 Some people, like yourself, having done this kind
9 of work as your field that you practice in, feel
10 very comfortable in reading a document like that,
11 what a target receptor species is, and the
12 terminology that is used.

13 And I understand a lot of chemical
14 aspects of things that other people may not
15 understand.

16 I think people reading through the
17 documents want to understand what the purpose of
18 the document is, why this particular study is done
19 this way; and we can't do that in a setup like
20 this; because then you have everybody ask

1 questions and we never leave; and the Technical
2 Subcommittee meetings are designed as to what
3 people have felt about having read the documents,
4 what they're reading, they're commenting, and
5 asking some questions along the way.

6 But the idea is to educate people as
7 to what is being done, so I think it is a good
8 idea to have a workshop. I think it should be
9 done at a time period where there is still
10 opportunity to ask about, "Well, why this species?
11 Isn't this species being studied? Why isn't this
12 area being studied, even though it is not part of
13 the IR?"

14 Layout for the property, we should
15 look at, that it is for these reasons, that is
16 something we should go out and understand with
17 knowledge, if people want it.

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Do we have a
19 consensus that this would be a good thing to do
20 for this particular document, assuming that we

1 have had some opportunity to add comments as we go
2 along in this process; is that correct?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

4 CO-CHAIR HEHN: So we will go ahead
5 and set up a time for an additional workshop on
6 the Ecological Risk Assessment and bring a lot of
7 these issues to the table and see if we can't get
8 them hammered out.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We tentatively
10 scheduled one for January 30th, which seems like
11 it is going to work. It is a tentative date, and
12 we will set that, and then get information out to
13 everyone. That will allow us plenty of time to
14 get ready, as well as to have other regulatory
15 specialists available at the workshop.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: What day of the week is
17 that?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Tuesday.

19 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Would it be possible
20 to also get the regulators to make comments on

1 this same document?

2 MR. FOSTER: I think it would. A lot
3 of times I found the regulatory comments to be
4 rather good, explaining what they're trying to
5 say, because a lot of times they are not only
6 commenting back to the technical people, but a lot
7 of times there are other people in between that
8 have to see these and, due to their experience,
9 have gotten good at it.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Paul and I can
11 work to get copies of the regulators' comments to
12 these people who have been reviewing the
13 Ecological Work Plan.

14 With that, we can take a break.

15 (Recess taken.)

16 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One of the things I
17 would like to bring up, we have the list of
18 proposed educational topics, that we discussed a
19 meeting or so ago, that Brad put together.

20 Talking to Jim, there was some

1 question about what sort of priority would we, as
2 RAB members, like to see as educational topics.

3 Let's pass these around; and what I
4 would ask you to do is put the ones to prioritize
5 by number on the left-hand margin as to what
6 topics you would be most interested in having
7 presented as an educational topic, and get them
8 back to me by the end of the meeting, or fax them
9 to me or Brad, and we will compile that and work
10 with the Navy regulators to try to prioritize the
11 educational issues and come up with a list for
12 what sort of things we ought to do first.

13 Please get these back to me at your
14 convenience.

15 MR. FOSTER: I was going to make a
16 quick, real minor comment:

17 I have faxed some information on a
18 couple of pesticides to Paul, and two of the
19 pictures did not actually come there, and that is
20 in the memorandum packet that you have of

1 comments.

2 I since found the two pages on
3 heptachloride, the first two pages of the section
4 of the document that I did give both to PRC and
5 then the Navy; and he is going to try to send
6 those out.

7 When you're looking through this
8 document, after some handwritten notes of mine,
9 then you come to this published sheet of this
10 document where I got them from, and then you come
11 to just a printed page, and it is like, well, what
12 does this mean?

13 The two pages, the title of the
14 section for that particular chemical, those two
15 pages are contained there. It makes a little more
16 sense when you get towards the end, and you come
17 to the toxic fluoride, and there is a title page
18 here on heptachloride. For what it is worth, you
19 will get those, so you won't be confused.

20 I got some additional information

1 that PRC or the Navy could use on those particular
2 items, that would be helpful; and I probably will
3 submit some others. I will give some other
4 toxicity information to PRC that they can use at
5 their leisure.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next we want to
7 move into a discussion of the UST Report.

8 Originally we were going to have a
9 Navy presentation and have a representative from
10 our technical consultant, who's working on the job
11 from ERM West; but in the last couple of days, in
12 talking to Paul and Brad and the comments on the
13 ecological, I anticipated that we would probably
14 spend more time, there would be more interest on
15 the ecological at this meeting than on the UST.

16 Rather than try to cram both topics
17 into this meeting, especially since we're going to
18 have one or more guests attending who don't
19 regularly attend these meetings in their entirety,
20 I deferred a more detailed presentation on the UST

1 program until next month, until January.

2 So I just wanted to say in its place
3 a few things about the UST report, and then take
4 any comments that you might have at this time, in
5 order to help us better prepare for a presentation
6 and discussion at the 23 January meeting.

7 MR. ALLMAN: Which is also the day
8 that our comments will be due. Is the
9 presentation on the UST just going to be for
10 review of how the plan was put together, what has
11 been determined; or is it intended to help us
12 understand what is going on with it?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It can really
14 accomplish both, and I think if there is interest
15 by the RAB members in further extending that
16 comment period, this is a situation with the UST
17 program where again we won't have funding to do
18 cleanup at this time; so while we would like to
19 complete the document, we are under less of a time
20 constraint than if we were ready to go out into

1 the field to do either an investigation or a
2 cleanup; so you have some latitude.

3 MR. ALLMAN: That sounds reasonable,
4 as long as you're going to devote more time for
5 comments, if something comes up in the discussion
6 that seems like a red flag of some sort.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The report that
8 was provided for review is the UST Investigation
9 and Corrective Measures Study, but it addresses
10 eight UST sites, and this is really the beginning
11 of what may be several reports on UST.

12 These are not the only eight; they
13 are the farthest along in the program.

14 In addition to that, we have some
15 additional tanks that will be investigated at a
16 later date, as well as tanks where we are going to
17 propose no further action.

18 So both of those, no further action
19 and the additional investigations, will be
20 provided in future documents.

1 And then, lastly, those tanks that
2 are being investigated under the UST program,
3 which these eight tanks represent, but there are
4 also former tank sites that are a part of our IR
5 sites, which are being investigated as part of
6 that particular installation restoration site.

7 So in the remedial investigation
8 reports that we will be looking at through this
9 next year, those tank sites that are inside of the
10 footprint of an installation restoration site will
11 be included with that IR site.

12 These eight tanks, which we provided
13 the review document for now, are really the
14 beginning of a series of reports on USTs and fuel-
15 related issues, so these won't be the last
16 documents.

17 MS. SMITH: Is there, therefore, a
18 previous document that discusses the overall
19 methodology much the way the Ecological Risk Plan
20 has an attempt to make overall theory behind the

1 individual sites, or is this one just going to be
2 a site-by-site remediation?

3 MS. KATHURIA: Commonly, UST tanks
4 that are pulled, the Water Board policy, the
5 Regional Board guidelines are very standard in the
6 way they pull a tank.

7 MS. SMITH: I understand it is very
8 standard the way they pull a tank. Some tanks are
9 going to be left in place. I am just wondering if
10 there is a previous document that we have not
11 received that you are using for guidelines to
12 determine how you go about remediating various
13 tanks, or is this just a site-by-site assessment,
14 and then you make a decision, "we're going to pull
15 it; we're going to fill it with sand; we're going
16 to do whatever?"

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is a good
18 question, and I don't have an answer for you right
19 now, and this is a good opportunity at this
20 meeting to hear these kinds of questions so that

1 we can be able to answer that for you at the 23
2 January meeting.

3 MS. SMITH: There is not a previous
4 document in which you laid out some kind of
5 guidelines for how you handled all your tanks?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, not
7 specifically.

8 But I think maybe in expanding on
9 your question, what we may want to do, what we can
10 do for the next meeting is to identify any past
11 documents related to the USTs as background, if
12 I'm reading the question.

13 I think I understand what you are
14 after, and this gives us an opportunity between
15 this month and next month to address that.

16 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One of the things we
17 have not got on this agenda, this refers to the
18 tank pulls that were done by PRC mostly in '92 and
19 '93, so we don't have some of those documents. If
20 there are some tank pull reports as part of that,

1 that might be part of that.

2 MS. KATHURIA: It is called a summary
3 report. Once you pull a tank and you have taken a
4 sampling, you write a summary of what you did and
5 what the sample indicated, and that is all the
6 summary report states.

7 Most of that data is summarized in
8 this report. I felt comfortable in reviewing this
9 data in light of the previous data that was
10 presented.

11 CO-CHAIR HEHN: It presents a
12 background of that particular tank pull and what
13 the rules were.

14 But if someone would like to review
15 the original documents and the original summary
16 reports --

17 MS. SMITH: It is not so much the
18 summary reports, just to figure out if there was a
19 methodology that we don't know about or strategic
20 plan, a regional strategic plan, even. I would

1 like to know what the methodology was.

2 MS. KATHURIA: Let me clarify. I
3 think I understand your question now.

4 The way you pull a tank and
5 investigate it and decide how to remediate it is
6 site specific. So every tank has a work plan on
7 how it should be remediated.

8 MR. FOSTER: You have to follow laws
9 and regulations on dealing with that particular
10 issue, because every tank is potentially
11 different, and every tank is treated differently
12 as a site-specific plan, too.

13 They follow laws and regulations that
14 they have written to guide that; and so what they
15 do, when tanks are in the Water Board program,
16 they are following those laws and regulations as
17 to how to deal with them.

18 I assume that, short of rewriting the
19 laws now and putting the Navy's "this is what
20 we're going to do" on it, which would be

1 pointless, since the law is already written,
2 that's what they do; and that's what anyone would
3 do.

4 At the Air Force bases, they follow
5 the laws and regulations.

6 MS. SMITH: There are a number of
7 tanks that are going to be abandoned because it is
8 awkward to get to them.

9 MR. FOSTER: Well, they have laws and
10 regulations dealing with them, what to do with
11 them in those situations.

12 But each situation, you have to write
13 that up; and the regulator has to look at it,
14 saying, "This is good; that follows the laws;
15 we'll do that." And they do it tank, by tank, by
16 tank.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: Are you going to
18 incorporate the tidal influence study into that
19 report, because a lot of the tanks -- well,
20 several, three or four of the tanks -- are right

1 in that area of the tidal influence.

2 CO-CHAIR HEHN: That is included in
3 the corrective action.

4 MS. SMITH: Right. Does it affect
5 the corrective measures?

6 MS. KATHURIA: When we look at
7 pathways and migration, we would ask that the UST
8 program --

9 MS. SHIRLEY: The report was
10 published in November 1995. The UST report was
11 before that. I'm wondering if that was going to
12 be incorporated?

13 MS. KATHURIA: You remember I
14 reviewed the UST report, so I will be looking for
15 that.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: My other question is
17 about fuel lines. Where do they fit in? Are they
18 considered a tank?

19 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

20 MR. FOSTER: It is a weird looking

1 tank.

2 MS. KATHURIA: The UST regulations
3 apply to all distributions.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I think
5 that we're really getting deeper into the UST
6 program than we have been able to in the past in
7 the RAB; and I think this next meeting and
8 subsequent meetings throughout 1996, we're going
9 to be spending more time on fuels-related issues;
10 and we're going to find fuels-related issues are
11 really the dominant issue at Treasure Island,
12 whether it is within an IR site or outside of it.

13 We're also going to take up the issue
14 of possibly moving the fuel-related site out of
15 the CERCLA program and into the UST program, and
16 we want to engage the RAB in that discussion, too.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: But that reminds me of
18 one other question you might not be able to
19 address here, and that is some of the tanks in
20 that UST Corrective Study are quite near IR sites,

1 and I was wondering, one or two of the ones that
2 will be pumped in order to remediate are right
3 near IR sites.

4 I was wondering what kind of analysis
5 is done about drawing the contaminants from the IR
6 sites into the -- is that possible, or how is it
7 evaluated?

8 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Whether that is the
9 appropriate corrective measure to deal with that
10 site.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Because it seemed to me
12 the corrective actions report dealt with each tank
13 as an individual entity, and it did not really
14 consider what was surrounding it.

15 So that is the first question.

16 One of the biggest questions that
17 came to mind, how does it fit with the surrounding
18 corrective action?

19 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One of the things I
20 would like to see us try to address at the

1 intermediate meeting and also at the January
2 meeting, it seems as though, from our review,
3 there were not a lot of false constituents in the
4 groundwater, especially this particular part of
5 the Island, but very significant concentrations of
6 diesel in the groundwater.

7 I wanted to keep this in mind, how
8 those were going to be addressed by the Regional
9 Board and how the Regional Board felt about those.

10 Also, there seems to be a lot of
11 groundwater monitor wells that have been installed
12 in the area of former tanks, but nothing has been
13 sampled at this point, and should those be
14 included in the monitoring program, since there
15 are significant levels of diesel in the
16 groundwater?

17 There seems to be kind of a hole in
18 this part of the Island where there is no
19 sampling.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: That reminds me of

1 another question:

2 In the steady transport analysis,
3 could you consider the location of utility
4 trenches and storm drains and that kind of thing?

5 MS. KATHURIA: We look at all
6 pathways.

7 MR. FOSTER: Those actual structures
8 are some of the more obvious ones in my
9 experience.

10 Even just a lot of times just
11 underground debris that is consistent and
12 continuous, like fuel-bearing pipes and stuff like
13 that that act as channels, that is part of the
14 pathway process in my experience.

15 MR. MC DONALD: I have a couple of
16 questions about the funding for the UST, the
17 fuel-pipe removal program.

18 Is that funding also like the
19 Ecological Risk Assessment funding in that it
20 might be available, there might be funding

1 available sometime during the fiscal year 1996;
2 and if so, once the report is completed, would
3 work begin shortly thereafter?

4 If it was fully funded, how long
5 would it take to complete the removal of those
6 eight tanks?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The actual eight
8 tanks in question have actually already been
9 removed. So what we're doing now is evaluating
10 the soil and groundwater conditions as a result of
11 their having been there.

12 We wouldn't be ready to start
13 remediation until much later this year, if it is
14 even this year. One thing, one project that is at
15 the very top of our to-fund list is the removal of
16 fuel lines at Treasure Island. That project, we
17 did complete the construction or destruction plans
18 and specifications for; and it is ready to go.

19 So we would like to remove those
20 lines as soon as funding becomes available, and we

1 are still hopeful that funding might become
2 available at the middle of the government's fiscal
3 year, which will be in the April 1996 time frame,
4 in which case we can still contract out that work
5 during 1996.

6 MR. MC DONALD: How much money are we
7 discussing in that particular project that is
8 already to go?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Somewhere in the
10 \$750,000 to a million dollar range.

11 MS. SMITH: Just for the pipelines?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is for the
13 removal of the pipelines at Treasure Island, and
14 it's close to 10,000 lineal feet, along with any
15 associated soil a given distance from the
16 pipeline. And then, once the pipeline and that
17 much soil is removed, we would evaluate if
18 contamination has moved any further than that.

19 It also involves the cleanout and
20 closure in place of the fuel lines at Yerba Buena

1 Island.

2 MR. MC DONALD: What time frame would
3 that particular project take, given what you know
4 about it today?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is just
6 again off the top of my head. Most
7 construction-type projects, start to finish, like
8 six months or so.

9 I would imagine that if it were
10 funded during 1996, the work would start in the
11 fall of '96 and be completed in the spring of '97.

12 MR. ALLMAN: Does Treasure Island
13 have to fall within the December 1998 deadline for
14 having all the existing tanks either modified or
15 removed or else get fined?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That refers to
17 operating tanks, tanks that are still in use. And
18 we hope that in the next probably within three
19 months to close out our last two active
20 underground storage tanks and pull those. Those

1 are located down the street on the south side of
2 Building 180, and then we are installing or have
3 installed a new above-ground tank to service our
4 fire and security vehicles.

5 So within a few months, we won't have
6 any operating underground storage tanks.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Jim, does it help you
8 to have work plans in place to get funding? In
9 other words, when you go to make your case that
10 you need funding, does it help to have a work plan
11 there that is all approved and ready to go, all
12 out ready to go out the door?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: When funding
14 becomes available, the ability to be able to
15 execute or start the work does factor into whether
16 something is funded or not.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: So it would help you a
18 lot to roll out the work plans throughout right
19 now?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In general, yes.

1 In fact, there is nothing -- in some cases, even
2 if the budget is X number of dollars per year,
3 depending on what occurs in other bases or other
4 parts of the country, if we are ready to do more
5 work than that, we can possibly get more than our
6 original budget.

7 That was real good input, as far as
8 helping us to prepare for a more detailed
9 presentation next month.

10 Next month we will have both the
11 project manager for fuels from EFA West as well as
12 our consultant on the job, ERM West; and we will
13 be able to answer questions in detail.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Will the agencies be
15 able to share what their thinking is on the
16 petroleum at TI?

17 MS. SIMONS: We're looking at
18 removing the petroleum out of the CERCLA process.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I talked to Gina
20 about the petroleum cleanup.

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

MS. SIMONS: The pH cleanup, we could probably talk about generally. We are in the very beginning stages of getting things together, but we could tell you what we have been thinking about.

MS. SHIRLEY: That would be helpful.

MS. SIMONS: And what we will model after.

MR. MC DONALD: One last question:

Is the Navy's intent to proceed with removal of all the tanks or the capping of all the lines or the removal of all the lines, regardless of whatever reuse plan is decided upon by the City of San Francisco?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. If you have an underground vessel, be it a tank or a fuel line, you either have to inactivate it and then reach some sort of closure, either by pulling it or by closing it in place; or if you're going to keep it active, you would have to transfer to

1 someone.

2 The nature of our underground storage
3 tanks and fuel lines at Treasure Island is such
4 that they're not really useful for the future. So
5 we are making plans to inactivate and remove and
6 close everything.

7 MR. MC DONALD: One possible
8 technique that is being considered by the City
9 involves filling of the Island with additional
10 soil and some kind of compaction.

11 Would that process change the Navy's
12 decision about closing tanks and leaving them in
13 place, if indeed there is going to be this process
14 for increasing the elevation of the Island and
15 compacting the soil? Would that change the Navy's
16 perception of what to do?

17 Because it seems as though that
18 process might have a great deal of impact on a
19 site where a tank is closed and left in place.

20 MS. KATHURIA: Once the tank is

1 closed and left in place, there is a desire to
2 change the geologic makeup of that; and you can
3 remove a tank that has been abandoned in place.
4 You can do that.

5 MR. MC DONALD: Would the Navy then
6 prefer, especially if requested to do so by the
7 City, to proceed with the removal of a tank,
8 knowing that sooner or later this dynamic
9 compaction process is going to take place and that
10 the existence of an abandoned tank could be a
11 problem in terms of the geotechnical work?

12 MS. CASSA: It seems to me that most
13 of the tanks on Treasure Island proper that are
14 likely to be abandoned in place are being done so
15 because there is a building in the way. So I
16 think the Navy is proceeding with the idea that
17 there might be a good chance the building might be
18 used or another building might be used to replace
19 that building, and it is a more remote possibility
20 that everything would be removed first from the

1 Island and the soil replacement action would be
2 taking place.

3 MR. MC DONALD: Are they under the
4 buildings?

5 MS. CASSA: They are physically under
6 the buildings.

7 MR. ALLMAN: How is soil sampling
8 being done?

9 MS. CASSA: Through the floor. That
10 is possibly a thing that the Navy could ponder.

11 MR. MC DONALD: It may or may not be
12 the case that that particular building would be
13 kept. There are a couple of buildings that the
14 City is more likely to keep under current plans,
15 but there are some that may not be in that
16 position, and I'm not able to tell you.

17 MS. CASSA: The cost involved in
18 removing a tank that is currently obstructed by a
19 building would be a great deal higher than the
20 cost that would be incurred when the action to

1 proceed to dump all that soil on the Island would
2 be taken.

3 It seems that all those buildings
4 would be moved out of the way, so it would be a
5 whole lot easier to remove the tanks than it would
6 be to deal with structures that are in the way
7 right now.

8 MR. MC DONALD: I see that could very
9 well be the case if at one point the City chooses
10 to remove the building, the tank might be easily
11 removed at that time.

12 MS. CASSA: In fact, there is
13 building demolition going on, being done at the
14 Naval Supply Center at Cisco, where basically that
15 scenario happened. Lots of underground structures
16 were taken out of the ground at the time that the
17 building was demolished.

18 If you demolish the building, you
19 just don't scrape the surface.

20 MR. FOSTER: A contractor likes to

1 start from square one and remove everything that
2 is in its way, particularly when he wants to put
3 in his own underground facilities.

4 MS. SMITH: Are any of those tanks
5 under the path that are out there that don't have
6 buildings on top of them?

7 There is a large section on the
8 northwest portion of the Island. It is just all
9 foundation. There is no buildings there. For
10 whatever reasons, they were taken out.

11 MS. CASSA: The Fire Training School
12 has lots of concrete on the ground and those tanks
13 in the ground there, but that will all be
14 addressed under remediation of Site 6.

15 MS. SMITH: But that is Site 6.
16 There is other foundations out there that are not
17 part of Site 6. Do they have tanks underneath
18 them?

19 MS. CASSA: This is something that
20 probably be deferred until later. The eight tanks

1 are under existing buildings.

2 MS. KATHURIA: The Board does not
3 like to abandon tanks in place. We prefer it to
4 be removed. So for every abandonment of a tank,
5 there is a site-specific decision to do so; and
6 there has to be very good reason to leave it in
7 place.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: More tanks are
9 being pulled than abandoned, and that is a good
10 question for us to maybe elucidate more on what
11 the criteria is when to abandon and when not to
12 abandon. That is a good question.

13 MR. ALLMAN: It turned out, after the
14 last meeting, I came the next day; and my boss had
15 on my desk the recommendations to improve the
16 cleanup process for California's leaking
17 underground fuel tanks, which is essentially what
18 the Water Board talked about in its presentation
19 last month.

20 This is from Lawrence Livermore,

1 contracted by the Water Quality Board. They went
2 through hundreds of thousands of records of tanks
3 throughout the state that were removed and
4 monitored over a period of time.

5 I was very concerned about the
6 process of bioremediation to remove benzene and
7 fuels from the soil and as a shortcut to avoid
8 spending a lot of money.

9 I'm not absolutely convinced it is
10 the best way. I have not looked into it. But I
11 would like to make it available to other members
12 of the RAB. It's only about 20 pages, and the
13 first page, there is an executive summary section
14 explaining what data we looked at, the percentage
15 of tanks that actually had benzene a certain
16 distance away from the tank, and what the actual
17 time scale was before the levels died down.

18 MS. KATHURIA: What is the comment
19 period on that?

20 MR. ALLMAN: This came out on October

1 16th, 1995. I'm not sure there is a comment
2 period. This is basically recommendations that
3 were made by Livermore, a group of scientists from
4 Livermore, of UC Davis, UC Berkely, UCLA, and
5 Santa Barbara, at the request of the State Water
6 Resources Control Board.

7 The recommendations were made to
8 improve and streamline the decision-making
9 process; and what they found, many companies were
10 run bankrupt by having to follow the older UST
11 procedures and finding out later that the
12 contaminants would not have penetrated if they are
13 under the water table underground or into
14 adjoining property; and there was a lot of
15 unnecessary destruction caused to people in
16 businesses by having those in place.

17 The reason I bring it up, people may
18 want to read it. It is short, right to the point.
19 It made me much less nervous about the concept of
20 cutting back on the amount of remediation that

1 would be done on these tanks, whether removed or
2 left in place.

3 It is based on a huge amount of data.
4 It is a good statistical evaluation.

5 MR. ONGERTH: Could the Navy
6 reproduce it for us?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we can do
8 that.

9 MR. ALLMAN: I brought an extra copy,
10 something else that might be useful to some
11 people, California underground storage tank
12 regulations that you referred to last week in the
13 water quality talk, and it is basically 80 pages,
14 but it is not 80 pages explaining what the
15 regulations are, but what might be more useful,
16 while I have to read that, I would probably read
17 this nice friendly version here, which is the
18 plain English version of the California
19 underground storage tank regulations.

20 This was put together by the State

1 Water Resources Control Board in March of 1993.
2 It is a little outdated for some specifics; but
3 glancing through it, it is a good overview, in
4 plain English, of what the reasons were for the
5 regulations; and so people are not as nervous as
6 to what is going on; because this is something
7 most people did not think about underground
8 storage tanks before.

9 CO-CHAIR HEHN: That would be one of
10 the things we would want to address in looking at
11 some of the remediation options for hydrocarbons,
12 the emerging changes in state and local
13 regulations.

14 The State Board is now addressing
15 those particular recommendations by Lawrence
16 Livermore and taking those into consideration in
17 part of Resolution 92-49 as to how to modify --

18 MS. KATHURIA: In addition, we're
19 also working on guidance how to implement some of
20 the recommendations that came out of the Lawrence

1 Livermore paper, so we are currently working on
2 that. That should be coming out in January.

3 CO-CHAIR HEHN: It will help a lot as
4 to what some of the options are for remediation of
5 hydrocarbons in groundwater.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: Are there hearings
7 coming up about those changes that you could
8 apprise us of?

9 MS. KATHURIA: Sure. We have Board
10 meetings once a month, where the public can
11 comment. They are the third Wednesday of every
12 month. I will try to find out if hearings are
13 coming up.

14 MR. ALLMAN: The copy of the plain
15 English version, that is actually from the State
16 Office. Can you get copies of this? We have
17 eight or so floating around our office.

18 MS. KATHURIA: I don't have that, but
19 I'm pretty sure I can get copies.

20 MS. SMITH: All you have to do is

1 call up. I can call up and request, and they will
2 send you one.

3 MR. ALLMAN: It might be good if we
4 can expedite it for next month's meeting that
5 people may want to look into it and sort of prep
6 themselves.

7 Before I saw this -- it came the day
8 after we heard the presentation -- I saw this, and
9 I really impressed my boss with a lot of new
10 stuff. But it would have been nice to have seen
11 it beforehand.

12 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I appreciate that,
13 and it is a good point that we need to discuss
14 further, either in the interim or the next
15 meeting, to go into more detail.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This was
17 excellent input to help us prepare for our
18 presentation on USTs and fuel-related issues next
19 month.

20 Now, we're moving into the open

1 question, general comment period; so we will open
2 it up to any general discussion that has not been
3 covered by anybody earlier in this meeting, if
4 there is any.

5 With that, we can then move into
6 proposed agenda items for next meeting, for the
7 January meeting.

8 We wanted to devote as much time as
9 possible to the UST and fuel-related issues.
10 That's our proposal.

11 And then, for the February meeting,
12 it appears that we will be involved in the review
13 of changes to the BRAC Cleanup Plan. We may be
14 able to adjust the February meeting date. It
15 would still be the 27th of February.

16 Then we will be working with Paul and
17 Brad on the educational topics.

18 MS. KATHURIA: Could we have the
19 agenda for the Eco Workshop, also, by the next RAB
20 meeting? That would be a week before the

1 workshop. The agenda for the workshop, if that is
2 possible.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can give an
4 example of the agenda. We're still finalizing
5 that agenda. That is probably going to happen
6 after tonight. Due to some vacation schedule. We
7 will give you an agenda ahead of time. I'm not
8 sure it will be available at the next RAB meeting
9 on the 23rd.

10 By the 23rd of January, we will
11 probably have a pretty well wrapped up agenda for
12 the meeting on the 30th.

13 Are there any new action items as a
14 result of tonight's meeting?

15 I have one action item I picked up:

16 It sounds like maybe we could be
17 providing regulators' comments to documents on a
18 more regular basis. That might be helpful.

19 MR. ALLMAN: I think it was the work
20 plan we had regulator comments. It made me feel

1 less guilty for not spending as much time as I
2 wanted to.

3 MS. SIMONS: We read practically
4 every document, comment on it, and they get sent
5 to the Navy. Obviously, a lot of times we get it
6 the same time as you. You should be able to get
7 any comments we make.

8 MR. ALLMAN: Your comment period ends
9 long before our comment period ends.

10 MS. SIMONS: Not necessarily.
11 Sometimes it probably coincides with the RAB
12 meeting, but lately our comment period has been
13 pretty much the same for the work plan. We're
14 finalizing our comments and turning them in this
15 week.

16 MS. SMITH: It would be good to have
17 those.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I agree.
19 Wherever possible, especially when the regulator
20 comment period ends first, we will make regulator

1 comments available on any document.

2 Any other proposed action items?

3 MS. SHIRLEY: To get that report
4 copy.

5 MR. ALLMAN: I have one with me, and
6 a copy of the main English version, and an extra
7 copy of the little more report, but also some
8 other charts and things we pulled together.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Whatever you want
10 to offer me tonight, I can take that for
11 reproduction.

12 MR. ALLMAN: I did not bring another
13 copy of the regulations.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: No, I'm talking about
15 the recommendations.

16 MR. FOSTER: The recommendations in
17 that yellow copy are the English version.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Lawrence
19 Livermore report.

20 MR. ALLMAN: I can give you one copy,

1 and Gina can check the other one. You can
2 reproduce it.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

4 MS. KATHURIA: I will see if I can
5 get a hold of the main English version. If not, I
6 can give you the non-English version.

7 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Is it possible
8 tonight to complete one of our action items, and
9 that was the site map we have been waiting to
10 finalize so that we can assume that all the
11 comments and all the changes that are being
12 requested by the RAB are in at this point, and we
13 can get that completed?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we have a
15 counterproposal. We discussed it during the
16 break, and some of the comments that the DAC had
17 made related to matching up tables with the map,
18 and it looks like we will have a good opportunity
19 to do that during the review of the BRAC Cleanup
20 Plan.

1 I think we would like to ask your
2 indulgence, as it were, since it would be only in
3 February; and I think we will have further time to
4 match up the data with the map and end up with a
5 more accurate product.

6 MR. ALLMAN: When you say "changes?"

7 MS. TOBIAS: There was a table, it
8 has investigative areas, the EBS zone IR sites,
9 and also the UST sites; and when you compare the
10 table to the map, sometimes the UST might show up
11 on one.

12 MR. ALLMAN: Graphical changes.

13 MS. TOBIAS: We want to verify all of
14 it. Basically all the information is prepared by
15 a contractor, so we would like to take the
16 opportunity during the BRAC Cleanup date to make
17 sure everything is correct. We will verify it
18 all.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We should be able
20 to finalize things and do a printing maybe by the

1 end of February.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

3 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Okay, does anybody
4 have a problem with that?

5 MR. JENSEN: This is another item.

6 I think it might be helpful if the
7 Navy could prepare a table for us, listing those
8 USTs that they're proposing to abandon in place
9 and maybe, next to each one, the rationale for
10 that.

11 MS. TOBIAS: That is in the BRAC
12 Cleanup Plan in Chapter 3, a table of all the UST
13 sites. It probably will be updated in the next
14 go-around.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can also
16 address that as part of the discussion next month.

17 With that, we can bring the meeting
18 to a close.

19 Let me just make a few reminders:

20 The upcoming meetings are on the back

1 of the agenda. The next regular meetings are 23
2 January and 27 February.

3 The next mid-month meeting in
4 December, it was at Brad's office, because the
5 City was making a presentation for that month
6 only.

7 The January mid-month community
8 member meeting on the 9th of January will be back
9 in our Administration Building, Building 1, on the
10 second floor, in the conference room where we had
11 previous meetings.

12 The next Citizens' Reuse Committee
13 meeting will be on the 8th of January, and be sure
14 to have a copy in the future, because they mailed
15 a copy by the City of the Alternatives Report. We
16 have had some on the table back there, and here is
17 another one here, if somebody would like to take
18 that tonight.

19 And then the Citizens Reuse Committee
20 Workshop, it was originally tentatively 27

1 January; and it sounds like that date has fallen
2 off and it couldn't be scheduled; so it sounds
3 like the City will have their workshop sometime in
4 February; and that will be on a Saturday. That is
5 a public meeting for the general public, at which
6 you're all invited to attend as well.

7 MS. SMITH: For clarification, the
8 Eco Workshop, that will be here, you think?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To be determined,
10 but it will probably be either here or maybe at
11 the Casa. I'm not sure if we might not have
12 enough room in our conference room; it depends on
13 how many regulators and guests we have.

14 We will stipulate really clearly what
15 the location is. It will either be this building,
16 the Casa, or Building 1.

17 With that, thank you very much; and
18 have a safe and happy holiday.

19 (Whereupon the meeting adjourned at
20 9:30 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PAUL SCHILLER, a duly Certified
Shorthand Reporter No. 1268, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing transcript
constitutes a true, full and correct transcript of
my shorthand notes taken as such reporter of the
proceedings herein and reduced to typewriting
under my supervision and control to the best of my
ability.

DEC 22 1995

(Date)

Paul Schiller

PAUL SCHILLER