

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  
23 JANUARY 1996  
7:00 P.M.  
FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER  
TREASURE ISLAND  
MEETING NO. 18

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR #1268

468

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

ATTENDANTS

U.S. NAVY

- JIM SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
- ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
- HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)
- JOHN PFISTER (UST & Fuel Lines)
- LARRY LIND (UST & Fuel Lines)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

- SHARON TOBIAS
- KATHY WALSH

ERM-WEST, INC.

- LESLIE GOODBODY

REGULATORY AGENCIES

- MARY ROSE CASSA (DTSC)
- GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)
- 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

- JAMES ALDRICH
- JOHN ALLMAN
- ARC ECOLOGY (CHRIS SHIRLEY)
- RICHARD HANSEN
- FRED HAYDEN
- PAUL HEHN
- GARY JENSEN
- DANIEL MAC DONALD
- KAREN MENDELOW
- RICK NEDELL
- PATRICIA NELSON
- HENRY ONGERTH
- DALE SMITH
- THOMAS THOMPSON
- TI CITIZENS REUSE COM. (LAURIE GLASS)
- TI YACHT CLUB (HARLAN VAN WYE)
- BRAD WONG (Community Co-Chair)

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

GUESTS

J. F. SPAGNOLE

VICTOR K. SAIZ

1 (The meeting was called to order at  
2 7:10 p.m. by Co-Chair Sullivan.)

3 CO-CHAIR CULLIVAN: Welcome to our  
4 January 23, 1996 Restoration Advisory Board.

5 I was talking to the manager for  
6 Morale, Welfare and Recreation, that runs the  
7 Nimitz Center; and it looks like it will be our  
8 last season in the Nimitz Center. It is currently  
9 planned to close the Nimitz in December of 1996,  
10 and any meeting after that we would be having over  
11 at the Casa de la Vista, along the Bay, at least  
12 until the base closes, and then to be determined.

13 We have got the heat working and no  
14 leak. In fact, if it gets too warm, I have  
15 control over the heat, so let me know.

16 Our first item is discussion and  
17 approval of tonight's agenda. Everyone should  
18 have received a copy in the mail, but we also do  
19 have extra copies on the table in the back.

20 This marks the first really

1 significant change to the meeting agenda as the  
2 result of discussions that I had with Brad and  
3 other community members.

4 We provided the agenda to move the  
5 cleanup topics up forward towards the beginning of  
6 the meeting and discuss the administrative issues  
7 more towards the close of the meeting.

8 So we welcome your comments on how  
9 this new agenda works, and we can further revise  
10 it, if necessary.

11 Is there any discussion regarding  
12 tonight's agenda?

13 With that, we will call the agenda  
14 approved.

15 The next topic is discussion and  
16 approval of both the November and December meeting  
17 minutes.

18 You might remember at the December  
19 meeting we were unable to -- because of the early  
20 timing of the December meeting -- get the minutes

1 out ahead of the December meeting, so we passed  
2 the November minutes out at the December meeting.  
3 But we have gotten the December meeting minutes  
4 out, and I also have extra copies of the December  
5 meeting minutes at the back table, if anyone needs  
6 it.

7 The floor is open to any discussion  
8 or comment regarding November or December minutes.

9 MR. NEDELL: I believe there is an  
10 error in paragraph 5 of the November 6th meeting  
11 minutes. It reports that the TDS levels for  
12 potential drinking water have to be below 3,000  
13 micrograms per liter. I believe that should be  
14 milligrams per liter.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

16 MS. CASSA: On the December minutes  
17 on page 4, the second bullet, the third line  
18 reads, "other than" -- never mind.

19 I will try the eighth point at the  
20 bottom. There are two times when the word

1 "cleanup abatements" appear, and the word "and"  
2 should be between "cleanup" and "abatements."

3 MS. TOBIAS: I have a comment.

4 What were the dates of those meeting  
5 minutes? Were they RAB minutes?

6 MR. NEDELL: I think it is RPM.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Rick's comments  
8 were regarding the BRAC Cleanup Meeting in  
9 November.

10 MR. NEDELL: Correct, the Remedial  
11 and Feasibility Study.

12 MR. MAC DONALD: I know that John  
13 Allman has some corrections to the minutes he  
14 would like to present. He spoke about it earlier  
15 this afternoon. He clearly intended to be here.  
16 He was delayed by traffic or something else, but I  
17 spoke with him twice this afternoon. He is quite  
18 interested in trying to set the record straight.

19 So if you could allow him to make his  
20 presentation, he also has some information in

1 writing.

2 MS. SMITH: Is it for the November  
3 and the December or the November or the December?

4 MR. MAC DONALD: I am not sure which.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to  
6 recommend that we take any other comments from  
7 those here, and then defer the final acceptance of  
8 the minutes until John arrives later in the  
9 meeting.

10 MS. CASSA: I would like to try my  
11 previous one again.

12 The December meeting, on page 4, the  
13 second bullet, the third line, the parenthesis  
14 reads, "other than terrestrial work at the skeet  
15 range," and I believe it should be "other than the  
16 terrestrial work and the skeet range."

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, with that  
18 we will await the final approval of the November  
19 and December minutes until John is able to present  
20 his comments.

1                   So we will move on, now, to the  
2                   public comment period.

3                   MS. SMITH: No, he is here.

4                   CO-CHAIR WONG: Let's move ahead and  
5                   do the public comment part until John gets  
6                   settled. Then we will come back, anyway. Let's  
7                   go to that part.

8                   MS. MENDELOW: I have a comment.

9                   I want to urge the TI Restoration  
10                  Advisory Board and the Citizens Re-use Committee  
11                  to adopt an ecologic principle of environmental  
12                  sustainability in the redevelopment of Treasure  
13                  Island.

14                  I have written a letter to the CRC to  
15                  express my concerns.

16                  The plans for hotels, casinos, theme  
17                  parks and golf courses are potentially good income  
18                  generators for the tax base but provide no plans  
19                  for sustainability of these projects, which use  
20                  large amounts of natural resources, for example,

1 water, and produce large quantities of solid  
2 waste, for example, throw-away products for food  
3 services at a theme park.

4 The options are basically  
5 service-oriented and leisure development, instead  
6 of providing an ecologically-conscious, mixed-use  
7 development.

8 Some of the ideas I have offered to  
9 CRC include a Bay research ecological observation  
10 facility; a marine aquaculture and fish farm; an  
11 organic biomass production; and Job Corps training  
12 in the environmental monitoring field.

13 Other issues not addressed in the  
14 CRC's proposal are transportation issues, building  
15 design for earthquake country, energy efficiency,  
16 and climbing control.

17 Finally, my concerns lie in the fact  
18 that this committee and the Navy are spending  
19 large amounts of time and money to clean up  
20 environmental problems caused by Naval operations.

1 My hope is that redevelopment of Treasure Island  
2 does not cause a new set of problems that will  
3 have to be cleaned up and dealt with again in the  
4 future.

5 I urge other concerned members of the  
6 RAB to give their suggestions to the Citizens  
7 Re-use Committee.

8 Thank you.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What I would  
10 suggest, maybe Dan can bring that to the next CRC  
11 meeting; or the minutes of our meetings are  
12 essentially Citizen's Re-use Committee meetings;  
13 and if members would like, we can either take it  
14 out of the transcript or if you have a copy you  
15 can give us, we can incorporate that --

16 MS. MENDELOW: Okay.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: -- in its  
18 entirety.

19 MS. MENDELOW: Okay, thank you.

20 MR. MAC DONALD: Karen, I would be

1 willing to present that at the February 5th CRC  
2 meeting and request to the Chair of the RCA that  
3 be an agenda item.

4 MS. MENDELOW: I have written a  
5 letter, but they just sent me a response. I have  
6 not read it yet. I will give you a copy. Thank  
7 you.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And, then, of  
9 course, all of the CRC meetings, although they're  
10 held at 3:30 in the afternoon, are open to the  
11 public.

12 MS. MENDELOW: I can't leave work to  
13 attend those. I wanted to go yesterday, but I  
14 couldn't.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm going to ask  
16 Laurie, not putting you on the spot, but what  
17 opportunities will there be, other than the CRC  
18 meetings, for public comments or commentary?

19 MS. GLASS: That is what I was going  
20 to talk about.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will defer that.

Also, we have a guest tonight, Mr. Spagnole; and since we're still in our public comment period, this might be an opportune time for you to make some statements about your program.

MR. JAMES SPAGNOLE: My name is James Spagnole. I am an attorney who is presently based in Alexandria, Virginia; but my practice is based in Northern California.

I have been a resident and participant in Treasure Island activities just about continuously since 1975, when I was a drilling reservist here, at which time my law practice was in Sacramento.

I have been on the base in either a full-time or drilling reserve part-time status from 1974 to about '82.

From 1983 to 1988, I worked at the

1 Pentagon on logistics, and worked on some  
2 transfers of military property at that time.

3 Subsequent to that, I worked at the  
4 Department of Interior as a principal deputy for  
5 the Fish and Wildlife Service of the National Park  
6 Service, and worked on the Presidio transfer and  
7 other surplus land transfer projects.

8 In 1993, when I returned to private  
9 practice, a portion of my practice has been  
10 developed to base closure issues and advising and  
11 consulting with cities, as bases are considered  
12 for closure, and then assisting cities and  
13 municipalities in the careful development of those  
14 bases.

15 One of the issues that I have taken a  
16 very direct personal interest in by virtue of my  
17 experience on the base is a fairly  
18 market-sensitive, civil-oriented use that has some  
19 multicultural diversity and meets a need for all  
20 San Franciscans; and that is the development of a

1 multi-sport recreational athletic park.

2 Unlike casinos, hotels, theme parks  
3 and golf courses, our project essentially is a  
4 development of open space status.

5 We propose a fairly environmentally-  
6 sensitive, low-impact minimal use of about 65 to  
7 80 acres in the center of the island on what looks  
8 to be unusable ground for any kind of heavier  
9 complex construction.

10 We propose to develop that in the  
11 short-term. We have private funds in an  
12 environmentally-sensitive way to bring athletic  
13 facilities to the island for use by the citizens  
14 of San Francisco.

15 We have met with soil scientists and  
16 a couple of agronomists and folks that handle  
17 natural athletic turf as their profession, to  
18 ensure that what we develop out here will be  
19 consistent with environmental objectives that are  
20 set by this subcommittee and also by the Citizens

1 Re-use Committee.

2 The last year and a half we have been  
3 working fairly closely with the Redevelopment  
4 Agency, the Port of San Francisco, the Board of  
5 Supervisors' staff, and others to ensure that we  
6 make all the procedural gates and leap over all  
7 the procedural hurdles.

8 We are at a point where our project  
9 has enough of a pulse and a heartbeat that we are  
10 prepared to discuss it in detail at the pleasure  
11 of this subcommittee and the Citizens Re-use  
12 Committee.

13 I have some plans which outline the  
14 area, but I will tell you very briefly that the  
15 center of our project is a very modifiable  
16 footprint that kind of emanates from where the  
17 existing Exchange is and specifically avoids the  
18 firefighting center, which we believe will be  
19 sought after by a multi-state firefighting  
20 training organization. It avoids all the Job

1 Corps areas, avoids the medical and general and  
2 legal areas, and it specifically avoids the  
3 above-ground fuel tank locations.

4 We seek the use of a center portion  
5 of the base from south center to the north center  
6 of the base, in a footprint that is very  
7 modifiable, in the range of 65 to 80 acres.

8 We are available. I have a local  
9 point of contact. I'm out here for two weeks a  
10 month, just about every month, working on this  
11 project; and we're happy to answer any questions.

12 I've got plenty of materials for you.  
13 I have both an artist's rendition of a portion of  
14 this space, and I have a large map, but I don't  
15 want to take time to put the map up now. I will  
16 be happy to answer any questions now or later.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. HEHN: I have a question for you:

19 One of the alternatives that the CRC  
20 has come up with was a sports complex and similar

1 to what you are talking about. Is that part of  
2 your particular plan, or is it different from  
3 that?

4 MR. SPAGNOLE: If what you're  
5 referring to -- the CRC is considering a sports  
6 complex, which would be our facility.

7 Again, the sports that we address on  
8 the complex are soccer, rugby, volleyball, La  
9 Crosse, flag football. Not baseball, not tackle  
10 football -- those are not really good uses of the  
11 land, pretty destructive of the land.

12 MS. GLASS: I just wanted to clarify  
13 a comment that you made:

14 I was thinking I heard you say that  
15 the sports complex is our complex, and I think a  
16 good statement would be to say it is based upon a  
17 similar concept, because the CRC is not in a  
18 position of endorsing a specific project at this  
19 time. It was arrived at with a lot of input from  
20 Jim's group.

1 MR. SPAGNOLE: We don't have a formal  
2 endorsement yet. That is still under  
3 consideration, as we heard last night.

4 MR. VAN WYE: Are you interested in  
5 anything else besides the 65 to 80 acres you're  
6 talking about?

7 MR. SPAGNOLE: In a perfect world, 80  
8 acres would serve all of our objectives. We could  
9 do it with as little as 65 acres, but a  
10 significant portion of our project is open space,  
11 free city recreational spaces.

12 We have plans for picnic areas;  
13 natural habitat recreation areas, if you will; a  
14 small amphitheater, like a city plaza; but a real  
15 passive use.

16 So in that respect, I'm not  
17 interested in getting in the business of building  
18 buildings or conducting any complex activities out  
19 there.

20 I just really feel that the island

1 has some real changes, seismic, engineering, as  
2 well as finance-wise, for anybody who wants to do  
3 anything over one story out here. I'm not anxious  
4 to get into that game.

5 The essence of our project is really,  
6 at the outset, an interim use. What we are  
7 proposing is to work closely with the Navy, the  
8 City, and you folks to ensure that, as soon after  
9 the base closes, there is some privately-financed  
10 commercial activity out here which is not  
11 injurious to the land and which gives citizens of  
12 San Francisco reason for coming out to this base.

13 Every project that I have seen that  
14 has been proposed has a time line in it of upwards  
15 of two years to maybe five or six years, before  
16 there is any real productive use of it. By  
17 productive use, I mean where citizens can come out  
18 here and have an experience other than the museum  
19 experience, which is positive, but have an  
20 experience which, for the City, will generate

1 revenues and create city interest.

2 MR. VAN WYE: How is the City going  
3 to generate revenue from the sports field?

4 MR. SPAGNOLE: Well, we have run the  
5 numbers. A lot of this is proprietary data, but I  
6 will tell you that we believe, with 15 athletic  
7 fields and the letters of commitment that we have  
8 right now, if you build it, we will draw, in  
9 essence, from the entire rugby leagues throughout  
10 the Northern California area; all the city soccer  
11 leagues, for whom we can provide a better facility  
12 than what they get in the City at just about the  
13 same rate that they pay right now to City Park and  
14 Recreation, within about 10 to 15%.

15 The benefits to the City are that  
16 we're going to generate tax revenues, jobs, small  
17 business incubator out of that prior to beginning;  
18 and it frees up the burden from Park and Rec so  
19 that the City can rest fields they have now and do  
20 the kind of things that need to be done for

1 inner-city recreational athletics.

2 MR. VAN WYE: What you're suggesting,  
3 basically, though, is the average citizen would  
4 not really come out and use the facilities unless  
5 he or she belonged to some athletic league?

6 MR. SPAGNOLE: Not necessarily. The  
7 fields themselves will be practically used to  
8 attract leagues, for which there will be a fee  
9 charged. But there will be upward of about 15 to  
10 20% of the property which will be open space, free  
11 recreational use.

12 MS. SMITH: How would people get to  
13 the island?

14 MR. SPAGNOLE: Well, our estimated  
15 usage looks to an average user day, Saturday and  
16 Sunday, in two-hour increments, which adds about  
17 100 to 150 cars from each end of the bridge.

18 MS. SMITH: Do you think automobile  
19 transportation is feasible?

20 MR. SPAGNOLE: No, the reason I

1 define it that way, I don't think we will create  
2 an appreciable increase in bridge traffic usage on  
3 an average weekend day.

4 If we have an exhibition game or an  
5 international match, for which there will be  
6 larger attendance, we have already begun  
7 negotiations with van pools, public transit,  
8 contract bus service, shuttle bus service, and we  
9 talked to the Red and White Fleet and the  
10 Hornblower folks about running ferries out there.

11 MS. SMITH: And you have no problem  
12 playing on toxic soils?

13 MR. SPAGNOLE: Yes, we have a problem  
14 playing on toxic soils. We're not going to do  
15 that. We want to play on clean ground, but we  
16 want to work with this committee and EPA to ensure  
17 that the level of cleanup is sufficient and  
18 economically feasible.

19 MS. SMITH: But you understand that  
20 playing on a recreational field requires a fairly

1 high level of cleanup, as opposed to industrial  
2 levels, which is what the Navy and the Department  
3 of Toxic Substances Control have been talking  
4 about.

5 MR. SPAGNOLE: I think it is a  
6 tradeoff, and I think, in the long run, the civic  
7 needs of San Francisco and the additional facet  
8 that this will add to the tourist draw will  
9 justify that kind of cleanup.

10 I am not of a personal opinion, by  
11 virtue of my experience on this island, that this  
12 island will support heavy industrial activity.  
13 The logistics are just too hard, and the politics  
14 are not there to do. That is my personal opinion.

15 MS. SMITH: The politics are not  
16 there, but the level of contamination is there.

17 MR. SPAGNOLE: Yes.

18 MR. ONGERTH: What kind of action are  
19 you seeking from this Board?

20 MR. SPAGNOLE: I'm not sure. I'm

1 here to provide information. Jim Sullivan and I  
2 have been talking moderately frequently about what  
3 it is that I can provide to you by way of  
4 information and what we want to do.

5 At some point, I would like to work  
6 with you so that we have a balanced cleanup plan,  
7 which is not so economically infeasible that I  
8 can't find private financing for it.

9 Part of the allure of this project is  
10 private financing, and I am working with several  
11 large Northern California-based corporations now  
12 to come up with commitments for construction  
13 costs, because the premise behind our project is  
14 to get this built with private funds, to operate  
15 it for a period of 12 to 15 years, which we  
16 believe is an acceptable interim use, during which  
17 time we believe that the City and County of San  
18 Francisco, the citizens of San Francisco, are  
19 going to come up with some long-term uses. Those  
20 long-term uses may not be consistent with what we

1 propose to do.

2 But in order to make it economically  
3 feasible and for those corporations to feel like  
4 they're getting their money's worth in terms of  
5 advertising exposure, they need 12 to 15 years to  
6 amortize out those costs.

7 I can pretty well estimate the  
8 construction costs for tearing down the buildings  
9 and creating the ground and putting up some  
10 stands.

11 What I can't estimate right now is  
12 the cleanup costs; and if that number skyrockets,  
13 private companies may walk.

14 MR. ONGERTH: I would like to ask  
15 Laurie Glass a question on this:

16 How do you visualize this proposal  
17 fitting in with whatever CRC comes up with?

18 MS. GLASS: Henry, the CRC is in the  
19 process of kind of grasping around with the  
20 concepts or the alternative proposals that the

1 consultants have come up with, kind of moving  
2 towards coming up with a preferred concept.

3 One of the things -- there are a lot  
4 of different aspects to this -- one aspect is that  
5 that sort of coincides with the different kinds of  
6 alternatives in the plan. It is the minimal use  
7 all the way to full use. It is kind of mulling  
8 over a lot of different ideas.

9 I think that Jim Spagnole's point  
10 that there may be an interim period of quite a few  
11 years is something that I have heard quite a bit  
12 of, in terms of taking that long for the City  
13 really to get some of the other funding for some  
14 of the perimeter improvements, etc.

15 The point is, I don't think that  
16 there is anything in Jim's proposal that is  
17 counterindicated by the kinds of things that are  
18 being talked about at the CRC.

19 One exercise that Jim engaged in  
20 recently was matching up his proposal with the

1 objectives that we approved at the December CRC  
2 meeting and finding a pretty good match for those  
3 objectives. So this way, that is a good approach.

4 There are ways that this would not  
5 necessarily be a good approach. If there was a  
6 large development, a theme park, and they wanted  
7 to do it tomorrow, obviously, there would be some  
8 problems.

9 There is a lot of unknowns and  
10 unknowables and a lot that will become clear as  
11 time progresses.

12 Setting that aside for the moment,  
13 the amount of time that may be needed to do  
14 cleanup on the island, which is another factor  
15 that will affect long-term use and may well affect  
16 interim use as well, so that's another range of  
17 questions.

18 I don't think I have been very  
19 definitive, but it gives you an idea of the kind  
20 of things that are being talked about.

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

MR. ONGERTH: Thank you.

MR. HEHN: I wanted to clarify a statement that you made, Mr. Spagnole. I understood it to mean that you're looking at a private company coming in, doing that kind of development, and the private company also funds the cleanup. Is that correct, or are you waiting for the cleanup to be done before they come in?

MR. SPAGNOLE: Depending on the level of cleanup, I think there are corporations with the commitment to community and civic development issues in the Bay Area, who also have a commitment to good, sound advertising and marketing, that will participate in funding some of the cleanup work.

But remember, we're just one of several users that will come on to the island early. The Job Corps is coming onto the island early. We propose to come out here and be a good neighbor and work with whoever else is out here;

1 and towards that end, we are prepared to shoulder  
2 our fair share of the cleanup costs, as long as it  
3 is economically feasible.

4 We can share a bigger burden, a  
5 bigger share of that, a bigger portion of that, if  
6 we have a longer use, so that these folks see that  
7 they're getting something for their money.

8 There is some precedent on other  
9 small bases that have portions of it turned around  
10 fairly quickly for an interim use, being  
11 characterized as a 12-year use.

12 Peese Air Force Base in New Hampshire  
13 is one where they created a different incubator  
14 and is an airplane hangar; and they used the  
15 interim approach to do that, to shortcut some of  
16 the procedural regulations; and they got that base  
17 productive fairly quickly; also, in Roswell, New  
18 Mexico, where Greyhound is now assembling buses;  
19 and in Beesville, Texas, where they built a kind  
20 of aviation park, aviation rangers' park.

1                   There are some of those opportunities  
2                   here in the Bay Area; but as you well know, there  
3                   are lots of bases closing in the Bay Area, some of  
4                   which have land that is naturally suited for heavy  
5                   industrial use, such as Mare Island; Hunters  
6                   Point; portions of Alameda, depending on what the  
7                   Alameda Re-use Commission decides to do.

8                   So there will be lots of suitors out  
9                   there for these heavy industrial uses, and what we  
10                  are proposing is for recreation and civic use,  
11                  other than the Presidio, that San Francisco really  
12                  needs; and that is where we are.

13                  In that regard, they are willing to  
14                  pay for some cleanup; but they do not want to pay  
15                  for all the cleanup.

16                  MR. HAYDEN: Just a question:

17                  You mentioned, as far as  
18                  transportation to and from the island, contacting  
19                  Hornblower, the Hornblower Services.

20                  I am wondering if you had explored

1 the question of ferry service with anyone else?

2 MR. SPAGNOLE: We have talked to Red  
3 and White Fleet. One of the principals in the Red  
4 and White Fleet is a rugby supporter. That is how  
5 I got to the guy, and he and I chatted about if we  
6 had an international rugby match and we had a lot  
7 of spectators, would the Red and White Fleet be  
8 interested in contract ferry services on a day  
9 basis? And, of course, by virtue of his interest  
10 in the sport, he is willing to do it.

11 When they balance the numbers, we  
12 will see what the cost-per-ride is.

13 But the principal premise behind our  
14 theory is not to engage in a dialogue which would  
15 create daily, continuous ferry service to the  
16 island, because that, from my perspective, will  
17 have to be subsidized. That is a municipal  
18 function, and I'm not sure that is a function for  
19 the private industry in terms of early  
20 development.

1                   But on the days that we have those  
2                   events, we would, if there is parking on the base,  
3                   charge for parking here, to discourage people from  
4                   driving, and use that money to subsidize the ferry  
5                   services. And we would contract the ferry  
6                   services and do that out of the cost of admission.

7                   CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to limit  
8                   this discussion to one more question. We have  
9                   another equally important topic we need to cover,  
10                  because it is time sensitive, with the UST  
11                  Program.

12                  Dale, I think you are next.

13                  MS. SMITH: I wanted to just ask  
14                  Laurie, we got a copy of the Second Revised  
15                  Alternatives Report after the first two, and I got  
16                  all the documentation.

17                  MS. GLASS: Keep those. They are  
18                  rare.

19                  MS. SMITH: Thank you very much.  
20                  They were fun to read.

1                   But my concern is that the City and  
2                   County of San Francisco, as opposed to this  
3                   gentleman, is proposing a dynamic compaction for  
4                   portions of the island. This man is proposing to  
5                   take over those portions of the island on an  
6                   interim basis for 12 to 15 years that you wish to  
7                   look at dynamic compaction.

8                   Is that not dynamically infeasible?

9                   MS. GLASS: Somebody asked this  
10                  question the other night, something similar, not  
11                  with respect to the recreation and sports  
12                  facility.

13                  Let me tell you, this is not endorsed  
14                  by the City and County of San Francisco.

15                  MS. SMITH: I understand that.

16                  MS. GLASS: I just wanted to make  
17                  sure.

18                  MS. SMITH: But you are working much  
19                  closer to something that is going to actually --

20                  MS. GLASS: All I can say, one thing

1 that is fair to say, there was quite a bit of  
2 discussion around the approach of dynamic  
3 compaction when it was first introduced by the  
4 consultants; and since that time, there have  
5 emerged several other approaches.

6 One of the reasons the consultant  
7 brought it up was, it was the cheapest way. In  
8 their opinion, it was the cheapest way to redo  
9 ground improvement.

10 But last night, yesterday also,  
11 somebody asked that. The response was, "Yes, this  
12 current Alternatives Report still is assuming  
13 dynamic compaction; but that is not necessarily a  
14 foregone conclusion that that is the only way or,  
15 in fact, that that is the way the ground  
16 improvement will be done."

17 And there are partial sorts of ways  
18 of doing it. You can do this bit and not that.  
19 Just for example, the Job Corps has their campus  
20 established; and they are not assuming anything of

1 the sort.

2 And so if you did dynamic compaction  
3 and you also did a surcharge and all the rest of  
4 that stuff that was mentioned before, this would  
5 be Treasure Island and here would be the Job Corps  
6 (indicating).

7 There are certain things, maybe we  
8 will have varied topography on Treasure Island; I  
9 don't know. There are things that will become  
10 clear through time, and there are ways that they  
11 can work out.

12 We can have dynamic compaction or  
13 some other approach over here. My understanding  
14 is you can do a little bit of this and a little  
15 bit of that.

16 Does that sort of answer your  
17 question?

18 MS. SMITH: It sort of answers it,  
19 but it actually gets us back to Brad, where our  
20 basic nexus is, which is, what do you want from

1           this piece of property, so we can say what the  
2           cleanup should be?

3                       MS. GLASS: Well, I keep on talking.

4                       CO-CHAIR WONG: We need to move this  
5           meeting along here. The open comment period is an  
6           opportunity for people to present some ideas, and  
7           I don't think it was designed to hijack the agenda  
8           per se.

9                       MR. SPAGNOLE: Thank you very much.

10                      CO-CHAIR WONG: I've got a feeling we  
11           will be hearing more about this project down the  
12           road.

13                      MR. SPAGNOLE: I apologize for taking  
14           so long.

15                      CO-CHAIR WONG: But it also seems  
16           like some of these other discussions we're  
17           starting to have we might address under the CRC  
18           presentation.

19                      But I want to remind everybody that  
20           the main focus is that we have a lot to go through

1 on the UST Program, and it is important that we  
2 have a good discussion about that.

3 I think we need to go back and  
4 address John Allman's comments, is that correct?

5 MR. ALLMAN: First of all, I  
6 appreciate you going back to that. I wanted to  
7 formalize my comments tonight, and I don't want to  
8 get into the details of the memorandum that I  
9 passed around. Everybody should have a copy of  
10 it.

11 I would ask that they be distributed  
12 with the minutes that go out with the meeting,  
13 because the details are better covered with the  
14 UST discussions.

15 But my comment is dealing with the  
16 minutes that are taken at the meetings of comments  
17 made by the Board.

18 This one is detailed very clearly  
19 what my reasons are for wanting to state this.

20 I have no question that I made the

1           comments that I made at the meeting, but I think a  
2           lot of the comments, what I have heard said at the  
3           meetings and what I read, is actually condensed  
4           when we receive the minutes; and since I'm not  
5           intending this to be a reflection on PRC's  
6           abilities to produce the minutes, but it is more a  
7           comment on the process of what goes into the  
8           administrative record, or what details should be  
9           disseminated to the Board members, such as the  
10          direct transcript be made available for people to  
11          look at to get an idea as to what the comments are  
12          we are referring to.

13                        I refer back to when I was a fresh  
14          young buck back in November, when it was first  
15          announced that the island was settling. I asked a  
16          question, "Is the island really sinking; and if  
17          so" -- the important part of my question was --  
18          "how does that affect the relocation of the  
19          groundwater table and the positioning of UST's  
20          possible leaching into the groundwater?"

1                   And what came out of the minutes was,  
2                   "John Allman asked if the island was sinking, and  
3                   he was told it was settling," and that was it;  
4                   whereas the important contents of what I was  
5                   saying was, "We have an issue that has been  
6                   brought up many times since then, after the  
7                   geologic study came out, which is the more  
8                   important issue about do we have to be concerned  
9                   about the groundwater being affected in the  
10                  future?"

11                  I'm just concerned that if the  
12                  administrative record became only the minutes that  
13                  are presented and mailed to us and not the text of  
14                  the transcript or the transcripts are not going to  
15                  be contained, that we have to be at least aware of  
16                  what goes into the administrative record or not.

17                  So I would like to suggest that,  
18                  possibly, at some future meeting, we take a few  
19                  minutes to discuss for our agenda what actually is  
20                  included in the administrative record and what is

1 not included in the administrative record, so we  
2 know when a lot of us spend a lot of our free time  
3 researching these issues and getting books to do  
4 these things, we are not wasting our time by  
5 saying things that just go into an abyss  
6 somewhere.

7 Those are my comments. That states  
8 clearly what my specifics were.

9 One other comment. I ask this be  
10 inserted into the administrative record.

11 I would also like to ask approval of  
12 the agenda. I want to ask, that I have a couple  
13 of minutes during the organizational business,  
14 just to make a comment about e mail service that  
15 is available to all RAB members and how to get  
16 connected with that.

17 That is just informational. I will  
18 take a moment to state that later.

19 Thank you very much.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: Did I hear you ask

1           that these be attached to the minutes?

2                   MR. ALLMAN:  They should be attached,  
3           because not all the Board members are here; and we  
4           are missing a few regulators as well.

5                   Thank you, Mary Rose, for coming  
6           tonight.

7                   CO-CHAIR WONG:  Can we approve the  
8           November 28th and December 19th minutes, as  
9           amended, with the provision that these are  
10          included, John's comments are added to that?  Can  
11          we get a consensus.

12                   MS. SHIRLEY:  I make a motion to do  
13          that.

14                   MS. KATHURIA:  I second the motion.

15                   CO-CHAIR WONG:  All in favor, say  
16          aye; opposed, no.

17                   (The motion carried.)

18                   MS. WALTERS:  The Presidio includes  
19          all the original transcripts in the administrative  
20          record.  It is standard, what the court reporter

1 is doing right now, to put into the administrative  
2 record.

3 MS. SMITH: It is not an  
4 administrative record, but our minutes really do  
5 get whitewashed.

6 Sorry.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next we would  
8 like to move into program updates.

9 MR. GALANG: The meeting minutes are  
10 included in the transcript, so this is not in the  
11 administrative record right now.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Ernie is bringing  
13 up the distinction that we will have a discussion  
14 at the next meeting how records are stored, and he  
15 is drawing a distinction between the  
16 administrative records at San Bruno and the  
17 information repository at the San Francisco  
18 Library, as well as on base here.

19 We will have a discussion on that at  
20 the next meeting, so you will know what the

1 resources are.

2 MS. NELSON: That will become an  
3 action item for the minutes of this meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That will be an  
5 action item for the Navy to present a discussion  
6 how the administrative and information repository  
7 is set up and operates.

8 Rachel could not be with us tonight  
9 through illness, so Mary Rose is going to present  
10 the BRAC Team Cleanup Meeting update.

11 MS. CASSA: I made a short review of  
12 my calendar to determine what the BCT activities  
13 were on December 19th. On January 10th, the  
14 project team met to discuss the scope of the  
15 parcel, specific environmental baseline survey,  
16 and survey for Building 3.

17 This addresses Parcel T-7, T-8, T-16,  
18 and part of T-10.

19 There is a relatively long time frame  
20 for the development of these documents. The

1 schedule seems workable, and it looks as if the  
2 Navy will be able to incorporate the RIF  
3 assessment from Phase II Remedial Investigation.

4 On January 16th, we had a project  
5 team meeting, mainly to discuss revisions to the  
6 BRAC Cleanup Plan. We got through Chapter 4 and  
7 discussed that, perhaps for tonight's meeting, and  
8 we have plans to meet on Thursday to discuss the  
9 comments and proposed responses on the Ecological  
10 Risk Assessment Work Plan and prepare for the  
11 Ecological Workshop next week.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mary  
13 Rose.

14 Now, Laurie, the subject has already  
15 been discussed about recent CRC activities; but if  
16 you want to make any further comments, maybe  
17 address what upcoming opportunities there are for  
18 public participation.

19 MS. GLASS: I have a schedule that I  
20 assume other people put together for our recent

1 CRC meeting. There were two in January, actually.

2 One of the things that I think would  
3 be -- well, the CRC is in this process of moving  
4 towards approving a re-use concept; and one aspect  
5 of the current discussion is about how specific or  
6 how general the plan has to be; and then there has  
7 to be some input from the cleanup side about this;  
8 because there is, to some extent, a desire to have  
9 a sort of a general plan in a workable kind of  
10 way.

11 Also, I wanted to let you know that  
12 there is not, after all, going to be a public  
13 workshop or forum that I mentioned at a previous  
14 meeting. There just turned out just not enough  
15 lead time, among other factors.

16 Instead, there is going to be -- and  
17 you will notice this on the schedule marked in  
18 March -- there is going to be one workshop at the  
19 Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency  
20 Commission meetings in March -- and those are yet

1 to be scheduled -- where public comment will be  
2 invited.

3 Those tend to be -- the Planning  
4 Commission meetings are in the afternoon or have  
5 been in the afternoon. I think they're all on  
6 Monday. I'm not sure.

7 The Redevelopment Agency Commission  
8 meeting starts about four o'clock and goes later  
9 in the afternoon, and they are always on Tuesdays,  
10 and I will let you know when they have been  
11 scheduled for.

12 Just a further suggestion that I  
13 might make concerning sending comments to the CRC:

14 Comments are always welcome. You can  
15 send them via me; I can't think of another way to  
16 do it. Probably through me is fine.

17 I would like to suggest that you  
18 review the Market Section of the existing  
19 Condition Study and Issues and Opportunities  
20 Report, so when you are making your comments, you

1 are making them on the basis of information that  
2 has been gathered about what is possible to do  
3 there.

4 It is always possible to have  
5 quibbles with what people say is possible to do  
6 and not do, but just think about that.

7 That's basically all I have to say.  
8 Thank you.

9 MS. SMITH: I did read the comments  
10 that came from the Treasure of the Bay Report, and  
11 there seemed to be some concerns, not so much by  
12 CRC but by the City and County of San Francisco,  
13 about the seismic issues and the impact of  
14 maintaining building standards to human habitation  
15 levels.

16 Is that an area of controversy with  
17 the CRC, or is that something that CRC is  
18 recognizing as needed to be done?

19 There was comments from Allison  
20 Kendall, in particular, and Katherine Bowman; and

1 the City of Berkeley basically agrees with all of  
2 that.

3 Is CRC backing away from it?

4 Because there was comments made that the Navy's  
5 offices were being overly --

6 MS. GLASS: You are referring to the  
7 minutes there?

8 MS. SMITH: To this (indicating).  
9 Not to the minutes, but to the attachments in the  
10 back of it.

11 MS. GLASS: The memos.

12 MS. SMITH: Is the Navy somehow  
13 feeling that people should be happy to be in a  
14 place with sand boils when there is a 5  
15 earthquake, or is the City wanting to upgrade?

16 I'm concerned, because our purpose is  
17 not to tell you what to do with the property. Our  
18 purpose is to tell you how to clean your property  
19 to your purposes.

20 MS. GLASS: Okay, I'm not sure I'm

1 understanding your question.

2 Your question, is the City seeking  
3 higher standards of some sort for residential uses  
4 for Treasure Island?

5 MS. SMITH: No, the statements in the  
6 minutes say that the Navy feels that the City is  
7 asking for too much from them in terms of --

8 MS. GLASS: That is something I would  
9 like to respectfully decline and not get involved  
10 in, because I am not a geotechnical person.  
11 Allison Kendall and Katherine Bowman are part of  
12 the Planning Department of the City of San  
13 Francisco; and the Navy, of course, has its own  
14 kind of take on this subject; and there have been  
15 various meetings about that.

16 I would be happy to give you a number  
17 where you can reach Allison Kendall and discuss it  
18 with her.

19 MS. SMITH: It is not an issue for me  
20 to discuss with her; it is our need to know if the

1 City is interested in that kind of safety or not;  
2 because if the City is willing to bow to the  
3 Navy's wishes to vacate without fully updating,  
4 then that's what we have to work with.

5 MS. GLASS: Fully updating in terms  
6 of seismic geotechnical?

7 MS. SMITH: I'm trying to find the  
8 statement here.

9 CO-CHAIR WONG: We need to move  
10 along. If you could review that.

11 MS. SMITH: They can respond.

12 MR. MAC DONALD: I would like to  
13 suggest that what you're asking for is a  
14 discussion on re-use issues. That is a very  
15 complicated discussion, which is outside of the  
16 scope of this Committee.

17 We're spending an hour tonight  
18 talking about things that are outside of the scope  
19 of this Committee. They are interesting, whether  
20 a ferry is going to be serving at Lake Field, but

1 it is irrelevant to what we are doing; and we have  
2 got a lot of important business to deal with --  
3 underground storage tanks and other germane  
4 issues.

5 We are wasting our valuable time and  
6 that of others who come to these meetings to talk  
7 about these issues.

8 MS. GLASS: I will talk with Dale at  
9 some other point.

10 MR. MAC DONALD: We can answer all of  
11 these questions, but this is not the forum for it.

12 I would like to ask the chair to  
13 exert some prerogative to cut down on extraneous  
14 discussion from here on out in this meeting and  
15 others, so that when these discussions begin to  
16 drift into these issues, that you bring us back.

17 We have gone through 35 to 40 minutes  
18 of nongermane discussion tonight that could have  
19 been stopped.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: Very well.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: With that, we  
2 will move to the BRAC Cleanup Process Phase.

3 Tonight we have a presentation on the  
4 Underground Storage Tank Program and Fuel Lines;  
5 and with us today, we have some of our Engineering  
6 Field Activity West; and our consultant I would  
7 like to introuce is John Pfister, who will present  
8 further discussion on the UST Program.

9 MR. JOHN PFISTER: Good evening,  
10 everyone. I'm glad to be here again. I was here  
11 in November and followed up on the discussion of  
12 underground storage tanks at Treasure Island.

13 The last time I was here, I presented  
14 some information for you; and I just wanted to  
15 clarify in this discussion some of the data that I  
16 presented, make it a little more clear for you.

17 Since the last meeting, we have  
18 discovered one other tank; and it was encountered  
19 during the utility excavation here at the island;  
20 and now the total that we have on the record are

1 74 tanks.

2 To date 35 of these tanks have been  
3 removed, according to my schedule.

4 MR. MAC DONALD: Could you describe  
5 where the new tank was located and what it was?

6 MR. PFISTER: It's located over on  
7 5th and M.

8 CO-CHAIR WONG: Can you point it out  
9 on the map?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The new tank is  
11 located approximately here (indicating). There  
12 were some repairs for a steam line, and they  
13 encountered this 74th tank.

14 MR. MAC DONALD: Was it filled with  
15 fuel?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The tank has yet  
17 to be excavated. We're proceeding to investigate  
18 it.

19 MR. PFISTER: I will describe the  
20 numbers here in the discussion for you.

1                   Finally, the last bullet there, we  
2                   have recommendations from an investigation done by  
3                   PRC for no further action at 12 of these 35 sites;  
4                   because at the time of removal, samples were taken  
5                   from the excavation and the side wall; and  
6                   analysis from the samples indicated that there is  
7                   either no contamination present or it was below  
8                   action levels.

9                   So remaining from the total that I  
10                  indicated -- that is 74 -- are 39 USTs. We have 2  
11                  active at the base, and these service government  
12                  vehicles. There is an area especially dedicated  
13                  to do that.

14                 The plan is to take these active  
15                 tanks out of service, and we're actually in the  
16                 process of doing that, pending an air permit,  
17                 which I believe we have gotten, so that should be  
18                 underway now to take the two active tanks out of  
19                 service, and they are planned to be removed.

20                 We have some inactive tanks, seeking

1 site closure for 11, planning on leaving those in  
2 place per Regional Water Quality Control Board's  
3 guidance for tanks, because of their size and  
4 their use.

5 The next is the 3 USTs that are  
6 inaccessible. Two of those are on YBI; the third  
7 is Building 201. It is below the building, so it  
8 is difficult to access. It has been closed in  
9 place, but we're seeking concurrence from the  
10 Regional Water Quality Control Board on that  
11 issue.

12 MS. NELSON: Which building is it  
13 underneath?

14 MR. PFISTER: 201.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 201. That is the  
16 Navy Exchange Building, underneath the snack bar.

17 MR. PFISTER: The other two tanks are  
18 on YBI. One is at the top of the hill by the  
19 tower there, and the last of the three is located  
20 actually on the shoreline of YBI, and actually

1 very difficult to access, and it would be very  
2 difficult to remove that tank, so we are seeking  
3 closure in place on that one as well.

4 MS. SMITH: Have you checked for any  
5 contaminants in the tank?

6 MR. PFISTER: That tank has been  
7 cleaned out, I believe.

8 And then we have 20 tanks that were  
9 suspected, based on records and personnel  
10 interviews; and we utilized two groups of  
11 consultants to conduct geophysical investigations;  
12 and based on the results of their work, we found  
13 one tank, which I indicated.

14 There are two other tanks. We  
15 believe those are oil-water separators, and they  
16 would not be regulated as USTs. That is yet to be  
17 determined, though.

18 Finally, based again on the work that  
19 the consultants did, 17 do not exist. They  
20 investigated the potential tank sites, using

1 geophysical methods, ground-penetrating radar, and  
2 electromagnetics, and spent quite a bit of time  
3 out there searching around with these devices for  
4 tanks and only found one.

5 Then there are 3 inactive tanks that  
6 we know of, and they are scheduled to be removed  
7 along with the two above there.

8 MR. HEHN: John, of the three USTs  
9 that are inaccessible and are supposed to be  
10 closed in place, are all of those oil, diesel,  
11 gasoline? What do they hold?

12 MR. PFISTER: The one at 201, I  
13 believe, is diesel. I will check my record here.

14 The other two are diesel as well.

15 MR. MAC DONALD: When were they  
16 cleaned?

17 MR. PFISTER: They were cleaned at  
18 the time of closure.

19 MS. KATHURIA: They have been closed  
20 in place, grounded up and cleaned out.

1                   Now the Navy is seeking approval for  
2                   that closure, and we're still reviewing it.

3                   We did a site visit a few days ago;  
4                   and to look at the tanks, one of them was under a  
5                   bridge, which, in my idea, is clearly inaccessible  
6                   and clearly deserves to be abandoned.

7                   We're still talking about the other  
8                   two, getting some more information.

9                   MS. GLASS:   When you're saying they  
10                  have been cleaned out, that is known; it is not  
11                  just reported; there is documentation for that?  
12                  How is that established that they were cleaned?

13                  MR. PFISTER:   There is documentation  
14                  when the closure activity took place.  I am  
15                  reluctant to use "closure," but basically  
16                  abandonment in place of the tank.

17                  Yes, it is cleaned out.

18                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  This work has  
19                  taken place in the last five or less years, so  
20                  this is not a cleaning that was supposedly done 20

1 years ago that we're relying on just records.

2 MR. ALLMAN: I assume that the  
3 sediments around the tank were tested for any type  
4 of leak that might have existed?

5 MR. PFISTER: Samples were taken from  
6 the tank.

7 MS. KATHURIA: As part of the  
8 ecological risk assessment.

9 MR. HANSEN: It turned out you had  
10 tanks which were inaccessible because there was a  
11 building above it. When the demolition is going  
12 to occur universally around the island, and the  
13 buildings are all moved, then the tank is  
14 accessible.

15 Is the Navy prepared to then remove  
16 the tank after the building goes away or the  
17 bridge goes away?

18 MR. PFISTER: Well, we would seek  
19 closure in place with the Water Board risk  
20 evaluation and contact. And if it is deemed that

1           it is a threat and contamination is at a point, at  
2           a level that is unacceptable, then we would  
3           schedule it for removal.

4                   MR. HANSEN:   At the latest time.

5                   MR. PFISTER:   Yes, after the building  
6           is demolished.

7                   MR. NEDELL:   What is your abandonment  
8           procedure?  You fill the tank with concrete?

9                   MS. TOBIAS:   Grout slurry.

10                   MR. ONGERTH:   I would like to express  
11           an idea that I previously expressed, that there is  
12           a question in my mind as to what extent should  
13           this Board go into the details of procedures that  
14           have been carried on?  Where do you limit this?  
15           How far does it go?  Do we go to the extent of  
16           demanding to know what the laboratory procedures  
17           were and how they were carried out and all of the  
18           details that somebody could go into if you were in  
19           a court of law?  Where do we draw the line?

20                   It seems to me that both of these

1 questions have to do with details I'm not  
2 interested in, and I don't think are important to  
3 this Board.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: Well, I'm not sure  
5 there is a modifying answer to that, Henry.

6 MR. ONGERTH: I was not expecting you  
7 to answer it.

8 CO-CHAIR WONG: The individual  
9 members of the Board are interested in the topic  
10 and want some clarification in their own minds.

11 We need to facilitate a forum for  
12 them to do that.

13 MR. ONGERTH: There is no end to that  
14 if you allow it to go on.

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: That's true.

16 MR. ONGERTH: Nobody can draw a line.

17 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think, then, it  
18 needs to be the will of the Board when the time is  
19 right in discussion on the USTs, but I think we're  
20 just opening this up and getting started on the

1 discussion.

2 MR. NEDELL: Actually, I have a  
3 followup to my question:

4 If the tank is abandoned in the  
5 manner described tonight, and it is under a  
6 building and the building is later demolished,  
7 what difference does it make if the tank is still  
8 there?

9 MR. PFISTER: That is a good  
10 question.

11 MR. NEDELL: Why would the Navy have  
12 to go back and do anything? If it is abandoned,  
13 it has been cleaned up. It is a rock in the  
14 ground.

15 MR. PFISTER: That depends on the  
16 request.

17 MR. NEDELL: My question is, it is a  
18 piece of rock in the ground. At that point it is  
19 no different than any other rock.

20 MR. PFISTER: We would be perfectly

1 willing to leave it there if nobody had any  
2 problems with that.

3 MR. ALLMAN: The issue, then, arises,  
4 too, if it is physically under a building where  
5 you can't do the sampling, if there is leakage  
6 into the groundwater, the sediment might go into  
7 the groundwater, and there are opportunities to  
8 position the monitoring well by the side, then I  
9 think we have to leave the option open if the  
10 building is demolished.

11 I think some testing has to be done  
12 to find out if there is contamination in the soil.

13 MR. NEDELL: I'm of the opinion at  
14 some point you have to say "enough is enough," and  
15 that you can't drag this process out for another  
16 30 or 40 years to get perfection.

17 There is going to be areas in the  
18 world that have contamination. We will discover  
19 them at some other time.

20 I think the intent, at least for me,

1 of participating here is to be sure that we take  
2 appropriate, necessary remedial measures to clean  
3 up the base to a point where it can be reused. It  
4 is not to achieve perfection to the year 2900, or  
5 something like that. It just isn't.

6 MR. ALLMAN: If the building is  
7 demolished in the future and the soil contaminated  
8 and bioradiation loss is not reduced to a level,  
9 due to lack of oxygen contents in the soil,  
10 because the building was placed there, then it is  
11 up to the City to flip the bill of \$150,000 to  
12 half a million to clean it up.

13 MR. PFISTER: Th Navy plans on  
14 monitoring the sites.

15 MR. ONGERTH: It seems to me it is  
16 the role of the regulatory agencies to police  
17 these matters.

18 I am not interested in trying to  
19 determine whether the Regional Water Quality  
20 Control Board does its job properly, whether the

1 federal EPA did its job properly.

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: At this time, it  
3 might be appropriate for us to let John continue a  
4 bit more so we can understand what is happening.

5 We're starting now to just talk about  
6 each other's values here, as opposed to finding  
7 out what is on the docket here.

8 MR. PFISTER: So my last slide, I  
9 said that we had 20 suspected. Seventeen did not  
10 exist, and we did some accounting and found out  
11 now we have 57 known tanks. That is pretty much  
12 the realm we have records on now.

13 I would like to make a difference  
14 between RECLA and CERCLA, as far as cleanup here  
15 at Treasure Island for the Navy.

16 The difference would mainly be based  
17 on substance; and for RECLA, it is strictly  
18 petroleum substance that was in the tank. For  
19 CERCLA, it would be all other materials.

20 So the reason there is a difference

1           between the UST Program and the IR Program is the  
2           substance.  However, there are some other issues  
3           that would make a differentiation.  A tank could  
4           be in the Installation Restoration Program if it  
5           is not petroleum or if the UST was taken out  
6           before the UST Program was implemented.

7                         Third would be if a release from the  
8           tank is commingled with an IR site release.

9                         So what I'm dealing with mainly is  
10          petroleum tanks.  Forty-two are in the UST  
11          Program.  As I mentioned, five will be removed;  
12          eight UST sites are considered in the document  
13          that has been presented to the laboratory, the  
14          pre-final document; and the remaining tanks are  
15          planned for closure in place, like I have  
16          mentioned, the home heating oil tanks; no further  
17          action based on non-toxic or low levels.

18                        We will also have some that we have  
19          not received a closure report, and it is pending  
20          and should arrive once we remove the remaining

1 active tanks on the base.

2 MS. NELSON: That would be 14  
3 remaining tanks.

4 MR. PFISTER: I'm sorry?

5 MS. NELSON: Did you not put a number  
6 there? But I have done the math, is that right?

7 MR. PFISTER: It should be 29  
8 remaining or planned for closure in place, no  
9 further action, and are due for closure in the  
10 summary report.

11 MS. NELSON: The 15 in the IR Program  
12 are the 41?

13 MR. PFISTER: No, 15 plus 42 is 57.

14 MS. NELSON: So 29?

15 MR. PFISTER: I'm sorry, I neglected  
16 that number. Twenty-nine remaining are planned.

17 And then the last bullet item, for  
18 the IR Program we have 11, which we have remedial  
19 investigation feasibility studies underway; and  
20 Ernie told me that should be due in draft in

1 August.

2 Based on PCR's recommendation, four  
3 should be considered as no further action under  
4 the IR Program.

5 I have compiled a data base here with  
6 all the tanks in it, and I have done it for  
7 myself. I have not really sent this to anyone to  
8 verify, so once that is done, it should be a  
9 pretty reliable analysis.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will be  
11 incorporating John's update in the updated BRAC  
12 Cleanup Program, which you will be receiving the  
13 15th of February.

14 MS. KATHURIA: The data base is done  
15 with all the sites in the Bay Area, asking the  
16 Navy to put all USTs in inventory data base forms;  
17 so the data base that John created is going to be  
18 similar to all Navy test areas.

19 MR. PFISTER: That is all I have for  
20 tonight.

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

Are there any questions?

MR. NEDELL: I actually have a question that relates to the memorandum John submitted this evening.

He states in that memorandum that he does not feel that bioremediation is a feasible, I guess, cleanup method for the contaminated soil.

I am interested in your comments, whether you agree or don't agree, and why.

MR. PFISTER: Bioradiation would be a good alternative, depending on reuse again; and apparently there is the issue of free product. Definitely we have to remove any free product.

The Lawrence Livermore Study, we're considering the findings; and we'll incorporate them in the program.

MS. KATHURIA: In addition, in the Board's perspective, bioremediation -- Jim left out the guidance -- it implements the Lawrence Livermore Study; and our perspective of that came

1 out at the State Board; and we're saying that  
2 bioremediation is a very feasible alternative for  
3 a UST site, not specifically for TI; but in  
4 general bioremediation should be looked at as a  
5 first alternative for remediation.

6 MS. WATERS: It is important that it  
7 is a low risk situation, and that's something that  
8 the Regional Board makes that determination.

9 MS. SMITH: You're looking at  
10 releasing the petroleum contaminants into the air  
11 with bioremediation?

12 MS. CASSA: Natural bioremediation is  
13 in the subsurface.

14 MS. SMITH: In the subsurface, with  
15 the increase of microaeration?

16 MS. CASSA: Naturally, no  
17 enhancements.

18 MR. PFISTER: Just micros in the  
19 soil.

20 MS. SMITH: Allowing it to be there

1 without any further action?

2 MS. KATHURIA: As Martha said, for  
3 low risk sites, if you read this, for sites where  
4 there is minimal -- as long as there is minimal  
5 groundwater impact.

6 MS. SMITH: What's minimal?

7 MS. KATHURIA: Low risk.

8 MS. SMITH: What is the level?

9 MS. KATHURIA: It depends on the land  
10 use, on what is happening on the site.

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: Is it fair to say it  
12 has not been established yet for Treasure Island,  
13 here?

14 MS. KATHURIA: This document came out  
15 January 8th, but I have been reviewing the new  
16 document with this policy in mind, and I will be  
17 looking definitely to its applicability at TI.

18 MS. SMITH: But it has not been  
19 established yet?

20 MS. KATHURIA: What?

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

MS. SMITH: For TI.

MS. KATHURIA: Yes, it has not. The Navy and we have not decided on any site that we feel that this guidance applies as yet. So we are really still reviewing this document.

MR. HEHN: I was going to mention that I talked to Gina tonight about having her and possibly Kevin from the Remedial Board, if he is available -- he is one of the people who wrote this document for the local Board -- to come and give us a presentation, possibly at the next meeting thereafter, to discuss how the Board used this new Lawrence Livermore Study and how they think that is going to be implemented, at least on their level, and maybe what they think the impact is going to be on the state level.

That is something we might want to have in the future as a future presentation and discussion point, because this thing is so new, and discussion is going through the regulatory

1 community like wildfire, because everybody is  
2 really up on it, and also the consulting industry,  
3 too, to see what the changes are going to be, and  
4 it is still going to be determined.

5 MR. HANSEN: Of course, you have  
6 gotten back to the chicken and the egg proposition  
7 again.

8 If there is no intent to ever try to  
9 use the so-called groundwater under Treasure  
10 Island for beneficial use, then the storage tanks  
11 won't have any impact on it; isn't that correct?

12 MS. KATHURIA: For drinking water  
13 purposes, but there are other beneficial uses of  
14 the groundwater on TI.

15 MR. HANSEN: For instance?

16 MS. KATHURIA: For instance,  
17 replenishment of the Bay surface water. We  
18 wouldn't want the TPA of the groundwater at TI to  
19 impact any organisms in San Francisco Bay through  
20 the groundwater intersurface.

1 MR. HANSEN: There might be a  
2 scenario where you have to cover Treasure Island  
3 with a tarpaulin to make sure there is none.

4 MS. KATHURIA: That is one way.

5 MR. ALLMAN: I'm still concerned  
6 about the settling of the island, as well as the  
7 fact that, back in 1860, before the island  
8 existed, there was a huge rainstorm that would  
9 have covered the island had it been there at the  
10 time, which at that point you're changing the  
11 entire water table structure of the island.

12 My other concern is, because of the  
13 island, we're trying to get funding to remove a  
14 lot of the transfer lines and fuel lines running  
15 throughout the island; but these basically produce  
16 numerous, numerous worm holes that fuel that to  
17 the outside or the inside of the broken pipe and  
18 end up far-removed from that location, and so you  
19 may mitigate one site in getting to a point of  
20 residual saturation, which is what the Livermore

1 Report recommends that you need to get to before  
2 you have the bioremediation occur. You clean up  
3 one site, and then you clean up another site and  
4 find out that whatever was there traveled up  
5 there.

6 MS. KATHURIA: One of the major  
7 concerns to look at is the pathways. If there are  
8 horizontal pathways, you do assess those to see  
9 whether your site is larger than you think it is.  
10 Is it going on horizontal corridors?

11 MR. ALLMAN: Well, is the Regional  
12 Board modeling in some way a potential change? I  
13 don't see how you can even model it. You don't  
14 know how to detect that, no product in one well.

15 If the water tables shift, at some  
16 point, up or below, you end up getting a pathway  
17 for the product to get into the water system at  
18 some point later.

19 By that point, it may be too late if  
20 you suddenly hit a pocket and have leaching into

1 the water table.

2 How do you predict that to determine  
3 to get it to a point that that won't happen  
4 without being able to measure it?

5 MS. KATHURIA: You are saying if  
6 there is a site and you have a pathway there, you  
7 have to look at the pathway?

8 MR. ALLMAN: The pathway may change.  
9 If it is infiltration from a heavy storm,  
10 basically pushing down the water to the water  
11 table or the island settling, and it is shored up,  
12 and it firms up and grows in the next fifty years,  
13 it then becomes a concern if there is residential  
14 housing at that point, and up until now there was  
15 not a concern about the well being contaminated.  
16 And now, all of a sudden, you have all this fuel  
17 in your wells.

18 MS. CASSA: I would like to address  
19 this:

20 I would like to say, first of all,

1           that what we are talking about is speculative.

2                         And, secondly, the residual that will  
3           be left behind after the removal of the pipelines,  
4           for instance, it seems to me you're talking about  
5           there being some highly saturated soil left  
6           behind.

7                         MR. ALLMAN:   Yes.

8                         MS. CASSA:   I think that after the  
9           pipelines are removed, it would be very difficult  
10          to identify any place to look for highly saturated  
11          zones, because one would expect them to be  
12          associated with the pipeline that had been  
13          removed.

14                        So in the time it would take piling  
15          up and settling of the island to move soil, that  
16          is now not in the water table, below the water  
17          table, I think it is conceivable that appropriate  
18          amounts of natural bioremediation could take place  
19          in that time frame.

20                        It is highly speculative, and it is

1 recognizable, but I really think that the risk of  
2 leaving a highly-saturated zone of soil in place,  
3 that would then somehow subside into the  
4 water-bearing zone, is quite remote.

5 To look for that zone would be like  
6 looking for a needle in a haystack.

7 MR. ONGERTH: I have a question for  
8 John.

9 CO-CHAIR WONG: Maybe, John, you can  
10 discuss that with Gina and Mary Rose during the  
11 break.

12 I would like to take two last  
13 questions on this, take a quick 10-minute break,  
14 and then come back; and I would like to see if we  
15 can't direct the conversation toward the memo that  
16 everybody got with comments on the outstanding UST  
17 document, and see if we can't guide the discussion  
18 that way, to make sure we have covered all the  
19 issues here and have a proper discussion of the  
20 documents.

1 MR. HEHN: I would like to go back to  
2 what John talked about. We can get back to that.

3 MR. HAYDEN: I was at the Water Board  
4 and listening to a discussion of the new  
5 guidelines; and as I understand it, once the UST  
6 or whatever is removed and the source of iron is  
7 removed, then you have a bioremediation. Natural  
8 biotic activity in the ground takes place.

9 In addition, you will have monitoring  
10 wells to develop a policy about what is going on.

11 So this is my question:

12 It seems to me that there are a  
13 number of monitoring wells, at least the 8 USTs  
14 that are presented in this report, and I am just  
15 wondering, does it seem that there will be an  
16 inadequate number to monitor in order to arrive at  
17 a decision about when additional work is needed?

18 MS. KATHURIA: For those particular  
19 UST sites?

20 MR. HAYDEN: Question.

1 MS. KATHURIA: I believe we have  
2 enough monitoring wells in place to monitor the  
3 sites.

4 In terms of remediating the sites --

5 MR. HAYDEN: As far as arriving at a  
6 decision as to further remediation.

7 MS. KATHURIA: I am not able to  
8 determine that yet.

9 MR. HEHN: To wrap it up, to get back  
10 after the break, looking at one of the things that  
11 John was alluding to about trying to put all these  
12 different pieces together so we can understand  
13 what kind of interaction we might be looking at  
14 from USTs and various pathways that might be out  
15 there in the pipelines, etc., that is one of the  
16 reasons why it would be helpful to have the  
17 overall picture of the island, how these things  
18 are interacting and are going to affect it.

19 We will get back to that.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: We'll have a

1 10-minute break.

2 (Recess taken.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: First, I would  
4 like to introduce, in addition to John Pfister  
5 tonight, we have Larry Lind, also from EFA West --  
6 he was a former UST person -- and, also, Leslie  
7 Goodbody, from ERM West.

8 So we will move to the discussion of  
9 Paul's subcommittee comments that we just received  
10 Friday. But we did have the opportunity to spend  
11 the last few days going over them.

12 Paul.

13 MR. HEHN: I guess one of the things  
14 that I would like to just open to discussion for,  
15 and I guess whoever from the Navy or ERM West  
16 wants to respond to those, going back to what John  
17 alluded to earlier, that is, trying to look at  
18 what the overall impact of the petroleum  
19 hydrocarbons and the USTs are on Treasure Island,  
20 and this is the first part of that, and the first

1 USTs, so what we would really like to address is  
2 how do we look at all the interactions of the  
3 USTs, the pipelines, and try to get a handle,  
4 rather than looking at each individual tank and  
5 its separate little entity.

6 It is not going to happen quite that  
7 way. That's what I would like to open the  
8 discussion.

9 MS. GOODBODY: Unfortunately, the  
10 Underground Storage Tank Program has always been  
11 separate from the IR Program; and basically, the  
12 eight sites that ERM is working on now and made a  
13 study on were selected because, when they were  
14 removed in 1990 and 1992, contamination was found  
15 in the excavation pits.

16 That is what prompted further  
17 excavation at those sites, and maybe Larry can  
18 comment on the program, but that's the way the  
19 Underground Storage Program has been run.

20 When there is any kind of

1 interaction, potential interaction, at a nearby  
2 site, we're doing our best to make sure that we  
3 make note of that.

4 If you put in a pumping system, that  
5 might drive contaminants to another site, but  
6 really our task has been varied, underground tank  
7 site specific, at all of the bases that we have  
8 been working on.

9 I don't know what else to say from  
10 there.

11 MR. HEHN: What I'd like to see us to  
12 try to get into is to make sure that we at least  
13 understand or potentially see what the interaction  
14 might be, and certainly about the preferential  
15 pathways that John talked about that are out  
16 there.

17 If some of the new methods we're  
18 trying to get finalized show, in those pipelines,  
19 that they are there, and like we talked at the  
20 last subcommittee meeting, they should add

1 stormdrains, we really need to know what those  
2 pathways might be.

3 John had a question about making sure  
4 that you do know where those are when you look at  
5 the remediation of a particular site, because it  
6 is not necessarily an independent entity in and of  
7 itself.

8 MS. GOODBODY: That is not included  
9 in the pre-final report, and a very detailed  
10 analysis of location of each stormdrain and each  
11 individual up site, and the depth that the  
12 stormdrains are occurring, and their relation to  
13 the depth of groundwater, that is all going to be  
14 incorporated in our final report.

15 We identify if there is a pathway  
16 there. We can either rule it out; or if there is  
17 a pathway that is of potential concern, perhaps  
18 the groundwater actually is coming in contact with  
19 the stormdrain, and there is possibly leaks, we  
20 might then suggest that to go to the next step,

1 and TV the sewer line, and try to figure out is  
2 this a real pathway, because we understand that is  
3 a big concern, the direct pathway to the Bay.

4 So the Navy will be addressing that.

5 MR. HEHN: That did not really come  
6 out in that report.

7 MS. GOODBODY: I know it did not.

8 MS. SMITH: Who is doing the  
9 assessment of the stormwater line? That's not the  
10 PRC, because it never shows up in PRC documents.

11 MS. GOODBODY: What we are doing  
12 right now for the storm sewer lines is trying to  
13 determine if our groundwater plumes associated  
14 with the underground storage sites are in contact  
15 with the stormdrains.

16 MS. SMITH: I understand that, but  
17 who is doing the stormwater sewage?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically there  
19 are two other actions going on. One is under  
20 non-base cleanup, just general Clean Water Act

1 compliance. The Naval Station has a stormwater  
2 pollution prevention program, which we are  
3 monitoring stormwaters, and we are producing an  
4 annual report to the Regional Board on the 30th of  
5 June.

6 MS. SMITH: So you have a kind of an  
7 idea where all your stormwater lines are?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We know pretty  
9 much exactly where they are. We're just finishing  
10 up a new mapping of the Bay.

11 And secondly, under our Environmental  
12 Base Line Survey, we are doing some selective  
13 tests with stormdrain systems.

14 MS. SMITH: Not ERM West?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: ERM West was the  
16 consultant for the EBS, but the actual  
17 investigative work will be done probably by PRC,  
18 so we will have a number of sources of data  
19 relating to the stormdrain system.

20 MR. NEDELL: In your monitoring of

1 your stormdrain waters, have you found petroleum  
2 hydrocarbons or evidence of contamination?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because of the  
4 parameters of storm events, we have not had a  
5 really good sampling yet.

6 MR. NEDELL: You were not monitoring  
7 last year?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In our previous  
9 monitorings of last year, no, we did not detect  
10 anything.

11 We have expanded our number of  
12 monitoring points from last year's program.

13 MR. NEDELL: But you monitor the  
14 discharges to the Bay?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 MR. HANSEN: Drainage discharges are  
17 there?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: About 42. Back on  
19 UST.

20 MR. HEHN: Can you address how this

1           purported program would have to be revised at this  
2           point, in view of all the new regulatory issues  
3           that are coming out, and what does that do to the  
4           report?

5                       MS. GOODBODY:   Are you pretty much  
6           talking about more funding?

7                       MR. HEHN:   The Lawrence Livermore  
8           Report, the latest utilization of the containment  
9           zone, and how this is all going to be done.

10                      It kind of discounts itself in that  
11           report and is coming into more prominence now.

12                      MS. GOODBODY:   Yes.   Gina was telling  
13           me earlier that her comments to this report will  
14           be viewed with that in mind, and so that's just  
15           one part of it.

16                      The other part I would like to stress  
17           is that a lot of the interim remedial action that  
18           we propose in this report are basically some point  
19           removal.  They're not necessarily cleaning up the  
20           MCL, not anything like that.  They are basically

1 source removal, groundwater monitoring, until  
2 they're able to establish either cleanup goals or  
3 are able to work through how the findings of the  
4 containment zone, the Lawrence Livermore, pertains  
5 to this site.

6 This is an interim remedial measure  
7 just to remove the source, at this point, with the  
8 systems in place that you can monitor through  
9 time, and if you needed to do more remediation,  
10 you can do that as well.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: I am wondering about  
12 this treatment technology application matrix for  
13 base closure activities. That was referred to in  
14 Section 4.

15 MS. GOODBODY: Yes.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: Is that a big report?  
17 Would it be possible to append the matrix to the  
18 report so that we can get an idea?

19 MS. GOODBODY: It is not big, but it  
20 is 12 x 17.

1 MS. CASSA: You brought several  
2 copies and PCR brought several copies.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: I missed it.

4 MS. CASSA: PRC has their own copies.  
5 It is a reproduction nightmare to append it. It  
6 is really unfortunate. But it is possible to make  
7 a copy available for you to look at.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: That would be fine. I  
9 just found it was a little difficult to follow  
10 that section without knowing what the  
11 possibilities in that matrix would be.

12 MS. GOODBODY: It is a good matrix,  
13 but somewhat complicated to follow.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Do you know if it uses  
15 best available technology?

16 MS. GOODBODY: Yes. They have proven  
17 and innovative, the proven technologies and  
18 innovative technologies.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Thank you.

20 MR. HAYDEN: Just one little quibble

1 or question:

2 You do mention non-attainment zones,  
3 and I guess when it is reread, it will be  
4 containment zones?

5 MS. GOODBODY: Right. And, in fact,  
6 the text in the report reflects the first version  
7 that was put out by the Regional Board; and the  
8 language might have changed a little bit.

9 So I'll make sure I check the  
10 language in Section 3 to make sure it's with the  
11 current language in the Abatement Plan.

12 MR. ALLMAN: So is it likely that the  
13 Navy is going to not do the pump-and-treat method  
14 for a lot of these sites, whether or not the plant  
15 will be available to handle the load, because the  
16 Livermore Report also recommends not to use  
17 pump-and-treat technology, because it shows it  
18 will not be effective?

19 MS. GOODBODY: Pump-and-treat  
20 basically is for source removal. If you have

1 floating product, that is probably your best way  
2 to deal with it at this point.

3 As to where your high-level  
4 contamination is or hot spots, if you're able to  
5 reduce the bulk of the groundwater contamination  
6 for a short period of time through correct pumping  
7 rates and that sort of thing, that is really the  
8 approach we are talking about right now.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Is that how you're going  
10 to get the levels down to residual saturation  
11 level, where then you can have bioremediation?

12 MS. GOODBODY: That is what we would  
13 like to do. That is kind of in the direction we  
14 would like to go to.

15 All of this subject has not been sent  
16 and hammered out as yet, but that is the direction  
17 we are going.

18 MR. HANSEN: What sort of a ballpark  
19 estimate would it take to accomplish that?

20 MS. GOODBODY: You know, when we put

1           these together, we put capital, and then annual  
2           for one year.

3                         Actual, those might be really good  
4           numbers.

5                         What site are you talking about?  
6           Pick a site and I'll tell you how much it is going  
7           to cost.

8                         MR. HANSEN:   For the total island.

9                         MS. GOODBODY:  I don't have a total  
10          here.

11                        MR. HANSEN:  One million dollars or  
12          ten million dollars?

13                        MS. GOODBODY:  For the total island?  
14          That's a good question.  This would be just for  
15          UST now.

16                        I can't give you that number right  
17          now.  I need to sit down with a calculator and  
18          figure it out.  I have a summary of costs here.

19                        MR. HANSEN:  You only have eight  
20          sites.  It would not be covered over all.

1 MS. NELSON: Is it impossible to put  
2 the costs together?

3 MS. GOODBODY: It's not impossible,  
4 no.

5 MR. HANSEN: In order of magnitude,  
6 is it a million gallons of fuel down there, or a  
7 hundred million gallons, or a supertanker full,  
8 or is it a gallon full?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The quantity of  
10 fuel, I think, relatively speaking, is not that  
11 large.

12 MS. GOODBODY: It all depends on your  
13 sites. 270 on Yerba Buena Island is probably our  
14 worst site.

15 I just couldn't tell you. That is a  
16 tough question to come up with a number right now.

17 MS. NELSON: Can we make that an  
18 action item for the next meeting?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The action item  
20 being for cost?

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

MS. NELSON: To ERM cost for  
remediation by island, Yerba Buena and Treasure  
Island, total.

MS. CASSA: For what sites?

MS. NELSON: The UST sites.

MS. GOODBODY: All I can do is the 8  
UST sites.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Navy will  
provide a cost figure as an action item on the UST  
Program.

MS. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. HEHN: It is important to keep in  
mind, in looking at the pump-and-treat scenario,  
that you are discussing -- and Gina maybe can  
verify this -- it is my understanding from the new  
guidance document that, unless there is a serious  
source problem, that essentially you have to get  
special dispensation from the Regional Board to  
even implement or impose a pump-and-treat on the  
groundwater at this point; is that correct?

1 MS. KATHURIA: You have to have  
2 compelling reasons to pump and treat. That is  
3 what the guidance says.

4 We are trying to push intrinsic  
5 remediation at sites at Treasure Island. That was  
6 written in a way to address the particular issue.  
7 You get reimbursed when you do your own UST  
8 cleanup, and sort of cut back on state money to  
9 discharge.

10 If you want to spend a lot of money  
11 remediating the site, you want to put parentheses  
12 around when it would be appropriate to pump and  
13 treat, and make the Board more sensitive to the  
14 kind of discharge that you are doing, that you are  
15 really wasting money, and we're not going to give  
16 you the money to do it.

17 MR. HEHN: Where is that with your  
18 remediation?

19 MS. GOODBODY: Removal of floating  
20 product, and usually pump-and-treat has been

1 proven to be non-effective when you are trying to  
2 clean NCO, pumping, and pumping, and pumping; but  
3 for source removal, it is a pretty decent way to  
4 go.

5 We would be in favor of  
6 pump-and-treat to remove it if there is a  
7 compelling reason.

8 MS. NELSON: Is containment?

9 MS. SHIRLEY: I wanted to find out  
10 how the tidal influence study will be incorporated  
11 into this final report.

12 MS. GOODBODY: When I get it from  
13 PRC, from Sharon. She said she would send it to  
14 me.

15 I think that sort of information is  
16 going to be really valuable.

17 MR. HEHN: Hasn't that been released,  
18 the tidal study?

19 MS. GOODBODY: Not before I got this  
20 report out, and I don't have it. I just found out

1 about it the other day.

2 MR. HANSEN: As a third request for  
3 what Patricia asked for, how much fuel are we  
4 talking about for Yerba Buena Island and Treasure  
5 Island? What is the order of magnitude of the  
6 cost?

7 And the third question I would have,  
8 how much is just drifting out into the Bay if you  
9 do nothing?

10 Just pretend it is a leaky valve of  
11 jelly.

12 MS. GOODBODY: That is a very good  
13 question; and at this point, none of our sites --  
14 I can show you some of the contours that we've  
15 prepared -- and it does not appear that any of the  
16 sites right now are leaking in the Bay. Keep in  
17 mind they have been in the ground a very long  
18 time.

19 MR. HANSEN: I did not notice an oil  
20 spill as I was driving over the bridge.

1 MS. GOODBODY: It does not appear  
2 that any of them are leaking into the Bay, based  
3 on the information we have.

4 MR. HEHN: Including Site 270?

5 MS. GOODBODY: It does not look like  
6 it.

7 MS. SMITH: What is 270?

8 MR. HEHN: The one at Yerba Buena.

9 (Showing of slides)

10 MS. GOODBODY: Where we have question  
11 marks, we have not characterized it. IR Site No.  
12 11 is off in this direction right here  
13 (indicating).

14 We are not really sure how they are  
15 interacting, and all I can say at this point,  
16 Sharon and I need to work with PRC to somehow  
17 figure out what the heck is going on.

18 Right here (indicating), that could  
19 be telling us that everything is okay out there.  
20 It does not appear -- the groundwater is flowing

1 in this direction (indicating), and we think it is  
2 a fairly consistent gradient.

3 We also have it characterized, we  
4 need to look a little bit more deeply into the  
5 Coast Guard at being maybe another source.

6 This site definitely needs a little  
7 more work. We went out there twice to try to  
8 characterize the plume. It kept looking bigger  
9 and bigger. We really don't have a handle on this  
10 one.

11 Our proposed alternative was to  
12 basically do some source removal, and we thought  
13 it would be a real good idea, just as an interim  
14 approach, to get things controlled. But we will  
15 see.

16 Are there any more questions?

17 MR. HEHN: In general, essentially  
18 all except 270 seems to be diesel; is that  
19 correct?

20 MS. GOODBODY: Yes.

1 MR. HEHN: And most of them look to  
2 be fairly limited in air standards?

3 MS. GOODBODY: Yes.

4 MR. HEHN: In your view, in your  
5 understanding of bioremediation, if you did  
6 adequate storage removal to take care of free  
7 product concentrations, how effective would  
8 natural bioattenuation be on these sites?

9 Give us your best technical answer.

10 MS. GOODBODY: I wish I had studied  
11 that for a little bit more on the data that they  
12 looked at. That would probably be your best  
13 estimate.

14 MS. KATHURIA: They looked at several  
15 parameters, CO, microbial counts, increase in  
16 concentration in the source area, the source of  
17 decay of bioremediation.

18 MS. GOODBODY: They looked at at  
19 least a thousand sites, and I really couldn't tell  
20 you at this point.

1 MS. KATHURIA: If we had a good  
2 handle on the source.

3 MS. GOODBODY: I don't think we do.

4 MS. KATHURIA: Monitoring Well 1.

5 MS. GOODBODY: The concentration  
6 wasn't that high, I don't think.

7 MS. KATHURIA: On monitoring Well 1?

8 MS. GOODBODY: The darkest contour on  
9 there represents above -- I will use the phrase  
10 "milligrams per liter here" -- about a thousand  
11 milligrams per liter is red; and above a hundred  
12 milligrams per liter is yellow; and then above 10  
13 milligrams per liter is the other color.

14 The diesel on the monitoring well was  
15 only 5.8 milligrams per liter.

16 MS. KATHURIA: In the text, it says  
17 it is different.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Do you have a copy of  
19 the references on page R-4 of the Livermore  
20 Report? The reference by Wright and others, and

1 Rice. I believe it is the same person that was in  
2 charge of the team, the one we have a copy of.

3 Do you have a copy of the California  
4 Underground Tanks Historical Case Analysis? That  
5 site they looked at, what product they looked at,  
6 and what statistics they used?

7 MS. KATHURIA: I don't have it  
8 myself. I can look at where to get it.

9 MR. ALLMAN: It would be good to have  
10 it available.

11 I got this one from somebody else, so  
12 get the other one.

13 MS. NELSON: I would like the  
14 proposal that Site 270 be brought up at the  
15 Technical Subcommittee meeting. There is several  
16 issues here worth mentioning. Right there are  
17 clear bubbles, and disguising a billion parts per  
18 million as a thousand parts per million is nice.

19 MS. GOODBODY: What they're saying,  
20 it is not big numbers.

1 MS. NELSON: We need to know more  
2 about it.

3 MS. GOODBODY: You are right. We  
4 have not characterized this site, and sharing  
5 information with PRC, and seeing if we can come up  
6 with any kind of explanation why, for instance,  
7 floating product is in that well; and I need to  
8 look into it a little further.

9 MS. NELSON: Let's make that an  
10 action item for the Technical Subcommittee and  
11 give ERM West an opportunity to do a little  
12 research with PRC.

13 MR. HEHN: Out of the eight sites, it  
14 got the largest impact.

15 MS. GOODBODY: And largest unknown.

16 MR. HEHN: And the largest unknown,  
17 and the possible upgrading source, which is kind  
18 of a real concern.

19 One thing I wanted to discuss with  
20 you, too, is, in looking at the remediation option

1 for these eight sites, or the seven, leaving 270  
2 out for now, you have sort of discounted the  
3 residual total microcarbons in the soil, in the  
4 saturated zone. In diesel, that becomes almost a  
5 continuing source problem.

6 Do you have any ideas how to address  
7 that source?

8 MS. GOODBODY: I feel that, in a lot  
9 of respects, what you propose for groundwater  
10 remediation is also going to work on your  
11 saturated soil; and that is usually a general  
12 school of thought.

13 Maybe getting source removal is one  
14 thing, but trying to tack this attached to the  
15 soil particles and in the groundwater, the whole  
16 component that is in a saturated zone, and trying  
17 to get that, we don't necessarily say that  
18 pump-and-treat is the way to go with something  
19 like that.

20 But Connelly has established, once

1 you remove our source, do we need to do anything  
2 else besides biodegradation?

3 What we're finding at the sites is  
4 that the water table has risen since the tags were  
5 pulled, and pretty much our contamination is  
6 typically confined to the saturated zone.

7 Excavation is just an economical  
8 approach at all for doing saturated soil.

9 So I think that, maybe once we have  
10 evaluated a little more volume, a little more of  
11 the Livermore volume, and come up with  
12 site-specific cleanup goals that we can all live  
13 with, then we need to go forward and say, "Okay,  
14 now, what do we need to do but pump and treat?"

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any more questions on  
16 the subject?

17 We have one last topic that Jim  
18 wanted to solicit some input on.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We want to take  
20 the opportunity, since we are in the process of

1 upgrading the last cleanup plan, of soliciting any  
2 comments that anyone may have on the existing BRAC  
3 Cleanup Plan, because if we stay on schedule, we  
4 will be providing you a draft of the revised --  
5 not the entire new document -- but the draft of  
6 the revised pages in about mid-February, sometime  
7 before our next meeting.

8 So whether you want to come and  
9 publicly hear, or call me, or send in any  
10 information about any comments you have on this  
11 existing document of March of 1995.

12 One thing that we will do is, I think  
13 we will make it a much friendlier document in  
14 Chapters 3 and 4, which are the two really most  
15 significant chapters of the document.

16 One discusses the program, and then  
17 the fourth chapter discusses what our objectives  
18 are.

19 So if you want to learn about USTs,  
20 you have to look in Chapter 3 to find out what we

1 did, and Chapter 4 to find out what we're going to  
2 do. And we're going to merge those together so  
3 that all the discussion on a given topic, like  
4 USTs, is in one place.

5 MS. NELSON: That is music to my  
6 ears. I was hoping that our revised map would  
7 also incorporate that.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The revision of  
9 the map is being done in connection with the  
10 provision of the documents, because yours and  
11 Rick's comments regarding the data, we are  
12 validating the data for the correct cleanup plan  
13 as well as for the new map, and we expect to issue  
14 the new map sometime in March, in the March time  
15 frame, as early as we can.

16 MS. SMITH: Will it also include lead  
17 and asbestos as the BRAC Cleanup Plan?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The BRAC Cleanup  
19 Plan includes discussion of all of our programs.  
20 The map is more oriented towards the USTs and IRs.

1                   With that, I will take comments at  
2                   anytime between now and when the draft comes out  
3                   in February.

4                   CO-CHAIR WONG: Under organizational  
5                   business --

6                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have a review  
7                   of action items; but in light of the time, if  
8                   anyone has particular questions or comments  
9                   concerning past action items as are identified on  
10                  the meeting minutes, please tell me or Brad, so we  
11                  can proceed to the rest of the orientation  
12                  business.

13                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Under the  
14                  organizational business, in terms of the interim  
15                  meeting update, I think Paul did a real good job  
16                  of summarizing what went on at that meeting and  
17                  the memo he submitted, you all received. I ask  
18                  you to refer to that.

19                  It is that time of year when we need  
20                  to consider co-chairs and alternate co-chairs,

1 community co-chairs for the upcoming year; so I  
2 would like to see if there is any discussion  
3 tonight. But I ask people to think about, for  
4 next month's meeting, whom they would like to  
5 nominate for community co-chair and alternate  
6 community co-chair as well.

7 If anybody has an interest in  
8 chairing the Technical Subcommittee, you can bring  
9 the nominations to February's meeting; and we can  
10 do a vote on that and get the community co-chair  
11 in place for the upcoming year.

12 The last thing I had under  
13 organizational business was, we have been looking  
14 at -- as part of the revision of the agenda  
15 here -- to move the BRAC cleanup process  
16 discussions up front, and then supplement them  
17 with educational topics to spend our time, bring  
18 people up to speed, on some of the issues  
19 surrounding some of the things that we'll be  
20 addressing in upcoming meetings.

1 I want to see if we couldn't agree.

2 We got feedback from the people on the list of  
3 future educational topics for the upcoming year  
4 that everyone has received at a previous meeting,  
5 and the feedback we got on this was, in order of  
6 priority, to see if we could have a discussion on  
7 how cleanup levels are established. That is the  
8 number one priority for an educational topic.

9 The second was to learn about  
10 petroleum hydrocarbon phase transport.

11 The third was to learn about human  
12 health risk assessment.

13 The fourth was ecological risk  
14 assessment.

15 And the fifth was geotechnical  
16 impacts on cleanup planning.

17 I wanted to see tonight if we can get  
18 a motion to accept these as the order of the  
19 educational topics that we would be addressing  
20 over the next five months.

1 MR. VAN WYE: I so move.

2 MR. ALLMAN: I second the motion.

3 (The motion carried.)

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: Great. That's it.

5 MR. ALLMAN: The item I wanted to  
6 slip in, I have had a call in for a while, and  
7 finally I got a call this week, a woman, Aimee  
8 Houghton, who works at Career Pro, which is  
9 affiliated with San Francisco State University's  
10 downtown office on Market Street; and they are  
11 also funded by the Department of Defense; and they  
12 are charged with, I guess, helping to educate  
13 members of RABs on issues that are going on, and  
14 discussions.

15 They currently have a sort of an e  
16 mail subscription set up, where people can send in  
17 comments, and they can be e mailed, and you can  
18 review them.

19 But in the course of talking to her,  
20 I found out anybody who is a member of a RAB,

1 regulator or community members, can get a free e  
2 mail account, where they can dial into any local  
3 California State University and connect to their e  
4 mail address.

5 And if you're kind of ticked off  
6 about having to pay \$13 and want to have e mail  
7 access anyway, this is, (a), your chance to get it  
8 free; and (b), I think it is a great way for us to  
9 keep in touch with each other. I have been using  
10 it all the time; it is a very convenient way of  
11 communicating with people.

12 I realize not everybody has a  
13 computer or has a modem. Career Pro sends out all  
14 the information in print as well as e mail. So  
15 for those of you who don't have it, you are not  
16 being closed out.

17 MR. VAN WYE: Do you have a point of  
18 contact or anything in writing?

19 MR. ALLMAN: She said it is okay to  
20 give her name. Her name is Aimee, A-I-M-E-E,

1 Houghton, H-O-U-G-H-T-O-N, at Career Pro, and that  
2 is in San Francisco at 954-7751.

3 So all you have to do is call her and  
4 suggest a log-in name for yourself, and then she  
5 will set you up for the account and I assume will  
6 help you figure out how to log in, using whatever  
7 software you need.

8 If you can't figure it out, call me.  
9 I will figure out how to log in.

10 MR. NEDELL: Will they put you on  
11 their mailing list?

12 MR. ALLMAN: I'm sure you can ask  
13 them not to. They send out a newsletter. You can  
14 ask them to remove you from the list and just have  
15 the e mail access.

16 I am working with them as part of an  
17 External Affairs Committee. They are trying to  
18 develop a web site for having information  
19 exchange, which can be then shared nationally with  
20 RABs around the country, and certainly within the

1 state and the West Coast.

2 So I am going to be working with her  
3 on setting up. We will talk about, at future  
4 meetings, about a local web site for our  
5 individual concerns at Treasure Island RAB; and  
6 that will be linked to other pages; so basically  
7 we will do a lot of work on immune or assay  
8 evaluations for doing the site assessments.

9 Everybody else has that same  
10 information available, so the RAB someplace else  
11 does not have to spend a lot of time with a  
12 contractor to do a lot of studies that we have  
13 already done here.

14 And by the same token, their RABs,  
15 they have done studies that we can take advantage  
16 of; and that way you know what is available.

17 MR. HEHN: To follow up on what John  
18 is talking about with Aimee, on the 18th of  
19 January there was a meeting by California EPA and  
20 the RAB Caucus, called by the statewide RAB Caucus

1 meeting; and one of the things that came out was a  
2 brief discussion at the end of that meeting with  
3 Dave Wang, DTSC; and we tentatively arranged the  
4 RAB Caucus to meet with Dave Wang possibly  
5 February 15, 16, or 28, or 29th at a site to be  
6 determined yet; and that same number for her  
7 probably will get you that information.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: ARC is setting up that  
9 meeting. You can then call 495-1786.

10 MR. HEHN: That is going to be a  
11 discussion on statewide RAB issues and concerns  
12 that can be discussed, and how to work through  
13 these issues with the DTSC in a more constructive  
14 manner.

15 The second thing is also just a  
16 little aside for the RAB.

17 During the Admiral's party back in  
18 December, I happened to meet with Gloria Root of  
19 CRC; and she very strongly expressed her great  
20 admiration for the members of the Treasure Island

1 RAB and their dedication in trying to do this on  
2 their own time and on their own dollars to get  
3 that information to CRC.

4 She said she was very, very  
5 appreciative about it; and she really noted the  
6 efforts that were made. So it is appreciated.

7 MS. GLASS: Speaking as one volunteer  
8 to another, I'm sure.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: I wanted to follow on  
10 and mention that the next Regional RAB Caucus  
11 meeting will be February 21 for community members  
12 at ARC.

13 MS. SMITH: Let me just follow on  
14 that.

15 ARC is also facilitating a Regional  
16 Sediment Subcommittee to study benthic creatures  
17 around sediment and benthic creatures around  
18 primarily Naval sites, but possibly also Army  
19 sites, so that we don't go through the same loop  
20 we went through the amino assay.

1                   They have got people; they have  
2                   funding from the University of California at  
3                   Berkeley to do major studies whether or not it is  
4                   appropriate to disturb marine sediments or not;  
5                   and if you do, what sort of remediation do you do?

6                   So that will be available, also, on  
7                   the Career Pro Web site, but also through ARC, as  
8                   it goes along. It is kind of a long-range, big  
9                   project.

10                   MR. ALLMAN: With concern to the web  
11                   site, I wanted to state that, right now, as of  
12                   yesterday, I'm working with Aimee, trying to set  
13                   it up; but I invite anybody that has an interest  
14                   in setting up a web page, or contributing to the  
15                   page, or learning how to do it, I welcome anybody  
16                   to call me, who wants to get involved with that.

17                   We will draft it in the External  
18                   Affairs Committee and do that.

19                   CO-CHAIR WONG: Great.

20                   Any other announcements?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We would like to  
2 get an idea, we are still scheduling the  
3 Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop for one week  
4 from tonight, right here, same time, same place.

5 We would like to get an idea of who  
6 is planning to attend that workshop. (Show of  
7 hands.)

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is a good  
9 number, and we will continue to work putting that  
10 together. We have a draft agenda for that.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Are guests welcome to  
12 that, or is that a closed workshop?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Guests are  
14 welcome.

15 Upcoming, as far as documents go, we  
16 closed out the common period on the Corrective  
17 Measures Study, and we will be working on the BRAC  
18 Cleanup Plan, and there are a few other documents  
19 coming a couple of months down the road, like the  
20 Fossil. I will have a schedule for those on the

1 agenda.

2 MS. SMITH: Is there anything on 2,  
3 ditto to the 2b field program?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is data,  
5 but it has not been validated yet.

6 We have the workshop next week, and  
7 then our next regular meeting is the 27th of  
8 February, and your next mid-month community  
9 meeting on the 2nd Tuesday, that will be the 13th  
10 of February.

11 And then the next Citizens Re-use  
12 Committee meeting is on the 5th of February.

13 MR. HANSEN: Is that interim meeting  
14 to be in this room?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Over in Building  
16 1. It looks like all the interim meetings will  
17 happen in Building 1, in the conference room; but  
18 the workshop next week will be in this room.

19 With that, unless there is any other  
20 comments, thank you very much; and we will see you

1 at the workshop a week from tonight; the interim  
2 meeting on the 13th; the next regular meeting on  
3 the 27th of February.

4 (Whereupon the meeting adjourned at  
5 9:35 p.m.)

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

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

CERTIFICATE OR REPORTER

I, PAUL SCHILLER, duly authorized  
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.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto  
set my hand and affixed my signature this JAN 26 1996  
day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1995

Paul Schiller  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
State of California