

COPY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

21 May 1996

7:00 p.m.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz Conference Center

Treasure Island

Meeting No. 22

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR #1268

529

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

IN ATTENDANCE:

U.S. NAVY

- Jim Sullivan (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
- Ernie Galang (RPM)
- Marvin Norman (Counsel)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MGT., INC.

- Sharon Tobias
- Stacey Lupton
- Susanne von Rosenberg (GAIA Consulting,
Inc.)

REGULATORY AGENCIES

- Chein Kao (DTSC)
- Rachel Simons (US EPA)
- Martha Walters (SFDPH)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

- James Aldrich
- John Allman

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

Chris Shirley (ARC Ecology)

Richard Hansen

Fred Hayden

Paul Hehn (Alt. Community Co-Chair)

Rick Nedell

Patricia Nelson (Community Co-Chair)

Henry Ongerth

Timothy Such

Laurie Glass (TI Citizens Reuse Comm)

Usha Vedagiri

Brad Wong

---oOo---

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

7:17 p.m.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will come to our May Restoration Advisory Board meeting. We have moved up that meeting from the 28th to the 21st, to let everyone take advantage of the Memorial Day Holiday weekend.

I'm glad everyone made it through the earthquake today. Perhaps Jim will give us earthquake tips during the break. The only casualty I know of is that Sue was baking some bread for tonight's meeting, and the bread collapsed during the earthquake.

The first item -- everyone should have a copy of the agenda. If not, there should be more on the side table back there. This was probably the earliest we ever mailed out the agenda. Probably everyone got it around Thursday.

The down side is there are a few simple changes in the agenda, things that evolved over the last week; so what we're going to do is,

1 we're still working on the 8:30 item, "Annual
2 Groundwater Monitoring;" we're still completing
3 the report; but rather than being able to present
4 the report tonight, we're going to give an
5 overview of the groundwater and other Phase II
6 topics that we're going to discuss in the next
7 couple of months.

8 So instead of the groundwater
9 monitoring report, it will kind of segue into the
10 report, which will be next month. I believe
11 that's the only substantive change.

12 Unless there are any other comments
13 regarding the agenda for tonight, we will proceed.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I have a comment on
15 the agenda:

16 I got the April Progress Report that
17 Ernie prepared. We learned that 10 of the IR
18 sites have been transferred to a corrective action
19 plan, and I think some of us here would like an
20 update on the basis of that decision.

1 MS. SIMONS: Under the BCT meeting --

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Under the BCT
3 update, we will provide a quick update on that.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Also, for the
6 benefit of our reporter, if everyone tonight can
7 talk one at a time and maybe a little slower, to
8 make sure that he is able to get everything so we
9 don't tire him out.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would also like
11 to ask people that have comments they can't wait
12 to tell the person next to them to maybe hold this
13 until the next break, so the reporter can be sure
14 to hear the principals speaking.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: With that, we
16 will move to discussion and approval of the April
17 23rd meeting minutes. There are additional copies
18 of the meeting minutes on the side table, if you
19 need them. Otherwise, are there any comments
20 regarding the 23 April minutes?

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I see a lot of
2 people reading the minutes. Shall we give people
3 a brief few minutes to read the minutes?

4 MR. HEHN: As part of the completion
5 of the last meeting, we were going to go ahead and
6 send out copies, either with the agenda or with
7 the minutes of the comments on the Bench Scale
8 Treatability Study.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we omitted
10 that.

11 MR. HEHN: I did bring some copies
12 along, and they are in the back at the signup
13 table.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any
15 comments concerning the 23 April meeting minutes?

16 With that, we will consider them
17 adopted.

18 We will move into the public comment
19 period. This is the period we set aside for any
20 member of the general public, at the beginning of

1 our meeting, to have any commentary so as to not
2 have to wait until after the meeting.

3 MR. ALLMAN: It is not what Paul
4 said, either; but the comments I made on the
5 treatability study, are those included anywhere?
6 Because they were not sent out.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are they included
8 with yours, Paul?

9 MR. HEHN: I did not include those,
10 John; but I do have a copy here.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will make some
12 copies that Paul has of your comments and make
13 your comments and Paul's comments available. That
14 is on the Bench Scale Treatability Study.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Can we make those
16 available with the minutes of this meeting?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will have to
18 append them with the minutes of the next meeting,
19 unless you want us to mail them out in a separate
20 mailing.

1 MR. HEHN: If it is okay with John,
2 we can send them out with the minutes.

3 MR. ALLMAN: That is fine.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Those will be the
5 minutes of tonight's meeting.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The minutes of
7 the May meeting, except for the copies that Paul
8 has provided at the side table, which you can pick
9 up tonight, we will append both Paul's and John's
10 comments to the May meeting minutes.

11 MR. HANSEN: Just a general sort of a
12 public comment:

13 Heaven forbid it would ever happen,
14 but because of the events of this afternoon, in
15 case there were an earthquake or significant
16 problems during the phasing down of the Navy's
17 interest at Treasure Island, with their already
18 announced intention of leaving and the fact that
19 the City really has not picked it up yet, would
20 the Navy accept any responsibility for rebuilding

1 of any significant magnitude if an earthquake were
2 to hit during the transitional period?

3 I recognize you can't answer that,
4 Bill; but somehow that needs to be addressed;
5 because those things could happen; and when you
6 are in betwixt the two --

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That might be a
8 good comment for the Citizens Reuse Committee.

9 MR. MARVIN NORMAN: The Navy would
10 not be able to transfer the property in any
11 condition where buildings were unsafe, so
12 buildings that were damaged by the earthquake, I
13 would suggest that necessary repairs for safety
14 would have to be done.

15 There would not be rebuilding of
16 buildings that were damaged to the point no one
17 could use them. There would have to be demolition
18 and clearing of those buildings.

19 MR. HANSEN: If the sewer treatment
20 plant were damaged, then it would be restored?

1 MR. NORMAN: That would be public
2 health and safety.

3 MR. HANSEN: Up to the actual day
4 that the Navy departs, and that date is --

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 30 September of
6 1997 or whenever the property is finally
7 transferred.

8 I can talk to you during the break,
9 and we can discuss it in a little more detail.

10 With that, we will close the public
11 comment period and move into the general update.

12 Ernie has volunteered, Ernie being
13 our lead, not an official member of the BRAC Team
14 but a member in spirit, and our lead remedial
15 project manager at EFA West.

16 MR. GALANG: As far as the BCT
17 update, the BCT met at the office on May 15th; and
18 we welcomed Ms. Chris Shirley at that meeting.
19 The items that we have discussed were the BOC air
20 sampling comments that we received.

1 There is an upcoming BCT West Coast
2 Conference in Newport Beach, in the Los Angeles
3 area, sometime July 28 to August 1st.

4 Then we also discussed the funding
5 for air (unintelligible) '97, which you have had a
6 chance to look at, and then also the Reuse Plan.
7 I think that is the very, very draft plan that
8 Martha shared with us at that meeting.

9 Then one of the big topics is the
10 transfer of some IR sites out of the CERCLA
11 Program to the Compliance Program of the Navy; and
12 during the initial site that we have determined
13 there were 10; and during that meeting we
14 determined that we're pulling out site 17; so we
15 will have 9 sites to be addressed under the
16 Compliance Program.

17 The reason for site 17 is because we
18 have some BOCs that we have found in the Phase
19 IIB, so we're going back this summer. If we will
20 have the funding, we will go back and get some

1 sampling again.

2 And then we discussed, also, the RAB
3 meeting agenda for tonight. And that's it.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: I really appreciated
5 the fact that you included me in the meeting as a
6 resource, and I think that the other bases should
7 do that, to have that link with the RAB, which is
8 quite valuable, I thought, if questions came up.

9 Anyway, I just wanted to say thank
10 you.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

12 MR. KAO: Could I expand a little bit
13 on the last item on the petroleum sites being
14 transferred from the IR Program to the Compliance
15 Program.

16 These are basically sites that were
17 found -- most or all of them are petroleum-only
18 sites. They do not fall under the jurisdiction of
19 CERCLA authority; therefore, it needs to be
20 transferred to the other program, which me, being

1 a new member of the BCT Team, I have not been
2 participating in the discussions; so I have a
3 number of questions I wanted to clear before we
4 can finalize that list.

5 MR. ALLMAN: In the minutes it says
6 that the DTSC stated that the results of the
7 study, of the treatability study, that is, could
8 not be used for sites that remained in the IR
9 Program. So basically the sites that were chosen
10 for the treatability study were apparently already
11 in the Compliance Program?

12 MR. KAO: Well, when I received that
13 treatability study work plan, Jim told me that was
14 the work plan for petroleum-contaminated sites
15 only. My reaction to that was, if it is
16 petroleum-contaminated sites only, it goes out of
17 the CERCLA Program; and I don't have to review
18 that.

19 But if there is any contamination
20 that is comingled with any hazardous waste, then

1 it needs to stay within the IR Program. Then the
2 treatability study itself does not apply.

3 MR. ALLMAN: My question is sort of
4 addressing the inverse issue, that is, the sites
5 that are now being transferred from the IR Program
6 to the Compliance Program under the Water Board.
7 There are going to be different locations other
8 than the ones that are being considered now in the
9 treatability study, where the specific samples
10 were listed in the work plan, or at least in the
11 treatability study.

12 Is that the same as the work plan,
13 the treatability study; or is this a separate work
14 plan for the treatability study?

15 MS. TOBIAS: It was the work plan for
16 the treatability study.

17 MR. ALLMAN: That addressed certain
18 sites based on the standard characteristic soils
19 or contaminant levels in those locations that were
20 chosen that were already in the Compliance

1 Program.

2 So were all the sites that are being
3 transferred similar soil type and under similar
4 conditions as the ones being used in the
5 treatability study? I guess this may be a
6 question more for the Water Board.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess there are
8 two issues, if I can summarize, John:

9 One is a question about what sites
10 now will be considered subject to the treatability
11 study; is that right?

12 And the other question, if I'm
13 understanding it, is those sites that were
14 considered in the treatability study that are now
15 transferred to this other program?

16 MR. ALLMAN: It is actually the
17 reverse. They are taking sites that are in the IR
18 Program and adding those to the Compliance
19 Program, which means, if the treatability study is
20 deemed feasible, then it would presumably

1 potentially be used at any site on TI under the
2 Compliance Program.

3 What I'm asking is, can the
4 treatability study be modified to make sure that
5 the soil types and basically geographic
6 considerations of the new sites that are going
7 into the Compliance Program, if those soils are
8 going to be sampled at least in the type in the
9 present treatability study?

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we need
11 clarification. What sites are going to be
12 addressed in the treatability study?

13 Sharon, if you can help us on that?

14 MS. TOBIAS: There has been a bit of
15 confusion, and the treatability study does list a
16 number of sites, and I don't know what sites off
17 the top of my head. It is true that there are
18 sites that we listed in there that are all being
19 transferred into the Petroleum Program. However,
20 the Navy -- I'm speaking for PRC, PRC emanating --

1 would like to apply the results. What we're
2 looking for in the treatability study is to
3 determine for a certain weight soil types if
4 bioremediation will work. And the weight soil
5 types that we plan on sampling during the
6 treatability study, where we're planning to get
7 the source of the soil, are representing some
8 petroleum soil that are remaining within the
9 CERCLA Program.

10 So we still feel that we can apply
11 the bioremediation treatability study to any site
12 that has petroleum-contaminated soil.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And petroleum, if
14 it remains in CERCLA, then you have some BOC, if I
15 understand the program; but the IR sites are the
16 petroleum plus BOC; and the treatability study
17 will be applied to those sites; but the technology
18 can also be used for petroleum-only sites; is that
19 right?

20 MS. TOBIAS: That's correct.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And the question I
2 have is, are there petroleum-only sites, that have
3 been transferred to the Corrective Action Program,
4 that will be subject to the treatability?

5 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, any site that is
6 going to petroleum only from the surplus is going
7 to the Corrective Action Plan; and we plan on
8 using the results from the treatability study to
9 determine to evaluate the best corrective action
10 plan.

11 MR. ALLMAN: That means I can express
12 my question, and it still applies.

13 Basically, for example, the naming of
14 the sites that are going to be used in the
15 treatability study -- and I look at the map to see
16 where they're located -- say they're located on
17 TI.

18 MS. TOBIAS: They're all on Treasure
19 Island.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Now, for example -- and

1 this may be covered; I just want to make sure that
2 it is -- if now you figure out that a site that is
3 on Yerba Buena Island, which has an entirely
4 different soil type chemistry and bacteria level
5 than landfill out here on TI, is suddenly
6 transferred into the Petroleum Program. The
7 treatability study works for the landfill material
8 that was used at TI and may not apply to YB.

9 MS. TOBIAS: That is correct.

10 MR. ALLMAN: So will that be taken
11 into consideration, that you have to do another
12 treatability study; or are you just going to
13 say, "Since the Water Board is allowing us to do
14 this, we will do it at these sites, even though
15 they're entirely different types of
16 geomorphology?"

17 MS. TOBIAS: To be perfectly honest,
18 right now there are five IR sites on YB Island.
19 Two of them are bridge sites, which are
20 complicated. One of them is a landfill which has

1 petroleum contamination, but remedy for a
2 landfill, you wouldn't need bioremediation for
3 capping or containment.

4 MR. ALLMAN: It does not matter where
5 the sites are. Hypothetical example --

6 MS. TOBIAS: I see your point. I
7 don't think we plan to have a choice of sites from
8 Yerba Buena Island.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Okay, we're getting too
10 technical now.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe we can
12 address your comments one on one during the break.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Before we close, I
14 would like to suggest that we create an action
15 item out of this and that either the Navy or PRC
16 or the Water Board identify those sites that will
17 be subject to the treatability technology.

18 MS. TOBIAS: Any petroleum-only site
19 is subject to that treatability study, any
20 petroleum site.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I understand that,
2 but are there specific sites? Can you create a
3 list of those sites, if it is different than what
4 is stated in the plan?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will come back
6 and restate this, rather than try to answer it now
7 in the middle of the meeting, as an action item.
8 We will clarify the use of the treatability study.

9 MR. KAO: I want to add one thing
10 about the petroleum exclusion subject: The few
11 meetings I attended, I feel there was a little bit
12 confusion out there as to what exactly petroleum
13 exclusion means; so I brought a number of copies
14 of our policy; and the title is "Interpretation of
15 Petroleum Exclusion;" and this is basically our
16 policy how to interpret what is petroleum
17 exclusion.

18 If you would like to have a copy, I
19 will leave it on the table there; and you can take
20 a copy of it.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Now, Laurie, do you have a brief update on the Citizens Reuse Committee activities?

MS. GLASS: I will try to make it as brief as possible -- I will make it as brief as possible.

The CRC met three times since the last RAB meeting, on May 6th, 13th, and 20th.

On the 6th, the BRAC Reuse Plan was handed out; and I sent you all a copy of it; so you should have received it in the mail.

It was discussed on the 13th and the 20th, and there was a section added on the 20th, which was yesterday, on implementation, which Jim brought an extra copy for you to have.

The CRC is scheduled to endorse this A Plan. Various people are making suggestions for changes and whatnot. Anyway, the CRC is scheduled to endorse the A Reuse Plan on June 3rd; and then it will start to march on the 12th of June.

1 The CRC is going to be meeting with
2 Mayor Willie Brown to make their recommendations
3 about the Plan to him, and it's possible at that
4 meeting that the mayor will exercise his option to
5 make some changes in membership of the CRC.

6 Also at this meeting yesterday, Larry
7 Florin announced that there will be a change in
8 the local reuse authority for Treasure Island. It
9 will no longer be the Redevelopment Agency; it
10 will be located in the mayor's office; and it will
11 be staffed with six people.

12 He said that this indicates -- and
13 this is scheduled to be implemented on July 1st --

14 MS. WALTERS: Actually, August 1st.

15 MS. GLASS: Larry Florin represented
16 this as an indication of the mayor's interest and
17 concern about the Treasure Island Naval Station
18 and the reuse here. So that's what that was.

19 Just one note about something that
20 was mentioned yesterday, actually.

1 Early on you may recall there was a
2 discussion of a whole island ground remediation on
3 Treasure Island, involving ground compaction and
4 adding soil. We had a number of discussions about
5 the effect of that, and that apparently has been
6 no longer assumed in the reuse planning for
7 Treasure Island.

8 There is still the assumption that
9 there will be some improvement to their perimeter
10 dike; and this, as many of you know, is in the
11 hundred feet range all around the edge. This is
12 where a lot of the fuel lines and what not are
13 located.

14 Maybe it is the same difference, but
15 I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

16 That's what I can think of right now.
17 I guess at a future meeting of the RAB there will
18 be a discussion of the Reuse Plan as it touches on
19 environmental cleanup issues.

20 MR. HEHN: Laurie, can you elaborate

1 a little bit on the change in no longer looking at
2 the fill? That is kind of a dramatic change of
3 what was previously assumed.

4 MS. GLASS: It is.

5 MR. HEHN: What the background of
6 that was?

7 MS. GLASS: One of the things that
8 does, which I think is probably, I guess, a major
9 factor, it moves the cost for addressing soil
10 issues, geotechnical issues, on Treasure Island
11 from the public sector to the private sector, or
12 the reuser, the specific reuser, and would
13 necessitate certain types of special foundations
14 for any new construction.

15 I wouldn't hazard a guess about
16 retrofit. That's one of the things that was
17 mentioned at the meeting.

18 MR. HANSEN: Was this based on any
19 new investigation, on physical insight, or just a
20 decision that was made?

1 MS. GLASS: Just some additional
2 thinking, some evolution in the thinking about the
3 different kinds of things.

4 I would add that the city attorney's
5 office is doing some assessment of the structural
6 conditions for existing buildings in their current
7 locations. Findings from that study are not yet
8 available. It will be very soon available.

9 MR. NEDELL: Why is the city attorney
10 doing that?

11 MS. GLASS: The mayor directed the
12 city attorney to look into that.

13 MR. NEDELL: I didn't know they were
14 competent engineers.

15 MS. GLASS: They hired somebody, who
16 was competent, to do that.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Laurie, I would
18 like to clarify. What you mailed out that the
19 community membership should have received is the
20 basic Reuse Plan.

1 MS. GLASS: That was mailed out like
2 the 7th, as I recall.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And what I have
4 on the side table, which was just produced,
5 literally, yesterday, is the implementation plan
6 that I heard, which Laurie --

7 MS. GLASS: The implementation
8 chapter.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The
10 implementation chapter of the Reuse Plan.

11 But you're still going to be mailing
12 out the implementation chapter?

13 MS. GLASS: I will. It will be
14 attached to the three minutes that you will soon
15 receive.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have these
17 advance copies of the implementation chapter on
18 the side table, and I found it very exciting to
19 read, because it is for RAB to chew on, because it
20 starts talking more specifically about what is

1 planned, where it is planned, and approximately
2 the time frame. And those are the kinds of things
3 we need to be thinking about in terms of planning
4 of the cleanup in conjunction with the reuse.

5 MR. HEHN: Laurie, does the CRC now
6 feel comfortable that they can deal with the
7 seismic issues that they had concerns with before?
8 Do they have another view of that?

9 MS. GLASS: I think that's fair to
10 say, because I think there are some diagrams that
11 show phasing, that show the perimeter
12 reinforcement, progression of the perimeter
13 reinforcement; and that was the basic thing that
14 needs to happen in order -- according to the
15 geotechnical duration developed for the Reuse
16 Plan, it was an important thing to assure that
17 rotational site failures will not happen on the
18 edge, which are apparently most dramatic, in the
19 event there is a high level earthquake, which is a
20 high level, once-in-a-hundred-years or once-in-a-

1 long-time event.

2 MR. HEHN: Thank you.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very
4 much, Laurie.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I have a question:

6 There are people among the RAB that
7 wanted to comment to CRC on the Plan before June
8 3rd, because there is really only one week between
9 now and then.

10 MS. GLASS: And Pat had asked me to
11 say that if you do have any questions or comments,
12 feel free to call me about your questions,
13 comments or -- vastly preferable -- in written
14 form. Even handwritten is fine. You can send
15 them to me at the Redevelopment Agency, 770 Golden
16 Gate Avenue, San Francisco 94102; or you can fax
17 them to me at (415) 749-2565; and I will make sure
18 that they get forwarded.

19 But I must say that, in order for any
20 comments to be considered, the deadline for the

1 committee on their comments is tomorrow, so you
2 can see that time is of the essence.

3 MR. HANSEN: Who did this?

4 MS. GLASS: This was part of the
5 reuse planning consultant team, Economic Planning
6 Systems. You see their name at the top.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will take two
8 brief comments; then we can move ahead.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Concerning the potential
10 for Mayor Brown to reappoint people, does that
11 affect your status as far as our communications to
12 CRC? Is that a potential replacement?

13 MS. GLASS: I really wouldn't know
14 how to answer that question at this point. Maybe
15 we can discuss that at break.

16 MR. ALLMAN: I was wondering, can a
17 new committee nix this whole plan and start from
18 scratch?

19 MS. GLASS: That is extremely
20 unlikely to happen.

1 MR. HAYDEN: Since the shift to Mayor
2 Brown's office suggests more of a politicization
3 of what is going on, I can't think of a major
4 design earthquake as being a one in a hundred
5 years sort of event; that when an earthquake
6 occurs, it is something that a major earthquake
7 just occurs. That is something that people are
8 trying to figure out in terms of probabilities.

9 MS. GLASS: I did not mean to
10 imply -- whenever the experts say, at whatever
11 probability the experts say, I am not a geologist.

12 MR. HAYDEN: And I am not a
13 politician.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

15 The next item I had, we have a
16 listing of the laboratories you used for the
17 cleanup investigations. Sharon prepared it for
18 me. I can't find it. When I do find it, we will
19 share it; but that was just a backup what we
20 previously said is under the laboratories that

1 apparently have been involved being used in our
2 project.

3 We will provide you, when I find it,
4 a copy of the laboratory list. It probably will
5 be mailed out with these meeting minutes.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If not, I suspect
7 it might become an action item, too.

8 MS. TOBIAS: I think it already was
9 one.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Speaking of
11 action items, in the interest of time, since we're
12 falling behind, I would like to jump to the BRAC
13 cleanup process, so we can get through our
14 presentation.

15 Unless there is any comment?
16 Otherwise I would like to go ahead and do the
17 presentation on the EBS/FOSL for the Navy brig,
18 since it is a timely document.

19 There being no comments, I would like
20 to introduce Susanne from GAIA Consulting; and

1 GAIA is a consultant to PRC. She's going to
2 provide us with a brief on the draft EBS/FOSL for
3 the Navy brig.

4 MS. SUSANNE VON ROSENBERG: Good
5 evening.

6 I am going to talk just briefly about
7 what the EBS area is that we looked at, to give
8 you a little bit of an overview of the features of
9 the area; and talk briefly about the proposed
10 reuse; and, in a little bit more detail, about the
11 risk evaluation results.

12 We do have five minutes scheduled at
13 the end for questions and answers, and you are
14 also welcome to talk to me during the break if you
15 have individual questions you want to ask me.

16 The first thing I wanted to do is get
17 everybody oriented; and forgive me, for those of
18 you for whom this is old news, but I wanted us all
19 to be on the same page.

20 We're talking about the area

1 surrounding the new brig in the northeastern
2 portion of Treasure Island. This is a detailed
3 blowup, and Sharon just passed out copies of these
4 slides so you can follow on in your handout. We
5 will be flipping back and forth between this slide
6 and the next slide.

7 Our EBS area contains four parcels,
8 Parcel T077, T078, T079 and T080. We reclassified
9 Parcel T078, T079 and T080 to BRAC Category 2; and
10 I will get into where that comes from in a minute.

11 The EBS area is approximately 9 acres
12 in size and approximately 5% of the entire area is
13 covered with buildings. It has the new brig and
14 the woodworking shop, and you can see them
15 indicated here. This little building is the
16 woodworking shop up here (indicating), and here is
17 the new brig.

18 We have got the ship-loading training
19 facility down here on Parcel 80; and Building 580
20 is a former building, the shipboard elevator

1 operation maintenance training facility.

2 For those of you who have not been
3 out there in the last three months, the 5-story
4 building no longer exists.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It was picked up
6 and moved.

7 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Disassembled and
8 shipped off site.

9 The remainder of the parcel area is
10 open space. All of the buildings that are located
11 within the EBS area were built after 1980, so
12 asbestos and lead-based paint are not of concern
13 for those buildings, so that is some good news for
14 you.

15 And then, indicated in your figure,
16 there are four IR sites that are adjacent to the
17 EBS area or roughly adjacent.

18 The parcels that are located up here,
19 10, 14, and 22, are considered to be in the
20 upgrade interaction; and IR site 7 is generally in

1 the upper side gradient direction. Again, it is
2 good news, because groundwater generally flows
3 away from the EBS area.

4 So then a little bit about the reuse.

5 As you probably heard, at this point
6 the City of San Francisco is planning to reuse the
7 facility for a women's jail. It is going to be
8 more of a holding facility than a long-term jail.
9 The average prisoner's stay is going to be about
10 15 to 20 days. There will be Sheriff's Department
11 and civilian employees, and they typically get
12 rotated on a 3- to 4-year basis.

13 The City is planning to make some
14 internal improvements to the building to allow
15 them to house up to 180 inmates. There will be
16 additional fencing that will be installed.

17 Those are the primary changes.

18 There will also be additional parking
19 facilities.

20 Any questions so far?

1 MS. SHIRLEY: Would the fencing go
2 around the whole area that is considered the FOSL
3 or an area outside?

4 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Good question.
5 There will actually be two pieces of additional
6 fencing. The new brig, right now, has an exercise
7 yard associated with it. This little blob down
8 here will be doubled fenced. It is a single fence
9 right now. And there will probably also be a
10 fence around the entire brig complex.

11 You see shaded in here with a kind of
12 dotted material, this is an estimate right now of
13 the lease area. The lease area is not going to be
14 the entire EBS area; it is only going to be a
15 portion of it.

16 We examined those four parcels,
17 because there was still some discussion about how
18 much parking would be needed, so we needed to look
19 at the widest possible extent, and it is going to
20 be less than the entire area of the parcel.

1 I mentioned earlier that Parcels 78,
2 79, and 80 were declared to BRAC Category 2. The
3 base YDBS, all four parcels were classified as
4 BRAC Category 7; and as you know, we have gotten a
5 lot of additional information since then, more
6 information from the IR Program; and we have also
7 looked in detail at the sewer line; so that
8 enabled us to reevaluate the BRAC categories for
9 those parcels.

10 Because we identified new releases at
11 the parcels and because the IR Program showed that
12 there was no contaminant migration onto those
13 parcels, they were classified as BRAC Category 2,
14 meaning there had been some storage over the years
15 but no releases.

16 Parcels that are BRAC Category 2 are
17 considered suitable for transfer, and that also
18 means no risk evaluation is needed. They are
19 suitable for transfer. Obviously, we don't assume
20 there is a risk associated with the parcels.

1 So the risk evaluation then focused
2 on Parcel 77. And Parcel 77 is a parcel that is
3 closest to the IR site, and one monitoring well,
4 and three hydropunch locations that are associated
5 with the IR Site 14 are located, actually, on
6 Parcel 77.

7 The good news is that we found no
8 volatile compounds and no petroleum compounds in
9 the soil at Parcel 77. And the concentration of
10 volatility in the groundwater was so low that we
11 don't believe there is a concern potentially
12 focused to indoor air.

13 We did find low concentrations of
14 benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene; and in the one
15 groundwater cell from the well, we found low
16 concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, motor
17 oil, which is non-volatile fraction.

18 Of course, we detected some metals,
19 which both in soil and groundwater are believed to
20 be naturally-occurring metals in the area.

1 Those are the constituents that we
2 looked at, that were found; and based on the fact
3 that we did detect some petroleum hydrocarbons and
4 some metal, the exposure pathways that are
5 potentially of concern or were identified as being
6 potentially of concern were the dermal contact
7 with or ingestion of soil, and predominantly rare
8 during construction activities, as a result of
9 some kind of subsurface intrusion and then, also,
10 ingestion or dermal contact with groundwater.

11 The concentrations of volatiles in
12 groundwater were below drinking water standards,
13 so we are actually only concerned about the
14 naturally-occurring metals. Again, we truly
15 believe them to be representative of naturally-
16 occurring conditions.

17 So then, to address those potential
18 exposure pathways, there are really only two lease
19 restrictions that are required specifically for
20 Parcel 77. We are prohibiting use of groundwater,

1 and that is not news. We did it for the other
2 EBSs and FOSL, and most of you are aware that the
3 shallow groundwater at Treasure Island is not a
4 significant or desirable source of drinking water,
5 so that's okay.

6 Then we are also telling the lessee,
7 we're telling the City, that they need to have
8 Navy approval as well as appropriate health and
9 safety measures for any subsurface intrusion work
10 that they're going to be doing, and, specifically,
11 subsurface intrusion, because the exposure
12 pathways that were identified were dermal contact
13 and ingestion of soil and groundwater.

14 So modifications to the interior of
15 the brig, which don't involve any contact with
16 soil, are obviously not of concern. So we
17 specified that.

18 Then we have the other standard lease
19 restriction things, like hazardous material
20 management and so forth to ensure the proper n

1 operation.

2 Are there any questions?

3 MR. NORMAN: On the first bullet
4 there, you mean suitability to transfer or
5 suitability for lease?

6 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Transfer.

7 MR. NORMAN: That's great.

8 MS. VON ROSENBERG: And that is based
9 on the new information that was gathered since the
10 baseline EBS.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: You said that you
12 believe that the metals are naturally-occurring.
13 What is the basis for that?

14 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Because they're
15 consistent with metals that have been detected
16 throughout Treasure Island. The concentrations
17 are similar; and not only are they consistent with
18 what has been detected at Treasure Island; but
19 they're also consistent with what has been
20 detected, for example, at Alameda, so the Bay

1 margin has kind of representative metals.

2 MR. HAYDEN: Are they naturally-
3 occurring or are they due to cultural influences,
4 these metals?

5 MS. VON ROSENBERG: I can't tell you
6 for sure. I'm not a geologist; I am an engineer
7 by training. But my understanding is based on the
8 geology of the area.

9 There are certain metals that
10 frequently occur, and those are the kinds of
11 metals we are seeing here.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Are the laboratory
13 results available for the soil and groundwater
14 samples that were taken and found to be positive
15 on Parcel T077?

16 MS. VON ROSENBERG: The appendix in
17 the EBS discusses the data that we used to arrive
18 at our conclusions. They are based on data
19 that -- Sharon, help me out on this.

20 MS. TOBIAS: Data collection.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It seems to me, I
2 recall last November I asked you for Phase IIB
3 laboratory results to be made available to the
4 Technical Committee as soon as it was available.
5 I have seen several work plans and reports now,
6 and we're just getting another one, where
7 decisions are being made based on the Phase IIB
8 results, which the Technical Committee has not
9 been given, even though it was requested last
10 fall.

11 I would like to make that an action
12 item.

13 MR. GALANG: It is due on June 3rd.
14 They have a two-volume validated database.

15 MS. SIMONS: It is part of the whole
16 process. They have to go through validation; and
17 then they are required to submit it to a test.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That part I
19 understand. But there is going to be a large
20 volume of data that is going to be made available

1 all at the same time. Decisions are being made
2 based on that information. Apparently it is
3 valid. And I believe my request was for advance
4 copy, so that the Technical Committee would be in
5 a position to have looked at the data prior to a
6 report being released.

7 I just want to make it a point of
8 information and clarification for the purpose of
9 this meeting, but that information has been
10 requested.

11 MR. HANSEN: This basically is the
12 third FOSL; is that correct, John?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The first FOSL
14 was for the Building 2 complex and the Building 3
15 complex, which is out for review until the end of
16 this week. And then this is our third FOSL.

17 MR. HANSEN: How about the
18 schoolhouse?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry, you
20 are right. The elementary school, which is an

1 existing operation, we did do a FOSL.

2 MR. HANSEN: And the job for site?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's a federal
4 transfer, and we have done a finding of
5 suitability to transfer. But because it was
6 within the federal government, it was not reviewed
7 by the regulators.

8 MR. HANSEN: So the train is leaving
9 the station.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the process
11 of reuse is ongoing.

12 MR. HANSEN: This FOSL is for a
13 specific building, which only occupies 5% of the
14 site, and for the uses of the prison. If they
15 need it to build another building, that will come
16 back to the Navy as long as the Navy is here, for
17 approval before they did any excavations?

18 MS. VON ROSENBERG: That's correct.

19 MR. HANSEN: What if, for the purpose
20 of the prison, they wanted to set up a soccer

1 field on some of the 95% of the land? Does that
2 have to come back?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we would
4 have to re-evaluate it if there was any change in
5 the reuse scenario; and the scenario here was
6 primarily the use of the brig structure, with
7 perhaps some outdoor parking and other laydown-
8 type area.

9 So if there was going to be a
10 recreational sports use involving youth, I think
11 that would be another scenario that we would have
12 to look at.

13 MR. HANSEN: That would not be
14 covered under this blanket of the FOSL?

15 MS. VON ROSENBERG: That's correct,
16 because the EBS and FOSL considers a specific type
17 of reuse; and in this case, it is for the use of
18 the jail and associated parking facilities.

19 MR. HANSEN: Not recreational? No
20 sport facilities? Not for planting of trees? Not

1 for putting up windbreaks? Just for this?

2 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Right.

3 MR. HANSEN: And you say another
4 fence would be required. Does that have to go
5 back to the Navy for the details?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They have not
7 completed their site plans yet; so when they do,
8 because this is a lease, when they propose
9 construction, they will come to us with the plans.
10 We will review it for both environmental reasons
11 and non-environmental reasons and then give an
12 okay for the work to proceed.

13 But most of the work is going to take
14 place inside the building. The number of exterior
15 improvements is going to be somewhat limited.

16 MR. WONG: A couple of quick ones:

17 This gentleman here pointed out a
18 good thing -- and it was not a typo -- that is, in
19 fact, that first bullet on the last page,
20 "suitable for transfer." But this is a FOSL, not

1 a FOSD.

2 MS. VON ROSENBERG: That is correct.

3 MR. WONG: We have not gone this far
4 before, but can you explain to me, does this mean
5 a FOSD could be coming down the road real quickly,
6 or how does that develop out of this scenario?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The FOSD, if
8 there was an actual proposal to transfer the
9 property, based on the EBS, which is more of the
10 technical side, the FOSL is more of the executive
11 summary. So based on the EBS, the property is
12 capable of being transferred. However, the
13 current proposal is to lease it; and so we're
14 finding suitability to lease.

15 Should there be a desire to transfer
16 at some later date, we would already have an EBS
17 that would provide the backup in order to write an
18 FOSD.

19 MS. WALTERS: The City is only
20 proposing to lease the property right now.

1 MR. WONG: We are dancing around the
2 thing. It was made clear months ago that the
3 mayor wants this and wants it now, to relieve the
4 overcrowding at San Bruno. So I am just curious
5 what is happening, because things are speeding up
6 very quickly here.

7 The other question I have is finding
8 a BRAC cleanup level of 2, as opposed to 7. I'm
9 trying to refresh my memory. I think we covered
10 that a few years ago.

11 Is that pretty much kind of the walk
12 through with a survey thing and more visual-type
13 stuff, as opposed to based on all the data?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. It considers
15 all the available data and it classifies the
16 property as 1 through 7.

17 There is a more detailed discussion
18 in the BRAC Cleanup Plan, but basically 1 is clean
19 as can be, never impacted by anything; 7 is at the
20 other extreme, meaning we really don't have enough

1 information to make a decision. And everything
2 else is somewhere in between.

3 MS. VON ROSENBERG: One thing I want
4 to point out: We look at the potential for
5 contaminant migration, so we looked at what was
6 going on with the IR sites, and clues from these
7 sites have been defined, so we know that these
8 three parcels have not been impacted by
9 contaminant migration.

10 There are no up-radiant sources to
11 the sewer that passed through these sites, and
12 there were no releases identified at those sites.

13 Once we met all those criteria, then
14 we can go to Category 2, which says that there
15 were no releases; so that is the reasoning behind
16 that.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Does the same reasoning
18 apply to Parcel 77, which still is being
19 monitored, because that is adjacent to 78?

20 MS. VON ROSENBERG: And we have left

1 that at Category 7, because the final disposition
2 of whatever is going to happen has not been
3 determined.

4 MR. ALLMAN: What about that being
5 adjacent to 78, though? Is there any risk of 77
6 contaminating 78?

7 And the second part of that question
8 is, once something reaches the suitability to
9 transfer, does that mean it is not looked at
10 anymore and no more samples are taken, and it is
11 assumed ready to go? Because, based on the CAP
12 complaint, areas that were cleaned up, they were
13 then becoming contaminated again through other
14 pathways under the island.

15 And you're saying there is no risk of
16 that here, but that is part of the general
17 process.

18 MS. VON ROSENBERG: I can definitely
19 answer your first question. Let me do that. I
20 don't have all the background for the second

1 question, but I will try to answer that.

2 In terms of how do I know that it is
3 not on 78, it is on 77, the concentrations of 77
4 are so low that the likelihood that it's migrated
5 onto 78 and actually caused a detectable impact, I
6 think, is negligible.

7 In addition to that, we have removed
8 the sources from the IR site, so we have had all
9 the time where the sources have existed, and the
10 plume had an opportunity to spread, but what we
11 see is that the northern portion of 77, there are
12 very low concentrations. And since we have
13 organic compounds, we are talking about petroleum
14 hydrocarbons; there is also probably some
15 biodegradation going on, although we're not
16 relying on that for this evaluation.

17 That also answers your second
18 question, that we don't expect there will be a
19 future impact for the same reasons. We have had
20 all that time for this stuff to migrate, and it

1 has not gone any further than Parcel 77.

2 MR. ALLMAN: So, basically, once
3 something goes to a BRAC Category 2, it's never
4 looked at again? That is my question, basically.

5 MS. TOBIAS: That, basically, is
6 true, I would think. I'm not a lawyer.

7 MR. ALLMAN: It is not being a
8 lawyer; it is a matter for BRAC.

9 Are you intending to go back?

10 MR. NORMAN: It is not a matter for
11 PRC; it is a matter for the Navy and its direction
12 to PRC.

13 If you have identified sites in a
14 parcel and CERCLA response action is underway,
15 that CERCLA continues to make remedy selection
16 decisions for these parcels. There is no CERCLA
17 response action, as I understand it, in those
18 areas. No cause, no sources have been identified;
19 no releases have been identified; therefore, there
20 would be no further work to be done.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we were
2 talking a little bit before the meeting and on
3 future topics; and the City will be presenting a
4 more long-range leasing plan, or FOSL plan; and
5 what we will probably do in a subsequent meeting
6 in the next few months is maybe have kind of a
7 FOSL/EBS overview and go back and discuss some of
8 these general questions of categories, and how we
9 come to a finding of suitability and suitability
10 to lease, and finding suitability to transfer as
11 part of the review of the City's plan for leasing
12 for fiscal year 1997.

13 So we will be able to address some of
14 these questions again.

15 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Let me take one
16 final question.

17 MR. HEHN: One statement: First, the
18 statement -- I want to reinforce the statement
19 that Pat made about how important it is becoming
20 to get this information out to the Technical

1 Subcommittee, because again we're being asked to
2 comment on something that we're not getting the
3 data to support, both from the standpoint of the
4 groundwater monitoring and also the Phase IIB
5 results. So it becomes very important, and it is
6 becoming more and more so by the day, it seems,
7 for us to get that information so we can put that
8 together.

9 I might also mention that we really
10 do need that map to put this into a perspective
11 that we can utilize to put the data to go, whether
12 it be a map that shows the IR sites and soil, that
13 kind of information, or at least the map that we
14 have been looking for for some time. It is
15 getting critical that we are getting that
16 information together.

17 Then the question is, how much of
18 that particular area that is being considered for
19 this FOSL, if you have 5% covered by a building,
20 how much of the remainder of that is paved?

1 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Only a small
2 portion. Most of it is grass covered.

3 MS. GLASS: Assuming that the brig is
4 used as a jail facility for inmates of one gender,
5 is there going to be an outdoor space for the
6 inmates?

7 MS. VON ROSENBERG: There is an
8 existing exercise yard, and it is paved.

9 MS. GLASS: All right, thank you.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very
11 much.

12 There are additional copies of the
13 brig FOSL. We mailed them out for those who asked
14 for them, but we have additional copies at the
15 side table.

16 Our next topic I would like to
17 introduce Marvin Norman, who has already spoken.
18 He is our EFA West counsel. Marvin is
19 dual-headed, as both our CERCLA counsel for the
20 cleanup and also our counsel for all base

1 closure-related issues at Naval Station TI.

2 Marvín has agreed to come out tonight
3 to talk about the administrative record and the
4 information repository. We have had several
5 discussions on that over the last few months, and
6 I don't want to raise the expectations that we
7 will reach a complete consensus tonight, but we
8 want to have the opportunity to get Marvín to talk
9 about the process and for him to hear your
10 comments and discussion on this issue.

11 MR. NORMAN: It is more of the
12 latter. I don't have a presentation. I just want
13 to start out by saying -- this may sound naive and
14 silly -- but this really is exciting to me. I
15 have not been to any of these, and I have been to
16 very bad RAB meetings, and this is a good working
17 RAB.

18 I think it was very important for me
19 to see the exchange and note the level of
20 exchange, the quality of information that was

1 taking place, because it influences my analysis,
2 my reasoning of how we should be handling this
3 administrative record, that makes a depository
4 conundrum.

5 Anyway, I really would like to just
6 have a free-flowing discussion. I don't think I
7 need to talk to people about what an
8 administrative record is and what an
9 administrative repository is.

10 As I understand this issue, there is
11 a concern that the RAB process, the RAB
12 discussions, are not being adequately reflected in
13 the administrative record or should be going into
14 the administrative record, as opposed to becoming
15 part of the informational repository. And that's
16 my general take. Perhaps that is incorrect. I
17 can hear from you on that.

18 I can start out by just saying what
19 probably most of you already know, which is that
20 the administrative record is a very particular

1 obligation required by statute that we must do
2 relative to our CERCLA cleanup. And it is the
3 information that is considered or relied upon,
4 which forms the basis for a response action
5 selection.

6 Now, there are two future purposes
7 for the administrative record. One is to
8 establish a record which will, in the future, be
9 the basis for any judicial review of the Navy's
10 decision. The Navy's decision will have to be one
11 that is supported, must have a rational basis. It
12 cannot be arbitrary and capricious, and the record
13 established must support that.

14 The second main purpose of the
15 administrative record is to be a vehicle for
16 public participation.

17 So now, as I told Jim and others, I
18 cannot really provide a bright line, catchall set
19 of recommendations here. I would say that there
20 are times when what is conducted here certainly is

1 information that should become part of the
2 administrative record. Otherwise the
3 administrative record would be woefully
4 inadequate.

5 I also just tell him and Ernie that
6 the administrative record has to be a set of
7 documents, a set of information, that is relevant.
8 It has to be adequate and complete.

9 So now that does not help him a lot,
10 because it does not leave him, on a regular basis,
11 making determinations with your support as to
12 which information that is part of RAB meetings is
13 relied upon and considered for the CERCLA response
14 action selection.

15 The RAB Charter, as I understand it,
16 is much broader than the CERCLA remedy selection
17 process. You are getting into other issues. You
18 are addressing compliance matters. You are
19 addressing reuse issues. Perhaps some contracting
20 matters cross your desk. Funding issues come up.

1 Much of what goes on here will have to be
2 considered information that is information
3 provided by the public and is considered or relied
4 upon in the Navy's remedy selection.

5 In addition to that, there are
6 established key points in the process in CERCLA
7 where public comment is formally solicited, and
8 the public comments that come in must be
9 documented and responded to. And I would see the
10 RAB participation there as well.

11 So if this does not help, please tell
12 me. I'm really confused.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a question:

14 The administrative record is reviewed
15 during the public comment period for proposed
16 plans; is that true?

17 MR. NORMAN: It should be.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: By whom is it reviewed?

19 MR. NORMAN: That is the real world,
20 and then there is the guidance. It should be an

1 ongoing maintenance action. We should be
2 periodically reviewing the administrative record
3 to keeping it clean and up to date. But it
4 becomes a sort of snapshot in time. The
5 administrative record is formally designated
6 relative to your response action decision.

7 For remedial actions, that would be
8 at the time of broad execution, when the
9 administrative record has been formally designated
10 as the set of documents, the set of information
11 that has forced the response action selection.

12 You want to know how can we know what
13 is going in there, and whether it is being kept up
14 to date, and whether it is reflecting your input
15 on a real time basis.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: I want to know that,
17 and I also want to know when I'm reviewing the
18 proposed plan, which is the thing which sort of
19 solidifies the actions that are described in the
20 ROD. Is it reasonable to look at the

1 administrative record and, in my comments, address
2 the issue of whether my comments are reflected in
3 the administrative record?

4 MR. NORMAN: I believe we have to
5 have an administrative record at the time; and
6 help me out, EPA, if I'm off base on that.

7 I think at the time we publish we
8 have to have an administrative record --
9 administrative record file and the administrative
10 record. The administrative files are not really
11 the administrative record. That becomes a
12 regularly-recognized record.

13 You should be able to go to the
14 information repository, which contains --

15 MS. SHIRLEY: That is not what I'm
16 asking.

17 I'm asking, the administrative file
18 is closed at a certain point?

19 MR. NORMAN: Right.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: Right. Around the ROD

1 and the proposed plan stage.

2 MR. NORMAN: At the time of the ROD
3 execution, not prior to that, because we have to
4 include the response to public comments as part of
5 the administrative record.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: Suppose I look through
7 the administrative record file and decide that I'm
8 not happy with the level of detail that is in that
9 file or there is something that was left out? How
10 would I ensure that that concern is addressed or
11 expressed?

12 MR. NORMAN: Express those concerns
13 to the Navy, to the BCT.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: And who's responsible
15 for reviewing the administrative record at that
16 time?

17 MR. NORMAN: Well, ultimately it
18 would be the Navy; but it is in conjunction with
19 other members of the BCT.

20 Why are you shaking your head?

1 MR. KAO: My interpretation is the
2 administrative record is the Navy's
3 responsibility.

4 MR. NORMAN: Correct.

5 MR. KAO: But legally we're not
6 responsible for your administrative record.

7 MR. NORMAN: You're not.

8 MR. KAO: I wanted to make that
9 clear.

10 MR. WONG: This is helpful. Kind of
11 picking up where Chris is, and let me just preface
12 everything by saying, picking up on your comments,
13 Marvin, some RABs were better than others. This
14 one seems to work well.

15 The spirit in which I'm asking that
16 is for the process nationwide. I really want to
17 make that clear.

18 So if I understand what you're
19 saying, it is that it is the Navy's responsibility
20 to determine what is relevant, adequate, and

1 complete in response to the administrative record?

2 MR. NORMAN: Right.

3 MR. WONG: And that's pretty much
4 subjective. We have yet to hear anybody that can
5 show us a statute that says what has to be in
6 there and all; and that was one of our main
7 concerns, where are the statutes? We can read
8 that stuff, too.

9 MR. NORMAN: There are guidance
10 documents.

11 MR. WONG: That notwithstanding, if
12 the Navy is the one responsible for determining
13 those three criteria in keeping the administrative
14 record, and nobody else, and then that record is
15 the only information that's usable if somebody
16 were to contest the ROD regularly down the road,
17 that's all the judge or whoever would be looking
18 at, which is my understanding, and I might have
19 that wrong.

20 It is a little bit like the fox

1 guarding the chickenhouse, because I certainly
2 would not furnish information in anything I could
3 be sued for in my record.

4 MR. NORMAN: Completeness is a key
5 part of that.

6 MR. WONG: Exactly.

7 MR. NORMAN: If someone is
8 challenging a response action selection,
9 established the important information was not in
10 the administrative record, then the administrative
11 record is basically nullified; and then your
12 review has been opened up.

13 Basically, the review is not limited
14 to the administrative record; and this is a key
15 obligation to complete. For example, showing that
16 if there was proposed participation, you have to
17 show that public comments, including RAB comments,
18 were responded to or addressed in some way.

19 So if a member of the public, a
20 private citizen, sought to challenge the response

1 action selection and says, "There is some critical
2 information that I don't find in the
3 administrative record," and the judge initially
4 attempts to limit the review to the administrative
5 record, and he says, "Hey, it is not in the
6 administrative record; therefore, the Navy's
7 decision must be arbitrary and capricious, because
8 it is not supported by this other information."

9 MR. WONG: There are two parts that
10 can happen here: One is somebody could sue to
11 contest the completeness, the accuracy and
12 completeness of the administrative record.

13 MR. NORMAN: Hypothetically, if
14 someone were to challenge a decision.

15 MR. WONG: That was going to be my
16 other part.

17 MR. NORMAN: And would contend
18 that the Navy's action is not supported by
19 substantial evidence; it is arbitrary and
20 capricious; and one finding of arbitrariness and

1 capriciousness is an incomplete administrative
2 record. It is circular, but that is how it works.

3 MR. ONGERTH: Marvin, a hypothetical:
4 I have raised a question about some
5 issue.

6 MR. NORMAN: Okay.

7 MR. ONGERTH: It's in the
8 administrative record.

9 MR. NORMAN: Right.

10 MR. ONGERTH: You respond. Here is
11 your response to my question.

12 MR. NORMAN: Right.

13 MR. ONGERTH: I am not satisfied with
14 your response.

15 MR. NORMAN: Right.

16 MR. ONGERTH: But you believe it is
17 adequate.

18 MR. NORMAN: Right.

19 MR. ONGERTH: How is that matter
20 dealt with from that point on?

1 MR. NORMAN: That is a difficult
2 situation. You can make some people happy some of
3 the time; you can't make all people happy all of
4 the time.

5 Comments must be responded to. Then
6 there would be an issue as to whether the
7 decision, once made, was rational; and the person
8 challenging it would have to establish that "that
9 decision was not rational because my comment was
10 critical to a rational decision," and then review
11 it.

12 MR. ONGERTH: In the administration
13 of the program, who is trying to develop this
14 record? Do they have an obligation to satisfy me
15 with relation to the issue raised?

16 MR. NORMAN: An obligation to
17 respond.

18 MR. ONGERTH: Once you responded, if
19 I don't like it, that's too bad; is that the
20 point?

1 MR. NORMAN: That's not how I would
2 like to word it. I wouldn't word it that way. I
3 would say that the administrative record would be
4 documents that would reflect the give and take,
5 the exchange of ideas, a process in which all
6 viewpoints may not have been responded to in a
7 manner that made the commenter happy.

8 That's true. I think I can say that.

9 MR. ONGERTH: It is more than a
10 matter of happiness. That's an emotion. I am
11 talking about an issue of fact.

12 MR. NORMAN: Right.

13 MR. ONGERTH: Where you have
14 responded, and I think your response is not
15 factually satisfactory.

16 MR. NORMAN: Right.

17 MR. ONGERTH: It is an error. It
18 does not cover everything, or whatever.

19 MR. NORMAN: Right.

20 MR. ONGERTH: It is inadequate in

1 technical terms, not in terms of my emotions about
2 the matter.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Marvin, if I can
4 put another spin on that.

5 Basically, it is going to come down
6 to people are going to comment; and we're going to
7 respond; and we may receive comments back again.
8 We, of course, are going to consider whether or
9 not maybe we need to -- as a result of comments
10 made to our response -- whether or not we need to
11 respond to that.

12 But ultimately there is going to be a
13 weighing at the end; and if we have not adequately
14 made our case, whether or not you're satisfied
15 with our comment or not, if we believe we have
16 made the correct response or series of responses,
17 then ultimately, if someone persisted, if someone
18 wanted to take that to court, then there would be
19 a burden of proof by either side; right?

20 MR. NORMAN: An action would lie in

1 the Federal District Court for the challenger to
2 establish that the remedy lacks justification on a
3 rational basis.

4 MR. ONGERTH: The burden is on the
5 challenger?

6 MR. NORMAN: Yes.

7 It is an intricate process; and at
8 some point, a decision is made.

9 MR. ALLMAN: This is the reason I
10 wanted this topic brought up. It is dealing with
11 the initial data.

12 I am a chemist, and I have this
13 affinity for raw data, and I have been told, and
14 we have all been told, that the raw data goes into
15 the information repository and it ends up, it has
16 a shorter retention time than the actual report,
17 so there is no way I'm going to go through, since
18 we don't actually get the data, we just see the
19 final reports where the data has been labeled, and
20 looked at, and evaluated by some other party.

1 Then that data goes into a report,
2 and my understanding is the data can be discarded,
3 because the report was created and people had a
4 chance to comment.

5 Say now, 20 years from now, you find
6 out there is a major plume of fuel from a mystery
7 tank that was not discovered; and the Navy says,
8 "Oh, no, we have the data showing that site was
9 clean when it was transferred, so you must have
10 done that in the 20 years you had the property."
11 How can you, then, go back and show the facts that
12 are in the report, that stay in the report, but
13 those facts may have been arrived at by somebody
14 who was either too tired that morning, or did not
15 read a number right, or punched their calculator
16 wrong? There is no way to go back and verify
17 that.

18 MR. NORMAN: You are saying new
19 evidence establishes that there is a problem at
20 the site.

1 We have an obligation; we make a deed
2 covenant and warranty any problem identified in
3 the future requiring further response.

4 MR. ALLMAN: That was to bring a
5 particular case of something happening. But
6 suppose we went through several months of
7 immunoassay data and how valid that data was and
8 had a bunch of bench studies done on how accurate
9 the different tests were.

10 And then that was evaluated, and it
11 was determined, "Now we go on to a different
12 company altogether," and then another company was
13 decided upon. We were told this decision was
14 made, and it was based on the data that was
15 collected during the study. And then you come
16 back and you want to say, "The data that was then
17 collected from that study was not evaluated
18 properly" or "it does need to be reconsidered."

19 Then you have no recourse to go back,
20 because then the Navy can just say, "We have our

1 report here; you can see the numbers we used; you
2 had a chance to comment on those."

3 We don't have a chance to validate
4 those numbers. I'm aware the contractors do the
5 validation of the data. That is what we heard
6 today. That is the reason it takes so long to get
7 the data. But if somebody is suing the Navy, for
8 example, the City, they never have a chance to see
9 the data before it is discarded.

10 MS. GLASS: You know, one thought
11 occurred to me, just hypothetically speaking, if
12 the City had a concern about this, maybe the City
13 could make a space as a repository for this data
14 that is being discarded as part of the City
15 library.

16 MR. ALLMAN: That is another issue
17 that I brought up before. Is that possible, or is
18 that the Navy's data and they can do what they
19 want with it? Or is it PRC's data?

20 MR. NORMAN: I am concerned, because

1 I'm not following this entirely.

2 I am not comfortable with the notion
3 of data being discarded; and if asked, I would
4 have asked that sampling and analysis data is
5 properly included in this part of the
6 administrative record.

7 Now, I guess there would be a
8 difference of opinion as to what form that data
9 should take in the administrative record. Is it
10 raw data? Is it magnetic tapes?

11 MR. ALLMAN: We were told it is
12 validated data. That is what we were told.

13 MR. NORMAN: Raw data would not have
14 a proper place in the administrative record. It
15 would not.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
17 clarify, John. When you were talking raw data,
18 were you talking in terms of the actual report
19 received from the lab?

20 MR. ALLMAN: Or how the samples were

1 collected, for example.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The actual lab
3 report that you would get directly from the lab?

4 MR. ALLMAN: You can assume that the
5 lab did their job right, since they do the same
6 thing all the time. But then that data is
7 evaluated in a certain way by somebody else, and
8 that's what ends up in the administrative record.

9 MR. NORMAN: It would be very
10 unwieldy, it would be a humongous animal. It
11 would take shelves and shelves.

12 If anyone had experience with this,
13 don't leave me hanging here, folks.

14 MR. SUCH: I have had a lot of
15 experience with complex litigation. This is the
16 sort of thing done all the time. It's called a
17 computer, and everybody generates the data to the
18 computer, and most formats are pretty common now,
19 and it is really simple to put it on a format, and
20 you can put it even on the Internet.

1 This is done day in and day out in
2 federal and state courts all over the country.
3 That would be a way to address this gentleman's
4 question with a little more seriousness.

5 MR. NORMAN: This is what?

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I understand this
7 to be reducing the data into electronic format,
8 and the electronic format is part of the
9 administrative record.

10 MR. SUCH: One, and two, the data
11 being full recorded data, which this gentleman was
12 addressing.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To clarify again,
14 John, maybe each of us has a different
15 interpretation of raw data. I sense you are
16 talking about not just a table of data from well
17 no. such and such, but you are talking about the
18 actual form filled out by a laboratory that was
19 sent to the Navy, that would be partially
20 handwritten, something that would not necessarily

1 be in electronic format, but would actually be
2 what is filled out by the lab and sent to the
3 client?

4 MR. ALLMAN: As an example, one of
5 the people that came and gave a demonstration on
6 many immunoassays was Encos; and I have used their
7 equipment; and it involves running a quality
8 control on standards to make sure that you are
9 within the right range. You're doing these things
10 manually; you're writing down numbers about which
11 one has a higher or lower absorbance when you are
12 preparing test tubes.

13 We saw this demonstration one day,
14 done, for example, in this case, by PRC. They
15 keep the notes. They write down whether it is
16 above or below 10 parts per million or 50 parts
17 per million. Then that data is transferred,
18 saying sample 1 had over 100 ppb; sample 2 had
19 between 10 and a hundred ppb; and that's all that
20 apparently would go into a table.

1 You may find out later, and I found
2 out that I had problems when I ran some of the
3 immunoassays, and I took two different companies'
4 kits with me on a trip to do these tests, and you
5 have errors with the equipment that you don't know
6 if you just see the final data.

7 I can see the collection on my table;
8 but if I can't see the quality assurance data that
9 showed when I ran my standards for quality
10 control, which is something that usually does not
11 end up in the final report, then you can't go back
12 and say, "This decision was based on this data in
13 this table that shows these levels were like
14 this." But there is no way to go back and say the
15 data was tabulated properly and things were
16 calculated properly.

17 MR. KAO: Can I just interject here?

18 Let's go back to the definition of
19 what we want the administrative record for.

20 What they want to do, what they use,

1 is validated data to go into the administrative
2 record; and that is the data on which they make
3 the decision. They don't base their decision on
4 the raw data. So what you're saying is if there
5 is mishandling or misinterpretation between the
6 raw data and the validated data, that will be
7 something that can be challenged outside of that
8 decision making; right?

9 Basically, you're saying, "I have
10 validated data in the administrative record, and I
11 don't care where their data is coming from. It is
12 coming through all the QAQC procedures from raw
13 data."

14 Now I have a set of data that is
15 validated, and the Navy is saying, based on this
16 validated data, "I make this decision." You can
17 challenge and say, "This decision of this data
18 does not lead to that decision." You can
19 challenge that. You can also challenge that your
20 raw data does not meet the validated data.

1 MR. ALLMAN: But you cannot do that
2 if the raw data has been disposed of by that
3 point. If it is up to the burden of the
4 challenger to prove that you did something wrong,
5 then the defendant is going to say, "This is my
6 data, and this is what we used for our decision."

7 Unless you can prove that data is not
8 correct and verified properly, then you lose.

9 MR. KAO: I agree. That's where your
10 record-keeping process comes in. This is good;
11 this is very good. I tend to rely on guidance
12 documents maybe too heavily; but for data, there
13 are directives. There is a point on it which
14 states sampling data, what the information
15 contents of administrative records are. There is
16 a bulletin on sampling data.

17 "Verified data during the RIFS or any
18 data collected in previous actions, such as
19 RICRA, or removal actions which are
20 considered or relied on remedial action,

1 unvalidated data should be included only if
2 relied on in the absence of validated
3 data."

4 MR. ALLMAN: That does not answer the
5 question.

6 MS. TOBIAS: I want to interject.
7 I'm not sure about the data. Under our contract,
8 all the data that PRC has collected for any
9 installation, we have all the data in storage. It
10 comes in; we get it validated by a subcontractor;
11 so we don't do the validation ourselves; and we do
12 use the validation 10%; we do that ourselves.
13 Then the data goes into storage. It is in
14 warehouses.

15 At the end of the contract, we turn
16 all the files over to the Navy; and that includes
17 the field notes, the field records, the raw data,
18 the everything we receive from the laboratories;
19 and I don't believe the Navy discards that.

20 MR. NORMAN: Nonetheless, it is not

1 going to become part of the administrative record.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

3 MR. ALLMAN: My question is, is it
4 going to be retained, though? What is the legal
5 requirement for retention?

6 MR. NORMAN: That is a different
7 issue. The administrative record is data relied
8 upon.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we
10 understand your question. I think we understand
11 it, and we're not going to be able to --

12 MR. NORMAN: I did not understand it
13 until now. He is talking about a general larger
14 record retention requirement, but that is not in
15 the administrative record. We do not keep
16 unvalidated data in the administrative record. We
17 keep a data summary sheet.

18 MR. ALLMAN: I would like to request
19 an action item. That is my whole purpose for
20 caring about the administrative record and the

1 information repository.

2 I would like to know what is the
3 required retention time put on the Navy to
4 maintain the data, once it is turned over to them
5 from PRC or any of the other contractors.

6 And I would like an answer to that
7 particular question.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
9 clarify that the definition of raw data is that
10 document that's produced by the laboratory that is
11 sent to the Navy.

12 MR. ALLMAN: I also want to know
13 about sampling data, too.

14 MR. NORMAN: Maybe I don't want to be
15 too mechanical about this, but MTP has definitions
16 that we would rely upon, the definition of
17 verified sampling data and invalidated sampling
18 data, and unvalidated sampling data. All three of
19 those are defined in the MTP.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I want to be sure

1 we are on the same wavelength. Sometimes we get
2 different interpretations of a definition, so I
3 think we probably have to get off line with John,
4 to make sure that we are both talking about the
5 same type of data so that we can properly answer
6 your question.

7 MR. NORMAN: One example: You have
8 an emergency removal action. You make your
9 decision in a hurry. You don't have to verify the
10 data. That would be an example of response action
11 supported by unverified or unvalidated data.

12 You have to have that in the
13 administrative record.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would like to
15 make a suggestion: I think we need to get the
16 comments out; I think it is time for the RAB
17 members, the community members to take time during
18 the break and write out their questions that we
19 have about the administrative record, so that we
20 can help the Navy in a subsequent meeting address

1 those issues.

2 And I would like you to know, Marvin,
3 if you don't already know, the immunoassay issue
4 is one that we brought up in our Technical
5 Subcommittee review; and it is near and dear to
6 our hearts here at this RAB; and I think there are
7 some issues that are probably separate from the
8 questions people on this committee may have.

9 Can I see a show of hands that people
10 are in agreement with this process, to write down
11 the questions so we can carry this on to another
12 meeting. (Show of hands) Can we have a show of
13 hands for those questions that people are burning
14 to ask and have answers in the next three minutes.
15 (Show of hands)

16 MR. NORMAN: I apologize for dragging
17 this out.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: No, we appreciate
19 your being here, I think.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Burning question

1 time.

2 MR. NEDELL: Actually, I have a
3 comment I would like to make.

4 I have not been here for a couple of
5 months, and it does not seem like much has changed
6 on this discussion.

7 I'd kind of like to do a reality
8 check. It appears to me there is some great
9 concern either about the competency or the ability
10 of the people who are doing the raw data sampling
11 to do it correctly or report the results better.
12 And it seems to me we're going to be getting the
13 summary results. We will have an opportunity to
14 look at them as this process continues.

15 I would expect that if you have a
16 challenge to issue to their ability to draw the
17 right conclusion, it would be better to do it now
18 than to wait for the 20 years that you perhaps
19 would look at for a future challenge.

20 I really can't understand what this

1 discussion is about. It does not make any sense
2 to me. We got the data. It's collected
3 contemporaneously. We can look at the results.
4 That's what we're here for. We can comment on it.

5 I think if you have a sincere concern
6 that it is not done right or it is in error, now
7 is the time to ask the question, when it is fresh,
8 and we've got it available to us. Why wait for
9 some long period of time?

10 MR. ALLMAN: To respond to that, we
11 don't review every piece of data that comes in.

12 MR. NEDELL: Why are you going to do
13 it in 20 years?

14 MR. ALLMAN: When we get the results
15 on the Phase IIB, I'm not going to recalculate
16 everything; and I'm just speaking in the interests
17 of whoever ends up owning the property, that they
18 should at least have a pathway to be able to get
19 the data and keep it themselves, if they choose
20 to, because there are certainly enough cases that

1 I have been exposed to where it turned out that
2 somebody did -- it is nothing personal with
3 anybody that is dealing with the validation of the
4 data. The unknowns you can't predict until later.

5 Once the data is gone, there is no
6 way to get those numbers back again. There has
7 got to be a retention time on the form for each
8 type of data that Marvin listed. Is it 7 years,
9 12 years, 20 years, or whatever they decide to do?

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think all views
11 are welcome here. Our mission is to comment on
12 the process, and there is no pressure on us to
13 reach consensus.

14 These are issues that the Navy can
15 address, and we can do that.

16 MR. HEHN: Maybe one way to answer
17 John's question is that in other base closure
18 issues, Jim, where they have transferred to some
19 public entity, what has happened to those files
20 that Sharon has referred to, the magnetic tapes,

1 the field notes, and that kind of stuff? Has that
2 been transferred to the group that has taken over
3 ownership of these bases, or is there a precedent
4 for it?

5 MR. NORMAN: I would say I don't know
6 of any examples yet. Maybe Chase Field, the Air
7 Force transfer.

8 MR. HEHN: How about Hamilton Field?

9 MR. NORMAN: No CERCLA there.

10 MR. HEHN: Laurie brought up a good
11 point. There is a concern about that field data
12 that has been collected. If the City is
13 interested and the City is concerned with that
14 particular issue for future review, potentially,
15 if the City is willing to and can accept those
16 particular documents from the Navy, I imagine the
17 Navy wants to store them or not. Maybe the City
18 can do so, maybe here on Treasure Island
19 somewhere.

20 MR. WONG: If you could indulge me

1 for one more second.

2 I think a lot of this could have been
3 sidestepped a while ago, and my little document I
4 have here, it's as of February 27, so we're
5 talking three months ago.

6 Simply, the question comes down to
7 this: If the administrative record is the
8 collection of information that any subsequent
9 judicial review would include, we just simply want
10 to know what the Navy is obligated to put in
11 there, what it is not obligated to put in there,
12 what their obligation is in timeliness in updating
13 that.

14 I assume it is open for all to review
15 at all times, so I can go to the library and look,
16 exactly as of today, what's in the administrative
17 record.

18 MR. NORMAN: What's in the
19 administrative record file or prior to a response
20 action decision.

1 MR. WONG: It does not technically
2 exist, so I might have some judgments as to
3 whether things have been in there or not.

4 MR. NORMAN: Things might need to be
5 added.

6 MR. WONG: Okay. At what point, as
7 public members here, and this is a little bit of a
8 RAB identity crisis here, I think -- and, by the
9 way, we asked what are the relevant laws? Can we
10 see the laws, the statutes and guidelines?

11 Nobody seems to be able to produce
12 that, and that's why you are here. So that, right
13 there, could have taken care of a lot of things.

14 MR. NORMAN: Section 113(j) and (k).

15 MR. NEDELL: They were CERCLA?

16 MR. NORMAN: 121 is the Judicial
17 Review.

18 MR. WONG: At what point, does public
19 comment, is it mandatory that has to be in the
20 final administrative record, not the file, the

1 record?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad, let me drop
3 this. These are hot and burning questions that
4 can't be handled in three minutes. Are you
5 expecting an answer to this, or is there something
6 that can be summarized on a piece of paper?

7 MR. NORMAN: I am very troubled. I
8 thought I had answered that. I have been a
9 complete failure in answering those questions.

10 I thought I gave you an idea what
11 goes in it and when things go in it.

12 MS. GLASS: His question keys on
13 obligation, however; and that has not been
14 addressed. Obligation to consider or to deal with
15 community input.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will, as an
17 action item, Marvin and I, write a paper,
18 thoroughly simple, what I have gotten out of this
19 discussion.

20 MR. NORMAN: Don't put off until

1 later what we can do now.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We're not able to
3 enunciate.

4 MR. KAO: I can answer this in one
5 minute.

6 Anything that you commented on doing
7 in the comment period for the ROD, the proposed
8 plan, there are statutes for amending when the
9 proposed plan is coming out.

10 There is going to be a 30-day comment
11 period. Everything that goes into that comment
12 period has to go into the administrative record.

13 MR. WONG: Verbal or written?

14 MR. KAO: There is going to be a
15 public meeting during that comment period. You
16 can provide verbal comments, which will be
17 recorded and transcribed; and you can also provide
18 written comments during that 30-day period that
19 also go into the administrative record.

20 MR. WONG: Into the administrative

1 record, not the administrative file?

2 MR. NORMAN: That is an obligation.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm still going
4 to take it as an action item. My action is that I
5 think there are two issues. I think basically
6 Brad's issue is how the administrative record
7 works and what should be in it, and then there is
8 John's issue regarding how is the raw data
9 preserved?

10 Those, I think, are the two issues.
11 And what I will take as an action item, with some
12 assistance, to try to more clearly enunciate that
13 and be able to distribute that to the RAB for
14 their comments.

15 I think now that I better understand
16 the background and the questions, I think I can
17 better put it into words what we think our
18 position is and see if we can reach a consensus on
19 this.

20 MR. NORMAN: I can distribute this, a

1 two-page discussion.

2 MR. ALLMAN: What about non-CERCLA
3 decision-making processes?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We may address
5 non-CERCLA. It may not fall into the law, but we
6 will address non-CERCLA.

7 MR. ALLMAN: That is fine.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thanks a lot,
9 Marvin.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think, between
11 Jim and I, if you have questions that you would
12 like answered in this paper, beyond what has been
13 described here or including what has been
14 described or asked here, please give them to Jim.

15 Thank you, Marvin.

16 MR. NORMAN: Thank you.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
18 take one more item, and then we will break.

19 The next item is the 1997 budget.

20 This is the danger of doing an agenda a week ahead

1 of time. I anticipated that we would have
2 completed our budget and sent it to Washington,
3 but we're still working on that. So I don't have
4 anything specific to report on the '97 budget
5 other than the comments that we received at both
6 last month's RAB meeting and at the Interim RAB
7 meeting.

8 These were incorporated into the
9 budget priorities, and those are the standing
10 priorities. And what we're working on now is
11 prioritizing some of the sub-items. But the major
12 categories that we have been given input from the
13 RAB on the major priorities, those stand as the
14 RAB recommended.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Can you let us know
16 what was in the budget and provide us copies, if
17 it is appropriate?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: When we complete
19 the budget, I hope this week, I hope to be able to
20 have something.

1 Last week I thought I would have
2 something to hand out; but when we have something,
3 once we've forwarded it to Washington, we will
4 distribute copies to the RAB.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Will that be in the
6 June meeting?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably we can
8 append that. We will be able to distribute it
9 sometime in June, whether it is part of the May
10 meeting minutes or some separate document.

11 With that, we will jump into the
12 break; and when we come back, we will have a brief
13 discussion of the community relations plan, brief
14 discussion of Phase II, and an update on BTAG.

15 (Recess taken.)

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We're going to
17 reconvene. Jim has gone back to his office to
18 pick up copies of the operating guidelines for the
19 RAB and asked me to continue the meeting with
20 Stacey's presentation on the update of the

1 community relations plan.

2 MS. STACEY LUPTON: I will keep it
3 very short and within time.

4 We talked briefly at the last meeting
5 about the community relations plan and updating
6 it, and here is an updating. There was a request
7 to give a little bit more explanation, so that is
8 what I'm going to give you tonight, to explain
9 what is the community relations plan, its goals
10 and contents, and the timing of updating it.

11 Basically the community relations
12 plan is a roadmap to involve the community in the
13 installation and restoration program. It
14 satisfies the legal requirements; it satisfies the
15 Superfund Reauthorization Act of '86 and is
16 intended to enhance dialogue with the community
17 and improve public involvement in the IR Program,
18 strictly IR Program.

19 The RAB is a really critical
20 component of the overall Treasure Island community

1 outreach program. I want to underline that. But
2 the idea here is to get out beyond the RAB and
3 talk to the general community and make sure that
4 they are kept informed, and their concerns are
5 flagged and considered in the course of the
6 cleanup process. (Showing slides)

7 Why prepare a community relations
8 plan? To inform the stakeholders; identify key
9 issues and concerns; and be sure they are
10 addressed during the course of the cleanup program
11 and not raised at the 11th hour; foster a better
12 understanding so folks understand the technical
13 issues involved in the cleanup, especially as they
14 relate to reuse, and obviously as legally
15 required.

16 Why are we updating the CRP? This
17 first CRP was completed in April '92, with the
18 interviews that were actually conducted in 1990.
19 Since that time we have had a closure decision, so
20 what we're going to do now is, we're in the

1 process of doing a new round of interviews; and we
2 are talking to a cross-section of the community
3 members.

4 We've got folks from the
5 environmental interest groups, from reuse interest
6 groups, elected officials, and East Bay folks,
7 too -- not only San Francisco, but East Bay folks,
8 also.

9 We just started; and as we go along,
10 as we identify these people, our new potential
11 group's interests view will probably include them
12 in the program.

13 Again, to identify new concerns and
14 issues, now that we have got base closure, there
15 is a heightened interest in Treasure Island. It
16 is to enhance the outreach strategy. The existing
17 CRP is pretty thin. The idea here is to go out
18 and really talk to people to find out, "How do you
19 want to be kept informed? What are your key
20 concerns and interests? What are some really good

1 information dissemination vehicles among the
2 community, whether it be radio talk show, The San
3 Francisco Chronicle, The Independent, fact sheets,
4 workshops, whatever." We will cover them in the
5 strategy, as well as update the IR information,
6 which includes installation and restoration site
7 information, as well as any new community
8 relations requirement.

9 Key contents identify a sample of CRP
10 from another base, if anyone is interested. Also,
11 the existing Treasure Island CRP, if anyone would
12 like to look at that.

13 Background and physical setting,
14 things like natural and cultural, historical
15 resources involved that people might be interested
16 in in the cleanup process. History of industrial
17 operations; it provides that.

18 It talks about the installation
19 restoration site and gives an update on regulatory
20 involvement in oversight.

1 It provides a section of the
2 community profile, demographics, education level,
3 other aspects to help draft the appropriate
4 community relations strategy.

5 Identify the community concerns and
6 issues that are discussed and identified over the
7 course of the interview.

8 A whole chapter of the specific legal
9 requirements tied to milestones in the IR Program.
10 Marvin mentioned some of them tonight.

11 And then the real meat of it is the
12 community involvement strategy, and that goes
13 through a whole array of different ways to address
14 specific concerns, specific target audiences.

15 It sets up milestones; it is
16 basically a tool to conduct an outreach
17 involvement program.

18 Timing and approach: Basically we
19 are in the process of interviewing now. I have it
20 tentatively down there, because we're having a

1 hard time reaching people. The availability is
2 somewhat tenuous, plus we are probably going to,
3 with the comments Laurie made tonight, with new
4 appointees and the changes with the reuse group,
5 we will probably talk to some of those folks when
6 that occurs in August. This may be pushed back a
7 bit, the interviews.

8 We're looking at probably September-
9 October to complete a draft community relations
10 plan. The Navy will review it. Following the
11 Navy's review and comments, they will provide it
12 to you. All your input is critical. You are
13 great tools for us to craft an appropriate
14 community outreach program.

15 Again, you are an important
16 component; but you're not the entire community
17 outreach. There is a community beyond the RAB, so
18 we need your input to get out to the folks.

19 The final CRP is based upon the
20 comments and input we get from you all.

1 Are there any questions? * 109

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I have got two
3 questions: One, some of the interviewees, do they
4 include residents of the Coast Guard facility and
5 also residents here, of Treasure Island?

6 MS. LUPTON: We talked about that,
7 and that is a really good point. Normally, we
8 will. This is an active base. We will include
9 folks who live on base; and because it is closing
10 and there seems to be such a transition, we
11 decided not to; but that's not out of the picture
12 to revisit that.

13 MR. HANSEN: The Coast Guard is
14 staying.

15 MS. LUPTON: I will talk to them
16 about that.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Then the people
18 that represent ships in the Marina -- I guess
19 Harlan is one of them -- the Yacht Club folks, and
20 maybe Caltrans. They seem to have some ideas of

1 either building a new bridge or retrofitting.

2 MS. LUPTON: These are good
3 suggestions.

4 MS. GLASS: Of course, the Job Corps
5 will have a presence early on, both the operators
6 and their clients.

7 MS. LUPTON: Okay.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: One more comment:
9 Is there going to be a fact sheet that is
10 distributed or prepared that will summarize the
11 process to date for these community members?

12 MS. LUPTON: In your fact sheet as to
13 interviewees?

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The interviewees,
15 just as part of the preparation for the ROD public
16 hearing.

17 MS. LUPTON: This is separate from
18 the proposed plan process, but we do have a fact
19 sheet that is a real general overview what the
20 installation restoration program is, where do you

1 get more information, that is handed out to the
2 interviewee.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. And what has
4 been done to date with regard to it?

5 MS. LUPTON: That is another fact
6 sheet that needs to be done separate from that.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It would be part of
8 this program?

9 MS. LUPTON: The community relations
10 program includes fact sheets that could be
11 quarterly or semiannually. These are the types of
12 things that you outline, that you recommend, or
13 say the Navy will now produce semiannual fact
14 sheets or quarterly fact sheets; or you find in
15 the interview that people don't trust fact sheets,
16 news articles, or we get a roadshow going.

17 The idea of doing interviews is to
18 find out what do people really want? People say,
19 "I don't want any fact sheet. I don't use talk
20 radio or get a roadshow. I will talk to Jim

1 individually."

2 So this is the kind of thing we're
3 trying to find out what is most effective.

4 The fact sheet is the traditional way
5 to get information out, but it is not the most
6 effective.

7 MR. HANSEN: Could we have a copy of
8 the existing CRP?

9 MS. LUPTON: We have one. We can
10 pass one around and make copies. I have it right
11 here. I will put it out for you to look at.

12 MS. SHIRLEY: Will you be sharing
13 with us a list of the people that you contacted so
14 that maybe we can spend ten minutes brainstorming
15 among the RAB?

16 MS. LUPTON: I can show you right now
17 the initial list we have. I have copies of it
18 right here, figuring that question might come up.

19 To date we have met with ARC, as well
20 as we have lined up --

1 MS. GLASS: When you say Willie
2 Brown, is that the mayor of San Francisco?

3 MS. LUPTON: Or designated staff.
4 That's just the title.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: People are taking
6 their time to review the list. Are there any
7 comments on the list that has been provided?

8 MS. LUPTON: People could call me. I
9 will leave you my number, which is 222-8245; and I
10 seriously would really welcome suggestions.

11 MR. ONGERTH: Have you considered
12 interviewing representatives of the East Bay area?

13 MS. LUPTON: I will let Jim talk to
14 you about that. We talked about that. I think
15 there were some concerns about that, since this is
16 San Francisco's purview.

17 MR. NEDELL: What is the concern?

18 MS. LUPTON: I would rather have Jim
19 address that. I'm not really sure myself. He
20 felt more comfortable with San Francisco.

1 We will get to the East Bay folks,
2 Urban Ecology, Save San Francisco Bay; so again we
3 welcome suggestions.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Summarizing this
5 list, I think I will ask for any kind of comments
6 on this; and we will go on to the next item.

7 We suggested East Bay
8 representatives, including MTC, beyond the list
9 that is provided here; Coast Guard; residents of
10 the TI Yacht Club; Caltrans; Job Corps.

11 MS. VEDAGIRI: State senators and
12 state legislators.

13 MS. LUPTON: You really try to hit on
14 the people that really have taken a very concrete
15 interest in Treasure Island. You don't want to
16 focus on elected officials. They are not always
17 as in touch as some of the people that are right
18 there in the community, dealing with interest
19 groups.

20 MS. VEDAGIRI: Not to focus

1 everything on them, but you have local and federal
2 officials. There don't seem to be state people.

3 MS. LUPTON: Any state senator or
4 assemblyperson that you would suggest that is
5 really involved with Treasure Island?

6 MS. GLASS: Burton.

7 MR. WONG: Carole Migden, and with
8 Willie Kennedy going off the Board of Supervisors,
9 a good substitute might be Michael Yaki, who got
10 appointed. He was Nancy Pelosi's point person for
11 Treasure Island.

12 MS. LUPTON: I thought about that.
13 We are talking to Pelosi's office. That is a good
14 suggestion.

15 MR. HAYDEN: Didn't Ron Dellums have
16 an interest in TI for a while and probably should
17 be contacted as somebody who is a representative
18 of the East Bay?

19 MR. ALLMAN: What about talking to
20 people that were involved in other RAB processes

1 that are further along. They may have knowledge
2 of some pitfalls or some advice as to, say,
3 somebody from Hunters Point or Mare Island. They
4 may have some advice to help us see what is coming
5 around the corner that we have not experienced
6 yet, because we are at an early stage.

7 MS. LUPTON: From the RAB
8 perspective?

9 MR. ALLMAN: Yes, basically, from
10 other RABs.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any others?

12 MS. GLASS: Representatives to
13 TIHDI -- it stands for Treasure Island Housing
14 Development Initiative.

15 MR. HAYDEN: Just because of the
16 location of TI, I am thinking of agriculture. I
17 brought up that question several months ago, and I
18 don't know what happened, but I think she sent a
19 letter to the CRC. If there's anybody who's
20 involved with agriculture who might have some

1 input, it seems like, in the long run, that might
2 actually be very beneficial for the island.

3 MS. LUPTON: Thank you.

4 CO-CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We have
5 another presentation on the agenda. That would be
6 for the annual groundwater monitoring report
7 overview.

8 MS. TOBIAS: I don't have a formal
9 presentation prepared. What I thought I would do
10 is explain to you what you're going to see in the
11 annual monitoring report.

12 In the report we have 11 IR sites,
13 and these are petroleum or other. This report
14 does not distinguish between the two. What we did
15 at these 11 IR sites, we collected four quarters
16 of data; so this report compiles all four quarters
17 and evaluates the data.

18 It also incorporates new monitoring
19 wells that were installed during the Phase IIB;
20 and they were sampled once; and the results of

1 that quarter of sampling are also presented. They
2 were sent at the same time as the fourth quarter
3 of the existing wells, to give you a snapshot in
4 time of what is going on at the site.

5 I have been reading it a lot, and it
6 is very informative. It gives a really good
7 picture of the groundwater potential contamination
8 at the sites.

9 We also included four new sites in
10 this report. They are not new sites, but they did
11 not have wells. No wells were installed during
12 the Phase 1, and so all you will see is one
13 quarter data for those.

14 What we plan on doing in June is
15 presenting to you one site, how we look at the
16 data and make our interpretation; and we do have
17 some contaminant plume maps in those reports as
18 well.

19 Then in July we wanted to take it a
20 step further and look at the soil at the site and

1 the groundwater, and show how we interpreted all
2 the data for the IR so we can show how we look to
3 the immunoassay data, how we use those results to
4 place the wells, and then how we interpret all the
5 soil and groundwater data to date for a site.

6 So it gives you an idea of what we
7 have done in our overall process; and when you get
8 our report in August, at least you understand what
9 we were doing, hopefully. That is our goal.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: When is the annual
11 report going to be available?

12 MS. TOBIAS: The Navy has been
13 currently reviewing it, but it should be out by
14 the end of the month, so you will be seeing it
15 shortly. And it's a pretty thick document, about
16 a 3-inch binder.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And then you
18 described some information you will be providing
19 us at subsequent meetings, leading up to the IR
20 report in August. Somewhere in there I understood

1 you to say you were going to take a site all the
2 way through.

3 MS. TOBIAS: In July we will take a
4 site, and I think originally we had thought we
5 would review one of the sites that we have a lot
6 of data for, the groundwater report. However,
7 some of the sites are being transferred out of the
8 CERCLA Program, so they wouldn't be in the RI
9 report. There is 9 sites. There are only going
10 to be 16 sites in the RI report, so the sites that
11 you might see in June may not be the sites you see
12 in July. We will give you a report for all the
13 sites all over again in July.

14 I think, for the groundwater report,
15 like sites 6, 14 and 22, those are the more
16 interesting sites or the solvent sites, how much
17 solvent contamination.

18 What we will attempt to try to
19 explain in the July meeting is what we did with
20 screening out the ambient for background levels,

1 and what the results of it were, and what it
2 means, and what our recommendations are for that
3 site.

4 Does that sound like what you're
5 interested in hearing about?

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Comment. I see we
7 are deep in thought.

8 MS. TOBIAS: Maybe I was not clear
9 enough. It is kind of late.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: You will give us a
11 little more than the groundwater monitoring report
12 overview?

13 MS. TOBIAS: The groundwater report
14 has a lot of information. We do have a lot of
15 data there. I hope you find it useful.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do you expect
17 comments back from the RAB on the monitoring
18 report?

19 MS. TOBIAS: It wouldn't be revised.
20 It is a one-time submittal. Perhaps if you don't

1 agree with how we interpreted the data, if you
2 want to make the comments before the RI comes out
3 in August, that might be helpful. Information
4 like that would be helpful in the preparation of
5 the RI report.

6 MR. HANSEN: You indicated some
7 annual groundwater monitoring report?

8 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

9 MR. HANSEN: Which means it is going
10 to go year, after year, after year.

11 MS. TOBIAS: No. During the Phase 1
12 RI that we conducted in 1992, we probably
13 installed 30 wells; and there are an existing
14 number of wells by previous contractors. We
15 completed four quarters of sampling those wells,
16 and this report summarizes the four quarters.

17 MR. HANSEN: Those wells remain
18 intact in the ground, don't they?

19 MS. TOBIAS: That's true.

20 MR. HANSEN: No one has the

1 responsibility for going in there and monitoring
2 them periodically?

3 MS. TOBIAS: That's what we have been
4 doing for the last year.

5 MR. HANSEN: But you say this is the
6 last one.

7 MS. TOBIAS: This is the last one.

8 MR. HANSEN: I thought they had to be
9 monitored until the cleanup is completed.

10 MS. TOBIAS: The next step is, we are
11 preparing an interim groundwater monitoring plan;
12 and in that plan, we're monitoring all of the
13 existing wells, if they need to have additional
14 samples. For example, if you have never seen
15 contamination in a well, you might only want to
16 sample that well annually instead of quarterly.
17 Sampling is a really expensive effort.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are using
19 "annual" in the sense of doing one year's worth of
20 data gathering, not "annual" in terms of every

1 year. But we have gathered a year's worth of
2 data, and that is going to help us in making our
3 decision. When the remedy is implemented, there
4 may be monitoring that goes along with that, but
5 the data we are collecting now is for the purpose
6 of reaching the cleanup decision.

7 MR. HEHN: Sharon, in July when we
8 look at a specific site for both soil and
9 groundwater data, will that be done both in cross-
10 sections as well as the plan view?

11 MS. TOBIAS: We have not selected the
12 site to go through. Sometimes it is pretty boring
13 on the cross-section. What did you have in mind?

14 MR. HEHN: I was wondering, because a
15 lot of times it gives you a different perspective
16 of what is going on, the depth perspective rather
17 than what is on the surface, especially if you
18 don't work the cross-sections a lot, you can't see
19 that.

20 MS. TOBIAS: You can't visualize it.

1 That's a good plan, and I will take it back to the
2 RI comparison, because what you see in July will
3 be in the RI. You're not going to see it later
4 unless you really don't like it.

5 Are there any other questions?

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will quickly
8 go through the next item.

9 Rachel has put together a brief
10 update on BTAG. There is not a whole lot to
11 update, but we wanted to inform you.

12 MS. SIMONS: Actully I asked my
13 contact on the BTAG, the Biological Technical
14 Advisory Group, and my representative at US EPA,
15 one of them, Clarence Callahan, actually
16 participated in the Ecological Technical
17 Assessment Workshop. Specifically, he gave me a
18 status on the Navy project to develop regional
19 screening numbers for sediments, and what he said
20 was -- I'm actually going to read this paragraph:

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

"At the March 20th BTAG meeting, BTAG formed several committees to jointly work on the development of regional screening numbers for contaminants commonly found at Navy sites in San Francisco Bay.

"Because of work schedules and limited time available from the regulatory agencies, the Navy and their support contractor personnel had only one committee meeting.

"At this time the Navy has proceeded to evaluate available sediment data collected from the sites. TBAG is presently evaluating the available databasis for toxicity and sediment chemistry that can be used for comparison to sediment data for the Navy sites.

"TBAG and the Navy will soon meet to discuss the process for evaluating the sediment chemistry and bioassay results.

1 As previously stated, this activity will
2 not impede the schedule for any Navy sites
3 in the Bay Area."

4 Hopefully, we have more to come. He
5 did not give me a schedule.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will provide
7 further updates as we get new information.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Jim and I are
9 discussing how we want to handle the
10 organizational business items here, the way of
11 operating guidelines, rather than discussing among
12 ourselves. I'm going to put it out to the group.

13 What I have done is gone back and
14 looked at the November 1994 operating
15 guidelines -- it has been about that long since
16 we have looked at them -- and I added four
17 provisions that will allow us whether or not we
18 need to recruit new members and that enables us to
19 organize ourselves into committees for the purpose
20 of keeping the RAB activity.

1 If you like, I can read you those
2 provisions that I have added. We have hard copies
3 now. Jim graciously left the meeting to make
4 copies of the revised operating guidelines, and
5 people can review them at their leisure, and then
6 we can discuss them at the next meeting.

7 I am very sensitive to the hour here.
8 I don't want to belabor this any further.

9 MR. ALLMAN: I'll make a motion that
10 we review what you prepared so far, and discuss
11 it, and put it on the next month's agenda.

12 MR. NEDELL: Second.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Jim will put them
14 out on the side table, so pick one up on your way
15 out.

16 Jim, can these be appended to the
17 minutes for this meeting so that those members
18 that did not attend tonight will get copies?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: There are a few

1 more agenda items. We can go through those
2 quickly.

3 I think the upcoming environmental
4 report review schedule is critical for those
5 committees that are interested in the report. Is
6 BRAC/FOSL out?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there are any
8 further comments on the Building 3 FOSL, please
9 get them to us the end of this week. It sounds
10 like everyone was fairly comfortable with the
11 Building 3 FOSL, in that it was very similar to
12 the Building 2 FOSL.

13 The comment period for the brig is
14 just about the time of the next interim meeting;
15 so even though we said 10th of June, we will
16 discuss the comments at the 11 June meeting.

17 And then the groundwater report, we
18 should have it out about the end of this month,
19 beginning of next.

20 And then we are starting a FOSL on

1 the firefighting school. We don't have a schedule
2 yet.

3 As Sharon discussed, we will have the
4 Phase IIB data package that Paul and Pat will be
5 receiving about the next two weeks.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The brig FOSL is a
7 report that we would need to review and get
8 comments into Jim by the 10th of June. Is there
9 interest in having an interim meeting, the first
10 Tuesday or the second Tuesday next month, to
11 address these topics? Is there a topic for an
12 interim meeting this coming month?

13 MR. HEHN: I think what Jim is saying
14 is that we can delay that until the 11th, to the
15 time of the interim meeting.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we will take
17 final comments on the brig; but in addition to
18 that, Pat was soliciting any other topics for the
19 11 June meeting.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: No other topics for

1 the 11 June meeting?

2 MR. HEHN: By that time we will
3 probably also have the groundwater data, so if
4 there is any discussion we want to have on that,
5 as well as the brig FOSL.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you,
7 Jim.

8 I guess I would like to leave with
9 some idea of what we're going to have on our next
10 month's agenda.

11 This meeting's agenda was rather
12 lengthy, and we have had a lot of discussion about
13 the administrative record. Is that something we
14 are willing to take up in July, as well, to
15 complete?

16 MR. ALLMAN: Jim, do you have time to
17 prepare your writeup by June?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I hope to have
19 something circulating before the June meeting, so
20 I would like to suggest that for the June meeting

1 we will have the groundwater discussion, and my
2 understanding is we need to devote a fairly
3 lengthy amount of time to that. And then we can,
4 hopefully, make some continued progress on this
5 administrative record.

6 Then, either June or July, we will
7 want to have a presentation on the Reuse Plan.

8 MS. WALTERS: We were thinking about
9 July.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In that case, it
11 sounds like we can devote as much time as we can
12 in June to the RI and the related administrative
13 record. And then in July, which will actually be
14 a pretty busy meeting, we will have continued
15 discussion of remedial investigation and a
16 discussion on the Reuse Plan.

17 I think that makes June and July,
18 especially July, pretty full.

19 MR. HEHN: What is the suggestion on
20 the geotechnical issues which seem to be changing

1 now?

2 MS. WALTERS: I will keep you posted
3 whether it is going to be June or July. We have
4 not heard anything official when it is going to
5 be.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The City is
7 waiting for some legal opinions regarding the
8 geotechnical issue.

9 MS. WALTERS: It sounds like in the
10 June meeting, for the June meeting.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That will be
12 groundwater, administrative record, and geotech.
13 That is a pretty full schedule for June. And in
14 July would be for remedial investigation and Reuse
15 Plan. I think that looks like a pretty good
16 program for June and July.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: You also have Phase
18 IIB results.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Originally, we
20 thought we would cover groundwater this month and

1 then go into more remedial investigation next
2 month. But, basically, we slipped that schedule
3 by one month.

4 MR. ALLMAN: If you're not to the
5 point of having -- like you're going to be getting
6 sheets with some questions, I assume, on the
7 administrative record. And depending, based upon
8 whether or not you feel comfortable addressing
9 these questions by then, it might be even better
10 to bump it to August, if it means to get the
11 actual questions answered.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will leave it
13 to the discretion of the RAB members. If you'd
14 like to include the discussion in June, maybe that
15 could be part of the interim meeting on the 11th,
16 to fine-tune the agenda for June.

17 MR. HEHN: I was going to ask what
18 the update was on our base map, whether that is
19 going to come in at about the same time as the
20 groundwater report and the RI report.

1 MS. TOBIAS: We are hoping to have
2 the base map to you by our interim meeting --
3 That's our next goal -- of June.

4 MR. HEHN: That would be a good time
5 to have it so we can put the data in context.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have got one
7 administrative note. I got a copy of volumes 1
8 and 2 of the City's existing conditions on the
9 back table. That was my one and only. So if
10 anyone has those, if they could please return them
11 to me. You're welcome to have a copy. You just
12 have to make them.

13 MR. ALLMAN: The Phase IIB data that
14 you mentioned is going to go to Pat and Paul. Do
15 we have the option of getting that, too; or is
16 that some voluminous thing that we don't want to
17 look at?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will leave it
19 to Pat and Paul to take a look at it. We will
20 make it available based on your recommendation.

1 MR. HEHN: This is the full Phase
2 IIB?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is pretty
4 voluminous.

5 MS. TOBIAS: It is about this big
6 (indicating). Only the analytical, validated from
7 the laboratory.

8 MR. ALLMAN: This will be an example
9 of the type of data that would end up --

10 MS. TOBIAS: In the RI, in the
11 administrative record file.

12 MR. ALLMAN: Just checking.

13 MS. TOBIAS: Making recommendations
14 to the Navy.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I want to thank you
16 and also solicit your questions again with regard
17 to the administrative record. Ernie has now the
18 list for groundwater monitoring reports. If you
19 did not put yours on it and want to, now is your
20 opportunity.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very
much for persisting through a slightly longer than
average meeting. We will see some of you at the
interim meeting on the 11th, and the next Citizens
Reuse meeting, the 3rd of June.

Have a nice Memorial Day.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at
9:55 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, 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
day of **MAY 24 1996**

Paul Schiller

Certified Shorthand Reporter
State of California