

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

---o0o---

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

25 JUNE 1996

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 23

---o0o---

COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR NO. 1268

535

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

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

- JIM SULLIVAN (BEC AND NAVY CO-CHAIR)
- ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
- HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- SHARON TOBIAS
- THORSTEN ANDERSON
- STACEY LUPTON
- PAUL BIGELOW

REGULATORY AGENCY:

- CHEIN KAO (DTSC)
- SHIRLEY BUFORD (DTSC)
- AMY BROWNELL

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

- JOSEPH ALCEDO
- JOHN ALLMAN
- CHRIS SHIRLEY (ARC ECOLOGY)
- RICHARD HANSEN
- FRED HAYDEN
- PAUL HEHN (ALT. COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
- GARY JENSEN
- ALICE LA PIERRE
- KAREN MENDELOW
- PATRICIA NELSON (COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
- HENRY ONGERTH
- DALE SMITH
- LAURIE GLASS (TI CITIZENS REUSE COMMITTEE)
- HARLAN VAN WYE (TI YACHT CLUB)

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

GUESTS:

FRANK L. ROLLO
REYES R. GOMEZ

1 (7:15 P.M.)

2
3 ---o0o---

4
5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are ready to
6 start tonight's meeting. Welcome to our
7 Restoration Advisory Board.

8 The first item is discussion and
9 approval of the agenda.

10 Everyone should have gotten a mailed
11 copy of the agenda, probably the earliest I ever
12 mailed out agendas before. You probably thought
13 the meeting was last week instead of this week.

14 There are additional copies of the
15 agenda on the back table if anyone needs them.

16 Are there any comments concerning
17 tonight's agenda?

18 With that, we will proceed.

19 The next item is discussion/approval
20 of the May 21 minutes.

1 There are additional copies of the
2 May meeting minutes on the back table also for
3 anyone who might need them.

4 Is there any comment regarding the
5 May meeting minutes?

6 MS. SHIRLEY: I was missing page
7 four. Was that missing for everybody?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. I've got
9 page four.

10 Was everyone missing page four? We
11 will check that and we will send it out.

12 MS. SMITH: Can we hold off approval
13 of the May minutes until we have gotten page four
14 to everybody?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will hold
16 approving the May minutes until the next meeting,
17 when everyone got the missing page.

18 MR. GALANG: Did everyone miss page
19 four?

20 (General assent.)

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Anyway, we will
2 defer approval of the May meeting minutes.

3 Next, we will go into the public
4 comment period. We set aside five minutes at the
5 beginning of each meeting for any members of the
6 general public who are attending. I see no
7 members of the general public, so we will proceed
8 into our program updates.

9 On the program updates, we did not
10 hold a BCT meeting in June, so the only meeting we
11 held was a meeting to discuss the finding of
12 suitability to lease for the parade. But Pat
13 asked me to make some comments on the change of
14 the surplus sites to non-surplus, and we have not
15 provided it to you in a list. I will check with
16 Ernie, but there are nine sites that we are moving
17 from CERCLA to Non-CERCLA. Those are: Our Site
18 4, the Hydraulic Training School; Site 19, the
19 Refuse Transfer Area; Site 6, the Fire Training
20 School; Site 14, the New Fuel Farm; Site 15, the

1 Old Fuel Farm; Site 16, the Clipper Cove Fuel
2 Farm; Site 20, the Auto Hobby Shop; Site 22, the
3 Navy Exchange Gas Station; and Site 25, the
4 Seaplane Maintenance Area.

5 Originally we had considered a tenth
6 site, Site 17, which is the tanks 103 and 104, but
7 because of constituents other than petroleum, we
8 have kept that in the CERCLA program.

9 So these nine sites that I have named
10 will not be in the Remedial Investigation Report
11 that we issue in August. Instead, they will be in
12 a draft, because they are moving into a non-CERCLA
13 program, they will be in a draft Corrective Action
14 Plan or CAP that we will issue in December. CAP
15 is kind of a combination remedial investigation
16 and feasibility study that's issued under the
17 Water Board regulations rather than CERCLA.

18 Under Citizens Reuse Committee,
19 neither Dan nor Laurie are here, but we did
20 provide at the interim meeting some early draft

1 copies of the Reuse Plan. But rather than make
2 copies for everyone, since they are continuing to
3 make some final changes, we have held off
4 providing copies to all the community members.

5 It is my understanding that the City
6 will complete its changes in the Reuse Plan in the
7 next couple of weeks, and once they finalize the
8 document that they submit to the Navy, then we
9 will provide copies to all of the community
10 members.

11 The next Citizens Reuse Committee
12 meeting is on the 8th of July, and that is noted
13 on the back of the agenda.

14 MR. HEHN: Just a quick comment for
15 anybody that is interested.

16 On the back table, there are copies
17 of the Final Report of the Federal Facilities
18 Environmental Restoration Dialog Committee, which
19 is a group of various regulators, public interest
20 groups, environmentalists, et cetera, that have

1 come up with a consensus of principles and
2 recommendations for improving facilities cleanup.

3 It is a very interesting document to
4 read, they have done a lot of work on that. Amy
5 Brownell is also a member of that committee.

6 They did a presentation at the end of
7 May on this final report and it gives some good
8 insight as to how the various agencies and
9 committees and RABs, et cetera, work together with
10 the other programs for consensus building in
11 federal cleanups.

12 MS. BROWNELL: If anybody has any
13 questions about it, it is not the easiest reading
14 in the world, so if you want some interpretation,
15 let me know.

16 Especially interesting, also
17 unfortunately the hardest to read, is Chapter 5,
18 which talks about the budget process. I
19 definitely learned a lot about the federal budget
20 process that I didn't know before, and there are

1 very useful recommendations for committee members
2 on how to get involved in that process to make
3 sure to have the priorities for cleanup and the
4 budgeting together.

5 So feel free to call me. My number
6 is in the book, or you can call any of the members
7 of the committee, everybody's number is in the
8 back of it.

9 Also, Lennie Siegel is going to do
10 another workshop in the fall for all RABs, Bay
11 Area RAB members, and they are going to include a
12 section on this report, so there will be another
13 chance if you want to learn more about it.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

15 Next I'm going to real quickly go
16 through action items. There are two items that we
17 have completed and I am just working off of the
18 meeting minutes from last month. Those of you who
19 have not already received them at the interim
20 meeting will receive a copy of the composite map

1 tonight. They are in the back.

2 Also with the May meeting minutes, we
3 provided a list of the analytical laboratories
4 used in the cleanup program.

5 With that, I would like to move into
6 our first presentation.

7 Frank Rollo is with the City and has
8 agreed to come out tonight to give us a
9 presentation on the geotechnical aspects of
10 Treasure Island and what the City's plans are.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we are
12 going to try a new format tonight for the
13 presentation. We will let Frank make a
14 presentation and I will distribute index cards, so
15 if questions come up during the presentation,
16 please make note of them and then we will take a
17 quick break, and then we will put the questions in
18 some logical order so that we can make best use of
19 Frank's time.

20 MR. FRANK ROLLO: Good evening. My

1 name is Frank Rollo. I'm with the firm of
2 Treadwell and Rollo, part of the team that was
3 selected by the San Francisco Planning and
4 Redevelopment Agency to evaluate Treasure Island
5 and Yerba Buena Island.

6 Our role specifically was to identify
7 geotechnical issues associated with the islands.

8 I am going to focus on TI, talk a
9 little bit about the setting, a little bit about
10 earthquakes, a little bit about problems
11 associated with the island, and then talk through
12 the timeline that has been established by the team
13 presented to CRC and then, last week, presented to
14 the Mayor.

15 With that, I will start.

16 (Showing slides.)

17 Many of these overheads are photos
18 taken back in '37 and in '89, so I apologize for
19 some of their quality.

20 Treasure Island. That's what it

1 looked like in 1937, and some people will tell you
2 that's what it is going to look like after the
3 next earthquake, but we will just focus on what it
4 looked like in '37.

5 Built in the middle of the bay on
6 sand shoals, it was built by constructing a
7 perimeter dike and then hydraulically placing sand
8 on the shoals. The Bay Bridge was just about
9 completed at that time.

10 Specifically, it was built using what
11 is referred to as the upstream method of
12 construction, designed by the Corps of Engineers,
13 for the purpose of the island was to host the
14 Fair, for then after the Fair left, it was to have
15 been San Francisco's International Airport.

16 The upstream method of construction
17 consists of building a perimeter dike up to a
18 certain level and then placing hydraulic sand
19 behind the dike, and following that, building
20 another dike, placing more sand, another dike and

1 more sand, so each successive dike is either built
2 on the shoals or on the hydraulic sand that was
3 placed.

4 So the island then consists of four
5 predominant layers: There is a sufficient layer
6 of sandy clay fill that is random fill placed at
7 certain locations. One theory is that, it was
8 postulated in the old days that if you can cap a
9 potentially liquifiable sand with clay, then the
10 water that comes up through the sand won't get to
11 the surface because the clay is relatively
12 impervious and if the water can't get to the
13 surface, it can't create what is called "sand
14 boils." And if you don't get sand boils, then
15 there is less potential for loss of bearing
16 capacity for bearing buildings.

17 You probably read about in the
18 newspapers --

19 Do we all know what liquifaction is,
20 the phenomena?

1 Beneath the sandy clay are the sands
2 and silty sands that are 30 to 50 feet thick.
3 They consist of both the hydraulically-placed or
4 dredged sand and the natural shoals. They are
5 loose; that means that the particles are not
6 densely packed. Because they are loose, when you
7 shake them, the water pressure is exerted against
8 the particles, pulls the particles apart, the
9 water rises to the surface and creates the
10 quicksand condition which is liquifaction.

11 Under the sand fill shoal are recent
12 bay deposits, bay muds of the consistency of stiff
13 mayonnaise or jello of variant thickness. The
14 thicker portions are out toward the north end of
15 the island. They are weak, they are compressible,
16 so if you put materials on these clays, they will
17 consolidate. Consolidation is nothing but
18 squeezing water out, and you squeeze the water
19 out, it becomes denser and denser, it occupies
20 less volume, so settlement occurs.

1 Because they are weak, if you put the
2 weight on too fast, it will cause landslides, or
3 if you shake it, it potentially can slide.

4 If you put buildings on it, they
5 settle. That is why most buildings on the
6 waterfront in San Francisco are pile-supported.
7 They go down through the recent sediments into the
8 old sediments, which, in the case of Treasure
9 Island, vary from about 30 feet thickness in the
10 south end to 200 feet in the north end. And then,
11 beneath these older sediments, is the rock,
12 similar rock that you see on Yerba Buena.

13 The first earthquake to come along,
14 the first significant earthquake to come along
15 after the island was built in 1937, was the 1957
16 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault, or the Daly
17 City earthquake.

18 It was a minor earthquake of very
19 short duration. At that time, it was reported
20 that liquifaction occurred on the island, that

1 portions of the island split open and cars got
2 stuck in the cracks. But liquifaction, in '57,
3 was not a well-known phenomena, so it was sort of
4 ignored.

5 Then the Loma Prieta came along in
6 1989. The Loma Prieta earthquake had its center
7 at Loma Prieta, about 60 miles south of us, south
8 of Santa Cruz. It had a measured Richter
9 magnitude of 7.1, which is considered a large
10 earthquake.

11 The blessing for us in the Bay Area
12 is that occurred so far away.

13 The second blessing then about the
14 Loma Prieta earthquake was that it was unique;
15 that is, it was bilateral. It had an epicenter
16 and ruptured in two directions, so it reached its
17 magnitude in one-half the time that a normal
18 earthquake -- if there is such a thing -- would.
19 In most earthquakes, you have an epicenter and
20 then a rupture, and then the length of rupture

1 gives you the magnitude.

2 This earthquake had an epicenter that
3 ruptured in two directions, so it was only
4 one-half as long, about 12, 15 seconds long, and
5 in San Francisco, in the Bay Area, there was only
6 about two to five seconds of strong shaking, which
7 is defined as an acceleration greater than .1g.
8 At Yerba Buena Island, the acceleration, the
9 highest acceleration measured was .07g.

10 On Treasure Island, the maximum
11 acceleration measured was .17g, so about two and a
12 half times as strong as the rock.

13 So you had about three to five
14 seconds of acceleration that exceeded .1g, but they
15 did not get any higher than .17g.

16 During that short period of time,
17 that short intensity, large sand boils were
18 created on the island. The water comes up, brings
19 sand up with it. It deposits the sand on the side
20 and then the center, after the shaking is over,

1 caves in. This is liquifaction. If there is a
2 building on top of that on shallow foundation, it
3 would settle differentially. So that caused some
4 serious concern.

5 (Showing slides.)

6 Here is another example of the
7 liquifaction that occurred and sand boils that
8 occurred on the island. Here is a classic cone,
9 the sand came up, it was deposited on the side,
10 and you get the depression.

11 The same phenomena occurred at random
12 locations in the marina and along the waterfront
13 of San Francisco.

14 (Showing slide.)

15 Another example, this happens to be
16 one of the main intersections, you can see the
17 large deposits of sand. Remember, this is
18 October, it was about 80 degrees that day. The
19 amounts of water that came up and created these
20 lakes, this is the sand that the water brought

1 with it and deposited.

2 What you see is occurring in a three-
3 to five-second period from an acceleration that
4 did not exceed .17g.

5 (Showing slides.)

6 Here is another example, this is
7 behind some of the barracks. All this is water;
8 again, the phenomenon of liquifaction.

9 (Showing slide.)

10 This is 12th, this is behind the
11 school, the play yard. This is all from
12 liquifaction, all this water coming up.

13 With that, knowing what happened in
14 '89, we then ask ourselves what would happen if an
15 earthquake occurred on one of the four segments of
16 either the Hayward or the San Andreas Fault.

17 I put up here, just to give you a
18 sense that it is anticipated, that between now and
19 the year 2020, there will be, there is a
20 probability, there is a 60 to 70 percent

1 probability of a magnitude 7 or greater earthquake
2 on one of the four segments of the fault, the two
3 faults that we have bordering the Bay Area.

4 It is also anticipated that the
5 accelerations associated with that level of
6 earthquake will be at least .4g, or about two and
7 a half times what was experienced at Treasure
8 Island from Loma Prieta.

9 More importantly, an earthquake of
10 this magnitude usually lasts between 20 and 30
11 seconds, as opposed to 12 to 15 seconds, and the
12 duration of strong shaking could be on the order
13 or 12 to 15 seconds, as opposed to three to five
14 seconds. So if you get that kind of shaking for
15 that length of time, you can expect to see much
16 more widespread liquefaction.

17 Another phenomena associated with
18 liquefaction is lateral spreading. Lateral
19 spreading is when the unconfined slopes, in the
20 case of the perimeter of the island, move out to

1 sea. And using various analytical techniques and
2 the results of numerous borings that have been
3 drilled on the island, we assessed the potential
4 for that lateral spreading and found that the
5 causeway is the most vulnerable, or it's expected
6 that the movements will be greater than ten feet;
7 and the second most vulnerable is a band around
8 the island about a width of 500 feet, in which
9 random movements in excess of ten feet will occur.
10 So you can have a spot here that moves out more
11 than ten feet and then perhaps nothing in another
12 spot.

13 (Showing slide.)

14 In fact, there is an area out here in
15 the deep mud where we not only anticipate the
16 lateral spreading, but we anticipate a rotational
17 type slide, where the mass goes out, including
18 some of the mud.

19 You step back 500 feet, we expect the
20 movements can be on the order of one to ten feet,

1 and, of course, in the center of the island we
2 expect this liquifaction to occur and the
3 liquifaction can range anywhere from a half a foot
4 to two feet.

5 So we have an island that is
6 vulnerable to major horizontal and vertical
7 deformations during a major earthquake on one of
8 the four segments of the two faults that border
9 the Bay Area.

10 Armed with that knowledge, we looked
11 at various solutions to strengthen the island, and
12 came up with what are called a stone column
13 method, which is basically constructing and
14 installing stone columns of crushed rock around
15 the entire perimeter of the island and the
16 causeway, the causeway being the first priority.

17 What happens is you vibrate a large
18 diameter, we call a stinger, basically a hollow
19 tube that you vibrate into the ground, and as you
20 vibrate this tube, it pushes the sand that was

1 occupied by the location of the tube and pushes it
2 laterally on the side. And then you withdraw the
3 tube, pour rock in, and that rock fills the void
4 left by the tube, and the sand that was in the
5 location of the tube now mixes with the sand next
6 to it and makes it more dense.

7 So you wind up with a column of stone
8 every six feet or so and dense sand in between.

9 (Showing slide.)

10 This is sort of the pattern that we
11 would envision that would be installed around the
12 entire perimeter. It is very costly, seventy,
13 \$80,000,000 to do the entire perimeter.

14 So in working in concert with the
15 Citizens Reuse Committee, the design team looked
16 at doing this work in stages. Stage one -- do
17 nothing. That would occur between the years 1997
18 and 2001. You basically identify areas. The Job
19 Corps is coming in; the new structure that is
20 being built for the Job Corps will be supported on

1 improved ground. We are actually taking the sand
2 and densifying it beneath the location of the new
3 gymnasium.

4 The City is currently assessing the
5 1,400 housing to see what will occur to it if
6 differential settlement of seven to 24 inches
7 occurs. As you know, these are in use by film
8 production. But the basic thing now is to utilize
9 some of the structures that are the newest, that
10 include the latest design techniques, and I guess
11 during that period of time collect the rent, so
12 that when it's all said and done, we can go to the
13 next stage, which is between the years 2002 and
14 2006.

15 Now, it is my understanding that in
16 1997 the Navy says good-bye.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Naval Station
18 closes.

19 MR. ROLLO: The Naval Station closes
20 and between '97 and 2001 --

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are in caretaker status and clean up the base and turn up buildings for reuse.

MR. ROLLO: The remediation may occur during that period of time if funding is available.

Starting in 2002, improvements to the island will take place. The most important one, of course, is the causeway. It needs to be strengthened first because your utilities come down and then a portion of the south dike and a small portion of the west dike will be improved using the stone column technique. With this in place, there is less risk of lateral spreading, so the access is maintained. As envisioned now, the Theme Arc will be built on a portion of the site, and the Job Corps will be built by them.

(Showing slide.)

Between 2007 and 2011, the first major Theme Park gets built, the additional

1 reinforcement occurs. This has already been
2 reinforced at this point, there may be some
3 modifications to this to prevent this portion from
4 affecting, from going out and affecting the back
5 side. These stone columns may be turned in the
6 east-west direction.

7 (Showing slide.)

8 Between the years 2012 and 2021, a
9 stone column wall will be installed across the
10 island, and there will be additional, to utilize
11 the Star Barracks, there will be additional
12 strengthening which will occur here, so they can
13 get into a visitor center type.

14 (Showing slide.)

15 Eventually, additional strengthening
16 will take place. This will become a neighborhood,
17 and that's the end of it.

18 Each increment, of course, will
19 require significant dollars, so that the stone
20 columns alone will be somewhere between sixty and

1 80,000,000. Then there is costs associated with
2 utilities; costs associated with new construction,
3 because the building themselves will have to be
4 built on deep foundations to gain support from the
5 old base sediment or on improved ground that may
6 include the similar type of installation such as
7 the stone columns that were shown here.

8 That's it.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. What we
10 would like to do is take a quick break and, to get
11 back to schedule, make it ten minutes and then if
12 you have any questions on the cards, please pass
13 them to Pat or myself and we will pass them to
14 Frank, and we will address the questions when we
15 get over the break.

16 (Whereupon, a short recess was
17 taken.)

18 MR. ROLLO: Let me look through some
19 of these. Great questions.

20 Question: "Please define

1 liquifaction."

2 Liquifaction is a phenomena that
3 leads to the loss of strength of granular
4 material. To have liquifaction, you have to have
5 granular soil, groundwater and vibration. The
6 granular soil has to be loose; that is, the
7 particles are not densely packed, and you have to
8 have a vibration.

9 The vibration usually has to last
10 long enough to cause, when an earthquake occurs,
11 the force that goes into the water. It creates an
12 excess water pressure. If the particles are
13 loosely packed, that water pressure pulls the
14 particles apart, water rises up through between
15 these particles and escapes to the unconfined
16 surface, which, in this case, would be the ground
17 surface.

18 In so doing, it brings sand particles
19 with it. The water can gush up into the air, so
20 basically liquifaction is a loss of strength that

1 occurs in the loose granular soils that are
2 submerged or saturated and are subjected to
3 vibration.

4 The next question is: "Why don't the
5 existing dikes provide some sort of resistance to
6 this lateral spreading phenomena that accompanies
7 this liquifaction?"

8 When the liquifaction occurs, these
9 sands will become a heavy fluid and they will
10 flow. Unfortunately, the dikes are built on this
11 flowing sand, so as this sand liquifies, the rock
12 will go with it. So the rock does not provide any
13 support. Had this rock extended down through the
14 sand into the mud, then it would have provided
15 some support.

16 "What will be done about foundations
17 of the existing buildings?"

18 It depends on the type of foundation.
19 It depends on the building, whether it is a
20 current building, an old building. It depends on

1 whether it can resist the earthquakes.

2 In some cases, the buildings may be
3 demolished. In other cases, the foundations may
4 be strengthened by adding grade beams that connect
5 the foundation together.

6 "Are the stone columns reinforced
7 with steel rods?" No.

8 "Where has crushed-rock stone columns
9 been used before?"

10 We used it on Marina Bay Development
11 in Richmond. We had a similar situation. We had
12 a thousand feet of shoreline. We were concerned
13 that would move laterally.

14 We installed stone columns in 1987,
15 there was no movement during Loma Prieta, but Loma
16 Prieta really was not a good test because it was
17 such a low-intensity earthquake.

18 "Has your firm considered that there
19 may be a fault east of the island in the Temescal
20 creekbed?"

1 That is a question for seismologists
2 and geologists. On the basis of the latest
3 reports that have come out, they do not indicate
4 the presence of an active fault in the Temescal
5 creek bed, so I'm going to rely on the USGS and
6 the California School of Mines and Geology.

7 "One hundred feet is allocated as
8 pedestrian access, yet your failure is predicted
9 for 500 feet. Should not water site uses be
10 eliminated?"

11 The stone column is being installed
12 to prevent lateral spreading. It will not prevent
13 liquifaction from occurring behind the stone
14 column.

15 So far as pedestrian access, I know
16 on many occasions where liquifaction can occur, as
17 long as you don't have horizontal movement, there
18 is less risk that you are going to be injured from
19 a liquifaction phenomenon.

20 So the answer is there can be access

1 around the perimeter, provided you don't get
2 lateral movement, and that is the goal right now,
3 to prevent lateral movement.

4 "Can a new perimeter be engineered to
5 contain the residual contamination on the island
6 that is present and at the same time prevent
7 migration and contamination into the bay like
8 slurry walls?"

9 Absolutely. You can use a soil
10 bed-like wall, if you need it, to contain. The
11 only issue then is you want to work in concert
12 with the community or the City to see where that
13 soil bed-like wall goes in relation to the stone
14 columns. The soil bed-like wall will not prevent
15 lateral spreading, it will slow with the sand.

16 "What happened to the idea of dynamic
17 compaction and the consequent damage to the
18 infrastructure?"

19 The concern with dynamic compaction
20 is unique, to have at least open space at least

1 200 feet between the actual area of dynamic
2 compaction and the adjacent structures.

3 Because the current plan incorporates
4 utilizing many of the existing buildings, if you
5 try to compact by dynamic methods at one location,
6 it would have an adverse effect on another. So it
7 has been ruled out at this time.

8 If at a later date it is decided that
9 a significant portion of the island would be open
10 space, then you can use dynamic compaction in the
11 open space and reuse it for new construction.

12 "Are any of the sand beds compacted?"

13 Yes, some of the newer structures, in
14 fact when we did the work for the pier, we
15 actually did some vibroflotation, where we
16 actually densified the sand, so there are select
17 locations around the island. I think the Fire
18 College is another, where ground modification
19 techniques have been used to strengthen the sand.

20 "How much clay is in the upper sandy

1 clay fill?"

2 It varies. It is random, it's not
3 over large areas, I don't know.

4 Question: "How large were the sand
5 boils on TI?"

6 I did not visit the island. There is
7 no record of actual dimensions, so I can't tell
8 you. By looking at the photos, I would say they
9 range from one to five or six feet.

10 "Do the dikes placed during the
11 original construction of TI provide any limitation
12 to the lateral spreading during an earthquake?"

13 No, they will flow with the sand.

14 "Are there other options to stone
15 columns?"

16 Yes, there is grouting, there is
17 dynamic compaction. We looked at other
18 alternatives; stone columns are the most cost
19 effective.

20 "How does this affect the

1 environmental work?"

2 I don't know. I will let Jim respond
3 to that. If you're doing groundwater extraction,
4 you have groundwater extraction wells in the area
5 where the stone columns are going to go, you're
6 going to have to move the wells.

7 "What is the purpose of the
8 cross-island columns?"

9 Because the north end of the island
10 may not be developed for a significant length of
11 time; because of this probability of an earthquake
12 occurring by the year 2020, consideration was
13 given, and because most of the utilization will be
14 at the south half, rather than continue the
15 perimeter dike all the way around, put this
16 portion in, then if we decide to utilize the north
17 end, you would add those other pieces and then it
18 would become redundant.

19 So the purpose is to get the
20 developed area contained by the year 2020.

1 "Would there be a benefit, i.e.
2 reduction of lateral spreading, if to the north of
3 this cross-island" -- unreadable -- "a bayment was
4 constructed, perhaps agriculturally generated?"

5 No, it would not help because the
6 problem is you have got to get down into the bay
7 mud with some sort of a containment structure, and
8 the bay mud is 50 feet deep, and groundwater, as
9 you know, is five to six feet down.

10 "Based on your study, could
11 liquifaction and lateral spreading cause
12 previously undetected pockets of fuel or
13 contaminated soil to come in contact with the
14 groundwater and spread contamination?"

15 These are sands. The groundwater is
16 down five or six feet. There are others here that
17 can address that better than I can. If the sands
18 have a high permeability, I suspect if movement is
19 occurring -- I don't know the answer to that.

20 "In general, is the seller

1 responsible when an unidentified contaminant
2 manifests itself many years in the future due to
3 change in geology?"

4 I will let the lawyers discuss that.

5 "Since it is likely that significant
6 groundwater contamination will remain around the
7 perimeter of the island, while the stone columns
8 are being installed, has the cost of health and
9 safety factors related to the contamination been
10 considered?"

11 If in fact we are told that
12 groundwater contamination exists and we are doing
13 the stone columns, then we will write that the
14 contractor and his people be held to a safety
15 train and then we go through the proper protocol.
16 Yes, it will add to the cost.

17 "Given the cost of stabilization,
18 what kind of use of TI would be necessary to
19 generate the necessary revenue to accomplish this
20 stabilization work?"

1 I think the plan which the Citizens
2 Reuse Committee has considered does, in fact, give
3 most of the revenue to do the stabilization. So
4 they are considering that as part of their reuse.

5 "Is the cross-island strengthening
6 also for utility corridors?"

7 Yes. In fact, you recall the
8 strengthening will go this way and this way
9 (indicating), and that strengthened portion will
10 be used, utilities will be built in that
11 strengthened portion.

12 "What is the rationale for the
13 cross-island strengthening?"

14 I think I explained that, and that's
15 it.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you for
18 coming up.

19 (Applause.)

20 Next, we will move you to our next

1 presentation on the BRAC cleanup process on our
2 groundwater report.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If the way of
4 collecting questions worked for you, could the
5 people at the end of the table hand out index
6 cards in the opposite direction and we can take
7 questions again after the presentation.

8 MR. JOHN ALLMAN: The index card
9 thing, is that index card thing because we have a
10 tight meeting tonight, or is this something we
11 will try out for a long term?

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We will try it out
13 and it is on the agenda under organizational
14 business.

15 MR. JOHN ALLMAN: Okay.

16 MR. PAUL BIGELOW: I'm Paul Bigelow.
17 I am with PRC. I am a geologist and have been
18 with PRC for about five years and I am going to be
19 giving you the Groundwater Status Report which was
20 issued at the end of May.

1 The presentation I am going to do has
2 three parts to it.

3 The first part is a summary of Phase
4 IIA remedial investigations. There are three
5 separate groundwater phases that were done as part
6 of that.

7 The second part is going to go over
8 the contents of the Groundwater Status Report.

9 And then the third part will be an
10 overview of one of the sites, and that will be
11 Site 6, the Fire Training School.

12 The purpose of the Groundwater Status
13 Report is to summarize the groundwater studies
14 that were done in Phase IIA, the remedial
15 investigation.

16 Identify and illustrate areas of
17 potential groundwater contamination and show what
18 is happening with the contamination over time in
19 the groundwater.

20 And the information in the

1 Groundwater Status Report will eventually be used
2 for the remedial investigation, the feasibility
3 study and the corrective action plan.

4 The information will be used for the
5 groundwater modeling that we are doing to develop
6 safe levels for the ground water.

7 The Phase IIA remedial investigation
8 consists of three separate ground water studies.
9 The first was the Aquifer Testing, which we did in
10 January 1995.

11 The second was the Tidal Influence
12 Study, which we completed in August of 1995.

13 And the third was the Quarterly
14 Groundwater Monitoring, which we did in November
15 of 1994, February of 1995, May of 1995 and
16 November of 1995.

17 The aquifer testing consisted of slug
18 testing, which is basically you introduce the slug
19 into the well, and you just place it in the water
20 and you measure the recharge of the water back

1 into the well, and this allows to estimate the
2 hydraulic conductivity of the soils around the
3 well. That is basically the permeability of the
4 soil to transmit water.

5 Then the hydraulic conductivity is
6 eventually used in estimating groundwater
7 velocity. We did slug testing at 12 wells at
8 Treasure Island and two wells at Yerba Buena, at
9 Site 11.

10 The Tidal Influence Study, which we
11 did in August of 1995, consisted of a 72-hour
12 water level measurement in 14 wells at Treasure
13 Island and the two wells at Yerba Buena Island,
14 again at the Site 11 of the Yerba Buena Island
15 fill. And we also had one at the Bay Monitoring
16 Station.

17 The purpose of that was to estimate
18 the vertical and horizontal magnitude of tidal
19 influence and to eventually average the 72-hour
20 water level measuring to figure out what the mean

1 water levels are in order to determine the mean
2 groundwater gradient, and I will show you some
3 figures from the Tidal Influence Study.

4 (Showing Figure 2-8.)

5 This is the northeast portions of
6 Treasure Island, Site 6, 12, 14 and 22. This
7 shows the groundwater table one hour after the
8 high tide at that time.

9 You can see the tidal gradient
10 reversal near the shoreline. The groundwater is
11 actually flowing in towards the island after high
12 tide, and then the parts and the island
13 groundwater is flowing out towards the shoreline.

14 MR. HANSEN: I don't understand that.
15 How do you know which direction it is going to? I
16 can see how you know if it is a vertical movement.

17 MR. BIGELOW: Within this area we had
18 five wells where we took the water level
19 measurements over a 72-hour period, and so we took
20 the water level measurement one hour after high

1 tide, and we plotted up the Water Table Contour
2 Map based on that.

3 Then these are the actual water table
4 elevations right here (indicating), so based on
5 those elevations, you can determine the
6 groundwater flow direction.

7 So at the shoreline, you have an
8 elevation of 5.5 feet groundwater, and then near
9 Site 6, you have an elevation of 5.15 feet
10 groundwater, which is flowing inward here.

11 Then further up a gradient again at
12 5.5 feet, and farther inland at six feet. The way
13 you can tell groundwater is going this way.

14 (Showing Figure 2-9.)

15 This is another snapshot of the Tidal
16 Influence Study in the same area, and this is
17 three and a half hours after low tide, so you can
18 see the water table has changed, where it's a
19 little bit deeper and everything is flowing
20 towards the shoreline.

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

(Showing Figure 2-10.)

Then this map shows the mean gradient, which is the average of the 72-hour water level measurement. And the mean gradient, it filters out all the tidal effect, so it shows the ultimate direction of the water flow.

(Showing Figure 4-2.)

Now I'm going to move to the quarterly groundwater sampling, which was the third part of the Phase III remedial investigation.

Again, that consisted of four quarters of groundwater sampling, in November of '94, February of '95, May of '95 and November of '95. The purpose of the quarterly sampling was to show the magnitude and trends of analytes detecting groundwater over time, and also to provide a baseline of groundwater quality for future comparison.

The site-specific contents of the

1 groundwater status report, the first three
2 sections of the report provide an introduction and
3 a regional background section, and also the
4 methodology section. And then the report is
5 divided by sites and the groundwater results are
6 discussed by sites.

7 In a situation where we had two sites
8 that were adjacent to each other, we combined
9 those sites and discussed them as one.

10 The groundwater results are presented
11 in several forms, including the analytical results
12 and tables, hydrographs, water table maps, water
13 table contours, concentration plots and
14 concentration map, and I will take you through
15 those.

16 I just wanted to mention how we
17 selected the analytes for discussion for each
18 site.

19 We did this based on three criteria:
20 One was the presence of the source on that site,

1 if there is a gasoline USTS site, then we would
2 probably discuss gasoline in the groundwater.

3 Second was the frequency of detection
4 of an analyte in a site, if deep flow was detected
5 in the majority of the wells at the site, then we
6 would discuss deep flow for the site.

7 Then the third criteria was the
8 frequency of detection above screening criteria.
9 The screening criteria we used was the ambient
10 water quality criteria, which is on a risk to
11 aquatic receptors, so at a site, if the majority
12 of the well contained, say, trichlorethylene above
13 the ambient water quality criteria, then we
14 selected trichlorethylene for a detailed
15 discussion of that site.

16 The reason we discussed the ambient
17 water quality criteria for screening is because
18 ground water is going towards the bay where we
19 have aquatic receptors.

20 We did not screen against any human

1 health criteria because of the low potential
2 beneficial use of groundwater as a drinking water
3 source.

4 Now I will take you through an
5 example site, Site 6, the Fire Training School.

6 (Showing Figure 4-5.)

7 The first thing we did was to plot
8 out the water level at Site 6 for all four
9 quarters. The elevations are on the vertical
10 axis, and time is on the horizontal axis, from
11 November '94 to November of '95.

12 So that the hydrographs show, you can
13 see the seasonal variations from precipitation.
14 In February of '95, you can see water levels rose,
15 and in May '95, in the dry season, the water
16 levels are lower. And in November, you have
17 moderate groundwater elevation.

18 MR. VAN WYE: Why didn't you do a
19 sample in August to get an even pattern throughout
20 the year?

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Would you like to
2 write that question on a card?

3 MR. BIGELOW: The second thing we did
4 was, based on the water level data, we plotted
5 groundwater contour maps for the sites, and we did
6 these for May '95 and November '95, and the reason
7 we selected those two quarters for presentation
8 was to show the water table during the dry season,
9 May '95, and during the wet season, which was
10 November '95.

11 We selected November of '95 also
12 because additional wells were installed during the
13 Phase IIB for remedial investigation before that
14 time, so we had an additional well coverage.

15 That was the rationale for selecting
16 those two quarters.

17 (Showing Figure 4-9.)

18 This shows the water table for May
19 1995 at Site 6, the fire training area here, and
20 this is the shoreline up here (indicating), and

1 these are the water table contours at Site B, 4.75
2 feet, and you can see the groundwater is flowing
3 out towards the bay.

4 (Showing Figure 4-10.)

5 Here is the water table map for
6 November 1995. You can see here that we have the
7 additional wells, we have a little bit of
8 coverage, and the water table is also a little bit
9 higher, about a half-foot higher at the center off
10 the site.

11 The arrows on the map show the
12 direction of the ground water flow.

13 The next thing we did was to plot up
14 the analyte concentrations for each quarter, and
15 the concentrations are in micrograms per liter,
16 which is parts per billion, and the concentrations
17 are on the vertical axis and time is on the
18 horizontal axis.

19 (Showing Figure 4-14.)

20 It shows that at Site 6 for

1 TPH-diesel, the concentration is going down over
2 time, and you can interpret that in several ways:
3 It might indicate that the diesel concentrations
4 are degrading and going down, or it also can be
5 interpreted that the plume is only downgradient.

6 Then we plotted up a concentration
7 map for both the May '95 report and for November
8 '95 quarter period.

9 (Showing Figure 4-13.)

10 This is the TPH-Diesel Concentration
11 Map for May 1995 at Site 6. What this shows is
12 these are the concentration contours plot, and
13 they're parts per billion.

14 So this is the heart of the
15 annualized plume, which is 1,000 parts per billion
16 micrograms per liter.

17 Again, we don't have it this time, in
18 May '95, we don't have the downgrading sites of
19 the wells to commit the contours.

20 (Showing Figure 4-14.)

1 Let me show you the November '95 map
2 for the TPH's.

3 This is where we have the additional
4 wells downgradient, so you can actually see where
5 the concentrations are decreasing as you go from
6 1,000 parts per billion to 500 to, eventually, 100
7 near the shoreline.

8 You can also see near the heart of
9 the plume the USTS's are located near there,
10 indicating they are probably the primary source
11 for the contamination of the site.

12 (Showing Figure 4-14.)

13 For Site 6, we also selected
14 TPH-Gasoline, and this is the TPH-Gasoline
15 Concentration Map for May 1995. It shows
16 basically the same type of plume we had for
17 TPH-Diesel centered around the UST.

18 Again, we don't have the covering in
19 May of 1995.

20 I think in your handout these maps

1 are switched around, so the November 1995 is
2 presented before the May 1995.

3 This is the November '95 map again.
4 It is similar to the TPH diesel plume map for Site
5 6.

6 One thing I might mention is you will
7 notice some dashed contours, and this indicates it
8 is an estimated contour. That is because you
9 don't have wells right there to draw a solid line.

10 That's it as far as the ground water
11 status report.

12 I would just like to mention that the
13 forthcoming reports, as far as the groundwater at
14 Treasure Island, there will be a groundwater
15 summary report for the February 1996 groundwater
16 sampling that was done for the Phase IIB well, and
17 there will also be a forthcoming interim
18 groundwater sampling plan for all the wells at
19 Treasure Island, that will give the approach for
20 groundwater sampling between now and the time that

1 the sites are remediated.

2 So that's it from me. I don't know
3 how you want to handle questions.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What we will do
5 is collect your comments and your questions and we
6 will take a five-minute stretch, collect the
7 questions and come back to answer as many as we
8 can. Please pass any commentaries to Pat or to
9 myself.

10 (Short recess taken.)

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are ready to
12 go. Thank you for your patience and we will be
13 addressing the questions we received. Depending
14 on how time goes, we will see how many we can get
15 through, but we will have them captured on the
16 cards for discussion during other forums.

17 MR. BIGELOW: The first question:
18 "For future reports of this type, please include
19 an abstract or executive summary which includes
20 why and how principal conclusions, or both. Nice

1 format."

2 We will take that into consideration
3 and try to do that in future reports.

4 The next question: "Explain the
5 meaning of frequency correcting analytes of
6 concern."

7 Frequency is how many times it was
8 detected in a well over the four quarters. So if
9 it was detected every time, that was frequent. If
10 it was detected twice, it was half the time.

11 "Where on the island are the
12 groundwater gradients at their peak, that is, are
13 the tops of the groundwater -- do they reflect
14 certain underground features like sandbars or
15 bedrock gradient?"

16 In the Groundwater Status Report,
17 there is a regional groundwater map, and it shows
18 mounding in the middle of the island, flowing
19 radially outward from the middle of the island.

20 No, there are not any features like

1 sandbars and bedrock gradient.

2 "Please describe B-tex results for
3 Site Number 6."

4 In the report, we discuss the B-tex
5 results, but I believe it was only detected in a
6 few wells. It was not detected for an analyte for
7 detailed discussions because it was not detected
8 in the majority of the wells. You can find it in
9 a concentration map.

10 "Please identify IR hot spots and
11 other IR sites other than Site Number 6."

12 The Groundwater Status Report
13 discusses the majority of the sites at Treasure
14 Island and Yerba Buena Island.

15 "Please address higher analyte
16 results in Figure 4-13, 4-14, 4-9, 4-10, that are
17 represented on the contours, for example, Well
18 MW-1, for 67,000 parts per billion."

19 It was located. That well is located
20 near former UST, and it is also located near

1 another well where we actually have a little bit
2 of floating product, so that's why you are seeing
3 that hot spot in that location.

4 "Do you think that the flood test is
5 an accurate test of the hydraulic conductivity
6 surrounding soil for only the well's sand pack?"

7 When you do a flood, and you plot up
8 the data, you get a curve, and usually you will
9 get a break in the curve, you will get recharge
10 from the sand pack, and then you will get recharge
11 from the formation.

12 So we only use the second part of the
13 curve, that is from the formation water. And for
14 the media that we have, fine and medium-grain sand
15 at Treasure Island, the flood test is fairly
16 accurate.

17 The literature in the case says it is
18 a good test for fine to medium-grain sands and
19 coarse sands.

20 It is not as accurate for silt and

1 clays.

2 "Is there a plan to add the wells in
3 the southwest portion of Treasure Island to the
4 quarterly groundwater sampling program?"

5 At this time, we don't have any plans
6 to do that.

7 MR. HEHN: There were a number of
8 wells that were installed as part of the UST
9 investigations for the former tanks down there.
10 Now there is no information for that particular
11 part of the island.

12 MS. TOBIAS: At this time we have not
13 made any plans. I don't think there is actually
14 any monitoring, except the one collected when they
15 installed the wells.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You will see more
17 non-CERCLA, this data is all coming from the IR
18 sites, you will see more data coming from the
19 non-IR sites over the course of the next year,
20 when we do a lot more of our UST work.

1 MS. TOBIAS: As we get through.

2 MR. BIGELOW: "What effect does the
3 tide have on the distribution concentration and
4 remediation of contaminants in the groundwater
5 near the Bay margin?"

6 Most likely, it has a dilution
7 effect. We will be looking at it closer in the
8 groundwater model, where we will be using
9 information for the groundwater models on the
10 concentration.

11 "Did dissolved oxygen result
12 presented in the text for each well sample for
13 each site?"

14 No, they are not. They are presented
15 in the quarterly results but not in the
16 Groundwater Status Report.

17 "How was the do collected?"

18 The dissolved oxygen is reflected in
19 the water quality meter.

20 "How accurate do you feel the

1 groundwater concentration contour maps are,
2 especially in the new data in the cross-gradient
3 direction and other information to delineate the
4 extent and gradient of any concentration?"

5 The Phase IIB wells were placed on
6 the results for geoprobe sampling, so the dashed
7 contours are estimated, but they're done with some
8 confidence, because the wells were placed based on
9 the geoprobe data and the geoprobe data will be
10 presented in the investigation report.

11 MS. TOBIAS: You will see everything
12 together in the Plan.

13 "Given that it is not clear where the
14 TPH was biodegraded or being washed out into the
15 bay, was any shoreline tests done to confirm
16 biodegradation?"

17 For Site 6, you can see the
18 concentrations decreasing as you go down the
19 gradient, so we did not do any confirmation at the
20 shoreline. I think the farthest downgrading in

1 concentration we had was a hundred parts per
2 billion.

3 "Concerning Figure 4-7, decline in
4 the contaminant concentration, is there any way of
5 estimating how much of the overall decline in
6 contaminant concentration is due to flushing by
7 tidal action and how much due to natural
8 attenuation due to the biological activity? Would
9 monitoring dissolved oxygen be useful?"

10 Yes, monitoring will be useful and
11 again we will look at the effect of tidal action
12 on the contaminants in the groundwater model.

13 "Regarding the constant flow of
14 groundwater within the island at every tide, what
15 would the impact of this water movement on the
16 proposed stone column to be built on the
17 premises?"

18 I would say it would be minimal. I
19 did not mention what the magnitude of the water
20 table fluctuation was at the shoreline. When we

1 measured it in August, it was about 1.8 feet near
2 the shoreline, so you could see the water table
3 move a maximum of 1.8 feet, and it expanded about
4 250 feet from the shoreline, the farthest for
5 tidal fluctuation."

6 MR. ONGERTH: At that furthest point
7 in length?

8 MR. BIGELOW: It decreases as you go
9 inland, about an inch in water table fluctuation.

10 MR. HANSEN: Those last three
11 sentences you just gave, I think, were very
12 important conclusions.

13 And the very first question that was
14 given to you on the cards.

15 What I will ask for is if you had had
16 an executive summary or an abstract and just
17 presented to us your conclusions, even though they
18 are tentative, it really would have saved me a lot
19 of time on Saturday afternoon, because to find out
20 what the report is all about, you have to read the

1 whole bloody text, and a two or three-page
2 abstract is what is generally done in reputable
3 scientific literature.

4 I appreciate the concerns that some
5 people expressed at having access to all the data,
6 but some of us can do without all the data, we
7 really would like to hear the conclusion.

8 MR. BIGELOW: I apologize for that.

9 MR. HANSEN: I'm sure it is dictated
10 by the format that you are required to do, and I
11 am just saying the regulators ought to modify that
12 a little bit for the lazy people, of which I am
13 one.

14 MS. BROWNELL: Smart people.

15 MR. BIGELOW: "Figure 4-2, which was
16 the hydrograph for water level, shows February the
17 highest level, May the lowest. If the source is
18 rainfall, this is illogical. If the source is
19 irrigation, this is logical. Please correct your
20 inference or your drawings."

1 The soils at Treasure Island are
2 fairly permeable, fine to medium-grained sand, so
3 when you see precipitation, you will see a rise in
4 the water table fairly soon after that, so that's
5 why the water table correlates almost directly
6 with the rainy season and the dry season.

7 When you are in something like a
8 layer of silt, the rise in the water table will
9 take a little bit longer because of slower
10 movement of ground water in the silt and in the
11 clay.

12 "Can your tidal flow calculations
13 predict whether the newly-detected fuel source
14 which interacts with the groundwater will affect
15 aquatic receptors in the bay? Can you predict
16 where any sources may have migrated from?"

17 Again, we will be doing some
18 groundwater modeling based on this data.

19 I don't know that we can predict a
20 new source from that data. The concentrations

1 perhaps are pretty good in showing where the
2 primary source is.

3 "What is the purpose of calculating
4 the median water level to show gradient?"

5 The purpose is to filter out any
6 tidal effect on the water table, so you know which
7 way groundwater is flowing, regardless of what the
8 tide does.

9 "Does it make the phenomenon of
10 hydraulic gradient reversal during tide
11 fluctuation?"

12 Yes, it filters out the phenomena of
13 gradient reversal.

14 "What is the screening level for
15 frequency of detection? Does majority mean only
16 chemicals detected in more than half of the wells
17 will be considered for evaluation?"

18 Generally, that was the cutoff point,
19 which was 50 percent, and you have to cut it off
20 at some point because you want to make sure you

1 have a concentration contour map that is actually
2 a contour.

3 The other reason is you don't want to
4 have complete data in it, or the report would have
5 been twice as long.

6 That's it.

7 MS. TOBIAS: There is one question
8 that was asked during the presentation, "Why did
9 you take the sample in August of '95, instead of
10 the true four quarters every three months?"

11 The reason we didn't, you may have
12 gathered, is that we wanted to see what
13 concentrations were, and we sampled all the wells
14 in the wet season.

15 MR. ALLMAN: Do you have plans to
16 sample the wells in the southwest area; you say
17 there has been no funding in the past. Has there
18 been a request for funding to see if anything has
19 migrated since they were installed?

20 MS. SIMONS: That's not a question

1 for PRC, those wells are part of the UST program,
2 but probably should be, at some point, joined, but
3 right now they are separate, so PRC is only
4 dealing with the wells at the IR sites.

5 MR. ALLMAN: The point is the wells
6 are sitting there, apparently they are not being
7 monitored, so why dig them if there is no funding
8 to monitor them?

9 It's really irrelevant to me which
10 program it comes under, it gives you an idea if
11 there is migration.

12 MS. SIMONS: That is a point that
13 maybe has to work out, what that program is.

14 MR. ALLMAN: That's what I'm asking,
15 whoever answers it.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We plan to sample
17 non-IR sites in '97.

18 MS. SMITH: Just in '97?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We plan to resume
20 our work in '97 and to reach a point where we can

1 complete the characterization of our non-IR sites
2 in the same manner that we're moving toward the
3 characterization of our IR sites.

4 The IR program is ahead of the UST
5 program.

6 MS. TOBIAS: I think the majority of
7 the wells, there are about 20 or 22 wells
8 installed in that program, and probably the
9 majority of the sites, nothing was detected at
10 those wells at the time we installed them.

11 MS. SIMONS: There are just so many
12 of them, not all of them, there was a site over
13 here, we did sample those in November because they
14 were right by an IR site, and they had detected
15 something, so we actually sampled those three
16 wells and I know there are some over here that
17 have relatively high levels, but a lot of the
18 others, nothing was detected.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other questions
20 before we move into organization business?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you
2 very much, Paul and Sharon.

3 MR. ALLMAN: One question. So when
4 you are going to start doing the sampling again of
5 the wells in '97, if nothing was detected, what is
6 your logic for doing them?

7 I'm trying to get a feel when you
8 decide when you're going to get a sample and when
9 you are not. It would be good to see if there is
10 any migration in that direction.

11 What was the Navy's reason for having
12 a sampling?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will be
14 sampling as part of the UST and fuel line
15 investigation program, which right now is in a
16 separate program from the IR program.

17 We will be collecting data as we need
18 to do to characterize the UST sites the same way
19 that we have been collecting data characterizing
20 IR sites.

1 MR. HEHN: We're talking about fiscal
2 year '97?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. For
4 us, '97 is after 1 October of this year, though
5 the funding does not always necessarily arrive on
6 the 1st of October, so your actual work funding
7 might not be until after 1 January.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other
9 questions?

10 We are going to move into
11 organizational business and I think there are a
12 couple of items that I would like to add to the
13 list that we have already started.

14 One is to give Laurie Glass an
15 opportunity to report on the CRC meeting, and I
16 guess two others.

17 I would like to report on the interim
18 meeting that we had two weeks ago and also make a
19 plea for Chris Shirley for her spot at the BCT
20 meeting to be filled by another RAB

1 representative.

2 So without further ado, we will go to
3 Laurie Glass.

4 MS. GLASS: I actually have a pretty
5 short amount of stuff to tell.

6 There have been a lot of meetings.
7 As you probably know, on June 3rd of this year,
8 the CRC had a meeting and endorsed the Draft Reuse
9 Plan with a few caveats; one is where there is a
10 diagram about height and bulk in the Draft Reuse
11 Plan that the CRC felt uncomfortable with and so
12 they said "Off with that."

13 And something else I can't remember
14 what, but it does not really do very much to the
15 cleanup aspect of things.

16 Then the CRC had a meeting with Mayor
17 Willie Brown on the 12th and presented its
18 thinking on the Draft Reuse Plan, and that was a
19 pretty interesting meeting. If you ever have
20 occasion to be with the Mayor, make sure you are

1 really fluid with your material, because he is a
2 very good listener.

3 And then on the 13th of June and on
4 the 20th of June there were presentations to the
5 Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission,
6 on the 20th voted to endorse the plan unanimously,
7 and that means it is sort of winding its way
8 towards the Board of Supervisors, which would be
9 the ultimate endorser of the Reuse Plan.

10 And then it goes into kind of a limbo
11 until the EIR/EIS plan has been completed.

12 And then that's when the Draft Reuse
13 Plan becomes the Reuse Plan in whatever form it
14 ends up.

15 Then today there was a presentation
16 of the Draft Reuse Plan to the Redevelopment
17 Commission, and they were not called upon to take
18 any action. They refer it with comments they
19 might get to make to the Board of Supervisors.

20 There is a subcommittee of the Board

1 of Supervisors called the Select Committee on Base
2 Closures that is supposed to be reviewing the
3 Draft Reuse Plan the week of July 8.

4 But when I called over there
5 yesterday to find out about that meeting, whether
6 it had been set, it was not. There seemed to be
7 some details yet to work out about that.

8 So if you are interested in knowing
9 about that, please let me know and I will make
10 sure you get the information.

11 Then July 15 is when the Draft Reuse
12 Plan is scheduled to come up before the Board of
13 Supervisors for their endorsement and their
14 comments and whatever.

15 Paralleling this process is the
16 process of preparing the homeless assistance
17 component of the Reuse Plan, which will be
18 forwarded to HUD and the Department of Defense
19 very close to, if not July 15th, which is when it
20 is coming to the Board of Supervisors, it will be

1 very soon thereafter. That is just to let you
2 know.

3 My work with the CRC is drawing to a
4 close in its official form. It's not clear if I
5 will be involved in the process after the end of
6 July, so I will probably still be around here. It
7 is kind of fuzzy what capacity I will be
8 participating with the RAB, but I have an ongoing
9 interest in the work here, so we will see.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. VAN WEY: Laurie, do we have any
12 sense whether there is any opposition on the Board
13 of Supervisors on the plan as it is going up to
14 them?

15 MS. GLASS: I myself have not heard
16 any specific opposition to it. I know there has
17 been concern, both at the Planning Commission and
18 at the Redevelopment Commission about what kinds
19 of costs there would be, what the City would
20 ultimately be responsible for paying, and that's

1 something that I think the economics such that
2 there is a gap between what is expected to be
3 generated in terms of value in revenue, and the
4 amount, the cost for the kinds of improvements
5 that would be necessary.

6 As Gloria Root, the Chair of the CRC
7 pointed out today to the Redevelopment Commission,
8 every other base closure has had some contribution
9 of federal funds for some portion of the base
10 closure above and beyond the planning fund, and
11 it's reasonable to expect there could be some of
12 that kind of thing happening for Treasure Island
13 as well.

14 Also, the gap is predicted for a span
15 of about 30 years, so it isn't this year, this is
16 the millions of dollars that are spread out over a
17 fair period of time.

18 MR. VAN WYE: I am sure we are all
19 encouraged by Mr. Rollo's comments that there is
20 plenty of money for all.

1 MR. ONGARTH: Is the Mayor supportive
2 of the plan?

3 MS. GLASS: He expressed appreciation
4 for the work of the committee. He did not express
5 any support or unsupport of the other plan. I
6 think that, as I am reading in the paper and other
7 places, he seems to keep his own counsel until he
8 is ready to make his statement about it, and I
9 don't think he was there yet at the meeting that
10 the CRC had with him on the 12th.

11 MR. ALLMAN: As long as he gets the
12 house.

13 MR. HANSEN: I think one of the
14 newspaper accounts said there would be six people
15 in the Mayor's Office working on this. Who are
16 the six people and are you one of them?

17 MS. GLASS: I don't know. I don't
18 think there has been any information about who
19 might be those six people. It is not clear,
20 lacking any kind of position descriptions of

1 anything else, it is not clear how I would fit
2 into that. It may be that my path lies in another
3 direction, the future is not clear to me.

4 I am concerned that there be some
5 carryover of people who have been involved in this
6 process and the planning process in the group of
7 people.

8 MR. HANSEN: Is the CRC officially
9 disbanded now?

10 MS. GLASS: No, that has not been
11 determined one way or the other. I think that
12 there is definitely feeling on the CRC that there
13 is a role for continuing citizen input to the
14 planning process in the next steps, but how that
15 will occur has not been determined yet.

16 MR. HANSEN: It would be terrible if
17 that group were lost, a lot of torment, a lot of
18 good thoughts.

19 MS. GLASS: I think what will happen
20 hopefully will work out well for the process as

1 well as the people who have an interest in
2 continuing to serve on that.

3 MR. HEHN: Whatever the next
4 questions are in developing and finalizing the
5 Redevelopment Plan, I think one thing the RAB
6 should be really concerned about is making sure
7 that we have a continuing dialog with that group
8 between the RAB and the controlling group to make
9 sure that there is understanding of the
10 environmental issues as well as the planning
11 issues.

12 MS. GLASS: I do need to point out
13 that Martha Walters, who is not here this evening,
14 but she will be continuing, because her job is
15 associated with the environmental cleanup portion
16 which, as we know, is going to continue.

17 So at the very least, she will
18 continue to be a liaison between the two groups.
19 And Dan is both a member of this group and the
20 CRC.

1 I just want to make sure that it is
2 not a redevelopment plan, you're getting into
3 these technical plans, there is something called
4 the Redevelopment Plan; the Draft Reuse Plan is
5 not a redevelopment plan, that comes later if at
6 all, so I just wanted to make that point.

7 I think that there are ways that this
8 group can make sure to maybe be a little assertive
9 in making sure that its voice is connected up with
10 the Mayor's Office as well. There is Martha, and
11 that will continue to be an important link.

12 Amy is here.

13 MS. BROWNELL: Martha definitely will
14 be doing what she does best, so she will be here
15 to make sure that that information gets back.

16 MS. SMITH: I think it is also
17 important, we worked hard to get a RAB member on
18 the CRC, and I think that link, not just a
19 governmental link, but a citizen link is
20 important, too.

1 MR. HANSEN: Earlier Jim had
2 indicated that the Navy, while you are closing
3 down your operations next year, will remain in a
4 caretaker status for the next four years.

5 During that caretaker status, does
6 that include running the Fire Department, some
7 sort of Police Department, and running the sewage
8 disposal?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, 30
10 December '97, the Naval Station as a military
11 organization closes. But the Navy and the federal
12 government will continue to own the property, so
13 we will have this caretaker office which will
14 continue to manage the property, and as pieces of
15 the property, however large or small, are
16 transferred from the Navy -- and that does not
17 have a set timeline -- it could be if we complete
18 the cleanup by 2001 and somebody is willing and
19 able to take the property, then that process would
20 end.

1 The short answer to your question may
2 be that we are working things out with the City.

3 There will be some transition of
4 municipal services from the Navy to the City, and
5 the timeline for that has yet to be worked out.

6 But right now today, we have a police
7 and fire department, we may still have a police
8 and fire department after the base closes, but at
9 some point there will be some transition to City
10 municipal services.

11 MR. HANSEN: If you stop cold turkey,
12 I don't think the City could cope with it.

13 MS. BROWNELL: No, they won't allow
14 that.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: No more questions.

16 I thank Laurie for your role as a
17 liaison between the two groups and we hope to see
18 you at the end of July and in the future
19 thereafter.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to

1 clarify, too, that we did provide copies of the
2 Draft Reuse Plan at the interim RAB meeting.
3 Rather than make copies for everyone, since it was
4 still being revised, we have held off and we
5 expect that a revised copy would be available in
6 the next couple of weeks, at which time we will
7 provide a copy to all the community members.

8 If anyone would like one in the
9 meantime, let me know. But we will send out
10 copies of the final plan within a month.

11 MS. GLASS: You remind me of that, I
12 did bring some copies of the last issue of the
13 newsletter. You all got it in the mail, but if
14 anybody did not, I have a few extra copies and
15 there is a number on the back here, Treasure
16 Island information line. You can call there and
17 say you want a copy of the plan, whether you want
18 to wait for the revised one or the one now, this
19 is a good way to let somebody know you want a
20 report.

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

Feel free to do that.

MR. HANSEN: Patricia, could you formalize your thanks to Laurie and I think we should all applaud her.

(Applause.)

MS. GLASS: Thank you.

MR. ALLMAN: Also, I don't know if anything in the by-laws prevented an ex-officio member from applying to be a volunteer board member, too.

CO-CHAIR NELSON: There are no restrictions and thank you, John, for the segue. You might recall, at the end of the last meeting we were going to do our homework and review the RAB operating guidelines as revised in May.

I would like some sort of feedback on the guidelines, if there are ready to be adopted maybe. We can have some discussion or a motion.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have some additional copies in the back in case anybody did

1 not bring theirs.

2 Basically, while people are picking
3 up copies, the thrust of the changes was to
4 clarify the process for adding new community
5 members.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And those changes
7 are underlined. Does everybody have a copy?

8 We have some responsibilities that
9 have been identified for the Navy Co-Chair, the
10 Community Co-Chair, and in two places the Navy
11 Co-Chair's responsibilities and the Community
12 Co-Chairs are identified.

13 We will start on page two, Item 12
14 was added.

15 "To maintain an active and productive
16 RAB, the Navy Co-Chair, at the request of the
17 Community Co-Chair, shall solicit and advertise
18 for new RAB Community Members in accordance with
19 the Navy guidelines."

20 And the Community Co-Chair Item 8 is

1 new: "To maintain an active and productive RAB,
2 the Community Co-Chair shall request the Navy
3 Co-Chair to solicit and advertise for new RAB
4 Community Members, upon receipt of information
5 generated by the Navy Co-Chair following
6 procedures in Section IV Meeting Attendance that
7 would require such an action."

8 And there is something new in Section
9 IV, Meeting Attendance. I guess we decided at one
10 time that after three consecutive meetings for
11 which there is no explanation is given, that we
12 would pursue these members to see if they are
13 still interested.

14 On page four, the new provision under
15 Section IV.

16 "The Navy Co-Chair will advise the
17 Community Co-Chair and RAB, if, based on the
18 information generated from following Sections B
19 and C above, new Community Members ought to be
20 recruited to maintain active and productive RAB."

1 There are three provisions on Item D,
2 committees on the back that is under Section VII.

3 "The RAB Community Members may
4 organize themselves into committees (e.g.,
5 Technical and Membership Committees) for the
6 purpose of addressing the Navy's environmental
7 work products and NSTI activities as may be needed
8 to keep such work reviewed and on schedule."

9 We have never empowered ourselves to
10 do that prior, so those are the new provisions.
11 Is there any discussion?

12 MR. ALLMAN: Question on page four,
13 the change, "The Navy Co-Chair will advise the
14 Community Co-Chair and RAB," if we need more
15 members. So does that mean that we would have to
16 ask the Navy Co-Chair? It seems we are short, if
17 we don't have people here, can we decide what
18 needs to be done and we go through the Community
19 Co-Chair? Can we decide that we need to have more
20 people as a Community Co-Chair?

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: As a Community
2 Co-Chair I would need to consult with the RAB.

3 MR. HANSEN: I think at some point
4 you need to decide what a quorum is, how many
5 members is it supposed to have? If it is a rainy
6 night and only three people show up and they
7 decide they want to take a strong stance on
8 something, is three people enough for a quorum, or
9 six people, or as many people as fit in a phone
10 book?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You bring up a
12 good point, and I will recommend that the quorum
13 issue be dealt with separately.

14 What we tried to do here was to just
15 validate the process for soliciting new members
16 and also about committees.

17 MR. HANSEN: What is the target for
18 the number of people on the RAB, an unlimited
19 number?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There are some

1 general guidelines that the Department of Defense
2 and the Navy did not want to block us into, it
3 must be five, it must be ten, it must be twenty --
4 there have been kind of some general suggestions,
5 I think I have seen ten to 25, or 20 to 30, it
6 depends on the nature of the site.

7 I think the ultimate determination
8 really is the group representative, and maybe 10
9 people might be representative, or maybe it is
10 going to take 20.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard, just to
12 give you some background. It became evident,
13 about a year ago, that attendance was slipping.
14 We were getting maybe five or six people.

15 We recruited new members. Since we
16 recruited new members, we have had a steady pace
17 here of about 10 to 15 members, I think 20 or so
18 that are members or were members at one time on
19 the Restoration Advisory Board.

20 Rather than set a number, we have not

1 done that.

2 MR. HANSEN: My concern is the group
3 might come up with something significant some day
4 and they might want to say, "On behalf of the RAB,
5 it is our strong position that such and such and
6 such."

7 We don't want that to happen if there
8 is only two or three people.

9 MS. SMITH: That's why everybody
10 should attend the RAB meeting.

11 MS. GLASS: So the CRC has turned out
12 to be a really important thing and there was a
13 quorum established on a fraction basis, so there
14 was one-third of the membership or two-thirds.

15 And what they said is kind of a
16 two-thirds kind of thing. For regular decisions,
17 a quorum would represent one-third of the total
18 membership, and for ordinary decisions it was like
19 a majority, a simple majority. But for what they
20 call important decisions, it would be a super

1 majority, that was like two-thirds of a quorum
2 basically was required.

3 It was set fractionally and there
4 were two different levels of decision making, and
5 that turned out to be good to have had it.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If you read the
7 Mission Statement for those that are really
8 concerned about a quorum, our purpose here is to
9 comment on and advise the Navy. It's not to make
10 decisions on an issue, so a quorum met the need
11 for it in providing comments and advice, people
12 can do that and be RAB members and provide
13 comments in writing. They can come to the
14 meetings and discuss different things, but that's
15 our mission.

16 The scenario of two or three people
17 attending a single meeting and making a decision,
18 their decision might be "Why don't we go home?"
19 but there is not a decision about any action that
20 the RAB is going to take because that's not our

1 purpose.

2 MR. ONGERTH: I view that matter the
3 same way but I don't understand, there is a
4 background it seems to me, that the critical
5 matter is at what point does the Navy feel that
6 there are too few people here to give the feedback
7 that they are hoping to get as the process
8 proceeds.

9 So a lot, in my mind, would depend
10 upon how Jim feels about it. When he sees the
11 attendance down here to six or eight, he may very
12 well feel that the group is no longer
13 representative enough to provide him with any kind
14 of community feedback that he believes is
15 necessary for the process.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I agree. It is
18 going to be a joint effort. Obviously, it is in
19 our interest, the Navy, to insure that we have got
20 a representative enough group so that we are

1 hearing representative feedback, so that we don't
2 get to the end of the process and find out we have
3 excluded comments from one group or another.

4 So that's basically all we're trying
5 to do here in a couple of these provisions, so I
6 would recommend that we adopt this.

7 This is, to use maybe an over-used
8 term, a living document, and I recommend that we
9 just adopt this and we can continue to change it
10 as we need to, but at least we will have clarified
11 these issues.

12 MR. HANSEN: I so move.

13 MR. ALLMAN: I want to find out, I
14 was involved in the process of selecting new RAB
15 members last time. I was sent a letter, a phone
16 call saying, "You have been selected," but there
17 may be some people that were selected that never
18 showed up to our meeting, just applied and never
19 showed up.

20 Is there an alternate list created so

1 that if after a couple of months somebody bails
2 out, it is not their cup of tea, an alternate can
3 be sent a letter saying, "Would you still like to
4 serve on the board?" This would save every year
5 having to advertise in all the papers.

6 I assume the idea of taking 24 or so
7 people isn't so that at least ten will show up,
8 maybe it is, but if you want a representative
9 group, if you do have alternates, you can say you
10 are the second or third or fourth alternate.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's a
12 consideration. The rules are kind of open on the
13 solicitation process and that could be a good
14 idea.

15 MR. ALLMAN: So that could be
16 incorporated into how we decide to do it next
17 time.

18 MS. SMITH: Dan McCormick actually
19 kept a list and I have a copy of the list and also
20 a copy of all the members.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have a copy of
2 all the members.

3 MS. SMITH: The trouble is, a lot of
4 people moved. We can send out letters to all
5 those people, but it is a year and a lot of those
6 guys are not in the Bay Area anymore. We have all
7 that information.

8 MS. GLASS: One more thing before we
9 move on this.

10 Would it be good to have some mention
11 of Robert's Rules of Order or something like that
12 in here?

13 MS. SMITH: If you want to be really
14 formal, we can do that. But that is a real formal
15 process.

16 MR. HEHN: There was some discussion
17 of that when we put together the original draft
18 form and we decided against it, because of the
19 formality of trying to maintain that.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can decide a

1 month or two or three from now to make some other
2 changes in all we are trying to do. Actually, we
3 never got around the formal process of getting
4 this formally approved, so I think the action we
5 would take now, we establish it as is and then we
6 can change it as we need to.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It has been almost
8 two years since we developed it.

9 MR. HANSEN: I propose we accept it.
10 The amendments that have been so well presented,
11 recognizing it is a living document and we can do
12 it.

13 MR. ALLMAN: I will second it.

14 MR. VAN WYE: It is a wonderful
15 discussion but I hope we can move on. The hour is
16 getting late.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Without further
18 ado, we have a consensus that we will call this
19 final and make changes in the future as we need
20 to.

1 MR. VAN WYE: My friend Dale wants to
2 be the sergeant-at-arms.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: There were really
4 two other items: One is the meeting format. I
5 guess we tried something new and different this
6 time to respond to some confusion we had between
7 the court reporter taking minutes and everybody
8 being able to get their questions and comments out
9 in an orderly fashion, so we can make better use
10 of speakers' time.

11 How did that feel for you? Can we
12 get some feedback if it is something we want to
13 keep going on in the future?

14 MR. ALLMAN: It might be a
15 possibility for a real hot or technical topic,
16 where you may want to filter out technical
17 questions and save them for an interim committee.
18 But if somebody who tends to like to be involved
19 in dialog, it seems to be more restricted.

20 I was getting really tired and it was

1 not any reflection on the speakers, but just
2 because basically we hear this person talking for
3 half an hour, then we break and hear him talk for
4 20 more minutes, and there is no feedback as far
5 as whether the questions are being interpreted
6 properly. It is just boom, boom, boom, and I
7 don't know that is is really necessary to have it
8 packed into a short time.

9 MS. SMITH: Part of that I agree
10 with. I think it worked pretty well to hold our
11 questions, but if the speaker responds to our
12 question in a manner that was not -- he answered a
13 question we didn't quite ask, it might be
14 interesting if we could feel, if we could say, "I
15 did not really mean that, I meant this."

16 But on the other hand, I heard some
17 questions that were pretty basic tonight and I was
18 surprised to hear them, so I think maybe people
19 feel hesitant to ask questions out loud that
20 really would clarify things for them, and they

1 felt more comfortable writing them on a piece of
2 paper and having them answered that way.

3 So I saw the benefit of doing it that
4 way as well as the restriction on the dialog part.

5 MS. SIMONS: I had a couple of
6 questions up there and I kind of agree with Dale,
7 I want to ask as I realized whether I had asked,
8 when I wanted to ask a couple more questions to
9 clarify, and they are going through them quickly
10 and I did not get a chance to jump in before the
11 next question.

12 I felt the format worked really well,
13 but we can have dialog after the question.

14 MR. VAN WYE: I would second Rachel's
15 comments.

16 MS. LA PIERRE: That's pretty much
17 exactly what happened with the type of questions I
18 have asked. There was an initial, "Yes, don't
19 worry about it," the feeling that I got from it,
20 but wait, there were four more things on that

1 card. Maybe it was in the essence of time,
2 because the speakers were trying to hurry and get
3 through all the cards. Maybe they were feeling
4 pressure from the intimidating cards.

5 If we could allow for a couple of
6 minutes for comments.

7 MR. HEHN: Get all the questions out,
8 then we would go through the written questions
9 first and have a designated time of ten minutes
10 for more follow-up questions based on what we had.

11 That came to mind in the discussion.
12 Kind of limit it timewise.

13 MR. VAN WYE: Well said, Paul.

14 MR. ONGERTH: There is no ideal in
15 this thing. We have gone from another model where
16 we had protracted discussion that went on and on
17 and on, and that's not very good.

18 And now this I think shortened the
19 process, but it has its shortcomings. And I think
20 we have to face up to making a choice here of how

1 much time we're willing to devote to a
2 presentation and a question and answer session.

3 I would support the model that is
4 used tonight rather than the one where the
5 discussion runs on indefinitely.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: This is an open
7 process. We can certainly refine it as we go
8 along.

9 MS. GLASS: I also felt a lack of the
10 questions really made a more interesting
11 presentation. I myself would like to support the
12 idea of having read the question and maybe allow
13 like a second or pause for the author to follow
14 up.

15 And maybe also what Paul was saying,
16 maybe devote a little bit of time at the end for
17 some other questions that one did not think of to
18 write down.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: A little bit of
20 spontaneity.

1 MS. GLASS: That might be a good
2 solution in terms of structuring the time. It
3 will go towards limiting the amount of time but
4 also allow a little bit more for interaction.

5 MR. ALLMAN: Tonight it seems we had
6 two really hot topics to discuss in the same
7 night. I'm not sure if we decided because of the
8 timing of the report, but we can also maybe have
9 one topic that we get involved with the
10 presentation the same and have more time for
11 questions and answers, say one big topic and have
12 the rest of the organizational stuff, what's
13 really necessary.

14 If the questions go on protracted for
15 a long time, it probably means that people have a
16 lot of questions and then it is just at the
17 discretion of the chairs to decide whether it is
18 running on too long or not too long, chop them
19 off.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have to get

1 used to having more topics. I think there are
2 only 12 meetings a year. I think we will probably
3 try to limit it to two, but two topics.

4 MR. ALLMAN: The geotechnical study
5 that was done back in November when we first heard
6 about it, so that is not something that has to go
7 on this month, unless it was a scheduling thing or
8 something like reports that obviously have to be
9 covered.

10 So they can be fitted into the
11 discussions like the geotechnical and we have to
12 have discussion on it.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will work to
14 balance it. One thing we can do in the interim
15 meetings is to take a look at the agenda to make
16 sure that we get a reasonable time.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Also in the last
18 meeting, we had lively discussion about the
19 administrative record and at the interim meeting
20 we established a new subcommittee called the

1 Information Repository Subcommittee, with the
2 acronym IRS, so a group of auditors that we can
3 sometimes come in contact with on an annual basis.

4 That group is headed by John Allman
5 and also includes Chris Shirley and Dale Smith and
6 Brad Wong and Martha Walters from the City, and is
7 open to anybody else that would like to work on
8 reviewing the listing that the Navy has put
9 together for the information repository and the
10 administrative record, and then report back to the
11 RAB on their interpretation of what could be added
12 to the administrative record that might not be
13 there, or even subtract it.

14 John, I don't know if you want to
15 give your phone number or whatever.

16 MR. ALLMAN: I think there is no
17 reason to limit it, it is just the people that are
18 on the technical subcommittee for the interim
19 meeting. That certainly does not exclude anybody
20 who either could not make it or has an interest,

1 because it is going to be meeting separate from
2 the interim meetings and I think we will wind up
3 dividing up a lot of the work because we have
4 different areas to cover.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
6 say that whenever John wants to hold a meeting, if
7 you let me know, we can do a group-wide mailing.

8 MR. ALLMAN: Is anybody interested
9 that's here now?

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: This was a
11 subcommittee that was born out of a lot of
12 interest in one particular topic, and I think both
13 Jim and I are looking to you for those
14 opportunities to create a subcommittee for those
15 topics where there is a lot of discussion or a lot
16 of comment.

17 We need to use our discretion in
18 maybe tabling the discussion and creating a
19 committee to look into the matter further with the
20 appropriate agency representatives, or PRC

1 representatives to get us the answers so we can do
2 a good job.

3 Last but not least, last time there
4 was the Existing Conditions Report for Treasure
5 Island out on the table, and if any of you might
6 have borrowed it, we have another individual that
7 would like to have it returned as reference, so if
8 you might have borrowed it, could you let either
9 Jim or I know so that we can get it back.

10 MS. GLASS: If you want a replacement
11 copy, call the Treasure Island information line,
12 one will be sent out to you promptly.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We need a
14 replacement for Chris Shirley at the BCT meeting
15 coming up on July 2nd.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: Not permanent, I'm
17 going on vacation. I just want people to know it
18 is not a long-term commitment, it is one day. It
19 is during the day.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: At DTSC in

1 Berkeley at 9:30.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: I just found it
3 valuable to attend. I was asked why I felt it was
4 necessary. I went to the BCT meeting representing
5 the RAB, and I just wanted to say I will be unable
6 to go next week because I will be on vacation. So
7 if the RAB wants representation, I just wanted to
8 inform people that somebody else has to do it.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. We will go
10 to the back page, Upcoming Environmental Report
11 Review Schedule.

12 We have just one document coming out
13 next month, and there is a sign-up sheet in the
14 back. It is going to have a fairly tight time
15 frame, this is the draft FOSL for the Fire
16 Fighting School. It is going to be a fairly small
17 document, because the site was originally playing
18 fields. This is not Site 6, this is the brand new
19 Fire Fighting School, so it was originally an open
20 area and then we constructed a new facility back

1 in 1992, and now we're going to be leasing it to a
2 consortium of state and local agencies to continue
3 to use it as a Fire Fighting school.

4 So there is a general feeling that
5 there are not too many environmental issues here,
6 and because the City and the State want to start
7 leasing it soon, the document is going to be
8 fairly small on an expedited schedule. But anyone
9 is welcome to sign up to receive it next month.

10 Because of the time, we will jump
11 across the open questions and discussion. I think
12 we have had quite a bit of good discussion here
13 tonight.

14 Then the proposed agenda items for
15 the next meeting in July. We will have a
16 continued discussion on the Phase II. Tonight we
17 talked about groundwater, next month we will be
18 talking about Phase IIB, which is the soil, and
19 that will be a prelude to the release of the
20 remedial investigation report the following month

1 in August.

2 In addition to that, which the
3 department is tentatively working on, there may be
4 a presentation on the Reuse Plan also that month.

5 MS. SMITH: Jim, can I ask a question
6 on that: This is the public comment period,
7 whenever this document gets kind of gelled. It is
8 a draft and public comment period.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Remedial
10 Investigation Report.

11 MS. SMITH: No. I'm talking about
12 the Reuse Plan.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Reuse Plan,
14 the actual public comments, my general
15 understanding is that is the EIS/EIR process.

16 MS. GLASS: On the Draft Reuse Plan,
17 these public meetings that I have been talking
18 about, I neglected to mention their input, which
19 is there are opportunities for public comment, and
20 so if you can't make the public meetings but you

1 want to make a comment, then it is appropriate to
2 write.

3 MS. SMITH: My comment was I got a
4 copy that I got in the interim meeting of the
5 public review draft. As an environmental person,
6 we don't comment on use, but normally there is a
7 response. It is like the CEQA process, although
8 this is not a CEQA, but there is an environmental
9 component to a CEQA process, and that's where we
10 should be discussing our comments about the plan
11 in terms of environmental, what we think is
12 environmental use.

13 How has the City and County of San
14 Francisco figured out how to make this process
15 work in conjunction with Treasure Island?

16 We can read all these documents and
17 we can sit here and talk, but if we don't have a
18 little packet --

19 MS. GLASS: The public comment on the
20 document in terms of the Reuse Plan is at the

1 Planning Commission meetings, the Redevelopment
2 Commission, and then the Board of Supervisors.

3 Also, if you want to mail them.

4 MS. SMITH: But that is the public.
5 We are an environmental advisory board.

6 MS. GLASS: I think it is in terms
7 that would be as part of the EIR process, and
8 that's just what Jim said.

9 MR. VAN WYE: What is the timelines
10 for that to happen?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For the EIS/EIR?

12 MR. VAN WYE: For the plans that the
13 Board of Supervisors is going to be looking at.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the Board
15 of Supervisors is going to be taking this plan and
16 giving it their endorsement, and then the end
17 result of this whole process is the City will
18 submit the plan on or about the middle of July to
19 the Navy. That will be the formal presentation of
20 the Reuse Plan to the Navy and federal government.

1 Then shortly thereafter, the EIS, the
2 NEPA-CEQA process will start with a public scoping
3 hearing sometime, I would imagine, within the next
4 90 days.

5 And then that process will continue
6 NEPA/CEQA for about 12 months or until probably
7 September of next year.

8 MR. VAN WYE: As an advisory board
9 that is concerned with ecology and that sort of
10 thing, what participation should we have in that,
11 if any?

12 MS. BROWNELL: There is a bunch of
13 opportunities during the EIS/EIR process.

14 MR. VAN WYE: Not individuals, but us
15 as a body.

16 MS. SMITH: We have been reading
17 documents for two years. I have six feet of
18 documents. We are not just going in and saying,
19 "I don't want a polo field over here."

20 We have some knowledge.

1 MS. GLASS: One of the ways that I
2 have seen that sort of thing occurs, the CRC goes
3 and presents its opinion at these public meetings.
4 And there is a designated person that goes and
5 presents testimony, other people show up.

6 MS. BROWNELL: Or if you discuss it
7 at a meeting and have comments from a meeting, you
8 submit those as part of the comments to the
9 EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR, they have a scoping, you
10 can input on what you want in the EIS/EIR. They
11 have different points where they present the
12 drafts of it and there are sections where they
13 discuss the interaction between the cleanup and
14 the other stuff, and you can comment on that.

15 MR. VAN WYE: Who is "they?"

16 MS. BROWNELL: Well, the Navy --

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is a joint
18 effort because it is NEPA/CEQA The NEPA portion,
19 the EIS is done by us, the Navy, and the CEQA
20 portion is done by the City of San Francisco, and

1 it ends up being a joint document.

2 MR. VAN WYE: Will this be done by
3 paid administrative staff, by outside consultants,
4 by citizens selected as commissioners?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The actual
6 EIS/EIR document is predominantly being prepared
7 by consultants to the Navy, with participation of
8 Navy staff and City staff. I think there are City
9 consultants involved, too.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Could this be a
11 topic covered as part of the Reuse Plan
12 presentation?

13 MS. SMITH: I think it is important
14 to see where we can tie in as a body, not having
15 to go to San Francisco and take a card and hope we
16 get called. That's not the purpose of me coming
17 here for two years.

18 But I think we, as a body, should
19 have some way of connecting with this process.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: Also, we should become

1 aware how this process will work. What the
2 scoping study is, in my opinion, it is one of the
3 most important parts to get involved in, but also
4 it is the very first, and so there is a lot of
5 energy behind it. It would be nice to have an
6 overview how it works.

7 MR. VAN WYE: I concur with
8 Christine's comments.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As an action
10 item, then, whether or not we have a formal
11 presentation of the Reuse Plan next month, we will
12 provide some information to clarify the NEPA/CEQA
13 process. We can at least do that.

14 If there are not any other
15 comments --

16 MS. GLASS: I am sorry. I noticed
17 that the bottom of this says that the next CRC
18 meeting is scheduled for July 8th, and the
19 thinking is it will be more like July 22nd. That
20 just happened today.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. That is
subject to change.

With that, if there are no other
comments, we will bring the meeting to a close.

Thank you very much, and we will see
some of you at the interim meeting on the 9th of
July or at the next regular meeting on the 23rd of
July.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned
at 9:51 p.m.)

---o0o---

UGCtp

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

I, PAUL SCHILLER, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter, 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.

Paul Schiller

JUL 01 1996

(Signature)

(Date)