

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

COPY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

23 JULY 1996

7:00 P.M.

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 24

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR NO. 1268

556

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)

REGULATORY AGENCY:

CHEIN KAO (DTSC)
GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)
RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)
MARTHA WALTERS (SFDPH)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

SHARON TOBIAS
THORSTEN ANDERSON
KATHY WALSH
PAUL BIGELOW

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

RICHARD HANSEN
PAUL HEHN (ALT. COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
GARY JENSEN
CLINTON LOFTMAN
RICK NEDELL
PATRICIA NELSON (COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
HENRY ONGERTH
THOMAS THOMPSON
LAURIE GLASS (TI CITIZENS REUSE COMMITTEE)
HARLAN VAN WYE (TI YACHT CLUB)
USHA VEDAGIRI
BRAD WONG

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

GUESTS:

KATHY LEE

AMY NECHES
PROJECT MANAGER
TREASURE ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

---o0o---

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

JULY 23, 1996

7:10 P.M.

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

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

We are ready to start the meeting. We are running about ten minutes late now and we will try to make up time.

We have two important presentations tonight, one on the Treasure Island Reuse Plan; and the second one, on the preview of our Remedial Investigation Report.

What we will do is, since some people may not have arrived yet, skip over a few of the administrative items and then come back to them so we can start the presentation.

But we will open up the public comment period. This is a five-minute period that we have

1 established at the beginning of each meeting to
2 allow members of the general public to speak on
3 any related issues.

4 Are there any members of the general
5 public who have comments?

6 (There were none.)

7 Okay. With that, we will close the
8 public comment period and we will move into our
9 first presentation.

10 We are privileged to have with us
11 tonight Amy Neches, City of San Francisco, and she
12 is the Project Manager for the Treasure Island
13 Reuse, and she is here to give us an overview on
14 the Reuse Plan.

15 I think maybe to help, everyone is
16 welcome to come up to the table and move up as
17 close as you would like to be able to better see
18 the plans.

19 AMY NECHES: Good evening.

20 As Jim said, my name is Amy Neches. I

1 am the Project Manager for Treasure Island with
2 the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

3 It is a great pleasure to be here
4 tonight. This is a very special moment for us in
5 the Treasure Island Reuse Plan, because yesterday
6 the San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously
7 and enthusiastically endorsed the draft reuse
8 plan.

9 So we are now making the final edits,
10 sending it to the Navy and to HUD later this week.

11 So after a great deal of work on the
12 part of a lot of people, including some of the
13 people in this room, this is a big moment for us.

14 What I would like to do is talk a
15 little bit about the process. I know you have
16 other presentations about Treasure Island, so some
17 of the material has probably been covered.

18 The planning process for Treasure
19 Island has been under way for over two years.
20 There have been, I think, 30 meetings of the

1 Citizens Reuse Committee; two large input
2 sessions; and I think lately a lot of press. I
3 see the redwoods article right here, if you didn't
4 know there were redwoods on Treasure Island, and
5 there has been a reasonably good amount of public
6 participation and input into the plan, and I think
7 we have developed a plan that seems to have good
8 consensus, representing interests in the City. I
9 don't think we have any opposition at this point.

10 In looking at Treasure Island, as you
11 know, there are a number of major constraints on
12 reuse and development. The three major
13 constraints are, first of all, the seismic
14 condition of the island.

15 This is a map that probably Frank
16 Rollo showed you when he was here, to show the
17 permanent seawall is fairly weak and that the
18 island, in the event of a major earthquake, could
19 be subject to major levels of differential
20 settlement and collateral spreading.

1 I think the seismic issue does not
2 prohibit development, it just makes everything
3 more expensive from our point of view.

4 Starting with the causway, the island
5 really just needs to be reinforced around the
6 edge. In fact, the Navy had about 35 percent of
7 the plans completed. They planned to upgrade the
8 causeway on the island for earthquake safety.
9 When Treasure Island was put on the base closure
10 list, they stopped to save the money, but it is a
11 constraint in looking at the cost of the
12 capability of development.

13 The second major constraint in looking
14 on the uses is transportation.

15 As you know, the bridge is at capacity
16 and the consideration for traffic is very poor.
17 So that looking at uses that would add a good deal
18 of traffic to the bridge, particularly during the
19 commute hours, would not pass the muster. That
20 would really not be a very good idea. That would

1 move towards the kinds of uses of alternate
2 transportation, primarily ferry transportation.

3 The third constraint is the legal
4 constraints, the constraint of the Tidelands
5 Trust. Yerba Buena Island is obviously a natural
6 island, Treasure Island is a man-made island built
7 on submerged land on the shoals of the Yerba Buena
8 land, and as such is considered to be in the
9 Tidelands Trust created by the California
10 Constitution.

11 Although the Navy has offered their
12 opinion that the Tidelands Trust was extinguished
13 by the 1943 condemnation by the federal
14 government, the State has opined to us that, no,
15 once the property is no longer owned by the
16 federal government, the Tidelands Trust is still
17 in place. It is simply submerged during the
18 period that the federal government owns it.

19 The Tidelands Trust would therefore,
20 when the federal government transfers it, come

1 into play and it has three major constraints on
2 use and development:

3 One, the type of use that you can
4 have. Basically, it is supposed to have
5 maritime-oriented commercial uses or
6 publicly-oriented uses. Anything that draws
7 people to the waterfront is considered a use that
8 is allowable under the Tidelands Trust.

9 Things like hotels, things like
10 recreation are allowable and desirable.

11 What's not allowed under the Tidelands
12 Trust is residential or general industrial and
13 commercial uses.

14 In discussions with the State Lands
15 Commission, we believe that we would be able
16 agreements for non-conforming uses for certain
17 periods for a reasonable number of years that
18 represent the remaining useful life of some of the
19 buildings, including some of the housing on
20 Treasure Island, so we can continue to use that

1 with the understanding that you cannot develop new
2 non-conforming uses.

3 The second major constraint of the
4 Trust is on conveyance. This land must be held in
5 the public trust by either the State Lands
6 Commission or in San Francisco under the Burton
7 Act. The City of San Francisco through the Parks
8 Commission, can act as a trustee, but the land
9 cannot be sold into private ownership. It can be
10 long-term leased up, I think, up to 66 years,
11 which is a viable period for commercial
12 development, but it cannot actually be sold. This
13 does not affect Yerba Buena Island.

14 That is the significant constraints in
15 terms of revenues that can be expected to be
16 generated and obviously on types of development,
17 and certainly is a constraint on and maybe in
18 terms of its conveyances.

19 Based on that, the Citizens Reuse
20 Committee, working with a large team of

1 consultants, looked at a lot of different
2 alternatives at Treasure Island and has come up
3 with a series of uses that really emphasize
4 visitor-oriented public recreational entertainment
5 uses.

6 These green areas (indicating) are the
7 publicly-oriented use areas, which will be
8 developed around the Job Corps, which is mostly
9 where all the bachelors' quarters are.

10 As you know, the Job Corps already has
11 this establishment here (indicating).

12 What we envision in this
13 publicly-oriented use is a continuation of the
14 film production and a linkage between that and
15 some kind of a theme park, some kind of creative
16 use of the property in terms of a theme
17 attraction, on developing a sports field and on
18 the San Francisco side is a primary site for hotel
19 development.

20 We will try to keep the museum in

1 place and retain Building 1 as kind of a gateway,
2 ceremonial gateway, and keep the marina and
3 hopefully expand this for an interesting use
4 (indicating), kind of pleasure park use of the
5 island.

6 Up here, where there is this dark
7 green around the island and extending onto Yerba
8 Buena represents open space (indicating).

9 What we envision is approximately a
10 hundred foot band, wider up here, sort of a
11 promenade around the island that would really
12 connect between the island and the water. It
13 would be for pedestrians and bicycles and very
14 limited vehicular use.

15 We obviously want the stabilized
16 shoreline for the seismic improvements, which
17 would be with hardened core for new utilities and
18 would run through that starting from the causeway
19 out.

20 Let me pull up the plan (indicating).

1 This is very pretty. I don't know if
2 you can read it. This is illustrative rather than
3 prescriptive. It shows what some of these uses
4 might be, so you can see the theme park area and
5 sort of the parkland area around here around here,
6 and connecting in from this promenade around the
7 island.

8 Moving over here (indicating), this
9 would be sort of institutional uses. This is
10 where the Treasure Island brig is, which is
11 proposed to be converted to a jail for women for
12 the San Francisco Sheriff.

13 The Fire Training School is here
14 (indicating), the Sewage Treatment Plant is down
15 here (indicating). These are obviously needed
16 uses that will stay.

17 Also, the Department of Public Works
18 is thinking of a new, smaller sewage treatment
19 plant which will eventually be built.

20 This is kind of a swing site for the

1 island. There are multiple designations. One
2 possibility that we would like to retain in
3 planning was a possibility of somewhere in the
4 range of two to 3,000 new residential units.

5 I just said that because Tidelands
6 Trust would prohibit that. Obviously, we know
7 that. Prior to any residential development of
8 this scale, we would require removing the
9 Tidelands Trust from that property, through some
10 kind of legislatively-accepted swap.

11 Another use that is possibly easier
12 and more appropriate is embedded with mixed open
13 space, including a certain amount of wetlands up
14 in this area of the island (indicating), using
15 outflow from the Sewage Treatment Plant, something
16 that we would like to look further into.

17 Obviously, the greatest constraint to
18 the residential would be the transportation. It
19 might be more appropriate for a retired community,
20 who don't use the bridge for commuting purposes

1 and for regular residential communities, or for
2 people who really are prepared to leave their cars
3 at home and take the ferry to work. We will see,
4 though. I think that is more off in the future.

5 Or it could be an extension of some of
6 the publicly-oriented uses, another hotel,
7 continuation of the theme park with a sports field
8 that could be expected to develop.

9 Over here on Yerba Buena Island, this
10 is where the existing residential uses are.

11 Stepping over (indicating), you can
12 see what we see in the long term would be the
13 possibility of new residential replacement of the
14 officers' housing that is there, with a hotel on
15 this site, new market rate residential, new
16 affordable residential.

17 This is the Nimitz Mansion and houses
18 that you may have read that the Mayor has an
19 interest in in terms of a ceremonial statehouse.
20 We are thinking of grouping houses together,

1 possibly for some kind of a conference center.

2 The area on the eastern tip of Yerba
3 Buena Island, it is interesting, it is the most
4 developable property remaining on Yerba Buena
5 Island because it is flat. It also has some
6 constraints because of the noise from the bridge.

7 One idea has come up with very
8 interesting possibilities of artists' work spaces.
9 We could have the work spaces on the bridge side
10 and that would be mitigation against the noises
11 for residential uses, and possibly also small
12 restaurants or cafes across Clipper Cove.

13 This part, of course, will remain with
14 the Coast Guard (indicating).

15 This is an ambitious plan and a plan
16 that we expect will unfold over a very long period
17 of time, and we really think it is a phased plan.

18 The first phase is the early interim
19 reuse, more than immediate reuse, because some of
20 these uses are not interim at all.

1 This shows what they expect the uses
2 shortly after the Navy departs in 1997 to look
3 like (indicating).

4 This is the area where we expect the
5 sports fields to be developed.

6 The Fire Training School will be in
7 use by the San Francisco Fire Department. The
8 brig, obviously.

9 The Waste Water Treatment Plant.

10 We have two or three public agencies
11 who are interested in the Hall.

12 The elementary school will stay in
13 place. Job Corps will be developed and hopefully
14 the museum and the marina.

15 This area over here (indicating) along
16 with the existing housing that is now on Yerba
17 Buena Island is part of the agreement that we have
18 reached on homeless services.

19 On the homeless services plan, I think
20 it is a really, really innovative plan. We worked

1 with a 14-member organization known as Treasure
2 Island Homeless Development Initiative, called
3 TIHDI, which, I think represents a really good
4 group of homeless service providers who worked out
5 an agreement that really, I hope, makes them a
6 partner in the development of the project over the
7 long run.

8 I would like to take a minute to tell
9 you about it.

10 The first part of that agreement is
11 the accommodation of housing, a total of 375
12 housing units. We think concentrating on the
13 1,400 series, because they are the newest and
14 seismically most stable houses of the family
15 housing uses on Treasure Island.

16 These will be used for a variety of
17 programs for transitional and permanent housing
18 for families and for individuals, and will be
19 linked with social service programs. It is really
20 a supportive housing model that has proved to be

1 successful around the Bay Area and around the
2 country.

3 The next piece of agreement with TIHDI
4 is for economic development. They will have
5 opportunities to operate some of the smaller
6 restaurants. They might operate one of those
7 restaurants, they might operate the commissary,
8 operate small businesses to create an economic
9 activity on the island which is good for the plan
10 as a whole and to provide jobs and job training
11 for the restaurants.

12 And then as the development expands
13 and you start to see the theme park and hotels,
14 they will get additional opportunities to run
15 other small businesses as well.

16 The final piece of the agreement with
17 TIDHI calls for a 25 percent proportion of new
18 permanent jobs created on the island to be set
19 aside to be filled by qualified homeless and
20 low-income San Francisco residents.

1 And the plan fits in really, really
2 well with that because things like hotels and
3 theme parks generate literally thousands of
4 literally low-scale, entry-level jobs that are
5 really appropriate for these kinds of job training
6 programs.

7 The TIHDI are really partners with us.
8 They want to see the development take place. So
9 we have really broken through what is often sort
10 of a confrontation between social service
11 providers and economic development interests and
12 tried to line it up into a partnership.

13 That is certainly one of the earlier
14 uses that we will have and we are working with the
15 Navy in terms of timing as to when that housing
16 will be available.

17 As we move beyond the first phase of
18 development, I just want to show you this map, 2,
19 3, 4 and 5, all the way through 2031, these are
20 illustrative phases (indicating).

1 It gives us a sense of how we look at
2 linking seismic improvements along the perimeter,
3 with the opening up, making available more
4 property for development so that it as you extend
5 the improved perimeter around the island, you got
6 more property available for new development.

7 You sort of get a sense from the dark
8 areas of the path of development (indicating).

9 This is an exciting chart here.
10 Obviously, all of this is expensive. It is an
11 expensive project. As you can see, and these are
12 planning level numbers, obviously we have not
13 centralized and gotten final cost estimates.

14 We estimate that looking at the entire
15 infrastructure, seismic, all the improvements,
16 ferry terminal, we come up with a price tag for
17 the entire island of about \$263,000,000.

18 Obviously, the nice thing about the phasing is you
19 don't have to do the whole island. You can do a
20 piece at a time, and that can kind of cut down the

1 costs.

2 What are the costs that are really
3 unique to Treasure Island? To give you an idea of
4 that \$263,000,000 over 72,000,000 is for seismic
5 shoreline stabilization; about 21,000,000 is for
6 ferry improvements, which would include a
7 terminal; improvements to this pier, a new ferry
8 pier here, and some off-island improvements within
9 the City and the Easy Bay.

10 The building demolition, which
11 includes the removal of the housing material, is
12 estimated at about \$35,000,000. It is extremely
13 expensive. You got to make a hole before you
14 start Treasure Island.

15 On the other hand, all the land uses
16 we are proposing would generate revenue as well.
17 And that is what you're seeing here in the
18 revenues, land and facility, and on Yerba Buena,
19 land sales and property tax increment bonds, and
20 what we call admissions tax increment bonds.

1 Traditionally, on things like theme
2 parks, you charge some tax. In this case, we
3 projected a dollar a head. I understand some of
4 the parks in Orange County charge much more, and
5 then you can bond against that the same way you
6 can bond against property tax increments. So the
7 total project base revenues are shown here
8 (indicating).

9 This is again sort of an early
10 projection of about \$225,000,000 which leaves us
11 with a projected cap today of about 38,000,000 for
12 the whole project, although at the early stages
13 you can start out with less. And where the money
14 comes from is a good question. We hope the Navy
15 will give us some, which is probably silly.

16 The next steps are now that the Draft
17 Reuse Plan has been adopted, it will go over to
18 the Navy and HUD and it will be used to create the
19 preferred alternatives for the EIR, which is being
20 conducted by the Navy.

1 This will also be sent to HUD, so they
2 can review the homeless services component which I
3 described.

4 The third major use is this really
5 kickoff negotiations between the City and the Navy
6 over conveyance, and money and management,
7 caretaker status and jurisdiction, all that type
8 of stuff.

9 As we move forward, I think the major
10 thing we are looking at is to start marketing. We
11 have already got some expressions of interest, and
12 we are really starting marketing, so that when the
13 Navy leaves, we are ready to step in.

14 Thank you.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I think
16 what we would like to do is to take a quick break,
17 sometime between five and ten minutes, in order to
18 write in any questions you may have, and provide
19 them to us on the comment cards, and we will come
20 back and address as many questions as we have in

1 the time remaining.

2 (Short recess taken.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will start up
4 in the time we have remaining. It looks from the
5 questions we got you will address the questions
6 and we will open it up a little bit for open
7 questions.

8 MS. NECHES: And the first card says,
9 two questions:

10 "Do you really believe that you will
11 be able to achieve six-minute ferry service,
12 according to The Chronicle?

13 "Where are theme park deliveries going
14 to park?"

15 These are very good questions.

16 Actually, the Direct Reuse Plan talks
17 about ferry service every six minutes, not six
18 minutes from the City to the Island. So I guess
19 if you have very, very fast service, you might be
20 able, but probably not. The actual estimate,

1 according to our ferry consultant, on the length
2 of the ferry is from the Ferry Building to the new
3 pier that will eventually be built here, depending
4 on the speed of the ferry, they vary tremendously
5 in speed, it will be 10 to 15 minutes, going
6 around up to here (indicating), probably 20
7 minutes.

8 From the East Bay over here, from Jack
9 London Square is also probably 15, 20 minutes.

10 Importantly, where are theme park
11 visitors going to park? They are going to park
12 somewhere else other than Treasure Island. The
13 idea is, particularly for the theme park, that
14 this would be only ferry or bus access.

15 Basically, this would be Disneyland or
16 something without the gigantic parking lot that
17 surrounds it.

18 Interestingly, for theme parks, it is
19 actually relatively easier to do that, because of
20 a couple of things: One is you link the purchase

1 of a ticket for a theme park with a ferry ticket
2 or a bus ticket.

3 Secondly, you make it clear, if you
4 tell people there is a little bit of theme park
5 parking, they all think it is theirs. But if you
6 tell them there is a gate and guard and you have
7 to have an access pass to get in, to get your car
8 into Treasure Island, people will get the message.

9 Finally, and perhaps most importantly,
10 ferries are actually really popular. People like
11 taking ferries.

12 Alcatraz gets a million visitors a
13 year by ferry. The Statue of Liberty gets
14 4,000,000 visitors a year by ferry.

15 The ferry can be actually part of the
16 attraction of going to Treasure Island. We kind
17 of feel like -- and this is certainly open to
18 interpretation -- that the ferry ride gets too
19 long when you're talking about something probably
20 more than half an hour. At that point, you might

1 begin to feel it is like an impediment to people,
2 but when you talk about 15 to 20-minute ferry
3 ride, it is very pleasant, people go to Angel
4 Island almost to take the ferry.

5 So we believe that there is good
6 parking access. What we would ultimately like to
7 see is embarking points from a few places around
8 the bay, from the ferry terminal in San Francisco,
9 which would not have separate parking. From Jack
10 London Square, which has plenty of parking. From
11 Vallejo, which has a ferry terminal.

12 We are looking at the possibility of
13 developing a ferry access at Candlestick Point
14 from Three Comp Park. With the Giants moving
15 downtown or likely moving downtown, Candlestick
16 Park will be in use eight Sundays a year. It has
17 thousands of parking spots right along the water
18 there, and we think that would really be a viable
19 place to provide access from the South Bay.

20 There is a lot of work that has to be

1 done on this, but we think the ferry
2 transportation system is going to be viable and
3 key to make the project work.

4 "Please define 'homeless' objectively.
5 At what point does a non-homeowner cease to be
6 homeless?"

7 "Homeless" actually is defined
8 objectively or non-objectively by the Department
9 of Housing and Urban Development, so we follow the
10 definition of the Department of Housing and Urban
11 Development.

12 I don't have it in my head, but I
13 believe it is somebody who is living in a shelter
14 or a jail or in some kind of program or on the
15 street without having a fixed regular place of
16 residence that is meant for human habitation.
17 That is the definition of homeless.

18 I don't understand the second part:
19 "At what point to the non-homeowners cease to be
20 homeless?" I do not understand.

1 MR. HANSEN: That was my question.

2 Suppose I come to Treasure Island because I just
3 got out jail, for example. How many years can I
4 live at Treasure Island before I lose my
5 authorization to live there on Treasure Island as
6 a homeless person?

7 MS. NECHES: If someone is coming
8 through a program and has gone through a screening
9 process and is accepted for housing at Treasure
10 Island, although a portion of the housing will be
11 transitional program-oriented housing, a lot of it
12 will be permanent housing, and that will become
13 where you live.

14 The important thing about the homeless
15 service is, remember that once people have a place
16 to live and a job and some support and some
17 structure, we are not homeless anymore.

18 I hope people don't walk around with
19 the idea that we are picking up what is going on
20 in Civic Center and moving it to Treasure Island.

1 That is not the goal here.

2 It is not to take the panhandlers from
3 Market Street and move them to Treasure Island.
4 The idea is to create exits to homelessness so
5 that you give people some assistance with housing
6 and jobs.

7 Employment is really key to keeping
8 people stable and keeping people housed, so what
9 you end up with is a mixed community.

10 Although we are talking about theme
11 parks and ferries, we are also talking about
12 communities which will have a mix of income, and
13 it will be permanent housing.

14 MR. HANSEN: I don't think you have
15 answered the question. Hypothetically, I get out
16 of jail and I am homeless. And I go to Treasure
17 Island and get a job as a janitor or whatever. A
18 year goes by and I have a good, steady job and I
19 like living on Treasure Island. Can I stay on
20 Treasure Island for 50 more years?

1 MS. NECHES: As long as you meet the
2 program requirements for the housing that you are
3 living in, yes, you can.

4 If you hit a lotto, you no longer meet
5 the income requirements, but if you are a janitor,
6 you will get to stay.

7 MR. WONG: It is two parts, whether or
8 not you have housing but there is also an income,
9 because I know a lot of people that would just
10 move out there and stay --

11 MS. NECHES: It is an income
12 requirement, and the homeless service provider
13 organizations are not suckers, there is a total
14 screening process.

15 "Will strong columns prevent
16 liquifaction or ground subsidence?"

17 No, they will not. All they will do
18 is contain lateral spreading. You still have the
19 issue of differential settlement, and what we look
20 toward is essentially area by area and even site

1 by site ground reinforcement, prior to
2 development, which will be based on the type of
3 construction and the needs for that particular
4 site.

5 You still definitely have an issue of
6 differential settlement.

7 "Why put housing on the most
8 seismically unstable portion of the island?"

9 In some ways, housing fits better
10 there in that housing units, the new housing units
11 that would be small, relatively lightweight,
12 wood-frame construction, one to two stories, do
13 very well on sort of mat foundation, almost like
14 little boats floating on their own bottoms. You
15 don't have to sink piles.

16 But clearly it is an issue, and before
17 you do that, you would certainly want to improve
18 that part of the island and not choose the most
19 dicey part of the island.

20 MR. NEDELL: I have some various

1 questions about your last comment about the mat
2 foundations.

3 MS. NECHES: Okay.

4 MR. NEDELL: What kind of differential
5 settlement are you expecting, inches or feet?

6 MS. NECHES: You know, I am not the
7 expert. We have to get Frank Rollo back here,
8 bring in a structural consultant.

9 I can only relate what I have been
10 told, you are passing my technical ability.

11 MR. NEDELL: I recall there was
12 comment at the last meeting or last week's paper
13 about the structures having to be pile supported.

14 MS. NECHES: The small housing units
15 we were told will not need to be pile supported.
16 We just had a structural FEMA level analysis in
17 the 1,400 houses, the newest housing, furthest
18 from the perimeter. The report came back that it
19 was going to pass a FEMA analysis, and FEMA
20 analysis does not tell you whether the building is

1 going to be in great shape. It tells you whether
2 it is likely that all the structures, all the
3 elements will stay up, and the housing and the
4 people will stay unharmed in a major earthquake.

5 The recommendations that came back
6 were that in order to be sound, you need to put a
7 shear wall into those units, into all dividers of
8 the lower parts of the units, at a relatively
9 modest cost, and that would be about \$7,000 per
10 housing unit, which is obviously pretty
11 inexpensive to create good housing for people.

12 That is, in fact, build on that type
13 of mat foundation that is alluded to in the
14 technical comments.

15 "What are predicted traffic impacts
16 for the theme park?"

17 As I said, we expect virtually all
18 visitors to come by ferry or by bus.

19 The traffic impact, I think will come
20 more from a certain portion of employees who will

1 probably end up having to drive, and then service
2 vehicles will drive as well.

3 There is discussion of that in here
4 and also a separate traffic study which goes into
5 detail traffic impacts for every use of the
6 island.

7 "When are the first parcels to be used
8 on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena during Stage 1,
9 looking at which parcels need the remediation
10 first?"

11 The first parcels to be used are in
12 use, which are the film production studios and
13 Building 1, although actually the Navy will have
14 some offices there.

15 We hope to be able to keep this
16 building open and keep the museum going. So those
17 are early uses.

18 Then the Job Corps the brig is a very
19 early use, that will actually be leased by the
20 City, probably within the next couple of months,

1 although there will not be any actual inmates
2 there.

3 The Fire Training School is slated to
4 be transferred from the Navy to the City within
5 the next couple of months, so that is an early
6 use.

7 The elementary school is in use and
8 will continue in use.

9 The housing, we would like to switch
10 as quickly as the Navy leaves, the kind of
11 structures that will deteriorate if they stand
12 empty.

13 And we hope actually to use this
14 building, use the administration building, the
15 Judge Advocate General's office building, and
16 possibly some of the smaller buildings, Hasta La
17 Vista, Foghorn, the NWR building, and those are
18 the initial parcels.

19 "What is the short-term plan for
20 housing, putting in the northern part of the

1 island?"

2 Well, we think that we are negotiating
3 an agreement with the State Lands Commission that
4 will allow use of this housing as sort of a
5 pre-determined period that we are working on, that
6 will sort of have a remaining economic life of
7 those buildings as a non-conforming use.

8 What we could not do prior to
9 resolution and removal of the trust is build new
10 housing.

11 "What potential land sales are
12 anticipated in Yerba Buena Island?"

13 The land sales, I think that we are
14 anticipating on Yerba Buena will probably be in
15 this area of the island (indicaitng), sort of the
16 hillside and top of the island facing the San
17 Francisco side.

18 We have got very nice views and very
19 nice wooded, sloped terrain.

20 There is a limitation in that a lot of

1 the Yerba Buena terrain, as you know, is very,
2 very steep and it is just unbuildable.

3 The top of the island, physically the
4 areas where the existing officers and family units
5 are, and the likely sale areas. And the flat
6 areas out on the eastern end of the island.

7 That's really going to have to wait
8 until CalTrans plans for the new Bay Bridge are
9 further advanced. I think CalTrans is probably
10 moving away from the plan of replacing the span
11 with a whole new span, but the plans that we saw
12 are concentrated to swing the bridge, which would
13 essentially wipe out this development.

14 But now I think we're moving back to
15 reinforcing, but they will probably use this
16 property as a construction staging area for some
17 period of years.

18 We hope to get to develop this end, it
19 is very, very nice, but probably not for some
20 period of time.

1 I think that is all I have got. Does
2 anybody else have any questions?

3 MR. WONG: I am not sure you can
4 answer this but maybe can suggest to me when we
5 can discuss these types of things.

6 There are already buildings, some of
7 the movie studios and things of that sort, so at
8 the point of transfer, what happens with the
9 FOSL's that we are looking at, clean-up issues and
10 things like that? What happens with that, since
11 they are already in use, nothing is done anymore?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I can briefly
13 answer that. I think when we go to leasing, it is
14 with the understanding that the nature of the
15 lease is such that it is safe in its current
16 condition to lease, and the nature of the leases
17 we have had thus far have been uses of existing
18 buildings and not making a lot of ground
19 improvements, which could contact soil with ground
20 water.

1 In fact, we have placed those
2 restrictions in the leases and what we need to do
3 with the movie studio parcels, if they are going
4 to remain studios, is to work with the City once
5 we determine what ground water and soil
6 remediation we need to do, and work with them to
7 do that work as they are continuing to lease the
8 property.

9 MR. WONG: Does the FOST process
10 change because then you do a finding?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will take all
12 the information we have had as a result of
13 completing the remediation and basically kind of
14 update the FOSL into a FOST, since they were down
15 at this site, it is ready for deed transfer.

16 MS. VEDAGIRI: If you transfer a
17 parcel to a private entity for private use and
18 then they find a ground water problem or
19 something, does the responsibility for cleaning
20 that up still remain with the Navy as the original

1 owner?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, in a
3 lease scenario, the Navy remains the landlord, the
4 owner of the property.

5 MS. NECHES: If we get it, where do we
6 go to? I think that would probably be the subject
7 of the conveyance negotiation between the City and
8 the Navy to determine who is going to maintain
9 residual liability for that. Actually, I think
10 some of that is covered in that the Navy will
11 retain the responsibility for all stuff known and
12 unknown, obviously with the exception that if the
13 new user is discharging, that is their
14 responsibility.

15 MR. HANSEN: Why would the City
16 contemplate selling land on Yerba Buena as
17 compared to giving an interested party a 50-year
18 lease or a 25-year lease, or whatever?

19 MS. NECHES: We may. It depends on
20 the type of development and on the financing

1 needs. Commercial development of the type that we
2 are contemplating on Treasure Island, like the
3 sports fields, hotels, theme parks, is fairly
4 compatible with leasehold financing and lease hold
5 development.

6 Residential, single-family

7 residential, generally is not. It is very, very
8 rare, particularly in this country, for people to
9 be interested in leasing, spending a lot of money
10 to lease a house, so that if you are doing like
11 condos or single-family homes, you generally do
12 have to do conveyance in order to make it
13 marketable.

14 For a hotel site, that might not be.

15 MR. HANSEN: Many of the homes in
16 Honolulu are leasehold.

17 MS. NECHES: Honolulu is a very
18 unusual market. I don't know if that would fly in
19 California. We have to look at the market.
20 Honolulu is pretty unique in that.

1 MR. VAN WYE: I am curious about the
2 Tidelands Trust. You indicated that you thought
3 that a change could be made to allow residential
4 development at Treasure Island. Would that
5 require action by the State Legislature or is that
6 Constitutional?

7 MS. NECHES: No. I think it is very
8 important for people to be as clear as possible.
9 To the extent that the property remains within the
10 confines, within the restrictions of the Tidelands
11 Trust, it is Trust property.

12 New residential development is not
13 allowed, there is not accommodation that can be
14 made for new residential development.

15 What you can do is swap properties out
16 of the Trust.

17 For example, if the City, the Navy,
18 whoever owns it at this moment, said, "Okay, we
19 will swap this portion of Treasure Island out of
20 the Trust in exchange for swapping other property

1 elsewhere into the Trust," then the property that
2 is swapped, that has to be approved by the
3 Legislature.

4 But the property that is swapped out
5 of the Trust is no longer within the Trust and no
6 longer has any Trust restrictions.

7 The property that get swapped in has
8 to sort of meet the requirements of being
9 suitable. You can't swap property in the Central
10 Valley under the Tidelands Trust; it has to be at
11 the water.

12 MR. VAN WYE: You indicated that the
13 Tidelands Trust is part of the California
14 Constitution. Does the Constitution give the
15 Legislature the control over it?

16 MS. NECHES: The State Lands
17 Commission, which is a three-member commission
18 made up of three elected officials, I think it's
19 like the Treasurer, not the Attorney General. I
20 actually don't remember. I know one of them is

1 the Treasurer. Three elected officials are
2 actually the Commission for State Lands, for the
3 Tidelands Trust.

4 The Legislature, I believe, has to
5 approve swaps in and out of the Trust. But the
6 Trust is created by the Constitution and under the
7 common law.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Time for one more
9 question.

10 MR. HEHN: Just a quick follow up to
11 the question about the use of the existing
12 housing during the Trust.

13 You said that some of those would be
14 used on the variance on what goes on. Were you
15 talking only about the 1,400 housing or all the
16 housing at the north end of the island?

17 MS. NECHES: We do not at this moment,
18 and I will try to be really careful. At this
19 moment, we do not contemplate using all of that
20 housing. Some of that is pretty old, kind of

1 rundown, and just because it is getting old, it is
2 sitting out there with a great deal of wind and
3 sea air exposure and it is not in great condition.

4 We were really more concentrating on
5 the 1,400 and the 1,200 series housing. It is
6 more stable.

7 Let me clarify, some of the other uses
8 that will fall within this kind of interim
9 non-conforming use agreement would be things like
10 the brig, possibly the Fire Training School, the
11 movie studios, all these uses are not
12 Trust-compatible uses.

13 The State Lands Commission has a very
14 serious mandate, but they also obviously
15 understand that we are kind of getting something
16 and we have to be reasonable in negotiations, but
17 in terms of at this moment, we don't contemplate
18 using all of that housing.

19 MR. HEHN: What does the City then
20 propose to do with the remaining housing?

1 MS. NECHES: We are hoping Jim will
2 get somebody to demolish it.

3 MR. HEHN: What happens then if you
4 look at reuse of those versus what our purposes of
5 trying to do remediation are for that? I am
6 trying to work that out where that fits in the
7 remediation.

8 MS. NECHES: It is an interesting
9 question. It depends on how much money is being
10 allocated.

11 The 1,400 housing and the 1,200
12 housing we will certainly use, certainly in the
13 long run, because there is contemplation of
14 residential in this area. We would like to see
15 the clean up to a level that will allow that to go
16 forward if other conditions like the Trust, like
17 the transportation allow it.

18 So the area happens to be where the
19 existing housing is. That may indicate that the
20 remediation issues are pretty much the same when

1 we're talking about in terms of ground
2 remediation.

3 But if we're talking about reusing
4 existing structures or making the properties
5 suitable for development of new housing
6 structure --

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I am going
8 to briefly, there were two cards addressed towards
9 our area. I will quickly address those.

10 One says: "What is the schedule of
11 FOSL's and FOST's?"

12 The answer is that the Navy will be
13 working with the City in the next couple of months
14 to develop a FOSL and FOST strategy, especially
15 for this upcoming year, so we hope to be able to
16 treat it in a one-year increment rather than in
17 the individual FOSL that we have been doing thus
18 far.

19 We will be talking more about that '97
20 plan over the next couple of months.

1 "How will the proposed land uses
2 affect soil and water clean up levels?"

3 It discusses more technical issues,
4 but basically the answer is, now that we have
5 this, this is our input, and our remedial
6 investigation, we're going to finish that, it's
7 just showing us what the conditions are.

8 Then we will move into the feasibility
9 studies and we will be able to use this as an
10 input.

11 We did not have this before, so we had
12 to speculate on uses. Now we will be able to
13 input these actual uses into our feasibility study
14 to determine what can we do, how much is it going
15 to cost, how long is it going to take, and then we
16 will have some options to decide from.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Our mission has
18 really just begun tonight, now that we
19 conceptualize the land use, we can think about
20 when we get our presentation on the RI results,

1 visualize what can work where on the island as far
2 as ground water clean ups.

3 This probably will not be our only
4 opportunity to talk about the Reuse Plan. But
5 next time it will probably be a marriage of the
6 Reuse Plan and our Clean Up Plan.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We want to thank
8 you for coming out tonight. We appreciate the
9 opportunity to get a detailed plan on the Reuse
10 Plan.

11 There are actually not that many
12 people that have been given this plan.

13 (Applause.)

14 We will take a minute or two to reset
15 up and we will move right into our remedial
16 investigation preview.

17 (Short recess taken.)

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will now move
19 into our remedial investigation report preview.
20 This is a preview of a report that we expect to be

1 delivering on or about the 22nd of August.

2 Again, this is the remedial
3 investigation report, this is the report of the IR
4 sites, and it does not include those nine sites
5 that we most recently have taken out of this
6 program. They are moving into the UST program, so
7 this RI report will be covering those remaining
8 sites in the CERCLA program.

9 THORSTEN ANDERSON: I am Thorsten
10 Anderson. I am with PRC representing the Navy.

11 Tonight, I, along with Paul Bigelow,
12 am going to be discussing the remedial
13 investigation process that has been ongoing at
14 Treasure Island.

15 I was kind of excited to give this
16 presentation, because the Remedial Investigation
17 Report, which is coming out next month, is kind of
18 a culmination of numerous years of work by the
19 Navy and the legislators, and it is really a major
20 milestone.

1 Even within the RAB within the last
2 year, we had several workshops on the human health
3 risk assessment; on the ecological risk
4 assessments that have kind of been building up on
5 this RI report.

6 The presentation tonight is going to
7 be in two parts: The first part is a general
8 overview of the remedial investigation process,
9 what kind of data evaluation is done during the RI
10 process; how it all fits together to form the
11 conclusions for the RI. Then also what kind of
12 information is contained in the RI report.

13 Paul is going to present the second
14 part of the presentation, which is a site-specific
15 example, using Site 24, the dry cleaning facility.
16 And Paul is going to present some of the soil and
17 groundwater results for that site.

18 There is one thing I forgot to
19 mention. You should all have a handout. In the
20 back there is a glossary of terms, so as we go

1 along, if there is something unclear, you might
2 look back to see if it is covered, and we will
3 also be answering questions at the end of the
4 presentation.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can take some
6 brief clarification questions during the course of
7 the presentation and then keep things rolling and
8 address questions via cards and open discussion at
9 the end.

10 MR. ANDERSON: This is kind of an
11 outline of the remedial investigation process, and
12 I am going to go through each one of these in
13 detail, starting with the objectives of the RI
14 process; performing the field work; evaluating the
15 data; identifying the nature and extent of
16 contamination; talking about the fate and
17 transport of contaminants; and you can refer back
18 to this. It is up on the wall each of the steps
19 in the RI process.

20 The first step in the RI process is

1 developing the objectives, and several pieces of
2 information go into them.

3 We review the historical operations at
4 the site. We also look at any previous
5 investigations that have been done at the site.
6 We also look at the geology and hydrogeology and
7 any information about conceptual model for the
8 site.

9 All this information is compiled and
10 the objectives are formed, and they are documented
11 in the field sampling plan.

12 The field sampling plan is then used
13 to perform the actual field work, which at
14 Treasure Island, the most recent field work was
15 done last summer.

16 At Treasure Island, we collected both
17 soil and groundwater samples, using the geoprobe.
18 These samples were analyzed, using field screening
19 techniques as well as an off-site laboratory and
20 other field activities, including the installation

1 of monitoring wells as well as air sampling.

2 Once the initial data was collected,
3 we wanted to make sure that we had delineated the
4 plume of any contaminants that we found. So the
5 Navy initially evaluated the soil and groundwater
6 data, and then came up with a proposal, which was
7 presented to the regulators at working meetings.

8 These proposals included any
9 additional sampling locations that were needed and
10 also identifying well locations.

11 And at the working meeting, the Navy
12 and the regulators kind of worked together to get
13 concurrence on whether sufficient data had been
14 collected at the site to delineate the contaminant
15 plume.

16 Once the data had been collected, it
17 was evaluated, and there are two parts to this
18 process: There is the human health risk
19 assessment and the ecological risk assessment.

20 The first part, the human health risk

1 assessment, we are discussing in numerous RAB
2 meetings as well as a workshop to briefly review
3 some of the things that go into the risk
4 assessment.

5 The first step is identifying the
6 chemicals of potential concern.

7 The second step is doing an exposure
8 assessment, which is identifying how humans are
9 exposed to contaminants that were found at the
10 site.

11 The third step is a toxicity
12 assessment, which is identifying the toxicity or
13 how the chemicals found at the site are affecting
14 the human population.

15 The information from the toxicity
16 assessment and the exposure assessment are kind of
17 combined in the risk characterization, where a
18 value is assigned to the risk to people living or
19 working at the site.

20 They kind of complement the human

1 health risk assessment, and ecological risk
2 assessment is also done. The process is a little
3 different. Here, the first step is evaluating
4 whether there is sufficient habitat for ecological
5 species at the site.

6 The second step would be identifying
7 the potential ecological receptors, provided there
8 is sufficient habitat.

9 And the third step is identifying the
10 chemical toxicity to those particular receptors
11 that were identified.

12 Now, the two risk assessments, they
13 kind of identify the worst contaminants at the
14 site. Those contaminants that cause the most risk
15 to humans and ecological receptors.

16 Those contaminants that are identified
17 in the risk assessment are evaluated further in
18 two steps, the first of which is identifying the
19 nature and extent of contamination.

20 The nature and extent is basically

1 identifying where the contamination is located,
2 and it also identifies the distribution of the
3 chemicals and identifies any hot spots or areas
4 where there are higher contaminations.

5 The chemicals identified by the risk
6 assessment are also evaluated for fate and
7 transport process. One way to locate fate and
8 transport is to ask the question, "Is the
9 contaminant more likely to remain in the soil or
10 the groundwater?"

11 Fate transport also looks at how
12 contaminants migrate either in the soil or in the
13 water, how do they get from one place to another.

14 There are a few different mechanisms
15 that are looked at in fate and transport. These
16 include sorption, which is the adherence of
17 chemicals to soil; volatilization, which is the
18 transfer of contaminants from either soil or
19 groundwater into the air.

20 There are two examples of degradation

1 processes which include oxidization and
2 biodegradation.

3 Now, the results of the risk
4 assessment, the nature and extent of contamination
5 evaluation and fate and transport properties are
6 all used to come up with conclusions and
7 recommendations for the RI report.

8 The recommendations can be combined
9 into three general categories, the first of which
10 is no action, and this would apply to sites where
11 the risk calculated by the human health and
12 ecological risk assessment is within the
13 acceptable risk range.

14 The second general set of
15 recommendations are removal actions, and this
16 would apply to sites where there is a small amount
17 of contamination that can easily be removed to
18 reduce the risk at the site.

19 The third set of general
20 recommendations is to evaluate the site further in

1 the feasibility study, and this would apply to
2 sites where the clean up process is expected to be
3 more complex.

4 The Remedial Investigation Report
5 that's going to be delivered next month is
6 considered a draft. The first step after it's
7 delivered, it would be reviewed by the regulatory
8 agencies before it is finalized.

9 Concurrently with this, the Navy will
10 be preparing a feasibility study, which evaluates
11 the potential clean up processes that could be
12 used to remediate the contamination that's
13 present.

14 The third step after the feasibility
15 study would be the preparation of our proposed
16 plan, which is using the information from the
17 feasibility study, focusing on one type of clean
18 up activity, and that's presented in the proposed
19 plan, which would be reviewed by the RAB and the
20 public.

1 That's the end of the first part of
2 the presentation. Now I am going to turn it over
3 to Paul Bigelow, who is going to kind of
4 illuminate what I talked about by giving specific
5 examples from Site 24.

6 PAUL BIGELOW: Thank you, Thorsten.

7 Again, I am Paul Bigelow. I am a
8 geologist with PRC and I am going to go over the
9 remedial investigation at Site 24, the dry
10 cleaning facility.

11 I want to emphasize that the Remedial
12 Investigation Report is still in progress. We are
13 still writing it, still evaluating the data, and
14 this is a review and summary of what we have done
15 so far.

16 The presentation format has three
17 parts to it. I am going to go over the background
18 of Site 24; give the history and the geology,
19 hydrogeology of the site.

20 I will also go over the Phase I

1 remedial investigation results.

2 And the second part of the
3 presentation will be the Phase II remedial
4 investigation, the actual field activities and the
5 approach to the sampling.

6 And then the final part of the
7 presentation will be the result of the remedial
8 investigation with the geoprobe sampling and the
9 groundwater sampling from the monitoring wells.

10 The background of Site 24, there was a
11 preliminary assessment site inspection that
12 identified primarily two potential sources of
13 contamination at the site.

14 Actually, I should show you where Site
15 24 is, on the southeast corner of Treasure Island
16 in this area (indicating), and this is a blow up
17 of that area. The bay is over here.

18 The two primary sources of
19 contaminatio in the area are identified in the
20 preliminary assessment of the site inspection or

1 an abandoned fuel line in this area, and the
2 former dry cleaning plant, which is Building 99.

3 The history of Building 99, the dry
4 cleaning facility, it was used in the 1940's and
5 1950's and the type of solvent typically was
6 tetrachloroethane contamination of the soil from
7 groundwater. That part of the investigation is
8 under the UST program.

9 However, we detected chlorinated
10 solvents in one well in the 1224, which is near
11 the former dry cleaning facility.

12 Also in the dry cleaning facility
13 there were some floor drains that go directly to
14 the soil, and that affected the pathway for the
15 migration of solvents to soil and in the
16 groundwater.

17 (Showing slides.)

18 This is a cross-section of the
19 subsurface at Site 24, going from west to the
20 east. This is the bay over here (indicating) and

1 the dry cleaning facility would be approximately
2 right here (indicating).

3 This cross-section is based on
4 geotechnical borings that were done near the site,
5 and field borings.

6 The subsurface consists initially of a
7 30-foot layer of sand, both are officially filled
8 sand and native Yerba Buena shoal sands.

9 That 30-foot layer of sand is
10 underlain initially by a thin layer of clay, which
11 is part of the bay mud settlement. Underlying
12 that is a thin layer of sand, and then underlying
13 the sand is silt and bay mud.

14 The groundwater at the site
15 approximately ranges from five to nine feet below
16 the ground surface, and groundwater flows towards
17 the bay.

18 (Showing slides.)

19 The approach to the Phase IIB remedial
20 investigation, we have two separate phases that

1 initially we came in and did the geoprobe
2 sampling, both soil sampling and groundwater
3 sampling. The purpose of the geoprobe soil
4 sampling was to determine if there was an ongoing
5 source for the solvents in the soil, the ongoing
6 source from the soil to groundwater.

7 And the purpose of the geoprobe
8 groundwater sampling was to define the vertical
9 and lateral extent of solvents in the groundwater,
10 and also to determine the best locations to put
11 monitoring wells.

12 The monitoring wells were installed
13 for the long-term monitoring of plume migration.

14 The actual Phase IIB field activities
15 that we did at Site 24, we did two geoprobe soil
16 borings, where we collected two soil samples from
17 each boring, and then we did 15 geoprobe
18 groundwater borings, where we collected
19 groundwater samples from three depths at each
20 geoprobe boring.

1 The groundwater samples were collected
2 at shallow groundwater, which is approximately
3 seven to ten feet; intermediate groundwater
4 sampling, which is approximately 18 to 20 feet
5 below ground surface; and the deep groundwater
6 sampling, which is approximately 28 to 30 feet
7 below the ground surface.

8 The rationale for sampling at various
9 depths in the groundwater is that solvents have a
10 higher density than water, so they tend to sink.
11 They migrate downwards as well as down gradient,
12 and there was not too much emphasis put on the
13 soil sampling because the nature of the solvent in
14 the soils tends to volatilize, so in the soil they
15 migrate towards groundwater.

16 Just a little bit on the type of
17 solvents we detected in groundwater, and the
18 degradation sequence.

19 We primarily detected three types of
20 tetrachloroethylene solvent, which has the acronym

1 "PCE," trichloroethylene, which has the acronym
2 "TCE," and dichloroethane, and the acronym for
3 that is "DCE", and I will be referring to them by
4 their acronym.

5 The degradation sequence for the
6 solvents is PCE is the dry cleaning solvent. It
7 degrades, it goes into TCE, and eventually DCE,
8 which goes into vinyl chloride.

9 We did have some detection of vinyl
10 chloride in the groundwater, but they were much
11 lower than the PCE, TCE and DCE. These three were
12 the primary solvents detected.

13 MS. GLASS: What is the little dotted
14 line?

15 MR. BIGELOW: It shows one, 1-DCE, but
16 it primarily degraded to give us the middle one.

17 Okay. I am going to briefly go over
18 the results of the remedial investigation and now
19 show cross-sections of the plume and the
20 contaminant plumes, which will give you more

1 details of the results of the investigation.

2 Geoprobe sampling for the soils, we
3 found one detection of DCE instead of the low
4 concentration of eight milligrams per kilogram,
5 and we did not find any other solvents in the
6 soil. This indicates that the majority of the
7 solvents have already migrated to groundwater and
8 there isn't an ongoing source for solvents in the
9 soil.

10 There the geoprobe and groundwater
11 sampling again define the vertical and lateral
12 extent of the groundwater and determine the best
13 locations for the monitoring wells.

14 And since the solvents migrate
15 downward, we screen the monitoring wells, we had
16 basically three areas of well clusters: One was
17 near the source, near the former dry cleaning
18 facility, and one was near the bottom of the
19 contaminant plumes, and one was between the plume
20 and the bay.

1 And at each well cluster there was a
2 well screened in the shallow, intermediate, and
3 deep groundwater zone.

4 The shallow zone is from 3.5 to 15.5
5 feet below the ground surface; the intermediate
6 zone is from 16 to 28 feet below the ground
7 surface; and the deep zone is from 35 to 45 feet
8 below the ground surface.

9 This map shows the results of the
10 geoprobe groundwater sampling. The geoprobe
11 borings, the color code to show the total solvent
12 concentrations in parts per billion for all three
13 sampling intervals for each boring.

14 So this was just to show the extent of
15 the VOC in the groundwater monitoring wells. The
16 color probing is the red boring locations are
17 concentrations of solvents greater than 10,000
18 parts per billion in micrograms per liter.

19 The orange locations are 5,000 to
20 10,000 parts per billion.

1 The yellow geoprobe locations are 500
2 to 5,000 parts per billion.

3 And the green geoprobe locations are
4 less than 500 parts per billion.

5 So based on the results of the
6 geoprobe groundwater sampling, we put in the
7 monitoring wells, and this is a cross-section of
8 the subsurface again. The former dry cleaning
9 facility would be here (indicating), and the bay
10 is down here (indicating).

11 And this shows the three well clusters
12 that we put in. Again, one well cluster was put
13 in near the source; one just downgradient from the
14 plume; and one between the plume and the bay.

15 The cross-section of the plume shown
16 here is of PCE, TCE and DCE concentrations of a
17 hundred parts per billion. So the PCE is shown in
18 red, and you see it in the shallow ground water
19 near the source, and it migrates downward and
20 downgradient. It degrades into TCE, which is

1 shown in orange, and as it continues, it migrates
2 downwards and downgrades into DCE.

3 (Showing slide.)

4 Another thing I wanted to point out on
5 the cross-section of the plume is that the DCE
6 plume is the most extensive, so that the figures
7 that I am going to show you next are for the DCE
8 plume.

9 (Showing slide.)

10 This is the PCE plume in the shallow
11 groundwater zone, which is 3.5 to 13.5 below
12 ground surface, and the concentrations are
13 color-coded again, high concentrations up to a
14 thousand parts per billion are located in here
15 (indicating). The source is the dry cleaning
16 facility which is right here.

17 And then if you go downgradient, the
18 concentrations decreased to 500 parts per billion
19 and it decreases down to a hundred parts per
20 billion.

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

(Showing slide.)

This is the concentration map for the intermediate groundwater zone which is 16.5 to 28 feet below ground surface. Again, it shows the sampling. The plume is more expansive in the intermediate groundwater zone, it migrates farther downgradient, the highest concentrations are near the source, and then it decreases as you go down the gradient.

(Showing slide.)

And finally, this is the concentration map for the DCE groundwater zone, which is approximately 36 to 48 feet below the ground surface, and localized contamination in this groundwater zone in near the source. The reason for this is the subsurface geology, approximately at 30 feet below the ground surface there is a thin clay layer, so what is happening is clays are somewhat impermeable and they tend to inhibit contaminant migration, so you're getting lower

1 concentrations in the deep groundwater zone.

2 In the shallower and the intermediate
3 groundwater zone, this is where you have the
4 artificial fill, so the contaminant can migrate
5 easier through the sand material.

6 Once we have defined the extent of
7 contamination sites, we are not in the process of
8 doing data evaluation, assessing the human health
9 risk assessment and the ecological risk
10 assessment.

11 For the human health risk assessment,
12 we are not analyzing the groundwater that way, it
13 is not a potential beneficial use for draining
14 water, but we are, however, evaluating soil
15 pathway for ingestion and also the volatilization
16 of solvents from groundwater, both soil and air.

17 For the ecological risk assessment,
18 what we have done so far is screen the groundwater
19 concentrations against the ambient water quality
20 criteria. The ambient water quality criteria were

1 established by the EPA, and their screening
2 criteria is based on risk to ecological receptors.

3 So for the primary contaminants that
4 we have, PCE, the ambient water quality criteria
5 is 450 parts per billion.

6 For PCE, it is 2,000 parts per
7 billion. And for DCE, it is 224,000 parts per
8 billion.

9 At Site 24, there was only one
10 exceedence of the ambient water quality criteria
11 per PCE in the shallow groundwater zone, and that
12 was at Well 24-MW07A in the shallow groundwater
13 zone, which is the other dry cleaning facility,
14 and that has concentrations of 740 parts per
15 billion.

16 The next step in the ecological risk
17 assessment is to do fate and transport modeling of
18 the contaminants in groundwater to see what their
19 impact might be on the bay.

20 And that's where we are at right now.

1 MR. VAN WYE: I would like to propose
2 that we just have a general discussion, so we
3 don't have ten people asking the same question.
4 It might be more helpful to have a colloquy,
5 members of the audience might wish to submit
6 questions, but I think the people on the committee
7 would fare better.

8 I do have a question and that is,
9 first of all, I think this is a wonderfully clear
10 explanation and I want to thank everybody for
11 putting this together. I have learned more in the
12 last half hour, I think, than I have learned in a
13 lot of other meetings that I have gone to in my
14 lifetime.

15 My sense is from what you're telling
16 us that the dry cleaning facility, using chemicals
17 which were not appreciated in those days as being
18 terribly harmful, it seems here this is the kind
19 of good news -- maybe I'm missing something -- but
20 it seems this probably would be a real great

1 source of contamination or one of the more major
2 sources of contamination on Treasure Island, and
3 yet it seems there is not much of a human health
4 potential and the ecological potential advantages
5 appears to be relatively minor.

6 Now, am I missing something?

7 MS. TOBIAS: You read our minds.

8 MR. BIGELOW: I would say that is a
9 fair assessment. Again, we still have to look at
10 the long-term migration of the plume and its
11 potential impact on the bay. That would be the
12 primary pathway.

13 MR. VAN WYE: In a sense, what I am
14 seeing here, this looks like an area that may well
15 be developed for sports fields, that they want to
16 play soccer on, and the City would be renting out
17 sport fields for teams.

18 Do I sense that you could play soccer
19 for a thousand years here before you would ever
20 start having a health problem because of any

1 contamination?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That sounds like
3 kind of a hypothetical question.

4 MR. VAN WYE: I don't want to put you
5 on the spot, but consider yourself on the spot.
6 If you can answer that -- if you can answer, say
7 it, I won't badger you.

8 MS. TOBIAS: Paul said what we're
9 doing, we're going to be evaluating volatilization
10 from the soil and groundwater to the air. We are
11 going to be conducting area sampling in the next
12 couple of weeks at the site to determine if
13 anything is coming up through the soil, look at
14 the pathway.

15 Actually, the results of that won't be
16 in the RI report, it will be in the draft final RI
17 report.

18 I don't think we want to say yes or
19 no, nobody will ever be affected, but based on the
20 ingestion of soil. We don't know about that

1 volatilizization pathway.

2 MS. SIMONS: As a regulator from the
3 point of view of EPA, I think your instincts are
4 right. You can't say that there will never be a
5 problem, but in general, now that people are using
6 the site now, it is not a problem and you are
7 right, we have to look at the exposure pathway,
8 how can people be exposed? And if people are not
9 drinking the water, and that's the main way they
10 can be exposed, as long as it is not hurting
11 anybody, you can leave it there and build the
12 soccer field and it should not be a problem.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I am going to go in
14 order, but I would like to see how many people
15 have questions because we need to stay on
16 schedule.

17 MR. HANSEN: I would like to echo what
18 Harlan said. I think the presentation was superb.

19 But my real question is
20 volatilizization, providing it does not degrade the

1 air quality in an excessive way, that is a natural
2 remediation, is it not? The contaminant boils
3 off, it goes out in the atmosphere. If the
4 atmosphere does not find it offended excessively,
5 then it's okay and pretty soon you are rid of it.

6 So that is a form of natural
7 remediation, the contamination boils off.

8 That is good news, I think, and I
9 agree with Harlan, it is not a big problem.

10 The other thing, it is not a very big
11 plume and if you figure a dump truck will carry
12 ten cubic yards, all you have got to do is to get
13 a frame of 200 dump trucks and you can carry that
14 stuff away.

15 It seems to me that the cleanup
16 process in the worst case is merely hauling away
17 200 dump truck loads, but if the ferries are going
18 to come out here all the time, we might as well
19 put it on the barge and the transport is less
20 expensive.

1 MR. BIGELOW: Excavation of soil is
2 not really a problem because we don't really have
3 the contamination of the soil that is in the
4 ground water. And you would not excavate
5 saturated soil. There are feasibility problems
6 and cost problems with that.

7 Generally, what they do for solvent
8 plumes is they do some form of barging to promote
9 the volatilization, and that would go into the
10 soil and they would sometimes do some extraction
11 of the vapors from the soil.

12 MR. ONGERTH: When was the dry
13 cleaning operation stopped?

14 MS. TOBIAS: I think in the late
15 sixties.

16 MR. ONGERTH: Twenty-five years ago.

17 MR. WONG: Are there two parts to
18 this, maybe there is not a human health risk here
19 because of the pathways or whatever. But is there
20 not the ecological risk site?

1 MR. BIGELOW: That is what we have not
2 finished evaluating.

3 MR. WONG: You have soccer fields, you
4 do have heavy watering. What would people
5 predict, more than rain, if you will, a good
6 soccer field, they water it probably every day,
7 roll it and do stuff like that every day.

8 What is the experience that would
9 happen to that type of stuff, would it force it
10 into the bay? Would the plume move?

11 MR. BIGELOW: It would have two
12 effects, you would also be diluting it more, but
13 you would probably increase the groundwater
14 gradient, which would increase the groundwater
15 flow.

16 The best thing to analyze a scenario
17 like that would be to put the scenario in the fate
18 and transport model.

19 Typically, you would just use
20 precipitation.

1 MR. WONG: Is the part of what the
2 ultimate end use is, you have to look at that
3 because it is not a matter of precipitation if it
4 is going to be all soccer field.

5 MS. TOBIAS: I disagree, speaking for
6 interpretation, what the City has been saying, we
7 may show things in certain locations, things can
8 move. The soccer field that might be shown at
9 this particular site might move 300 yards away and
10 that might become part of the theme park, and a
11 theme park would more likely be paved.

12 So that's why we would more likely
13 look at this part of maybe 50 percent of it is
14 paved, 50 percent is not.

15 MS. VEDAGIRI: On the equal risk
16 assessment, I wondered why you were comparing
17 these values against acute instead of chronic in
18 the aquatic criteria.

19 I wondered what the distance is from
20 the site to the shore or where the bay is.

1 MR. BIGELOW: I have to scale it out
2 for you. The closest well is 400 feet from the
3 bay, and as far as the ambient water quality
4 criteria, we are using ambient water quality
5 criteria, I believe, for PCE. They have
6 established chronic criteria for PCE, they have
7 not established chronic criteria for DCE and DCT.
8 That is why we use these criteria, because there
9 is not a chronic criteria.

10 MS. VEDAGIRI: Or there is a chronic
11 value, does it exceed it?

12 MR. BIGELOW: Yes, at the well closest
13 to the dry cleaning facility, I believe 740 parts
14 per billion, and I believe the criteria for PCE is
15 450.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We went over this
17 as kind of a representative site. We don't want
18 to prematurely judge the site, that's what we're
19 doing when we complete the remedial investigation
20 and move into the feasibility study.

1 MR. BIGELOW: I want to emphasize that
2 was just an initial screening with the ambient
3 water quality criteria. We have not finished the
4 full assessment, I'll just give you an idea of the
5 magnitude.

6 MR. WONG: To kind of get away from
7 Site 24 and the RI process. The outline you gave
8 us on the first page, the third box there, is that
9 essentially the table of contents for the report?
10 Is that the way this report kind of flows? Is
11 that what we can expect?

12 MR. ANDERSON: I think generally it
13 is. The way the report is organized, there is a
14 few chapters up front with kind of general
15 information that applies to the whole base,
16 Treasure Island, both TI and YBI lanes, and then
17 the report goes into site-specific discussion, and
18 it does basically flow the same way.

19 There is a few more pieces up front,
20 there is a site history. It talks about the

1 objectives of the RI; it talks about the geology
2 and hydrogeology of the site. Then it talks about
3 the analytical results, what the laboratory said
4 was detected.

5 Then there is the section on the human
6 health risk assessment, a section on the
7 ecological risk assessment, a section on the
8 nature and extent, so basically from there on it
9 is just like this.

10 MR. WONG: Is there supporting data
11 for the conclusions in there as part of the
12 document?

13 MR. ANDERSON: Well, there is quite a
14 bit of supporting data. There are tables of
15 analytical data as well as figures with both data
16 as well as plume maps on them. Those are all kind
17 of included with the chapters, and there are
18 appendices with additional information.

19 So there is quite a bit of
20 information. It is difficult to organize so much

1 information, but you hopefully will wade through
2 it.

3 MR. WONG: A couple of quick ones. Am
4 I right there is a formal comment period with
5 this; is this considered a deliverable document?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is. As a major
7 document, it has a 60-day comment period, so we
8 will be closing the comment period two months,
9 basically toward the end of October.

10 MR. WONG: My last one, am I right,
11 these are site specific or for the whole base? Is
12 this for the whole naval station or is it just
13 site specific?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It includes all of
15 the IR sites that are in the program and it will
16 be site by site, basically section by section.

17 MR. WONG: Including Yerba Buena
18 Island?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Including any of
20 the IR sites from Yerba Buena Island.

1 The only thing there that you may have
2 seen in the previous RI reports are the sites we
3 moved out of the CERCLA process into the UST
4 process.

5 MR. HANSEN: Refresh our memory about
6 how many IR sites there are.

7 MS. TOBIAS: Fifteen sites.

8 MR. VAN WYE: Will one of the sites be
9 the skeet range offshore?

10 MS. TOBIAS: It will be.

11 MS. GLASS: I have two parts to the
12 question: Is there sort of a home for hierarchy
13 among these various compounds, and are you going
14 to include that in the report, a discussion?

15 MS. TOBIAS: Part of the problem at
16 this site is the risk for human health and
17 ecological are very different. I think the human
18 health, the risk driver there will be vinyl
19 chloride at that particular site.

20 MR. ANDERSON: It depends actually

1 both on the toxicity and how much you found. If
2 you find a little bit of a very toxic compound, it
3 may be equal to a lot of light toxic.

4 MR. VAN WYE: You have made reference
5 to three different chemicals, and I don't have
6 them, PCE, TCE, DCE, and vinyl chloride. Will the
7 report indicate, so a member of the public who
8 might be reading this report would be able to
9 understand what is TCE, for instance, and why is
10 it harmful or in what manner is it harmful?

11 Could one pour TCE over one's hand and
12 your hand would all of a sudden rot and fall off?
13 Why are these chemicals harmful? That may seem
14 like a simple question, but it is a bottom line
15 question.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. As part of the
17 risk assessment, one of the things they do is what
18 is called a toxicity profile of each chemical that
19 is found, and that does include some of the
20 harmful effects, whether it is cancer causing.

1 Some of them are detailed as to what
2 organs they affect, and things like that.

3 It is fairly technical information in
4 general, so I don't know how --

5 MR. VAN WYE: I think it might be
6 helpful, because a lot of people are going to read
7 this, including us, of course, to know why we
8 should be concerned if there is TCE in the ground
9 or in the water.

10 What would it do to me if I came into
11 contact with it? Because if it is not going to
12 hurt me, what do I care.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think some of
14 the questions that you are asking, this one in
15 particular, some of the things we would be able to
16 address either in further presentations or
17 possibly in some special workshop.

18 One of the things we will have to work
19 out is what types of meetings we're going to need
20 to have during the review period of this document,

1 so we can go into issues like this.

2 MR. HANSEN: We need not be obscure,
3 add another page to the report and go to any
4 standard toxicological textbook, and take out
5 three or four sentences to describe each of the
6 compounds. There is nothing mysterious about it.

7 MR. ANDERSON: I think the comment is
8 good. We will definitely think about even kind of
9 simplifying the information that is already there
10 through a table or something that is more easily
11 understandable.

12 MR. NEDELL: Are any of these
13 household products that we might have found as
14 cleaning solvents or whatever, in the old days?

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Energine, spot
16 remover is TCE, a household product. You can pick
17 it up at the supermarket.

18 MR. KAO: I have a comment more for
19 process.

20 On one of your slides, the conclusion

1 and recommendation there are three things, no
2 action, removal action, and continued site
3 remediation in the feasibility study.

4 If you found the risk was in the
5 acceptable risk range, then no action would lead
6 to a no-action RAB. 1

7 The one I wanted to point out is
8 removal action really is not a gateway for the
9 investigation of the two remedial action plans. A
10 removal action within the definition of NCP is
11 intended for an interim source removal. So if you
12 find contamination outside of anything of no
13 action, you would still have to go through a
14 feasibility site study, even if it took removal
15 action in the interim to remediate some or a major
16 problem.

17 MR. BIGELOW: Within the NCP, a
18 removal action can be a final action.

19 MR. KAO: No.

20 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, it can. If it is

1 designed as a final action, it can be the final
2 action.

3 MR. KAO: It can be final but you need
4 to have a remedial action plan to address that.

5 MS. TOBIAS: Right, that's correct.

6 MR. KAO: The reason this removal
7 action got taken out of this whole process is that
8 removal action is for people who don't know,
9 removal action really gives the Navy a lead role,
10 it does not require a whole lot of public
11 participation. The decision can be made within
12 the Navy to take a removal action. It does not
13 have to go through feasibility study and public
14 participation process, as opposed to all the other
15 prophecies, RI's, FS, the RAB will definitely have
16 a public participation comment period and people
17 can make comment on it.

18 That's why I say removal action does
19 not lead from the investigation to a final
20 decision.

1 MR. BIGELOW: A removal action, you
2 can do either a remedial action plan or an
3 engineering evaluation cost analysis, and they are
4 basically streamline. And at the completion of
5 those, there is public participation and a comment
6 period, and then it goes into an action
7 memorandum.

8 I am not sure what the State
9 terminology is. It can be a final action and does
10 have public participation and it does have
11 streamline feasibility study.

12 MR. KAO: I guess we have different
13 definitions. In reality, yes, that could be a
14 final action, but that decision still has to go to
15 a RAB.

16 MR. BIGELOW: I don't want the RAB to
17 be misled, there is public participation in a
18 removal action, there is a public comment period,
19 review period, and there is a response period, and
20 there is eventually a RAB or ROD action

1 memorandum.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It seems to me we
3 have raised some issues we can discuss either in a
4 subcommittee meeting or in the ROD, at the removal
5 action process. And just what bad players there
6 may be that were observed on the bay on the IR
7 sites, during the Phase II work, we need some
8 discussion and dialog information about what those
9 are, so we can review the RI in combination with
10 the remedial investigation.

11 I think we're getting a little bit off
12 schedule here and we have not yet approved the
13 agenda.

14 There are some administrative items
15 that we would like to go back and address. I
16 would suggest that if you have any other questions
17 or comments on the presentation, to write them
18 down on the cards that you have in front of you
19 and give them to Jim or I, and we will be sure
20 that those are addressed for you.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you for the
2 presentation.

3 We will move back to the meeting
4 minutes. The May meeting minutes, there was a
5 page omitted, I got it and apparently other people
6 didn't, so we sent out a copy of the missing page
7 four, and if there are any comments regarding the
8 May meeting minutes, otherwise we will move to
9 approve those.

10 MR. ONGERTH: I so move.

11 MR. HANSEN: Second.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any opposed? It
13 is carried.

14 Okay. We have approved the May
15 minutes.

16 Now the June minutes. I have
17 additional copies of the June minutes on the back
18 table if anyone would like them, otherwise are
19 there any comments concerning the June 25 meeting
20 minutes?

1 MR. VAN WYE: I appreciated the
2 completeness of the meeting minutes. I thought
3 they were very well done.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think it is a
5 great partnership between our reporter and PRC.

6 MR. VAN WYE: I move their approval.

7 MR. HANSEN: Second.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no
9 other discussion, we will consider the June
10 meeting minutes approved.

11 Next, we will move into the program
12 update. We had a short BRAC clean up team and
13 remedial clean up miniature meeting the 2nd of
14 July. We discussed the background levels of
15 elements in the soils and also the air sampling
16 project that was started. The minutes for that
17 meeting are still being completed, so you will be
18 seeing the minutes of that meeting in the next
19 couple of weeks.

20 Then the Citizens Reuse Committee, I

1 will jump back to that when Laurie returns.

2 I think we can just move into
3 organizational business while we are waiting for
4 Laurie.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The meeting format
6 again is on the list here. We used our index
7 cards last meeting and this meeting and we're
8 trying to balance spontaneity and dialog with our
9 responsibility, so that the reporter can take good
10 minutes and that everybody's questions can be
11 answered.

12 We have experimented a little bit
13 tonight. Was that comfortable for everybody?
14 There is a little different mix of people here
15 than there were at the June meeting.

16 MR. VAN WYE: I have a really strong
17 preference for just open dialog. I think it is
18 better for a deliberative body such as we are, and
19 we have an experienced court reporter, I think,
20 that does not seem to be a problem.

1 I think the problem, and for members
2 of the public that might want to submit questions
3 by way of notes, that would be entirely
4 appropriate, but the people who are on the board,
5 I think the value of dialog to be able to get a
6 sense of what is puzzling one of your colleagues
7 may engender questions.

8 If you are just writing things down,
9 it is kind of an artificial construct. So I would
10 hope in the future we go to a dialog thing,
11 although if somebody felt compelled to write a
12 question, I am sure that could be entertained.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It poses some
14 difficulties for us because, particularly for
15 questions that are highly technical, we may need a
16 little bit of time to respond. So some of these
17 questions just can't be answered right back, and
18 having the comment card enabled us to look at the
19 question, discuss it among ourselves, and maybe
20 provide then a better answer than we would if we

1 had to try to respond on the spot.

2 I am still of the opinion that we try
3 to reach this happy mix, but in terms of the more
4 detailed, technical questions, I think we are
5 going to need some method of having a little bit
6 of time to look at it and respond, otherwise we
7 have the situation that we had some months ago
8 where we tried to give a quick answer but it is
9 just not sufficient.

10 MR. VAN WYE: The simple answer to
11 that is that the responder would say, "That is a
12 kind of a technical question. Would you write it
13 out so I have a little time to consider it."

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would agree with
15 that. I think that's the kind of mix we need to
16 develop.

17 MS. SIMONS: With these cards, a lot
18 of times I felt that we got questions from some
19 people who normally, when there is a group, did
20 not ask questions. And it seemed like some people

1 who might not ask questions verbally wrote
2 questions down, and that was kind of nice.

3 If you want to write questions on the
4 card, people should be able to do that as well.

5 MR. VAN WYE: Absolutely, I have no
6 problem with writing questions on the card, I
7 think that's fine.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We need to develop
9 some kind of order to get those answered in the
10 same manner as the dialog. I don't know that
11 there is any real right way to do it, but I think
12 we do have a commitment to getting everybody's
13 questions addressed and moving along on the
14 meeting agenda so that we are out of here at a
15 reasonable time.

16 MR. THOMPSON: I think one of the
17 really salutary effects of the cards is that kind
18 of a variety of questions were answered, well and
19 quickly, as opposed to spending 15 or 20 minutes
20 going over the same question.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right. We
2 experimented also a little bit with the breaks
3 tonight so that people who wanted the dialog could
4 come up and meet with the presenter, and that
5 seemed to make those people happy as well. So
6 there is a mix here that we can use. There are
7 all sorts of ways to address things.

8 MR. NEDELL: I tend to underscore
9 Harlan's comments, though. I think it needs to be
10 discussed orally and the timekeeping element can
11 be enforced by keeping responses short and keeping
12 questions to the point, which is partly yours and
13 Jim's responsibility.

14 If others want to submit a question in
15 writing, there is no problem with that. There is
16 other bodies that do that, generally large
17 audiences.

18 But I think that writing a question
19 leaves room for a misunderstanding what the nature
20 of the question is, and not giving the answer that

1 is to the question you really want to have
2 answered.

3 To me, the purpose of this committee,
4 this group is to sit there and ask questions so
5 that we can satisfy ourselves that the work is
6 proceeding in the manner that is to our interest.

7 MR. HEHN: I think one of the things
8 that we talked about at the interim meeting, in
9 order to solve both those questions or processes,
10 there would have to be a program where we can turn
11 in the question on a written form, a written
12 question, but if this is a question of follow up,
13 certainly follow up verbally, say, "I don't
14 understand that, let me try to get a different
15 answer on that," and also have some time available
16 during that response period to have the questions
17 or something that you thought of that was maybe
18 based on the question that somebody else has
19 written down.

20 I think there is room for both of

1 these. It did work pretty well in trying to get
2 those written questions and trying to consolidate
3 some of those responses. I think that worked
4 quite well.

5 We need to have a verbal period where
6 we can ask follow-up questions or other questions.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Are people happy
8 with kind of mixing it up?

9 MEMBERS: Yes.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We will do our best.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will try this
12 course and make adjustments as we go. It appears
13 we will be able to strike a balance.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We also had other
15 business here: Process for Review of Remedial
16 Investigation Report. We're trying to develop
17 subsequent meetings so that we can all fully
18 understand the remedial investigation and want to
19 begin thinking of how we blend that with the use
20 plans.

1 Comments are due within 60 days of the
2 report being issued in August. And the tentative
3 schedule was to have it go 60 days between the two
4 RAB meetings, which would leave us two weeks in
5 the beginning of October, where we may want to
6 have a workshop and an interim meeting, so that we
7 can refine and develop out comments on the RI.

8 I know that I wanted to bring that up
9 for discussion and also get some feedback tonight.

10 We got the introduction to the RI
11 report. We also have opportunities in August and
12 September to have these workshops. I would like
13 some discussion on what people think they would
14 like. Obviously, October is going to be critical,
15 because we need to produce our comments.

16 MR. HEHN: Is everybody planning on
17 reviewing the Phase IIB RI report, or would
18 certain people like to make comments on certain
19 sections of it, the risk assessment portions or
20 the work portions or anything else.

1 We can divide that up essentially so
2 that everybody does not have to do everything.
3 That is going to be a very substantial report.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To clarify, as we
5 have been doing, we are inviting community members
6 to review the report, if they so desire, and we
7 put a sign-up sheet in the back, and I will
8 continue to solicit in our mailings anyone who
9 would like to have a copy. But it will be about
10 this big -- probably about three binders worth, so
11 we understand not everyone is able to review it.
12 But we do invite you if you would like to sign up
13 to receive a copy.

14 MR. VAN WYE: The members of the RAB
15 have to sign up to receive a copy or is that for
16 members of the public?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, it is for
18 members of the RAB. Basically, what we have been
19 doing other than a few documents like the BRAC
20 clean up plan, which we provide automatically to

1 everyone, we give people the opportunity, everyone
2 may not want to review every document, or some
3 people will have interests in one document and not
4 another.

5 Generally, that seems to be working.

6 MR. VAN WYE: Will there be an
7 executive summary to this document?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, there will be
9 a fairly substantial executive summary, 10 to 20
10 pages.

11 MR. VAN WYE: I would hope, I would
12 think all the members of the Base Restoration
13 Advisory Board would get a copy, executive
14 summary.

15 MR. GALANG: Yes, executive summary
16 goes to all the members and the sign-up sheet is
17 for the members for the whole report.

18 MR. HANSEN: Only two people so far
19 have signed up for this whole ball of wax.

20 MR. NEDELL: Is there going to be a

1 location where we can come and view it and read
2 the parts we're interested in?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will have
4 copies in our library at TI. There will also be a
5 copy at the San Francisco Public Library. Since
6 they moved into their new quarters, I have not
7 seen how they handle the documents. I think you
8 have to ask for it and you can get it behind the
9 counter.

10 But we can make documents available if
11 someone wants to take it briefly and give it back
12 to us, that's fine, too. Whatever it takes to
13 provide you with a copy of the document, either
14 permanently or on a short-term basis, and we will
15 have a copy available at any of our interim
16 meetings. Any time we have a meeting, we will
17 have copies of the document available.

18 MR. WONG: There is a 60-day public
19 comment period. The clock starts on August 22nd
20 or whenever it gets issued.

1 I don't know who is the public. Part
2 of our charge as a RAB is to insure there is good
3 public participation, knowledge that this stuff is
4 happening.

5 If I understand things correctly,
6 community members, now is the time between now and
7 August, maybe our August meeting, to figure out a
8 publicity plan, so that people in the Bay Area
9 know this is coming up.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I need
11 to get some clarification on that.

12 All of our documents are reviewed by
13 the RAB, but there are certain documents under
14 CERCLA that require general public review.

15 MS. TOBIAS: This RI is not going out
16 for public comments, it is for regulatory review.
17 Members of the RAB have an opportunity to review
18 the document.

19 What goes to the public for review,
20 and correct me if I am wrong, is a proposed plan.

1 When we get to the point where we are making a
2 recommendation or the Navy makes a recommendation
3 on how to clean up a site, the RI, Remedial
4 Investigation Report and feasibility studies are
5 available for public review, and they provide
6 public comments on that proposed plan.

7 But the RIFS is not out for public
8 comment, except you make comments on the proposed
9 approaches.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: So this is regulatory
11 review, this is not a public comment period?

12 MS. TOBIAS: That is correct.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: Which means there is a
14 whole different set of criteria and rules and all
15 of that that kicks in there, that is what I need
16 clarification on.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, this
18 document is being reviewed the same way that we
19 have previously been reviewing documents. We have
20 not yet gotten to the point in the process where

1 there is a formal general review and comment
2 period.

3 MR. HEHN: Let me ask a quick question
4 on review, based on the RI report.

5 For those that may not want to plow
6 through the whole report but ask questions and
7 have interest in perhaps more information at these
8 meetings, is it possible to include those
9 questions that are asked at this meeting and get
10 the response as a paragraph, so those comments are
11 captured as well, rather than have a formal
12 response document that the RAB produce, so we can
13 recapture both pieces?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are basically
15 capturing all of the questions, whether they come
16 in a meeting or in an official technical
17 committee.

18 MS. SIMONS: Maybe we can designate
19 one specific meeting for people to ask questions
20 that don't feel like going through the whole

1 report.

2 MR. HEHN: We are starting the
3 process, the questions that are being brought up
4 now should be part of that process because you're
5 asking questions we want to know and need
6 clarification on or not clear on or whatever.

7 MS. SIMONS: Aren't they recorded in
8 the minutes? As you ask when we respond. If
9 there needs to be more than that, we can give you
10 what you need, then you can take it and come back.

11 MR. HEHN: I need to pull it out of
12 the minutes to include in that sort of comments.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I see what you're
14 saying. That is something we can think about.

15 MR. WONG: I am looking under the
16 August thing here. It says "Remedial
17 Investigation Report Discussion."

18 I would just like to make a general
19 comment that to a certain extent I feel like I may
20 have gotten that today now that I understand a

1 little bit more of what the process is.

2 I would like to make a plug that what
3 would be helpful instead of wandering through the
4 thing is if there is some way to summarize what
5 the significant findings were, and I am sure there
6 are thousands of them, some sort of subjective
7 process has to go into it, but that would be
8 helpful.

9 The people there said four volumes
10 four inches thick, so it would be helpful to get
11 what are the significant conclusions, I guess, or
12 whatever that have been made, and maybe that would
13 help us jump off in a discussion on "How did you
14 come to that?" and kind of explore how those
15 conclusions were drawn.

16 From my end, it would be helpful,
17 rather than giving an overview.

18 MR. GALANG: I think the executive
19 summary will give you more information, and then
20 you can deal with the details.

1 MR. WONG: It is due out on August
2 22nd, which means we will get it the Monday before
3 the RAB meeting that following Tuesday, so it
4 would be helpful if we all had that as the
5 presentation can walk us through the executive
6 summary and make sure to highlight what the
7 important conclusions are, so that when we take it
8 from there, we can see what is important from your
9 end.

10 MS. SIMONS: I think that that is what
11 you are planning on.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are generally
13 thinking of where this was kind of a preview, next
14 month will be, "Okay, we have the report done.
15 Here is what it says."

16 MR. WONG: Okay, great.

17 MR. HANSEN: I agree with what Harlan
18 says about an executive summary, but I need to
19 bring up what I said at a previous meeting, that
20 most scientific papers, instead of just a review

1 of all the data, most scientific papers published
2 in the scientific literature, the author is
3 required to give an abstract.

4 If you can't give an abstract in five
5 sentences, it will never get published in a
6 scientific journal.

7 So the executive summary is nice, but
8 20 pages is still pretty formidable, and the
9 subject matter is not all this complicated. We
10 are not dealing with astrophysics here, so each
11 time the report comes up, the summary of this
12 report should be presentable in one page or less.
13 That's the way most businesses are run.

14 If you can't say it in one page, don't
15 bring me your problem. I am sure that's what they
16 do at PG & E; right?

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Among other
18 organizations.

19 MR. HANSEN: That's always a good
20 goal. If you got something to say, put it down in

1 one page, and give me plenty of appendices, give
2 all the data and resources, give me a lot of
3 background, but tell me what the thrust is in one
4 page, or you won't get my attention.

5 I think we're all busy and have other
6 things to do.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we can
8 certainly look at balancing the size of any
9 summaries we produce versus the amount of detail.

10 MS. GLASS: Maybe have an abstract and
11 then have an executive summary. But once you have
12 done an executive summary, it is a whole lot
13 easier to do an abstract.

14 MR. HANSEN: The data can be the
15 appendix, can't throw the data away, but we don't
16 have to wait for the data to get the essence of
17 the report.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. What I
19 would like to suggest is that at the next interim
20 meeting a schedule be roughed together what

1 outside meetings other than the September and
2 October meetings are needed. I think it is
3 probably more difficult to do that right here, but
4 I think over the course of the next couple of
5 weeks, at the next interim meeting come up with a
6 draft schedule for outside meetings.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think that is a
8 good goal.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That segues into
10 the next section, basically the upcoming reports.

11 Today was the closure of the
12 Firefighting School comments, and it was discussed
13 at the last interim meeting, and I received
14 comments there. Basically, the comments were
15 primarily clarifications and editorial, and
16 neither the community members nor the regulators
17 had any comments on the Firefighting School FOSL
18 that would cause us to make significant changes,
19 so we expect that document to be completed
20 shortly.

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

The Draft Interim Groundwater

Monitoring Plan is out. It was mailed out to several people. Comments on that are due the 13th of August.

Also the Draft Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment Draft Final Quality Assurance Project Plan, both of these documents are out on the table. I put a little tag on them, "Navy copy," but if you would like them in addition to the people who already receive them, we can provide them.

But they are minor documents, so we only have a 30-day comment period, which will end up on the 13th of August.

Lastly, the draft RI. The reason I mention the 13th of August is that leads us to the discussion of the date for next interim meeting, and the choice is basically as to whether to have an interim meeting on the 13th, but then we would need to get the comments right away on these two

1 documents or whether to have it the week before,
2 which would be a little earlier than we normally
3 have it, but have it on the 6th and allow time to
4 have comments received after that meeting.

5 I think we used that scenario a couple
6 of times, where it has taken a couple of days to a
7 week to receive comments after the interim
8 meeting. So that's why I would suggest having the
9 interim meeting on the 6th of August, if these
10 documents are going to be discussed.

11 MR. HEHN: Don't you think there
12 should be some discussion on the Interim
13 Groundwater Monitoring Plan and reviewing the
14 Ecological Risk Assessment? If somebody wanted to
15 respond to that, that would be great.

16 I also might be unavailable on the
17 13th, so if we are able to get that on the 6th,
18 I'm happy to do that.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it would appear
20 that the 6th of August date may work pretty well.

1 Unless there are any other comments, I
2 will leave it here as indicated that the interim
3 meeting will be on the 6th of August.

4 Another agenda item will be the
5 discussion of when to have other meetings related
6 to the remedial investigation.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: May I have a show of
8 hands, anybody reviewing the Ecological Risk
9 Assessment? I think Dale was planning on
10 reviewing that as well.

11 (Show of hands.)

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What we did, we
13 sent out cover letters to everyone and then
14 indicated who had received the document, so if
15 anyone who didn't receive the document would still
16 like one, please let me know and there are sample
17 copies out on the back table for anyone who would
18 like to look at it before they leave.

19 MR. GALANG: There is a companion
20 document for the work plan, and I sent it to the

1 same people that received this other work plan,
2 the Ecological.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Agenda items for
4 the next meeting for August. As we discussed, we
5 will have the continued report on the remedial
6 investigation.

7 We will also have a firm budget and
8 project list. The list that the RAB members
9 reviewed back in May, we're still massaging that a
10 little bit. It still looks like our funding is
11 holding and we should be receiving on the order of
12 ten and a half million dollars for clean up next
13 year. We will have a pretty well finalized list
14 by the time of the next meeting that we can share
15 with you.

16 Then a question had come up about
17 NEPA/CEQA process, and since we now have the Reuse
18 Plan, or will have it within the next few weeks,
19 we will be firming up our plans for the EIS/EIR,
20 and we will provide a brief discussion on that.

1 In general, it looks like the first
2 public scoping period for the Reuse Plan will
3 probably be in September.

4 And then in September we continue
5 discussion on Remedial Investigation Report and I
6 would like to suggest that we have a presentation
7 on corrective action plans, since those sites that
8 moved out of the CERCLA program will now move into
9 the UST program and will have corrective action
10 plan.

11 Any comments or proposals concerning
12 either the August or September agenda?

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Jim, I just have a
14 comment.

15 A while ago I think we got the
16 schedules on this happening in the next year or
17 two. It might be nicer to refocus where the Reuse
18 and the RAB process come together, and anyone with
19 these discussions, so that we have an idea of what
20 we will be doing in these next six months.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Kind of a big
2 picture presentation.

3 MR. VAN WYE: That's an excellent
4 suggestion.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. With that,
6 unless there is any open discussions, I think we
7 can bring the meeting to a close, unless there is
8 any other -- I'm sorry, Laurie can provide an
9 update on the CRC.

10 MS. GLASS: I just wanted to say that
11 the CRC has not met this month, does not intend to
12 meet formally. I guess there is going to be some
13 kind of gathering but it is not going to be a
14 meeting.

15 So this next Citizens Reuse Committee
16 Notice for Friday is not going to occur.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

18 MS. GLASS: The next meeting has not
19 been scheduled. I am not sure when it will occur.

20 Citizens Reuse Committee members

1 continue to have appeared at all these meetings
2 that have been going on with the Board of
3 Supervisors and so on, so they are continuing to
4 act on behalf of the Plan, and as indicated in the
5 report, so I imagine they will continue to be
6 around. But you will be notified of anything by
7 advance agenda of any upcoming meetings.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Then we expect to
9 see the Reuse Plan in about a week or so.

10 MS. GLASS: The revised version, my
11 understanding, is being put together and it should
12 be out.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And Laurie and I
14 will work out how we distribute it, whatever works
15 best.

16 MS. GLASS: It probably makes sense
17 for everybody on the RAB to get a copy.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The intent is for
19 every RAB community member and the regulators to
20 get a copy of the draft, but it is the draft that

1 will be moving into the EIS/EIR process. We did
2 make the 3 June earlier draft available to those
3 members who had wanted it, but with the
4 understanding that it was probably going to have
5 some changes.

6 We will have a copy of that, so we
7 will probably see that over the next month.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you, Laurie.

9 If there are not any other comments,
10 we will bring the meeting to a close.

11 Thank you very much.

12 The next interim meeting will be on
13 the 6th of August at 7:00 p.m. in Building One,
14 and our next regular meeting will be on the 27th
15 of August.

16 (Whereupon the meeting adjourned at
17 9:43 p.m.)

18 ----o0o----

19
20

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

CERTIFICATE

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 28 1996

(Signature)

(Date)