

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

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

27 AUGUST 1996 CERTIFIED COPY

7:00 P.M.

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 25

---oOo---

REPORTED BY: PAUL S. SCHILLER, CSR 1268

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 U.S. NAVY:

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

6 PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

7 SHARON TOBIAS
8 BARBARA SOOTKOOS

9 REGULATORY AGENCY:

10 CHEIN KAO (DTSC)
11 GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)
12 RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)
13 MARTHA WALTERS (SFDPH)
14 SUSAN GLADSTONE (RWQCB)

15 COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

16 JOHN ALLMAN
17 CHRIS SHIRLEY (ARC ECOLOGY)
18 PAUL HEHN (ALT. COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
19 GARY JENSEN
20 CLINTON LOFTMAN
KAREN MENDELOW
RICK NEDELL
PATRICIA NELSON (COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR)
HARLAN VAN WYE (TI YACHT CLUB)
USHA VEDAGIRI
BRAD WONG

GUESTS:

MASOOD GHASSEMI

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

---o0o---

(The meeting was called to order by
Co-Chair Sullivan at 7:15 p.m.)

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our
August Restoration Advisory Board meeting. We
will go ahead and get started.

Rachel and Gina called, they are
having some car problems, so I expect them to be
with us momentarily.

Everyone should have a copy of the
agenda. There are additional copies in the back
if you need one.

The first item would be discussion
and approval of tonight's agenda. One change that
Pat and I had to make just in the last week was to
take out the Remedial Investigation Report,
because of our extension in schedule, and we will
go into that in a little more detail.

So we moved up an item concerning

1 schedule of deliverable documents that we were
2 planning to do next month to this month.

3 So the main items this month are
4 discussion of the budget and project list;
5 discussion of the schedule, and then community
6 members had asked some months ago discussion on
7 the NEPA process for Treasure Island. So those
8 were the three main items.

9 Are there any comments concerning
10 tonight's agenda?

11 With that, I will consider the agenda
12 approved.

13 Next, are there any discussions
14 concerning the July meeting minutes? If anyone
15 needs a copy of the meeting minutes, there are
16 some additional copies on the back table.

17 Are there any comments regarding the
18 July minutes?

19 Okay. There being no comments, we
20 will go ahead and approve them.

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

Next is Public Comment.

We provide a time at the beginning of each meeting for members of the general public who are not a part of the RAB to make public comments. Is there anyone who wishes to give public comments?

We will close the public comment period and now we will move into program updates.

I don't think we will have an update from the Citizens Reuse Committee, but for the BRAC Cleanup Team Meeting, the primary discussion in our BCT meeting last week concerned the extension of the Remedial Investigation Report Schedule, and we are happy to have Susan Gladstone here from the Regional Water Board to discuss one of the reasons for our decision to schedule the extension, and that was the involvement of the BTAG in the process.

SUSAN GLADSTONE: I work with Gina as a technical support on the ecological risk

1 assessment for Treasure Island, and I also sit on
2 the BTAG, which is the Biological Technical
3 Assistance Group.

4 I assume everybody has heard of that
5 before, if not, I can tell you a little bit about
6 it, who they are.

7 It is made up of a group of agencies
8 shared by US EPA and made up of all of the
9 agencies that have been involved in looking at the
10 various military facilities, NOAA, Fish and Game,
11 US Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of
12 Toxics, Regional Water Board, other human health
13 agencies within the state, and we act as advisors
14 to the various remedial project managers within
15 our agencies in terms of ecological risk
16 assessments.

17 We get together as a group to provide
18 coordination amongst the agencies when we have
19 various issues that come up.

20 But in the ultimate, we advise our

1 project managers in terms of what issues are
2 important for ecological risks.

3 The project that is being done now,
4 the toxicity reference value, is important for the
5 ecological risk assessment, because it is at that
6 point when we collected all the data that we need
7 to do a risk characterization, and the toxicity
8 reference values are being developed to look at
9 birds and mammals.

10 The Navy has developed an approach
11 for looking at a number of receptors which they
12 have in common with a number of bases in the Bay
13 Area. Some of the shorebirds, some of the
14 raptors, some of the small mammals that we see
15 almost at every site, or we know that provide
16 habitat for some of those animals, so rather than
17 to try to understand what the risk is and working
18 at it in a process site by site, the Navy has
19 decided to develop an approach where we pick
20 receptors which are common to those sites and

1 which are significant receptors we feel in terms
2 of the contaminants, and determine what the
3 exposure is for those organisms.

4 In this way, we can apply it to the
5 various sites and what the process involves is
6 actually quite lengthy, and the reason I mention
7 the BTAG is because this project is being done
8 with the cooperation of the BTAG, which is various
9 agencies and the Navy and their contractor, PTRC.

10 The process is quite involved because
11 it is a consensus process. We have a lot of
12 contaminants for the Bay Area's bases. We have
13 several receptors that we are concerned about, and
14 the literature search that is involved in that
15 process is quite intensive to determine what sort
16 of exposure for the contaminants are going to be
17 of concern.

18 Those values apply to the receptor
19 that you are talking about; for example, the Great
20 Blue Heron. It is going to apply for that

1 receptor, no matter which site it is located.

2 The specific information comes from
3 the site itself, when the sediment data or the
4 soil data has been collected, or the surface water
5 data, or any tissue data that is collected, like
6 they have done at Treasure Island.

7 Those data are put in sort of a
8 modeling equation and compared to what values we
9 see at risk to these receptors, in this case the
10 Great Blue Heron, that come from the literature.

11 We're trying to develop a range of
12 risks where we are looking at a no effect level,
13 which means that if we find that the contaminant
14 does not reach the no effect level, then we are
15 not going to be as concerned for that contaminant
16 for that receptor.

17 And we will also have an average
18 effect level or a low effect level, which means
19 that we are going to be concerned about the risks
20 of that contaminant to that receptor. That's sort

1 of in a nutshell of what is going on.

2 I did not come with anything
3 especially to prepare for that, except to sort of
4 let you know, and be available if there are
5 questions about how this process works.

6 Again, what happened, PRC has spent
7 many hours in the library looking at the
8 literature to look what is out there and trying to
9 determine what is relevant. They bring all of
10 that data to the group and we look at it as a
11 group in terms of what the literature is, the
12 value of those reports and the settings.

13 There have been a number of criteria
14 that have been set out, and we as a group in terms
15 of best professional judgment try to make some
16 determination what we think are the reasonable
17 levels, and we get consensus from every party in
18 the group or we don't proceed.

19 We don't come to agreement unless we
20 get consensus. Sometimes it takes a while to work

1 that out.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any
3 questions?

4 MS. VEDAGIRI: Clarence Callahan had
5 mentioned that the BTAG was working on sediment
6 screening values that would be specific to San
7 Francisco Bay. What is the status of that?

8 MS. GLADSTONE: Actually, the BTAG is
9 not working on sediment screening values. I don't
10 know if Clarence misspoke or he was referring to
11 something else.

12 The Navy has proposed sediment
13 screening values, or developing sediment screening
14 values the same way they have done with the TRV,
15 and they are to bring that information to the BTAG
16 and have discussions about the credibility or the
17 value of those sediment screening values.

18 At this point, BTAG has not received
19 any proposal from the Navy, has not received
20 specific numbers.

1 MS. SIMONS: I can't remember. Did
2 you explain the reason we're talking about BTAG is
3 because that is one of the reasons why we are
4 going to wait with the RI report?

5 The sediment values are important and
6 this process is going on, but since we have not
7 actually done the work for the sediment work,
8 that's not going to delay it, because it is not
9 part of the RI that is coming in in October.

10 MR. GALANG: This sediment study is
11 being prepared by the Navy and the draft will be
12 out sometime in October, it will be presented to
13 the BTAG, will be perfect for our offshore
14 ecological testing.

15 MS. GLADSTONE: I think Rachel brings
16 up a good point, that the sediment screening
17 values are a mechanism to look at what the aquatic
18 organisms are being exposed to.

19 The toxicity reference values are
20 used as you get further down the process, when you

1 got all the data and analyzed all the data, then
2 you have to make some decisions about the risk
3 characterization and the exposure to the birds and
4 mammals.

5 These are different pieces that will
6 come into play, that's the part that is holding up
7 the process is the TRV's.

8 There is another TRV meeting, we have
9 had four meetings this month, to get all of the
10 contaminants that we notice for Treasure Island to
11 address the receptors of concern.

12 There is another meeting this week
13 and we hope to have all that done by the end of
14 August.

15 MS. NELSON: It seems to me that the
16 deadline for the RI draft being released has been
17 known for a long time, and using the consensus
18 process in establishing the TRV, we can only
19 surmise that there is some issue with establishing
20 some of the values, that is the only thing that is

1 holding up the release of the draft RI report.

2 Is there some issue that BTAG has
3 been trying to address that has delayed the draft
4 document for 60 days?

5 MS. GLADSTONE: If there are other
6 reasons for the delay?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIAN: That's one of two
8 reasons. The other reason being that we needed to
9 conclude some air monitoring.

10 MS. GLADSTONE: In terms of getting
11 to your question, part of it is trying to find all
12 of the literature that we can that we think is
13 relevant for some of the contaminants.

14 We actually have some of the
15 information for the contaminants, we have been
16 working on it since July.

17 I can't say that there is anything in
18 particular that's causing a delay. It's just a
19 very long process. Each person in the group has
20 sort of taken responsibility to look at more

1 detail and some of the chemicals or some of the
2 receptors or some of the studies, and I think it
3 is a process, discussion for each chemical as we
4 go through.

5 So I can't say that there is anything
6 in particular that's holding it up. I think it's
7 just taken longer than we anticipated.

8 MS. NELSON: When did this process
9 begin?

10 MS. GLADSTONE: Well, actually the
11 process started last October with focusing on some
12 of the other sites because this is a baywide
13 effort. We're focusing on contaminants for each
14 bay, as there are RI's coming up, and the
15 ecological risk assessment is coming up. I think
16 Treasure Island was about the third site we have
17 known we would do.

18 We started working on some of the
19 contaminants beginning last October, met several
20 times last fall and winter, and then started again

1 in May.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: Will you be producing a
3 report that explains the logic of the values?

4 MS. GLADSTONE: The Navy is putting
5 together a document to describe in great detail
6 the process that we use to evaluate these numbers.

7 I don't know, I actually don't know
8 when that report will come out, but within the
9 report for Treasure Island, there should be an
10 appendix or a section or a chapter or something
11 that will describe this process.

12 We have done that. It has already
13 been done for Moffatt. If you're interested in
14 finding out what that process is before the report
15 for Treasure Island comes out, I can refer you to
16 Moffatt Ecological Risks, but I imagine it will be
17 incorporated into the report for Treasure Island.

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Would this part of
19 the original work plan, this would be part of the
20 original Phase IIB report, or was it added on as

1 an addendum report?

2 MS. TOBIAS: It was not part of Phase
3 IIB, this is the Phase II Ecological Risk
4 Assessment for all the onshore sites, so it was in
5 the Ecological Risk Assessment or plans, and it
6 was always intended to be part of the RI report.

7 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Okay.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very
9 much.

10 MS. GLADSTONE: My phone number is on
11 the signup sheet. If anybody has any questions,
12 you are welcome to give me a call any time and I
13 can talk to you more about it.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Chris, since you
15 were at the BRAC cleanup team, is there anything
16 you want to add as a community member?

17 MS. SHIRLEY: No. Are you going to
18 discuss the schedule anymore, the pushback of the
19 schedule?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Just to validate

1 that the schedule for the RI itself has been
2 extended from 22 August to 22 October.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: But have you resolved
4 the rest of it? Did it push everything else down?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We're still
6 looking how the rest of the schedule is going to
7 play out. It does not necessarily mean that
8 everything down the line moves 60 days.

9 Chris and I had a discussion looking
10 at the whole schedule and seeing how this would
11 affect it, and seeing what we can do to minimize
12 its effect.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: My questions was, maybe
14 Martha can answer this, changing the ROD date,
15 does it affect the City's planning at all?

16 MS. WALTERS: I don't know, I can't
17 answer that.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: That came up at the
19 meeting and no one had a clue. It would be nice
20 to know.

1 If it does not affect the City, then
2 maybe it's not important. But if it does, then it
3 is.

4 MS. WALTERS: Right.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the ROD date,
6 the record of decision remedial action is in
7 place, and there is still quite a bit of time
8 allowed after that for both the remedial design
9 and the remedial action.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: Right. That is a sort
11 of a threshold.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Correct.

13 Martha, not to put you on the spot
14 because I know you just got back, but is there
15 anything as far as the reuse efforts of the City
16 and the CRC? I don't think there is any news.

17 MS. WALTERS: No. The draft reuse
18 plan is available at the back table.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thanks to Martha,
20 we have a copy of the draft plan. There should be

1 a copy for everyone present tonight, and those not
2 present, we will mail out the copy.

3 While we are talking about that, what
4 we did do, what you have is the Draft Reuse Plan,
5 and then in the back is Volume I of the TIHDI
6 Homeless Provider Submission, and I felt it was a
7 short enough document to include.

8 I think it helps to go into a little
9 bit more detail what the proposals are than what
10 is in the Reuse Plan.

11 There is also a Volume II of the
12 TIHDI proposal which Hugo has one complimentary
13 copy on the back. It is about a three-inch
14 document, and basically it is appendices to
15 TIHDI's proposal, consisting of all of the minutes
16 of the Citizens Reuse Committee plus some other
17 additional appendices.

18 If anyone would like it, you can see
19 Hugo to sign up for a copy, otherwise we felt that
20 Volume I provided the basic text of their

1 proposal.

2 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Is there a comment
3 period on this, or where is this document now in
4 terms of the public?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm glad you
6 asked. Actually, it's really kind of a segue into
7 our discussion later on on NEPA and CEQA, because
8 basically what the publication of the Reuse Plan
9 allows is for the Navy and the City to start the
10 NEPA/CEQA process, that's the EIS/EIR process, and
11 there is an extensive formal commentary involved
12 in that, starting with a public scoping hearing
13 that tentatively is scheduled for -- and I have it
14 listed on the back of the agenda -- the 25th of
15 September. However, that date is not a formal
16 date yet, so it is possible that that date could
17 move into October. But that will be the first
18 formal public meeting regarding the Reuse Plan.

19 With that, I will move into action
20 items, and there is a couple of action items that

1 have been completed and I am working from the list
2 that's in the meeting minutes from last month.

3 Under "Outstanding Action Items," the
4 Navy will provide the RAB with a work plan and
5 other guidance documents concerning lead-base
6 paint analysis.

7 I have some copies in the back of
8 Title X of HUD, and Title X is our guidance
9 document for lead-base paint inspection and
10 abatement.

11 So there are copies in the back, if
12 anyone would like one, we can make those up or we
13 might want to send it out to everyone. I think it
14 is about ten pages.

15 CO-CHAIR HEHN: How much interest is
16 there in receiving that document? Do you want to
17 have a signup sheet in the back?

18 MS. NELSON: Make them available.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They are
20 available in the back with Hugo.

1 And then, next under "Outstanding
2 Action Items," the Navy will provide the RAB with
3 a description of the EIS process, and we are going
4 to go through that in tonight's meeting.

5 Under "New Action Items," the Navy
6 will provide copies of the Draft Reuse Plan, which
7 we're doing tonight.

8 Are there any other comments or
9 questions concerning action items?

10 MR. KAO: May I add a little bit on
11 the lead-base paint issue here.

12 There is extensive discussion between
13 the military and the regulatory agency on the
14 lead-base paint issue, not so much on the building
15 itself, but the lead-base paint falling on the
16 ground as a result of regular maintenance.

17 The issue there that has not been
18 resolved is that military branches, all three
19 branches, consider that part of Title X
20 regulation, and regulatory agencies are still

1 thinking that lead in the soil is a CERCLA issue,
2 and that issue right now has not been resolved.

3 We have some agreement from the
4 residential side of it, just the housing, for
5 buildings in the housing area that happen to be
6 falling in Title X and also can be addressed
7 simultaneously with the CERCLA regulation, where
8 outside of the residential area, that's where the
9 disagreement is.

10 The military branches don't think
11 that is a CERCLA-regulated issue.

12 MS. WALTER: Do you know when you're
13 going to come up with some kind of decision on
14 that?

15 MR. KAO: We're trying to resolve it
16 in a way, so we don't have a direct confrontation
17 on the jurisdiction issue.

18 We're trying to resolve it in a way
19 that we can accommodate each other on technical
20 issues, so right now there is an ad hoc group and

1 there is a CEMAC, and it is looking at that and
2 trying to develop a guidance document to address
3 that.

4 MS. WALTERS: Do you know when they
5 will come out with a final position?

6 MR. KAO: In terms of what?

7 MS. WALTERS: What their position
8 will be. I know that, for example, the way in
9 which the Army is dealing with lead in the soil in
10 non-residential areas is to go in and start
11 cleaning it up, even though it is not funded, they
12 have it on their budget list, but I don't know if
13 the Navy and the Air Force are doing the same
14 thing or not.

15 MR. KAO: No.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other
17 comments or questions?

18 With that, I will move into our next
19 item, which is a discussion of the fiscal year '97
20 budget and project list.

1 I put this together for tonight and I
2 will go over it on the overhead.

3 This represents the current iteration
4 of the process that we started some months ago,
5 looking at project lists and discussing at both
6 our regular meetings and also in our interim
7 community member meetings.

8 On the list, as we discussed before,
9 our highest is Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment
10 Offshore Sampling, which is getting on the way.
11 And the primary reason for that is it represents
12 the typical path toward completion of the entire
13 cleanup.

14 If you don't complete the offshore
15 sampling, we can't complete the ROD for the
16 offshore sites, and the sites that are affected
17 are Site 13, which represents the outfall areas
18 around both Treasure Island and Yerba Buena
19 Island, and also Site 27.

20 The skeet range in Clipper Cove, as

1 well as other parts of Clipper Cove.

2 Second is our BRAC Cleanup Update,
3 and the reason its priority is it is a primary
4 tool of communication as well as a way to sell our
5 program in Washington to obtain funding.

6 Then we have an item for Restoration
7 Advisory Board, to support the effort of these
8 meetings.

9 Number 4 is our CERCLA Records of
10 Decision, which after the two offshore sites,
11 these onshore sites represent the critical path,
12 the next critical path toward completion of the
13 entire cleanup, and those are the sites that are
14 being covered under the ROD.

15 Then there is interim groundwater
16 monitoring on the sites listed.

17 Number 6, Site Specific EBSs/FOSLs,
18 that is a particular concern of Martha and some of
19 the community members to be sure that we get
20 enough prioritization, EBSs and FOSLs to support

1 interim uses.

2 Then Number 7 is FOSTs for Screened
3 Clean Land Parcels. What this is, when we went
4 through our initial environmental baseline survey
5 and prioritized categories as 1 through 7,
6 Categories 1 and 2 represent properties that
7 either had never had any hazardous materials
8 present or, if they did, there is no known harm to
9 the environment.

10 We have a number of these properties,
11 not very many, because of the urban nature of
12 Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, but we are
13 in a position to be able to do findings of
14 suitability to transfer those properties.

15 Next is the Tiered Screening for BRAC
16 Category 3 Property. What this is, it feeds in
17 from our environmental baseline survey sampling,
18 which I will discuss in a little bit, and it takes
19 the results of our sampling and takes property
20 which is otherwise Category 7, meaning we don't

1 have to worry to make a decision on its
2 suitability, and goes through a tiered process to
3 categorize Category 3, meaning releases may have
4 occurred but there is no threat to human health
5 and to the environment.

6 Then FOSTs for Utility Systems. That
7 is going to be somewhat dependent on what utility
8 systems may essentially be transferred over the
9 next year or two.

10 Number 10, we have an item on data
11 management, which relates to our electronic
12 display of data and possibly may feed into our GIS
13 system. We are going to be developing the scope
14 of that over the next month or two.

15 Then Number 11 is a relatively new
16 item that Ernie and I worked on, and it has not
17 been scoped out yet, but basically having a
18 placeholder for taking some interim action for YBI
19 sites, should YBI become a more fast track for
20 reuse. In other words, if there is going to be a

1 fast track use of housing, which is predominantly
2 what the facilities are on Yerba Buena, we have
3 several CERCLA sites there, and what interim
4 action might be taken to allow use of the adjacent
5 housing area.

6 At this point we don't have a scope
7 on it, but we wanted to put it in there as a high
8 priority placeholder for funding purposes.

9 12 is the Fuel Line Removal, which
10 has always been a high interest item of ours.
11 Next to keeping the ROD on schedule, fuel line is
12 one of our most critical compliance on non-CERCLA
13 projects.

14 We are calling it Phase I, because we
15 did a report that identified most of the fuel
16 line, but there may be some small diameter fuel
17 lines which we're going to be investigating for
18 and which could result in a Fuel Line Removal,
19 Phase II.

20 Then Design for Lead Based Paint

1 Abatement in Housing, so this will be the plan to
2 inspect.

3 One reason we may have do a more
4 detailed plan to inspect is that a number of the
5 houses that are affected are potentially historic,
6 so the abatement actions we take on the houses are
7 going to have to be planned in a little more
8 detail and require some additional approval than
9 with a non-historical building.

10 Then we have the Workplan for UST to
11 remove this year and we will be doing a work plan
12 for that.

13 Actually, we will also be doing
14 semi-annual groundwater sampling rather than
15 quarterly.

16 Then we will be doing remedial
17 investigations on the UST sites, where we already
18 removed tanks.

19 Number 17, we will be removing Number
20 234.

1 And then we will also be doing
2 remedial systems design on UST sites that we
3 already completed a remedial investigation on.
4 The UST sites, as opposed to the CERCLA sites, are
5 really in several groupings that are moving on
6 different schedules. So we have a combination of
7 actions on the UST site, whereas most of the
8 CERCLA site is moving on the same schedule.

9 So in '97, we will be both removing,
10 investigating and planning remedial systems design
11 for various UST sites on Treasure Island and Yerba
12 Buena Island.

13 We will also be preparing a work plan
14 for above-ground storage tank removals. We have a
15 number of above-ground storage tanks. We are in
16 the process of determining which of those may
17 still have a useful future under reuse, and which
18 ones don't.

19 For example, we have two large fuel
20 tanks, 103 and 104, which also sit on one of our

1 IR sites, and they are old, World War II tanks.
2 They have no future use, and so we are going to be
3 planning to remove those tanks as well as some
4 other tanks which we have still yet to determine.

5 We will have to have some discussions
6 with the City to verify that the tanks we propose
7 to remove have no further use, and if they are
8 tanks that the City definitely wants removed, we
9 can address that also.

10 Then AST removals themselves. We
11 think we can complete both actions in the same
12 year. We will be doing an Asbestos Inventory
13 Phase II, which is basically a completion of our
14 asbestos inventory. Most of the base we
15 inventoried last year, but there are some
16 buildings remaining in Phase II, and we will pick
17 up any remaining structures, mostly smaller type
18 structures.

19 Then we will be locating potential
20 additional fuel lines.

1 We will be doing a Lead Based Paint
2 Inventory, Phase II. Again, we completed the lead
3 based inventory of most of the housing areas, but
4 there is some additional housing that needs some
5 survey work as well as potentially some currently
6 non-housing structures, which may potentially see
7 some residential type of use, like barracks
8 buildings.

9 Then we will be getting into some
10 asbestos abatement and lead based paint abatement.

11 The reason it is listed as Phase I
12 for both asbestos and lead based paint, and the
13 reason we have the line there is based on the
14 guidance we received from Washington, everything
15 about the line has the highest probability of
16 funding. Everything below the line potentially
17 there could be some funding changes.

18 So it was of most concern to get all
19 of our key work into the first 26 items above the
20 line.

1 MS. WALTERS: What is the total
2 amount for that?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The total amount
4 for that is around 6.5 million.

5 MR. ALLMAN: If all these are
6 approved, what will be the total approved, just
7 above the stars?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is about six
9 and a half million dollars.

10 MS. WALTERS: I thought maybe that
11 you would be getting thirteen.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That was an
13 earlier figure. In some cases, there is some
14 figure shown which also includes our in-house
15 costs in the EFA web, so that's been taken care
16 of.

17 So what is represented on this list
18 is the actual contract and in the field work.

19 MS. WALTERS: So when you talk about
20 EFA, that includes management cost?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our total,
2 excluding in-house cost, is just about
3 \$11,000,000.

4 MS. WALTERS: So the 5.5 million goes
5 below the stars?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 5.5 goes to
7 everything below the line.

8 Briefly, we have a PCB survey. We
9 have previously done one and this would complete
10 it. We may do some tweaking above and below the
11 line, and the PCB survey is a relatively minor
12 item, so we may move that into the upper half of
13 the list, as well as the Ozone Depleting
14 Substances Survey, which is another rather minor
15 item to identify equipment on the base that PFC's
16 and chlorofluorocarbons and other ozone-depleting
17 substances, primarily for refrigeration systems
18 and halon fire suppression systems, and we may
19 survey them and make a determination if they still
20 have a use or reuse. If not, to de-energize and

1 remove the ozone-depleting substances.

2 Then we will be doing a lead based
3 paint abatement, Phase II, if we got the full
4 funding.

5 And we may do an update of our
6 environmental baseline survey, that is something
7 we will have to consider whether or not we just do
8 an update EBS, and we do each individual FOSL or
9 FOST, or whether we go through an update of the
10 entire document.

11 We have not determined that yet, this
12 is a placeholder to make sure that the money is
13 there if we need to do that.

14 Then, going ahead to remove any
15 ozone-depleting equipment that we don't need.

16 And then there was a change from
17 previous iterations, fuel line removals,
18 investigation based on the removal of the fuel
19 line in the early part of the year, we will be in
20 a position by the end of the year to start the

1 remedial investigation on that site, and that's
2 one reason why this hearing priority.

3 It is no use making it a high
4 priority if we could not even start the work until
5 the latter part of the year, until after the fuel
6 lines have already been removed. The fuel line
7 removal project is likely to take most of the
8 fiscal year, since it probably won't start until
9 around the first of the year.

10 Then an additional removal, Phase II,
11 if we identify some of these existing smaller
12 diameter fuel lines.

13 Lastly, we have a small project,
14 emission reduction credits, closing out our air
15 permits and identifying them either for transfer
16 or for use at other federal facilities.

17 MS. WALTERS: The facilities report
18 will come from the City?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. We look to
20 satisfy both the Reuse Plan and also there may be

1 requirements for remediation that require the air
2 credit.

3 But looking at the need of reuse is
4 part of the emission reduction credit process.

5 When this is a change, 37 and 38 are
6 changed from previous iterations. These are
7 removal of contaminated soil at the Firefighting
8 School and the Fuel Farm and Gas Station.
9 Originally, we had a higher priority on these, and
10 the primary reason for moving these where they are
11 now is that they are relatively high cost items,
12 one million dollars plus, and we felt that if they
13 were too high a priority, they would squeeze out a
14 lot of these other smaller compliance projects
15 like USTs and lead based paint and asbestos, so we
16 moved them toward the end of the list.

17 Then another reason in looking at it
18 a little closer, for the Fuel Farm and the Gas
19 Station, we won't be closing those facilities
20 until possibly as late as 30 September '97, so it

1 wouldn't do us any good to have the money
2 available earlier in the year when the Gas Station
3 can still be operating until September.

4 And lastly, under Solid Waste
5 Management Unit, that is another placeholder.

6 Should we have a need to do any miscellaneous
7 retroinvestigation, we would be able to do that.

8 The total is just under \$11,000,000,
9 10.95 million dollars.

10 We also have some ongoing funded
11 projects that are primarily on the IR side.

12 We have no action ROD's for Sites 1
13 and 3.

14 And then we have the Correction
15 Action Plans for the sites that we moved from the
16 CERCLA to the UST program. These are sites where
17 the dominant contaminant is petroleum.

18 Lastly, we have funding, '96 funding,
19 to do sampling of sites that were identified in
20 the Environmental Baseline Survey in order for us

1 to better characterize those sites.

2 MS. SIMONS: I was confused. I
3 thought that the EBS sampling, we did not have
4 money to do that. We have the work plan
5 finalized, I thought that we were waiting for
6 fiscal year '97. Has that changed?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I am
8 half right and half wrong. It turns out we have
9 the funding to do everything but the storm water.

10 MS. SIMONS: The storm drains. Okay,
11 so we have some of the money.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have some of
13 the money that we base the work plan on, so we
14 could be in a position to go ahead with that.

15 MS. SIMONS: But where is the rest of
16 the funding, what is the priority for that?
17 That's kind of important because we need to look
18 at the storm drains in order to move the parcel at
19 57.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a good

1 question. There are a few small subprojects that
2 are included in some of these major project items,
3 and it's probably really in with the site-specific
4 EBS with the FOSLs.

5 We have money to do EBS-type work.

6 MS. SIMONS: It is higher priority?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. Rachel
8 makes a good point that we have sites that are
9 categorized Category 7, meaning we don't have
10 enough information to be able to determine whether
11 or not there is a release or not, and in the EBS,
12 the sampling, it is important to make that
13 determination.

14 MR. ALLMAN: Items 37 and 38, which
15 are the removal of contaminated soil?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Are any of these sites
18 expected to be used with X-19, if the treatability
19 study works for on-site bioremediation?

20 And if so, would you be allowed to

1 turn that money over to sampling the soil and
2 monitoring to see how it is working or not?

3 Basically, the contaminated soil will
4 be, if you take it away and have it remediated off
5 site --

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

7 MR. ALLMAN: While this is going on,
8 the final work plan came out for the treatability
9 study for the bioremediation using X-19.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, John.

11 Basically, this project is a source removal
12 project. We are going to remove the hydrocarbon
13 contaminated soil from the site, so it does not
14 continue to affect the surrounding soil and
15 groundwater, and it will still remain on site so
16 that it could be treated as part of another
17 project.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Is that going to be put
19 in some project in case that it works as an
20 alternate budget item, so it does not have to wait

1 two or three years, so it can be treated outside?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We expect to be
3 more than likely treating soil in '98 that we
4 generate from the fuel line and these are the
5 projects.

6 I don't have a specific answer for
7 you, but we do expect to do that, it is likely
8 that we will do on-site treatment.

9 Ernie or Sharon, do you have anything
10 to add to that?

11 To basically answer your question,
12 John, it is a source removal project.

13 CO-CHAIR HEHN: The Bench Scale
14 Treatability Study has been funded, though, and
15 that is going to be ongoing?

16 MS. TOBIAS: Yes. That began earlier
17 this month and the Corrective Action Plan and
18 feasibility study at the petroleum site, both of
19 those results of treatability study to determine
20 if there is a viable alternative at these sites

1 and other sites.

2 MR. ALLMAN: Right now you're putting
3 it down, this is getting budget money for removal
4 of contaminated soil?

5 MS. TOBIAS: But this is for the
6 design, not just a physical removal. That is my
7 understanding and I could be wrong.

8 MR. GALANG: You have the interim
9 removal action in the process, so maybe we can do
10 something, we have this interim study done before,
11 but now it has been delayed until we get
12 bioremediation for this site, and these sites,
13 apart from the petroleum, on the site that the
14 Corrective Action Plan does not work for these
15 sites.

16 MS. KATHURIA: I think that he is
17 asking if this money allocated for the removal of
18 contaminated soil at the Firefighting School
19 actually has the assumption that you are actually
20 removing the soil, and if you're not removing the

1 soil, because it is being treated by
2 bioremediation, maybe that's the way you want to
3 go.

4 Is that money flexible to do
5 something else with it?

6 MR. ALLMAN: Thank you, that is
7 exactly right.

8 MS. SIMONS: The Corrective Action
9 Plan looks at the different alternatives. We may
10 do bioremediation, but we may not. We may have to
11 treat the soil.

12 I think also just to clarify maybe
13 that people understand, removal does not
14 necessarily mean you just pick it up and haul it
15 away. Removal action can mean any type of
16 treatment. It could be a groundwater pump and
17 treatment or removal action.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Basically, the answer is
19 yes, the cost is included in that as well.

20 MS. SIMONS: Yes.

1 MR. ALLMAN: I hope the test works.

2 MS. NELSON: I might have missed

3 something. Is this '96?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, I'm sorry.

5 Just to clarify, down to here, the 10.9 million

6 dollars, this is 1997, so this is dependent on

7 Congressional funding starting 1 October.

8 The funding may not arrive right on

9 that day. In fact, it takes us some period of

10 weeks or maybe longer for the funding to reach us.

11 MS. NELSON: Is Congress taking any

12 action on this, to your knowledge?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is in the

14 defense bill, I think, one of the bills has

15 already passed.

16 And then the other one is likely to

17 pass during September. But even then, when the

18 government starts the new fiscal year on 1

19 October, it takes some period of time for the

20 funding to actually reach us at the base level.

1 But everything at the bottom of that
2 page, ongoing funded projects, those are funded
3 under this year's money or earlier, so that is
4 work that's ready to go that we have money in
5 hand.

6 MS. NELSON: Thank you.

7 MR. ALLMAN: I have a question
8 concerning Items 20 and 21 for AST removal.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

10 MR. ALLMAN: Does that include,
11 because once you get to the AST, they are not
12 covered under the UST program, as I understand it,
13 there would be no requirement for sampling or
14 anything of the sort, or for remediating the soil.

15 For example, Item 19 is remedial
16 investigation of the UST removal. Are we going to
17 be doing remedial investigation of the soils
18 beneath the ASTs, as they have been around since
19 World War II?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It turns out that

1 the primary ASTs we're going to remove already on
2 existing IR sites.

3 You are correct, but you didn't have
4 a specific project listed; one, probably because
5 the removals will take up close to the end of the
6 fiscal year; and the fact that the larger tanks,
7 one of three, one of four, and all of the tanks at
8 the Fuel Farm, are already covered under the site.

9 MR. ALLMAN: So it has all been
10 covered under IR sites?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are still
12 making up our list of removals. We have a number
13 of tanks associated with our boiler plants, which
14 are spread throughout the island, as well as some
15 other miscellaneous tanks, and first we need to
16 determine whether or not those tanks will have a
17 future use.

18 And then we make plans to remove
19 them.

20 MS. KATHURIA: John, there are AGT

1 regulations, both federal and state, that apply.

2 There is an AGT program that was looked at.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And outside of
4 the big tanks that are already sitting on IR
5 sites, the other smaller tanks are pretty small or
6 are of fairly new vintage.

7 Any other questions?

8 This list, this project list, is not
9 cast in stone. This is basically our road map
10 that we are going to start out on, situations will
11 change.

12 The publication of the Reuse Plan and
13 plans that the City may have for interim and other
14 early uses may cause us to make some changes, and
15 we will do our best to meet both the need of
16 re-use and the need to complete the cleanup in a
17 timely and cost-effective manner.

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: The work that is
19 proposed from 1997, has that already been bid out
20 and contract settled, or do you have to go through

1 this process if the funding is approved?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In some cases, we
3 have already started scoping, putting together the
4 contract. But we can't actually make any awards
5 until we have money in hand.

6 CO-CHAIR HEHN: So are there any
7 items on here that are already essentially
8 assigned or that are already scoped out, so that
9 they are ready to go as soon as the funding
10 becomes available?

11 MR. GALANG: Based on the ecological
12 assessment that has been ongoing since 1995, it is
13 ready for award for PRC. As soon as we get the
14 money, we will start it.

15 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Any of the other
16 items on there that are all ready?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The fuel line
18 removal job, we have had that all ready to
19 contract for about a year now.

20 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Get some of these

1 things already ongoing.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Most of the other
3 projects are in some phase of project scoping.

4 We hope to, pending the availability
5 of funding, be able to award a lot of these in the
6 fall, the November/December time frame.

7 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I am thinking about
8 the time lag in going through the process.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

10 MR. ALLMAN: The lead based paint, as
11 I understand it, does not cover any abatement of
12 lead in the soil around the houses?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, it does. It
14 follows the HUD Title X guidelines, which provide
15 for investigation of the soils out to a certain
16 distance from the housing unit, and that's in
17 Title X.

18 MR. ALLMAN: So that's covered in the
19 funding?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is covered

1 in the funding for lead based paint abatement, as
2 it relates to residential units.

3 And what Chein is referring to, there
4 is an ongoing discussion concerning lead based
5 paint at non-residential structures.

6 MR. ALLMAN: What do you budget for
7 when you are asking for money?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right now, the
9 budget is based on our current obligation under
10 the law, which is to abate residential structures.

11 We've gotten a little bit behind, I
12 was going to do another presentation that expands
13 on this, but I think we can take a short,
14 ten-minute break and get back on schedule.

15 (Short recess taken.)

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are ready to
17 move into the next section. We went ahead and
18 passed out copies of the next presentation, which
19 is on document review, two sheets, one for IR and
20 CERCLA, and the other one for compliance.

1 And the third handout was the
2 follow-up presentation on the NEPA process.

3 And then Pat has also passed out
4 comment cards. We can maintain the pretty
5 free-flowing discussion tonight, but if anyone
6 would like to avail themselves of cards and leave
7 us their comments and questions at the end of the
8 meeting, the cards are available.

9 This is the item we were going to do
10 in September, we moved up to this month, that is
11 to discuss upcoming documents, and this is really
12 a process that we're going to continue and
13 continue to try and improve upon.

14 The first sheet lists the
15 Installation Restoration Program documents. I
16 won't read through everything. Basically, it
17 discusses the Remedial Investigation Report, the
18 Corrective Action Plan, the No Action Draft RODS
19 for Sites 1 and 3, and all of this work is already
20 funded, and that's why in the last column it says

1 "Yes," meaning that is 1996 or earlier money, and
2 this work is proceeding, not depending at all on
3 1997 funding.

4 The second sheet, which is the front
5 and second page, is a compliance document.

6 This is not quite as posh as the one
7 on IR, but it lists what we think will be the
8 major documents produced under compliance, and
9 some of the probable dates, but not very many.

10 All of this work, with the exception
11 of part the EBS sampling is 1997 funded.

12 So if I have a funding column list,
13 all of these would be "No," except for the first
14 one, EBS sampling report, which would be a
15 "Yes/No."

16 Again, both these sheets really
17 parallel the list of projects for 1997. This is
18 really work products coming out of those projects.

19 If there are any questions or
20 comments, I did not think we needed to spend too

1 much time on this. This is something that we will
2 continue to evolve.

3 We should have a more advanced
4 version of the compliance sheet next month.

5 MR. KAO: The IR review document on
6 the second item, that's three different reports?

7 MR. BYERS: All one report.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other
9 comments or questions?

10 MS. VEDAGIRI: There are two
11 documents out there, one of them is the sampling
12 program. How come that does not appear on this
13 list of documents?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This was not a
15 major document and we talked about this a couple
16 of days ago, and we are going to go ahead and, in
17 documents like these on the list, we just did not
18 have them included because it was a smaller
19 document.

20 But in answer to your question, yes,

1 we will. We did not on this sheet, but we will.

2 MS. VEDAGIRI: I think it would help
3 us, even if the smaller documents, not just this
4 particular one, if they were at least listed as
5 being available, because except for the Community
6 Co-Chair, there are a lot of us who don't get even
7 enclosures.

8 We only get the cover sheet, so we
9 don't even know that these documents exist unless
10 they happen to be out here, because there are some
11 extra copies. But there are people that have
12 special interests in certain of these smaller
13 documents.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You are correct
15 and your point is well taken.

16 If we publish a document, we will
17 provide a listing of it ahead of time as much as
18 we can.

19 MS. NELSON: Jim, can we make that an
20 action item to have a complete list?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: New action item
2 to maintain a complete list of all published
3 documents.

4 MS. NELSON: Major documents with
5 comments.

6 MS. MENDELOW: You mean like monthly?
7 I was wondering about that because I get a lot of
8 these papers without enclosures, and it's very
9 difficult to know what the documents are and what
10 their dates are and what's going on.

11 I just get very confused every month.
12 I get like three or four of these things.

13 So is there some other system that
14 you could set up? I know they come out at
15 different times during the month, but maybe we
16 could get like one listing per month of what's
17 coming out.

18 MS. VEDAGIRI: If you can at least
19 include the report titles at a minimum, even if
20 you're sending us a cover sheet without the

1 enclosures, if the report titles are included,
2 instead of saying "Enclosure."

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The key is to
4 maintain an up-to-date listing of those documents
5 and also to be able to provide some comments, some
6 brief discussion or announcement of the documents
7 at each of the meetings.

8 Next, some months ago, there has been
9 a request to discuss the NEPA process, and we put
10 together this very brief overview of NEPA (showing
11 slide).

12 First, what is NEPA? NEPA is the
13 National Environmental Policy Act. It was signed
14 into law in 1969 by President Nixon and, in short,
15 it requires the federal government to evaluate
16 potential environmental effects of any proposed
17 action that the government is taking.

18 In looking at the overall base
19 closure process, we have about four major items
20 going on:

1 We have the military property
2 disposal process. Just briefly, the military
3 property disposal includes both structures and
4 non-structures, material, typewriters, desks,
5 chairs, things like that. That process is ongoing
6 now. We have been working with the City and the
7 City-screened material for use.

8 Then next is the community planning
9 process through the local reuse authority. The
10 City of San Francisco is a designated reuse
11 authority, and that has resulted in the Draft
12 Reuse Plan that we have tonight.

13 Then skipping to the fourth column,
14 we have the cleanup process.

15 Then going back to NEPA, really the
16 fourth column here, NEPA is not a physical
17 process, it is a planning process and it evaluates
18 the effects of the proposed reuse and it also
19 takes into account the cleanup.

20 NEPA goes far beyond CERCLA or

1 related cleanup laws. It really considers
2 environment in the broadest possible sense.

3 It includes endangered species,
4 historic preservation, coastal zone management,
5 clean air, environmental justice, as well as all
6 of the cleanup and related laws.

7 This rather detailed slide shows the
8 NEPA process as well as some of the other parallel
9 processes. And for the NEPA process, it shows
10 both the Environmental Impact Statement or
11 Environmental Assessment, which is kind of a lower
12 tier to Environmental Impact Statement.

13 For the reuse of Treasure Island, it
14 definitely has enough potential impact that we
15 proceed directly to the Environmental Impact
16 Statement phase.

17 In some cases, where you might have a
18 smaller project or less potential impacts, you
19 might do an assessment first, and that determines
20 whether or not you have impact or needs to move on

1 to do a full EIS. But we are proceeding directly
2 to the EIS process.

3 What is that process? For one, the
4 NEPA process exempts the actual decision to close
5 the base. That was a Congressional decision.

6 There may be some exceptions to that,
7 but if the federal government were undertaking
8 other types of closures or construction somewhere
9 else, they might be required to do an EIS. But in
10 this case, Congress specifically excepted the
11 decision whether to keep the base open or closed
12 from the NEPA process.

13 So the NEPA process really starts
14 with the reuse, whether the base should be open or
15 closed. It starts with the Community Reuse Plan
16 and the Board of Supervisors on the 22nd of July
17 endorsed the Reuse Plan and then allowed the Mayor
18 to turn it over to the Department of Defense and
19 HUD.

20 Our Goal is to complete the EIS

1 within about 12 months, with the Reuse Plan having
2 been received, so we basically received it the end
3 of July. Because the process is going to be
4 somewhat complex, we expect to probably complete
5 it in just over 12 months, probably in the
6 September '97 time frame.

7 The other timeline is to complete it
8 by the time the base closes, in order to allow the
9 reuse to proceed, and we will integrate CEQA, the
10 California Environmental Quality Act as the state
11 companion to NEPA.

12 Whereas the Navy is required to do
13 NEPA as a federal agency, the City is required to
14 do CEQA, because the City has taken actions at
15 Treasure Island which trigger CEQA.

16 So companion to the EIS is an EIR,
17 Environmental Impact Report. Those could be done
18 separately, but there is benefit in doing them as
19 a single document. It saves the City effort by
20 being able to incorporate its EIR into our EIS,

1 and it results in one document rather than two, so
2 our intent at this point is to have a combined
3 EIS/EIR.

4 Where are we at right now?

5 Basically, we are at the beginning of
6 the process.

7 This shows both NEPA and CEQA. They
8 are fairly similar, but there are some differences
9 in the two processes. Now basically, we have
10 started EIS and EIR planning and we are getting
11 ready to announce, to officially announce the
12 scoping hearing, and that will then allow us to
13 prepare the draft EIS, which if we have the
14 scoping hearing in September, the draft EIS would
15 probably be done by sometime in December.

16 Then the draft EIS would go into a
17 public comment period and ultimately leading to a
18 Record of Decision and a final EIS in the summer
19 of September of 1997 time frame.

20 Both the NEPA and the CERCLA process

1 use the term "Record of Decision" as a
2 finalization of the approval process.

3 Then, concurrently, the City would
4 have approved the EIR and that allows the City
5 then to formally finalize the Reuse Plan and make
6 changes in the zoning and actually go into the
7 implementation phase.

8 As I previously mentioned, NEPA
9 really uses environmental in the broadest possible
10 terms. These are typical environmental issues.
11 They would be considered in the EIS; the reuse, of
12 course, traffic, which is going to be an important
13 consideration, and transportation, socioeconomics,
14 aesthetics, historical and archaeological
15 resources, Native American concerns -- and all the
16 way down the list, so those are potential issues
17 to be addressed in the EIS.

18 The actual environmental cleanup will
19 probably be a relatively small part of the EIS,
20 especially since we will be proceeding with the

1 assumption that the federal government is going to
2 continue the cleanup.

3 That's basically it for this brief
4 overview of NEPA.

5 Let me add for our CERCLA ROD, the
6 CERCLA process that we go through substitutes for
7 doing a NEPA document on the cleanup decision, so
8 the public process we go through in order to get
9 to the CERCLA ROD takes care of the EIS type
10 issues.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Several months ago we
12 had the discussion about the discussion about the
13 Ecological Risk Assessment, and I have asked about
14 the seals that haul out on Yerba Buena Island,
15 whether they are considered in the Ecological Risk
16 Assessment.

17 The answer was "No, because they are
18 not on the IR site," and the Ecological Risk
19 Assessment only covered the IR site.

20 So when you're doing the EIS under

1 NEPA or the EIR under NEPA, is that going to take
2 into consideration the crystal zone uses,
3 endangered biologies, or noise problems outside of
4 the IR site, or is it just going to be the IR
5 site?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is a good
7 question.

8 The IR really just is a small subset
9 of this whole NEPA process. So the NEPA process
10 considers any potential effect coming from any
11 direction or location upon some affected species.

12 MR. ALLMAN: No matter where it is,
13 no matter how the zone is labeled or anything,
14 which is good.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If it is
16 potentially affected, whether it is on the Coast
17 Guard side of the island or the Navy side of the
18 island.

19 MR. WONG: I may not have followed
20 this correctly, but you said that the public

1 comment period for CERCLA would cover the NEPA
2 public comment needs. Did I misunderstand?

3 If one is a subset of the other, how
4 can that be?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I probably can't
6 state this as well as a lawyer could, but
7 basically the government is taking an action on
8 the cleanup decision, but the CERCLA process
9 provides for a formal public input, in addition to
10 the RAB, formal public input and commentary, and
11 that takes the place of doing a separate
12 Environmental Impact Statement on the cleanup.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: This Environmental
14 Impact Statement only addresses the needs. But
15 the CERCLA process takes care of the --

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe another way
17 of saying that, and I'm somewhat conjecturing, if
18 the CERCLA ROD process did not have formal public
19 scoping and formal public commentary, then maybe
20 there would be a requirement to do NEPA.

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

MR. WONG: I understand.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Can you address, sort of give us a rundown of what will take place at this public scoping hearing?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Just briefly, from my basic understanding, the public scoping hearing will introduce the plan and I believe it will also introduce some alternatives, because they are required to evaluate not only the proposed plan but also some potential alternative, including, I think, even a no action proposal.

I think there is a requirement, "Here is the Reuse Plan, we're also going to evaluate if we do nothing or no reuse." So the plan will be introduced, there will probably be some discussion of the NEPA process and the CEQA process by both the Navy and the City staff, and then it would open up to public commentary, either oral or written.

CO-CHAIR HEHN: Will there be plenty

1 of advance notice as to when this actually does
2 take place, and will all members of the RAB be
3 notified by mail?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I am pretty
5 confident that the RAB members have already been
6 included on the Citizens Reuse Committee listing,
7 and I think, thanks to Martha and Laurie.

8 And I think there is a legal
9 requirement to provide at least 15 days notice, so
10 I think you, as being involved citizens, would get
11 a direct mailing. There would also be
12 advertisement placed.

13 But the tentative date is September
14 25, but it has not been formally announced yet,
15 and it is possible that that date could be
16 extended into October, but it is going to occur
17 sometime in the September-October time frame and
18 it will take place right here.

19 MS. VEDAGIRI: Does the City Planning
20 Department have any role in this EIR?

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh, definitely.

The City Planning Department is handling the CEQA, the EIR end of this.

So we are really working in partnership with the City Planning Department on this EIS/EIR process.

MS. VEDAGIRI: For this whole preferred reuse concept, there will be only one EIS?

CO-CHAIR SULLIAN: There will be one document, an EIS as we are planning it now, an EIS/EIR, and this one document will evaluate the Reuse Plan, which you have gotten tonight as the proposed plan, and then there will be several alternatives also evaluated.

MS. SHIRLEY: And the scoping hearing is where some of the other alternatives are brought out?

MS. WALTERS: Right. This is the preferred plan that the City has proposed.

1 There are three other alternative
2 plans, but this is the one the City likes the best
3 that we voted on, the Board of Supervisors and the
4 Mayor approved of that.

5 MS. VEDAGIRI: So even though the
6 City will be the user and developer of the reuse,
7 it is still the Navy that actually pays for it and
8 puts the document together?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Navy has to
10 do an EIS, because as a federal agency we are
11 allowing the reuse to happen, so we're taking that
12 action, and then the City also has a requirement
13 to do an EIR.

14 Conceivably, we can do an EIS and
15 they can go off and do an EIR, but we're doing the
16 document and that's pretty common in this type of
17 situation and that allows the City to make use of
18 the work that we are already doing on the EIR.

19 MS. WALTERS: That just streamlines
20 the whole process.

1 MR. WONG: A quick question, Martha:
2 There is the Draft Reuse Plan we got tonight. It
3 is the preferred one.

4 There is the no action, which always
5 has to be there. But you said there are three
6 others. Where are those coming from?

7 MS. WALTERS: That was part of the
8 Citizens Reuse Committee charge, it was to come up
9 with four different plans or alternatives, and
10 this is the preferred alternative.

11 MR. WONG: Okay.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They would be
13 basically variations on this plan, more
14 residential or less residential.

15 MR. WONG: Okay.

16 MR. ALLMAN: I am confused about the
17 no action. Is that going to be if nothing is
18 done?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You are required
20 to evaluate what the effect is, basically to do a

1 baseline, to say, "If we have no action, what, for
2 example, would be the effect on traffic as opposed
3 to if we implement the Reuse Plan?"

4 And then you would feed the delta.

5 Presumably, the no action would be
6 one extreme and the reuse proposed plan would be
7 another. All of that is slated to get under way
8 publicly in about a month, but you will be
9 notified once we finalize the date.

10 MS. VEDAGIRI: Does the same
11 contractor that does all the remedial work also do
12 the EIS?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. Conceivably,
14 you could have a consultant who did both NEPA type
15 work and remedial type work.

16 In our case, we have a different
17 consultant, Petrotech.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Aren't they also PRC?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Only
20 coincidentally over the last year. But they're

1 still operating as separate companies.

2 Any other questions? Otherwise we
3 will proceed.

4 Now, moving into Other Business, I
5 will turn it over to Paul and Pat.

6 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I was not prepared
7 for this, since I became drafted last night to do
8 this.

9 However, I presume that the schedule
10 for review for the RI report is going to be
11 delayed for a while, so we don't need the schedule
12 for that.

13 The interim meeting we had planned
14 originally will be delayed until such time as we
15 get the RI report.

16 You probably all got copies of the
17 comments we put together in the Draft Interim
18 Monitoring Plan and also the Stage II Ecological
19 Risk Assessment.

20 I want to thank you, Usha, for taking

1 the time to review that, and I think you had some
2 other comments or questions concerning the Phase
3 II Ecological Risk Assessment.

4 MS. VEDAGIRI: I am kind of confused
5 about how the Equal Risk Work Plan and the CMECC
6 go together, because as I see it, they are going
7 to collect all this analytical data for sediments,
8 water and so on, and they will be compared against
9 these ss-based specific values for sediments and
10 water that the Navy or whoever is working on.

11 And then today Susan Gladstone also
12 talked about TRVs that they are developing for
13 terrestrial receptors.

14 The example she gave was the Great
15 Blue Heron, which is a terrestrial receptor, but
16 it dives, it is aquatic, it feeds on fish and
17 vertebrates.

18 My question is with this in place,
19 you go out there and collect all this analytical
20 data based on the detection limits that were set

1 out in that plan, but all the numbers against
2 which they are going to be compared against are
3 not yet developed, so what happens if the screen
4 levels that come out here later are lower than the
5 detection limits that we are using. Will you go
6 back and resample, or how will you be dealing with
7 it?

8 MS. SIMONS: That is a real good
9 question. I was under the impression that the
10 screening levels will be agreed on before we go
11 out and sample, and that comparison can be made
12 before that.

13 I think, I'm not sure exactly what
14 will happen with BTAG, but that's what I
15 understand.

16 We are not getting funded until next
17 year, which means we may not get the money until
18 December or January. We won't be out in the field
19 until after that, so that gives them time to come
20 up with the levels.

1 That is a really good question and I
2 assume that is what is going to happen.

3 MS. VEDAGIRI: But the detection
4 levels will already be laid out.

5 MS. SIMONS: That does not matter.
6 We have a final work plan, as long as the
7 screening levels come out before we go the sample,
8 then you can go back and compare them to the final
9 document, and we can make amendments to it or
10 change it if we need to.

11 MR. KAO: We probably can bring your
12 question to them and have them take a look at it.

13 My understanding is they have come up
14 with a lot of numbers already. Susan was just
15 talking about they have come up.

16 MS. SIMONS: Sediments.

17 MS. KATHURIA: Your question was if
18 our detections levels are above our sediment
19 screening levels.

20 MS. SIMONS: First we have got to

1 find out what the screening levels are.

2 And then, once we have that, we are
3 to go back and compare them to the detection
4 limits, and if there is a problem, we will find
5 that out before we sample. And if there is a
6 problem, we have to get a different type analysis
7 to figure out what the damage is, how bad is it?

8 But that is something that definitely
9 needs to be evaluated.

10 MR. ALLMAN: Do you have a stick EPA?
11 Can you use non-EPA methods?

12 MS. SIMONS: I can't answer that
13 right now. I think, now that we have made
14 adjustments in the baseline, when we had detection
15 limit differences, slightly different methods,
16 variations, modification of methods, I don't know
17 about the methods for analyzing sediments, what
18 type of method we use.

19 Just because the Ecological Work Plan
20 is final right now, the way I understand the

1 Ecological Work Plan technically is final right
2 now, but we can still make changes before we go
3 out in the field if we need to.

4 MS. VEDAGIRI: But the understanding
5 clearly is that the screening numbers will
6 definitely be available before the sampling?

7 MS. SIMONS: That is what I
8 understand. We can go back and make this an
9 action item and check it, which is a good idea,
10 but that's the way I have always understood it.

11 MS. KATHURIA: The clean up will
12 probably be higher than the ERL/ERM set
13 nationwide.

14 They are somewhat conservative, so as
15 long as the detection levels are below the ERLs
16 and ERMs, we are in good shape because our San
17 Francisco Bay numbers will most likely be higher
18 than those.

19 MS. NELSON: Did I hear a volunteer
20 to make this an action item?

1 MS. SIMONS: I think what we will
2 have to do is check on the status of, first, the
3 screening level. I have no idea of what is going
4 on.

5 MR. GALANG: We had a meeting
6 yesterday with PRC. They are preparing the
7 sediment criteria, so the draft will be available
8 in the middle of October so that it will be
9 reviewed by the agencies.

10 MS. SIMONS: You are going to present
11 us with levels in mid-October? Okay.

12 The BCT should be an action item to
13 look at the detection of what the status is of the
14 screening numbers involved.

15 I think it also would be good to just
16 make sure the BTAG knows, hey, we need these
17 numbers a month before we go out in the field, so
18 they know what our schedule is, make sure we have
19 a time, and it does not delay it.

20 MR. GALANG: The schedule for the

1 BTAG is October 15. They will get this problem.

2 MS. SIMONS: They still need a while.

3 MR. GALANG: I guess it will be in
4 time when we go to the field, which is maybe by
5 March or February.

6 MS. VEDAGIRI: But we're talking
7 about two sets of screening numbers, because as I
8 understand it, the screening values that the Navy
9 is developing are going to be based on benthic
10 invertebrate effects for the sediment.

11 But the TRVs for receptors that may
12 feed on the benthic invertebrates, those are being
13 developed by the BTAG.

14 But really, you might have the same
15 set of chemicals with high potential for
16 bioaccumulation included in both.

17 You don't know for sure what the
18 number for PCB is in sediment for benthic
19 invertebrates, that will be the same number as
20 PCBs when you take the Great Blue Heron into

1 account.

2 MS. SIMONS: There is definitely
3 overlap.

4 MS. VEDAGIRI: So in terms of the
5 developing the numbers I am interested in, what
6 the timetable is for the TRVs to be available in
7 relation to when they go into the field for
8 sampling, and also when the Navy sediment numbers
9 can be available.

10 MS. SIMONS: That's a good question.
11 I will tell you what I know right now.

12 Are those part of your comments?

13 MS. VEDAGIRI: No. My comments were
14 very specific.

15 These questions really were related
16 more to the work plan. I was just confused seeing
17 all these things, but I couldn't understand the
18 timetable.

19 MS. NELSON: Should that be a Navy
20 action item, to find out what the schedule is?

1 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Yes. When those
2 numbers become available to the regulators, that
3 they also be available to the RAB at that time.

4 Is that appropriate?

5 MS. SIMONS: I'm not going to review
6 them. My technical support person will. I'm not
7 sure. We have to figure out how it is going to
8 work.

9 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Is that when they
10 come up with the BCT, that might be the time, that
11 might be a chance that we should have to review
12 those? Is that appropriate?

13 MS. VEDAGIRI: I would like to see
14 them.

15 MS. NELSON: I would like to add a
16 complication to that.

17 Today I received by Federal Express
18 the Eco-Toxicological Test and Sampling Analysis
19 Plan for the Development of Cleanup Goals, asking
20 for comments.

1 I don't know about all RAB comments,
2 but the Navy would like to receive a sample by
3 September 16, '96, and I have not had time to
4 review that.

5 How does that fold into the
6 ecological sampling and screening and activities?

7 MS. TOBIAS: Actually, that work plan
8 is more of a separate entity.

9 What they're trying to do is collect
10 soil samples. We will be collecting soil samples
11 and bring samples and perform bioassays to
12 determine what is actually toxic to the aquatic
13 receptors.

14 That is part of our groundwater
15 modeling effort. We are going to use the results
16 of the toxicological testing to determine what is
17 safe to leave in the groundwater and safe to leave
18 in the soil.

19 It is more for the protection of the
20 bay that we are trying to leave it. It is not

1 really part of the whole effort, it is briefly
2 mentioned in the Phase II Ecological Risk
3 Assessment, but this is not the actual analysis we
4 will be conducting.

5 In that work plan, we identified the
6 sites we will be collecting the soil samples from
7 and the tests we will be running and the
8 bioassays.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Are the tests going to
10 involve amino assays?

11 MS. TOBIAS: No.

12 MS. SIMONS: To go back when the BTAG
13 was coming up with the sediment screening values,
14 they had a list of things they were going to do,
15 and one of them, because this is a region-wide
16 approach, was to have public involvement.

17 I remember they had groups of people
18 and there was actually a group of people
19 specifically to have a time frame to do that, find
20 a time frame to do that. I can check on that.

1 I know they were aware this is
2 something they needed to do, so I hope that kind
3 of answers your question. I will find out what is
4 going on with that.

5 MS. SHIRLEY: Also, the CMECC meeting
6 on September 11th, it might be appropriate to ask
7 that question.

8 MS. SIMONS: What is CMECC?

9 MS. SHIRLEY: The California Base --
10 help me out.

11 MR. KEO: CMECC is California
12 Military Environmental Coordination Committee.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: That meeting will be on
14 the 11th of September.

15 MS. TOBIAS: There is no meeting on
16 the 11th of September, there is a whole bunch of
17 meetings, but nothing on the 11th.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: Never mind. We will
19 deal with this offline.

20 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I have a question on

1 this document that we just got today, but also the
2 additional addendum to the Work Plan for the Phase
3 IIB.

4 Are those documents that you are
5 looking for comments from the RAB on both those
6 documents?

7 MS. NELSON: They seem to be
8 similarly scheduled for September 16.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe that is a
10 good way of seguing into the next item, Upcoming
11 Reports.

12 On the agenda, we had only listed the
13 Draft RI Report, but as I mentioend, these other
14 two documents did come out recently, and we
15 recognize that we were remiss in not making it a
16 little clearer that they are available, and we did
17 ask for comments.

18 These are the addendum, the
19 additional work, RI work, and then the
20 ecotoxicological.

1 MS. SIMONS: I have not gotten that
2 one yet.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And both these
4 are smaller documents, and we were asking for
5 comments on, because we would like to start this
6 work on September 16th.

7 MS. TOBIAS: I think we have to have
8 the agency comments by September 6. Again, I
9 apologize for the short time frame. Our goal with
10 these two documents is to get out and sample for
11 the localization activity, and we want to
12 incorporate the results of this into the draft
13 final RI for the Corrective Action Plan.

14 This is basically our time frame and
15 we are not trying to -- we did not really
16 anticipate, we did not realize about the three-day
17 weekend or anything.

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Can we make that as a
19 time frame for comments, say the 13th of
20 September, so we have the opportunity to discuss

1 this at the interim RAB meeting on both these
2 documents, and/or maybe we can make comments to
3 Jim verbally and/or written at that meeting to
4 give you some feedback on those.

5 I don't think we will be able to do
6 it by the 6th.

7 MS. TOBIAS: We're going out on the
8 16th. If you comment on the 13th, it will be
9 impossible to incorporate the comments for our
10 sampling activities unless we delay our sampling
11 activities.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: How about verbal
13 comments, then, at the meeting on the 10th? That
14 stretches it from the 6t to the 10th.

15 MS. TOBIAS: That well might be
16 cutting it close because we have other contractors
17 involved in doing this.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The regulators
19 will be able to review it in a short time.

20 MS. KATHURIA: You knew it was

1 coming, because in the original work plan we sort
2 of said, "Well, when you're getting close, exactly
3 let us know where you are taking the soil
4 samples," but the general methodology was
5 something we sort of agreed upon through the work
6 plan process.

7 So this is sort of details that will
8 be a simple review.

9 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Just in the brief
10 review on the Phase IIB addendum, I got some
11 questions about methodology, and I think we need
12 to at least discuss, at some point, prior to going
13 out and doing them.

14 So we can make that comment, if you
15 like, and you can do whatever you need with that,
16 but I don't think we can respond that quickly.

17 MS. SIMONS: This addendum, what I
18 assume, I have not looked at this in detail, is
19 actually the same methodology that we used, I
20 thought, during the Phase II work last summer; is

1 that correct?

2 MS. TOBIAS: That is correct.

3 MS. SIMONS: Our understanding was we
4 were not going to look at that in detail. More
5 like the location, that is the way I was kind of
6 approaching the review.

7 MS. TOBIAS: That is true. For that
8 smaller document, we do not really anticipate a
9 lot of comments on that.

10 The methodology would be a question.

11 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One thing I might
12 suggest then is when this might come up in the
13 future, when we get these on a very short
14 turnaround time, that you might also be prepared
15 to give a presentation at the RAB at that meeting
16 where they are handed out, if there is any doubt,
17 so we have a chance to at least review them and
18 respond.

19 MS. TOBIAS: That is a very good
20 point.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess it really
2 comes down to either we need to get comments prior
3 to the interim meeting, or we take comments as far
4 as the 10th.

5 It is basically a decision we have to
6 make.

7 MS. SIMONS: It is impossible to give
8 verbal comments on the 10th. Some of them you may
9 be able to incorporate if it means just moving a
10 location or something like that, but otherwise you
11 may not be able to.

12 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I think some of the
13 details that I'm not clear of, as far as your
14 planning on that, you may be able to resolve that
15 and maybe one of the things we might want to
16 suggest is PRC attend that interim meeting and
17 answer the questions, and maybe we can get it
18 resolved that night.

19 MR. WONG: If I am following right
20 here, is what is in the documents the methodology

1 the same that was used before, and this is just a
2 confirmation of the specific sites you are going
3 to be doing; is that what I heard?

4 MS. TOBIAS: And any additional
5 locations.

6 MR. WONG: Okay. But the methodology
7 for the sites is the same as done before, and
8 there are already subcontractors ready to go on
9 the 16th.

10 MS. TOBIAS: We are in the process of
11 securing the contractors and lining up the crews.

12 MR. WONG: So even if we did
13 something on the 10th or the 16th, it does not
14 sound like the methodology is up for discussion at
15 this point, it is just a confirmation of the
16 sites.

17 So I guess our issue is the
18 methodology, and we had some questions about
19 whether that is valid, we agree or disagree with
20 the sites.

1 I don't know the answer to that, but
2 it seems to me that it is all for naught if there
3 is disagreements on the methodology and there is
4 agreement on the sites here.

5 But I think it is a matter of, I
6 guess, courtesy and protocol. We are trying to
7 make the point here, why bother doing this if it
8 is done basically after the fact? We are going to
9 spend our valuable time trying to provide comments
10 when it is a done deal anyway, and I don't think
11 that is a good faith effort. That is basically
12 whate is being said here.

13 So I don't know specifically what the
14 issues are, if it is methodology or the sites, or
15 if it is really, "Look, if we are going to do this
16 in a partnership, let's do it right, otherwise
17 we're kind of losing ground."

18 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I agree. I can't
19 really address those questions right now, Brad,
20 only because of the fact that we don't really have

1 had a chance to really look at the documents and
2 certainly the other ones, not having seen yet, so
3 I can't address that at all.

4 I need a little time to take a look
5 at those and try to do our part, which should give
6 you some feedback on that from the public
7 standpoint.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Ernie, is it
9 possible that somehow between now and the interim
10 meeting we can articulate to Paul and Pat kind of
11 what the parameters are of what we're looking for,
12 and potential comments?

13 I think Brad's point was well taken.
14 If we were not prepared to change, for example,
15 the methodology, we would want people to know
16 that, so they wouldn't be preparing those types of
17 questions and instead focus on the areas where we
18 are able to potentially make some adjustments to
19 the plan.

20 MR. GALANG: Maybe I can call Paul

1 next week to maybe give us some major comment that
2 he can address. He can call us or call me.

3 CO-CHAIR HEHN: I will be happy to
4 work as a clearing house for any comments anybody
5 might have for either of those documents, either
6 written or verbal.

7 We will try to capture those and pass
8 them along.

9 MS. NELSON: It seems to me we are
10 only waiting two days, since the 10th is a
11 Tuesday, to provide comments, and the interim
12 meeting might be considered.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will go ahead
14 and commit to taking comments at the meeting on
15 the 10th, and then in the meantime, Ernie will be
16 our Navy point of contact for any questions
17 related to the two documents.

18 MS. NELSON: I would like to answer
19 the reports that will be seen at least in the
20 six-month cycle of this nature that come in, that

1 kind of slip in out of the blue, so we will be
2 notified there will be agendas, either for an
3 interim meeting or for a RAB meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Also, this
5 is another reminder, if anyone who has not signed
6 up, even though we are extending two months, who
7 has not signed up and who would like to receive a
8 copy of the Remedial Investigation Report, we will
9 continue to solicit for that for the next couple
10 of meetings. Because of the size of the document,
11 we will only be sending it to those people who ask
12 for it.

13 Next is Open Questions and
14 Discussion.

15 Are there any open comments?

16 MR. ALLMAN: More of an announcement.

17 The next interim meeting on the 10th,
18 the Information Repository Subcommittee and
19 anybody else who is interested, whether or not you
20 are on the committee, in the fate of the documents

1 that go into the administrative record, or the
2 information repository, we will be meeting an hour
3 earlier at Building 1. Jim said it would be fine
4 to go there an hour earlier.

5 Whoever is interested should gather
6 around that area, everybody is welcome.

7 With the RI coming out now, this is
8 the point where the decision is going to be made
9 to be final what is kept and not.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: Also, this Federal
11 Register Request for Comments on Restoration
12 Advisory Boards, Jim provided copies for this on
13 the back, and the comment period for that ends on
14 November 4th. So if anyone is interested in
15 commenting on the procedures and guidelines for
16 Restoration Advisory Boards, here is where it goes
17 from internal guidance to a more codified status.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, this
19 is proposing a change to the US Code to have
20 specific language regarding Restoration Advisory

1 Boards.

2 CO-CHAIR HEHN: Can I ask Jim that we
3 add to the announcements for the interim meeting,
4 then, that the meeting of the IRS is going to be
5 an hour early.

6 MS. NELSON: We had discussed at some
7 point on the review of the members, and their
8 level of activity on the RAB.

9 Has anything happened with that?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have been
11 collecting some data on that, but we were not
12 prepared for it tonight.

13 I guess the question is do you want
14 to discuss that at an interim meeting or the next
15 regular meeting?

16 MS. NELSON: It seems like the
17 interim meeting might be full. Maybe the RAB
18 meeting, if there is information available.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So
20 basically we will make it an action item to report

1 on the status of membership at the next meeting,
2 and we can put that under Organizational Business
3 at the September meeting.

4 That's a good transition into
5 proposed agenda items for next meetings.

6 For September, I am less clear now on
7 why we put RI report into September. Are we in a
8 position to have some discussion on the RI report
9 in September? I think this is when we were still
10 in the process of looking at the schedule.

11 In that case, we have to remove that
12 item, Remedial Investigation Report, out of the
13 September agenda.

14 But we are, I think, fairly firm in
15 having a presentation on the Corrective Action
16 Plans, which I think is pretty timely, given the
17 upcoming documents.

18 This envisions a kind of a
19 backgrounder to what a Corrective Action Plan is.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Would we then move on

1 the schedule, possibly September, IR for the reuse
2 process?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We had some
4 discussion at the BCT meeting and Chris was very
5 helpful in refining that definition, this idea.

6 I was getting a little unclear as to
7 what we could really accomplish with this, and
8 what we thought is that rather than calling it an
9 IR site, is selecting a geographic site as a pilot
10 for the risk assessment, or the pilot, I think,
11 for the cleanup process.

12 And the intent was -- and maybe this
13 item has kind of evolved -- but the way we
14 discussed at the BCT meeting, we would be taking
15 geographic area and looking at all the elements of
16 cleanup, not just the IR site, not the UST sites,
17 but everything, lead, asbestos, and seeing what is
18 everything that is required to get this property
19 ready for reuse.

20 MR. ALLMAN: So what will be the

1 agenda item if you're talking about selecting the
2 sites or actually doing the pilot study?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think this item
4 has evolved, it was to kind of set up maybe over a
5 meeting or several meetings a focused look at a
6 specific area rather than trying to get our arms
7 around the whole island.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: To sort of integrate
9 into a manageable unit. I think Paul brought that
10 up.

11 CO-CHAIR HEHN: One of the things we
12 might think about doing that, too, and one of the
13 reasons I think we want to involve Martha in that
14 process is we would like to also get some feedback
15 from the City by saying, what are their
16 priorities, and use a site which will fit into
17 their priorities, too, so we are actually making
18 progress on something they want to focus on as
19 well.

20 That is something we could combine.

1 MR. ALLMAN: That probably could
2 happen in September.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It could happen,
4 as far as starting the process. I think maybe
5 then, probably between Pat and Paul and I and
6 Martha, we will have to take a look at this over
7 the next month and see if we can at least start
8 something at the September meeting, at least maybe
9 to put out some potential sites.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: At Fort Ord, they had a
11 matrix, where they charted progress from all the
12 different programs that were needed to verify or
13 to decide that the site was clean.

14 That was run by the Reuse person at
15 the Army, I can't think of her name right now, but
16 it was a very nice visual.

17 She had dots that were basically
18 clear if it was on its way, half-dots if it was
19 close to being done, and black-dotted dots is
20 finished.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For each item?

2 MS. SHIRLEY: For each item that was
3 necessary for a parcel to be considered
4 transferrable.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we can
6 probably do something with this for the next
7 meeting, at least to get something going.

8 I think the Corrective Action Plans
9 will be our major presentation item, and maybe we
10 might augment that with some other discussion of
11 fuels-related issues, and then this item on the
12 pilot area.

13 MS. NELSON: How about a BTAG update
14 also, considering we had a lot of discussion here
15 tonight about cleaning levels, if somebody can do
16 that.

17 MS. KATHURIA: It may be better to do
18 it in October, because they will be further along
19 with the TRV process as well.

20 October might be the next time.

1 MS. NELSON: October might be a
2 little crowded between the RI and we will probably
3 get some feedback on the scoping, the process, so
4 if there is something they can give us, if we have
5 interest in moving it faster.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will look into
7 that and see if we can do it in September or
8 October.

9 For September, we will have the
10 Corrective Action Plan. We will look at the
11 proposal of a geographic site as a pilot, and we
12 may have a BTAG update.

13 MR. ALLMAN: BTAG update is fine, but
14 how close are we getting with the GIS setup? I
15 guess Rachel --

16 MS. SIMONS: It is out of my hands
17 now.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is back in the
19 Navy's court, and basically we're trying to work
20 out some database related issues with the software

1 manufacturer.

2 MR. ALLMAN: You have not played with
3 the State yet?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, not until we
5 get over this database hurdle. Rachel made a lot
6 of progress on evaluating what the data
7 requirements are, and now it is the Navy's
8 responsibility to try to get the thing to work.

9 MR. ALLMAN: I see. Thanks to Rachel
10 for doing that.

11 MS. SIMONS: I would like to see us
12 taking the next step.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would hope in
14 the next month or so we would be able to take the
15 next step.

16 Any other potential agenda items?
17 October is going to be pretty full with the RI and
18 also at least some comments on the EIS/EIR
19 process.

20 MS. NELSON: Maybe in October we

1 would have an idea as to what the budget will be.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The budget. We
3 may be in a position to do a budget update in
4 October.

5 Any other comments regarding an
6 agenda item?

7 Maybe we will be able to have a draft
8 of the agenda for the 10th meeting.

9 MS. NELSON: I am leaving on vacation
10 on the 3rd and won't be back until the 19th.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will work with
12 Paul. I want to say publicly that Pat has been
13 very gracious of her time in working with me on
14 the agenda, and I appreciate that. She definitely
15 has been providing a lot of input.

16 Okay. The next regular meeting is
17 the 24th of September. There will be a Community
18 Mid-Month Meeting on Tuesday, the 10th, at 6:00
19 p.m., the meeting of John's committee, and 7:00
20 p.m. for the regular community meeting.

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

There is tentatively still an EIS hearing on the 25th of September. If there is any change, you will be notified.

With that, thank you very much and have a safe and happy Labor Day holiday.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.)

---o0o---

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

SEP 03 1996

(Signature)

(Date)