

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

---o0o---

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

24 SEPTEMBER 1996

COPY

7:00 P.M.

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 26

---o0o---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

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

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

- JIM SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
- ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
- HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- SHARON TOBIAS
- KATHY WALSH

REGULATORY AGENCY:

- GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)
- AMY BROWNELL (SFDPH)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

- RICHARD HANSEN
- PAUL HEHN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)
- ALICE LA PIERRE
- KAREN MENDELOW
- PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)
- HENRY ONGERTH
- DALE SMITH
- THOMAS THOMSON

1                   A T T E N D E E S   (Continued)

2   COMMUNITY MEMBERS (Continued)

3           TI MUSEUM (LAURIE GLASS)

4           USHA VEDAGIRI

5

6                                   ---o0o---

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

7:15 P.M.

2

3

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. We will go ahead  
and get started.

4

5

6

7

Welcome to our September Restoration Advisory  
Board meeting. If you need an extra copy of the meeting  
agenda, there is copies in the back with Hugo.  
Otherwise, I will move into tonight's agenda.

8

9

The first item is discussion or approval of  
the agenda.

10

11

Does anyone have any comments concerning  
tonight's agenda?

12

(No response.)

13

14

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no comments,  
we will proceed with the agenda as written.

15

16

17

18

The next item is the discussion and approval  
of the 27th August minutes, the last RAB meeting. There  
is additional copies of the minutes on the back table,  
if anyone needs them.

19

20

Otherwise, are there any comments concerning  
the August minutes?

1 (No response.)

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no comments,  
3 then, we will consider the August minutes approved.

4 Our next item is public comments. We set  
5 aside a five-minute period at the beginning of each  
6 meeting for members of the general public to make a  
7 statement.

8 Is there any public comment other than  
9 community members who can comment at any time?

10 (No response.)

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no public  
12 comment, we will move into the program updates.

13 First, the BRAC cleanup team meeting. We had  
14 a relatively short meeting on September the 18th. We  
15 discussed the FFSRA agreement. We went over the BRAC  
16 cleanup plan update, or the BRAC cleanup, the schedule  
17 for the BRAC cleanup plan update. And we discussed  
18 getting ready for tonight's RAB meeting.

19 That was basically it. It was a fairly short  
20 meeting.

1                   Anything we should add, Ernie?

2                   MR. GALANG:   Nothing.

3                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  All right.  There was  
4 another event that occurred over the last month, and  
5 that was the Urban Land Institute.

6                   The mayor invited the Urban Land Institute,  
7 which is a nonprofit organization based in Washington,  
8 to do, what they call, conduct an advisory services  
9 panel regarding the reuse plan.

10                  So the Urban Land Institute staff, based in  
11 Washington, got together a panel of their membership, I  
12 think about 10 or 11 architects, planners, real estate  
13 professionals, from around the country.

14                  He gathered them together here for the last  
15 week.  They reviewed the reuse plan as well as  
16 interviewed, I believe, about 100 individuals both from  
17 the city, the Navy, other agencies, the public, members  
18 of the Citizens' Reuse Committee, and at the end of the  
19 week, on Friday, at the new library, they presented  
20 their general findings, and then that, subsequently, is

1 going to be put into about a 100-page report, which they  
2 expect to issue in about two months.

3 MR. HANSEN: Who is the Land Use Commission?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Urban Land Use  
5 Institute.

6 MR. HANSEN: Who are they?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: A nonprofit professional  
8 organization of planners.

9 It's a public service. They have a staff in  
10 Washington to oversee the administrative duties, but,  
11 then, as a public service, they get volunteers from  
12 membership across the country to voluntarily look at,  
13 review projects and make recommendations.

14 So the city was able to get this very broad  
15 group from around the country, some of whom were  
16 involved in other base closures to look at the city's  
17 reuse plan independently and make recommendations.

18 MR. HANSEN: In that regard, how much  
19 substance is there to this report that we see in the  
20 newspaper from time to time about contemplated swap of

1 this property to the Maxum Corporation for the redwood  
2 trees?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, there are  
4 discussions going on between the Department of the  
5 Interior and this company regarding possible federal  
6 land swaps.

7 Treasure Island has been mentioned and,  
8 apparently, other federal lands, but there is nothing  
9 definite at this time. It's beyond the Navy. It's an  
10 issue of federal land, so the Department of the Interior  
11 is the lead federal agency.

12 So, at this point, we have no specific news,  
13 but it is conceivably something that could happen. But  
14 there is no indication, no definite indication at this  
15 time that it is going to happen.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Start with Dale.

17 MS. SMITH: Are there any other base closings  
18 in the Bay Area that are being looked at by the Urban  
19 Land Institute?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I believe Treasure Island

1 is the only one.

2 MS. SMITH: Are there any other pieces of  
3 property owned by the Navy in California that are being  
4 looked at by this group?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I don't know. I don't  
6 know.

7 They mentioned that they have done, over the  
8 years, like over 100 of these advisory panels. I don't  
9 know what other bases they might have done in the Bay  
10 Area.

11 MS. SMITH: Would we get a copy of this  
12 report, and would they make it available to us?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. It will be a public  
14 document when the report comes out. I'm fairly certain  
15 it's a public document. It will come out in about 60  
16 days, in November. We should see a copy.

17 The Urban Land Institute is also having their  
18 annual convention in San Francisco, I think, also in, I  
19 think, early November, so that might be another  
20 opportunity to get information. But I'm pretty sure

1 that eventually we will see the written findings.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Karen?

3 MS. MENDELOW: Was anyone from TI, your  
4 office, or anyone on this board part of these hearings  
5 or discussions?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No one from the RAB, no  
7 community members from the RAB that I'm aware of. But I  
8 never saw a list of the 100 or so people.

9 I was interviewed. The CO of the base,  
10 Captain Hano, as well as several people from Engineering  
11 Field Activity West in San Bruno.

12 MS. GLASS: Jim, apparently many, if not all,  
13 more or less, CRC members were interviewed, so that  
14 would have included Dan McDonald. So there would have  
15 been at least that.

16 MR. HANSEN: All of the CRC members?

17 MS. GLASS: Many, if not all.

18 MS. MENDELOW: It was an interview that  
19 happened. You didn't hear discussions about the plan or  
20 anything like that.

1 MS. GLASS: Well, they gave the presentation.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, in interviews,  
3 they were gathering additional facts, asking opinions of  
4 each interviewee what they thought of the land use plan.

5 In the case of myself as a Navy  
6 representative, we didn't comment or I didn't comment  
7 specifically on the land use plan. I just answered  
8 questions as appropriate concerning the environmental  
9 cleanup.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul, do you have a  
11 question?

12 MR. HEHN: Yes. I just wanted to know if you  
13 could sort of summarize the highlights of their results.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I scribbled about  
15 eight pages of notes. I could give the Cliff notes  
16 version.

17 They thought development of TI was very  
18 doable.

19 They thought that the environmental cleanup  
20 was not as big an issue as it is on other base closure

1 sites.

2           They also thought it was a plus that there was  
3 only one municipality involved. In other base closures,  
4 the base cuts across several municipalities and  
5 sometimes that created several jurisdictional issues.

6           On the challenges side, they saw what we  
7 already know: the seismic issues, potential issues of  
8 the Tidelands Trust, the fact that the job corps is  
9 already going to occupy about 10 percent of Treasure  
10 Island, and traffic and access issues. But they felt  
11 there were answers.

12           Their one general comment on the plan, well,  
13 their comment on the plan was, they thought less of  
14 housing than what the reuse plan indicated.

15           The panel saw TI as primarily an opportunity  
16 for nonhousing, visitor oriented, such as a theme park,  
17 which is already in the plan, some sort of entertainment  
18 retail center, open spaces, promenades, walkways,  
19 hotels -- both conference and tourist related. So they  
20 saw it as an attraction for both Bay Area residents and

1 for visitors.

2 Yerba Buena Island, they didn't see it as  
3 being able to be as fully developed, and they thought,  
4 in fact, that its more pastoral virtues should be kept  
5 so that it could be developed on a lower scale, possibly  
6 a bed and breakfast.

7 They wanted to see more development of the  
8 Marina and possibly some sports fields.

9 So it was generally in concert with the reuse  
10 plan except on the issue of housing.

11 But this was their oral presentation. They  
12 will go into more detail in about a 100-page report that  
13 will be written over the next 60 days.

14 Now, this is strictly an advisory panel. The  
15 city will just take that as advice and make any changes  
16 as appropriate.

17 MR. HEHN: Do you think that this was just  
18 done on the part of the mayor to give it an independent  
19 review of the plan and see if it's in line with what  
20 others think?

1 MS. GLASS: In their opening remarks, that  
2 indicated they were intending to do kind of a tabula rosa  
3 evaluation of the land, but also they saw their role as  
4 potentially validating the reuse plan.

5 MS. MENDELOW: Was there anything brought up  
6 in context with the sustainability plan that's been  
7 written in the last few months in the context of the  
8 reuse of Treasure Island?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sustainability as far as  
10 what is in the plan?

11 MS. MENDELOW: Well, there is a sustainability  
12 plan that's been written over the last six months that's  
13 going to be approved by the board of supervisors.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh, that the city has  
15 written.

16 I'm not real familiar with it. I did see a  
17 copy of it at one time. There is kind of a general  
18 environmental sustainability plan that the city produced  
19 for the city as a whole.

20 MS. MENDELOW: And then Treasure Island, as a

1 part of the City of San Francisco, is any of the aspects  
2 of that plan going to be looked at in terms of the Urban  
3 Land Institute looking at the reuse plan?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think they  
5 certainly did in terms of traffic. I mean, they really  
6 see an opportunity for TI to both serve, both sort of by  
7 necessity and also as kind of a model as a low traffic  
8 impact site, and an opportunity to boost the ferry  
9 ridership in the bay.

10 But the reuse plan is proceeding under the  
11 aegis of the city, so, presumably, whatever other plans  
12 or programs that the city has, TI reuse would be part of  
13 that, too.

14 Also, I should mention, the EIS hearing has  
15 been set. At the time that I sent this out, I was still  
16 unsure of the date, but it will be October the 9th.

17 When I send out the mailing for the next  
18 interim meeting, you may be getting other mailings,  
19 also, because I believe the RAB members are on the  
20 city's, one or more of the city's mailing lists, so you

1 may end up being bombarded in the mail about the  
2 environmental impact statements.

3           The date is the 9th of October. That's a  
4 Wednesday. It's the day after our interim meeting on  
5 the 8th. So it will be on the 9th at 7:00 p.m. at the  
6 Ferry Building. It won't be here on Treasure Island.  
7 It will be at the Ferry Building downtown. That was for  
8 reasons of wanting to maximize public transit for San  
9 Francisco residents. Treasure Island still isn't served  
10 by Muni. We are only served by AC Transit, and they  
11 charge the transbay rate surcharge. It's like 4.50  
12 round trip between here and the city.

13           I will send out notices regardless, but more  
14 than likely, you will see other notices for that.

15           So the Scoping hearing really kicks off the  
16 environmental impact statement, environmental impact  
17 review for the reuse plan. It's primarily an  
18 opportunity for the public. There will be a brief  
19 presentation at the beginning, but it's primarily an  
20 open forum for the public to make comments.

1           So depending on the amount of comment, it  
2 could be a short meeting or it could be a long meeting.

3           We also expect the Navy in the city. The city  
4 has moved into, has an office now in Building 1 on the  
5 second floor right across from the room that we have our  
6 interim meetings in. So the city has a full-time  
7 presence on Treasure Island now.

8           We expect to have a meeting within the next  
9 week, probably a series of meetings to look at the reuse  
10 plan, interim reuses over the next year or two. Part of  
11 the discussion, of course, will be, how does the cleanup  
12 get integrated with that?

13           We hope maybe at next month's meeting, either  
14 the October or November meeting, to be able to make a  
15 presentation on our FOSL finding of suitability to lease  
16 plans for at least '97 and, if not, a little more longer  
17 range than that.

18           So if there is no other comments under General  
19 Updates, I will move to -- actually, I would like to  
20 defer review of action items. I think I need the break

1 time to go over it. So unless there is any objection,  
2 we will skip over that and pick it up after the break.

3 We will move into, which puts us just about  
4 right on time, we will move into our presentation on  
5 Corrective Action Plans by Gina Kathuria from the Water  
6 Board.

7 MS. KATHURIA: Hi. I'm Gina Kathuria from the  
8 Water Board. You all should have gotten a handout of my  
9 presentation.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will pass them out.

11 MS. KATHURIA: I will give you a brief  
12 overview of a Corrective Action Plan and talk to you a  
13 little bit about where it fits into the process.

14 I am with the Water Board, which is an agency  
15 under California EPA. We are partners with DTSC and the  
16 Air Board and the Pesticide Board and some other boards  
17 that are within Cal EPA. We have jurisdiction over  
18 petroleum, and that's what we are going to address with  
19 the CAP, petroleum related contamination.

20 Corrective Action Plan is CAP for short.

1 That's the acronym. I just wanted to quickly go over  
2 the difference with the two programs.

3           There are two major programs at Treasure  
4 Island that dominate environmental cleanup here. One is  
5 CERCLA, which you guys are greatly familiar with, and  
6 the other is UST program, which I think my supervisor  
7 gave a presentation about that before, but I just wanted  
8 to give a quick refresher.

9           CERCLA starts out with PA/SI, which is a  
10 preliminary site investigation. Then you go to RIFS,  
11 which is the document that you will be reviewing later  
12 on, the remedial investigation, and then eventually NFS.  
13 At that time, you go to a ROD, which you make a decision  
14 and then you eventually implement it.

15           What the UST program is, you do a removal work  
16 plan for a tank, so you remove a tank. Then if it's  
17 leaked, you move on and you do a CAP and then you  
18 implement the CAP. So it's much more streamlined than  
19 CERCLA, as you can see.

20           I wanted to start off with the definition of a

1 Corrective Action Plan, and this is a broad definition.

2 It just means any activity related to a leak.

3           It includes the investigation of the site,  
4 which includes the analysis of data at that site, which  
5 includes also a feasibility study looking at different  
6 remedial plans or remedial alternatives and doing a cost  
7 effectiveness evaluation of them, and it includes a risk  
8 assessment. It includes cleanup goals protective of  
9 human health and the environment, and also looking at  
10 protective beneficial uses of groundwater at Treasure  
11 Island. There is a recommendation also in the document  
12 which tells you, the recommendation recommends the  
13 remedial alternative that they would like to implement  
14 at a site.

15           So that's the definition of Corrective Action  
16 Plan, everything from investigation to implementation of  
17 a remedial action.

18           Here are some topics that I would like to see  
19 in the CAP when we get it December 2nd of this year, the  
20 one for Treasure Island.

1                   You want to see a risk assessment, obviously,  
2 a human health and eco, limited risk assessment. You  
3 want to know a little bit more about the mobility of  
4 your contaminant of concern, which is petroleum, for  
5 this CAP. You want to know how it moves in the soil and  
6 in the water. You want to obviously look at the  
7 hydrogeology of the site, are there any preferential  
8 pathways, the soil types and receptors. And you also  
9 want a discussion of the quality of the water at your  
10 site, which goes into a further discussion of your  
11 beneficial uses. And you want a feasibility study,  
12 again looking at different remedial alternatives and  
13 doing a costing for each of those alternatives. And,  
14 again, you want a recommendation for what action you  
15 want to take.

16                   The recommendation will be made by the Navy to  
17 the Water Board, or to the agency that is going to be  
18 reviewing the document. We review the document and we  
19 have to agree with the alternative for it to be  
20 implemented.

1 I wanted to go into a little bit how the  
2 public is informed. Here are some examples that are in  
3 the regulations of how you can get the public involved.  
4 These aren't mandates. These are just examples. It's  
5 very flexible as to the degree of public involvement  
6 that you want at a site. It can go from just a simple  
7 notification in the newspaper to actual public meetings  
8 like this, like we have today, but it's just very  
9 flexible because of the site, like a gas station on the  
10 corner of a commercial zone, you wouldn't have much  
11 public involvement because of your neighbors or  
12 commercial, you know, people, and they wouldn't want to  
13 have input. There are no residents nearby, so it would  
14 be different at different sites. And so we wanted the  
15 regulations to have that flexibility.

16 At Treasure Island, we haven't talked much  
17 about what the public involvement will be with the CAP,  
18 but it will definitely undergo RAB review, at least the  
19 draft version of this.

20 So why move sites from CERCLA to the UST

1 program? We started out with, the site started out with  
2 CERCLA because we thought that there were contaminants  
3 of concern regulated under CERCLA, such as solvents or  
4 other contaminants, but we realized that some of the  
5 sites just had petroleum, that there weren't the other  
6 concerns that we originally thought that were there.

7           So only the sites that just have petroleum are  
8 legally excluded from CERCLA, and that's why we are  
9 moving it to the UST program. That's the legal reason  
10 why we are moving it.

11           The benefit to move it is, again, it's a  
12 faster process to get to cleanup. As I showed before,  
13 the flow chart, there is less documentation, and, also,  
14 the CAP comes in as a draft, and you review it and then  
15 you have a final. So there is not that draft final  
16 phase like the other documents in CERCLA.

17           These are the sites currently being moved. I  
18 forgot to put a site in. It's site 4. It should be 4  
19 slash 18.

20           MS. SMITH: What is the name of that site?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 4 is the hydraulic  
2 training school, but it's right adjacent to, more or  
3 less contiguous with, site 19, the refuse transfer area.

4 MS. SMITH: All right.

5 MS. KATHURIA: That's my presentation.

6 Are there any questions?

7 (No response.)

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Show of hands?

9 We've got Henry and then Richard and Paul and  
10 then Dale.

11 MR. ONGERTH: Gina, what is the regional  
12 board's position or thinking about the potential  
13 benefits for use?

14 MS. KATHURIA: Although Treasure Island meets  
15 8863, the regulation that describes potential drinking  
16 water areas, we have done a staff in-house evaluation of  
17 Treasure Island and determined in-house that there is no  
18 probable use of the water for drinking water purposes.  
19 So we are looking to de-designate.

20 MR. ONGERTH: So this whole thing may

1 disappear if that de-designation occurs?

2 MS. KATHURIA: What whole thing?

3 MR. ONGERTH: The process you have been  
4 describing.

5 MS. KATHURIA: No, no.

6 MR. ONGERTH: No? Straighten me out then.

7 MS. KATHURIA: The basic plan lists five  
8 beneficial uses in groundwater.

9 You have agricultural use; you have industrial  
10 process; you have industrial supply; you have surface  
11 water replenishment; and you have drinking water.

12 So just because this isn't drinking water, it  
13 doesn't exclude the other uses from applying here. A  
14 major concern will be the impact to the surface water.

15 MR. ONGERTH: When you say "surface water" --

16 MS. BROWNELL: The bay.

17 MR. ONGERTH: Leakage out into the bay.

18 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

19 MR. ONGERTH: Thank you.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard?

1 MR. HANSEN: I have two questions: How many  
2 gallons of water are you talking about underneath  
3 Treasure Island, is it one million gallons or ten  
4 million gallons or what?

5 MS. KATHURIA: Well, we have a shallow zone  
6 under TI which extends to about 20 feet.

7 MS. TOBIAS: About 30 feet.

8 MS. KATHURIA: 30 feet.

9 So that zone is what we are talking about.

10 MR. HANSEN: In one of these reports, I think  
11 that would be a useful number to have. The City of San  
12 Francisco uses 100 million gallons of water a day, for  
13 reference, and water under Treasure Island, is that a  
14 drop in the bucket or is that a significant amount of  
15 water?

16 At some point, we should look at that  
17 calculation because it might be a trivial amount of  
18 water.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Henry, did you want to add  
20 to that question?

1           MR. ONGERTH: It's not just the volume that's  
2 sitting there that you could use once and it's gone,  
3 mining it, but what is the yield of, say, that water  
4 basin, is it 5 gallons a minute for perpetuity, is it  
5 500 gallons a minute, or whatever units you want to use.  
6 That, to me, seems the more important aspect of this.

7           The mining, you use it once and it's gone,  
8 what's replenishing.

9           MR. HANSEN: I bow to the insights of my  
10 distinguished friend, but in actual fact, I think it's  
11 not a question of mining.

12           If I could stand corrected, Jim, I think the  
13 water underneath Treasure Island is largely due to the  
14 irrigation on the grass of the island itself rather than  
15 the natural rainfall. So it's sort of as though you  
16 were in Colorado and you were seeding, you were  
17 creating.

18           But, again, that's a number that people will  
19 need to know before they do much assessment.

20           If all the people left Treasure Island and

1 there was no more leaky sewer lines, no more lawns being  
2 irrigated, I suspect that the natural water under this  
3 terrain due only to rainfall would be fairly trivial.

4 MS. KATHURIA: The in-house evaluation was, I  
5 believe, available to the RAB as well, where we had the  
6 benefit of San Francisco City and County doing a master  
7 plan and looking at the groundwater within the whole  
8 county and seeing what they wanted to preserve, that  
9 they are planning to use in the future, and looking at  
10 also emergency supply, you know, would they actually use  
11 Treasure Island in the case of an earthquake?

12 San Francisco City didn't have Treasure Island  
13 as a plan of use within their master plan of managing  
14 the groundwater within the county, so we also looked at  
15 that as well.

16 But if anybody wants a copy of our evaluation  
17 of Treasure Island and its potential for drinking water  
18 use, I could make that available.

19 MR. ONGERTH: I would like it, please.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul and Dale and come back

1 to you, Richard.

2 MR. HANSEN: Could we first have an indication  
3 of who would like that report? I think at least two of  
4 us would.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Three.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will put a sign-up  
7 sheet in the back. We have Richard and Henry and  
8 Laurie.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul?

10 MR. HEHN: Two questions here: One would be,  
11 on that potential de-designation for Treasure Island and  
12 the associated uses for San Francisco, do you have a  
13 timetable of when that might be accepted or approved to  
14 the Board?

15 MS. KATHURIA: The de-designation?

16 MR. HEHN: Yes.

17 MS. KATHURIA: We are looking to put it in the  
18 ROD, the no further action ROD that will be coming  
19 sometime in the near future.

20 What we do is bring the ROD to the Board and

1 make that recommendation. Although it's a potential use  
2 of groundwater, according to the regulation, it's not a  
3 probable use of groundwater. And we get their input  
4 through the ROD and have it sort of monumented in that  
5 process.

6 MR. HEHN: So if the ROD is accepted, then it  
7 assumes the fact that the regional board then accepts  
8 the fact it can be deregulated.

9 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

10 MR. HEHN: And that's only as a drinking water  
11 source and not for any other industrial use purposes, is  
12 that right?

13 MS. KATHURIA: Not at this time. We don't  
14 have enough information to make that de-designation.

15 MR. HANSEN: So you will say it will be  
16 de-designated for domestic use?

17 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But it's likely then that  
19 surface water replenishment would then be the most  
20 critical category.

1 MS. KATHURIA: Even drinking water, that would  
2 probably be the driver anyway for sites that border the  
3 bay, but more inland, then it wouldn't be.

4 MR. HANSEN: The second question was: In  
5 moving the USTs from CERCLA into compliance under the  
6 regional board, are there any concentrations showing  
7 hydrocarbons or any parts of hydrocarbon constituents  
8 that would throw it back into CERCLA again?

9 MS. KATHURIA: Are you talking about  
10 particular defects?

11 MR. HANSEN: Yes, or anything else that might  
12 show up.

13 MS. KATHURIA: No. Anything created from a  
14 petroleum leak, even though some of the substances  
15 talked about which may be considered hazardous under  
16 CERCLA, such as defects, still is excluded, which  
17 includes semi volatiles, the TPHs and BTEX components of  
18 petroleum as well.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dale and Usha.

20 MS. SMITH: Just to go back to Richard's

1 questions, you mentioned that groundwater went down 30  
2 feet approximately, and the island is only 9 feet off  
3 the surface of the bay.

4 I think he's right. I think we need some  
5 clarification here, because if you stop watering, I  
6 think you find saltwater intrusion, and I would like to  
7 have some kind of clarification.

8 I will talk to Richard about this later, but I  
9 think you're playing number games with us, and I'm not  
10 clear on that.

11 My other thing is that site 6 had tremendous  
12 amounts of petroleum, floating product, and you're  
13 declassifying it to a UST site.

14 My understanding of UST site cleanups, you  
15 can't do site 6 under a UST program because there is too  
16 much floating product and it is migrating.

17 I would like to understand why -- you can move  
18 it from CERCLA, and that's fine, but to a UST program,  
19 that's not fine, because there is a tremendous amount of  
20 floating product there. It's one of the dirtiest sites

1 on this island.

2           The UST is just removing a tank, cleaning the  
3 soil around it and backfilling. And you can't do that  
4 with floating product migrating out to the bay and  
5 migrating in with the tides. This is a tidal action  
6 site, and it's very, very dangerous.

7           MS. KATHURIA: The UST program includes  
8 removing a UST and, if it's leaked, it includes  
9 remediating it and investigating it. That's how I see  
10 the UST program and what regulations mandate the UST  
11 program.

12           So when product is removed from a site,  
13 Chapter 16 requires a removal of that free product which  
14 is under the UST program.

15           So by moving it into the UST program, you're  
16 not declassifying it or making it any less of a concern.  
17 You're just saying: Hey, our only concern at this site  
18 is petroleum free product or petroleum soil can impact  
19 the soil, so let's move it into the UST program that  
20 just deals with petroleum.

1           So within the UST program, site 6 definitely  
2 has a high priority in getting the source out, which  
3 includes the UST tank and the free product.

4           MS. SMITH: There is no UST tank there.

5           MS. KATHURIA: No, it's not there.

6           MS. SMITH: It's floating product. You could  
7 light the stuff. There is no tank.

8           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But the source of the  
9 product at site 6 is the tankage that was there that has  
10 been removed.

11          MS. SMITH: Right.

12          MS. KATHURIA: But by moving it to the UST  
13 program, Dale, we're not saying we don't want to deal  
14 with the free product.

15                 We're just saying that the petroleum is the  
16 only concern at this site, and to address our petroleum  
17 concern at site 6, we need to (a) get the free product  
18 out of there, and we need to evaluate the heavily  
19 contaminated soils as well.

20                 So by moving to the UST program, you're not

1 saying that it's less of a concern, you're just saying  
2 that it's only a petroleum concern.

3 MS. SMITH: So when will we see documentation  
4 on how you plan to handle things, like the fire training  
5 area and tank farm in Clipper Cove, when will there be  
6 documentation?

7 MS. KATHURIA: December 2nd is when the Draft  
8 Corrective Action Plan should be coming out. You will  
9 see the results of this. You will see them analyze the  
10 data. You will see, hopefully, flue (phonetic) maps.  
11 You will see also a recommendation for action.

12 So you will see all that on December 2nd.

13 MS. SMITH: All right. And, lastly, my last  
14 question is, you said there will be a limited risk  
15 assessment, which I believe you mean a limited health  
16 risk assessment.

17 So you're not concerned at all with the  
18 petroleum sites and their impact on the bay?

19 MS. KATHURIA: No.

20 MS. SMITH: You're doing a limited human

1 health risk assessment on these sites.

2 MS. KATHURIA: We're doing an ecological risk  
3 assessment as well and deriving aquatic TPH numbers at  
4 Treasure Island as well, which we would use to derive  
5 cleanup goals for our petroleum sites both in the CERCLA  
6 program and the UST program. So we are looking at both  
7 the human health and the eco risk assessments at those  
8 sites, yes.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, limited just refers  
10 to the fact that it's related to petroleum.

11 Richard, I'm sorry?

12 MR. HANSEN: When this report is available on  
13 the 2nd of December, will it cover this Livermore region  
14 for the EPA natural attenuation issue for petroleum  
15 products?

16 MS. KATHURIA: I think that passive  
17 remediation is definitely going to be an alternative  
18 that will be looked at when looking at the feasibility  
19 study, yes.

20 MR. HANSEN: Has that whole concept gone

1 anywhere from where it was six months ago when we heard  
2 about it?

3 MS. KATHURIA: Gone anywhere in terms of  
4 regulations and policy changes?

5 MR. HANSEN: Right.

6 MS. KATHURIA: We haven't made any policy  
7 changes, but we definitely have directives to look at  
8 passive remediation and biodegradation.

9 MR. HANSEN: Nationwide?

10 MS. KATHURIA: Statewide.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, basically, it's  
12 another tool that we've added to our tool kit.

13 MR. HANSEN: Is it any more universally  
14 accepted than it was six months ago or a year ago?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I couldn't really say  
16 outside of what the State of California is doing. I'm  
17 not familiar with that.

18 MS. SMITH: I can say, for the City of  
19 Berkeley, the answer is no, but you can get the entire  
20 document off the web.

1           The Lawrence Livermore National Labs has put  
2 the document on the web because it is so controversial.  
3 And I met with DOP two weeks ago over the issue. They  
4 are studying it further, but they said you can get the  
5 document.

6           CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would like to take Usha's  
7 question and then get a sense of how many more we have.

8           MS. VEDAGIRI: Minor follow-up questions to a  
9 couple of the issues that Paul raised.

10           Regarding the de-designation that you said  
11 would be incorporated into the ROD, ultimately, I  
12 thought it would need an amendment to the basin plan in  
13 order to become part of the public record, or to become  
14 part of the policy; is that correct?

15           MS. KATHURIA: That's also a process that can  
16 happen.

17           I think that because of the report that we  
18 have done, the in-house report on looking at different  
19 beneficial uses within the City and County of San  
20 Francisco, we made several recommendations, and some

1 orders have been adopted with the recommendations stated  
2 in the staff report that we worked on.

3 I know what you're saying about the basin plan  
4 and having it to be de-designated through that, but we  
5 are looking at other alternatives to achieve the same  
6 goal.

7 We are looking at whether we can do it through  
8 a ROD. The next time the basin plan becomes amended,  
9 then have it placed in that as well. But for the  
10 interim having it written in the ROD.

11 MS. VEDAGIRI: And the other question that I  
12 had was, when you said that the UST program covers only  
13 the petroleum products, an issue that came up at our  
14 technical subcommittee meeting, too, was whether that  
15 included additives, like MTBE, or other specific  
16 chemicals that may not be petroleum derived products.

17 Do you address the risks or cleanup or  
18 whatever for those?

19 MS. KATHURIA: Well, MTBE is petroleum  
20 derived, sort of. It's in the petroleum and happens

1 when it leaks.

2 But MTBE at Treasure Island is not a concern  
3 because the spills happened before MTBE was used. So at  
4 TI, we are not worried about that.

5 But you were concerned about other chemicals  
6 that we might have found?

7 (Ms. Smith and Ms. Vedagiri in a discussion.)

8 (Inaudible.)

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do you want to turn up the  
10 volume there, Dale, so everybody can hear?

11 MS. SMITH: The MTBEs were introduced in the  
12 '70s, and that fire training site was used until the  
13 '80s. How can you say it was not introduced on the  
14 island?

15 She's bringing up a very cogent point, and I  
16 think your dates are off.

17 MS. KATHURIA: We said if the release happened  
18 before '80 -- I think it's in the early '80s -- if a  
19 release happened before the early '80s, then MTBE was  
20 not a concern to the Water Board.

1                   But if a release happened after the early  
2 '80s, then it was a concern.

3                   CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is that a release or a known  
4 release? It sounds like there may be a release here but  
5 not known at the time. You don't have to answer that.

6                   Let's take one more question and then move  
7 along.

8                   Paul?

9                   MR. HEHN: In looking at the acceptance of a  
10 ROD, and the questions that came up earlier about taking  
11 that through the basin plan, does the ROD then get  
12 accepted by the State Board, or is it only accepted by  
13 the regional board, and how does that play into the  
14 basin plan?

15                   MS. KATHURIA: Those are good questions  
16 related to the policy end of how we will de-designate.

17                   I don't have a good handle on that at this  
18 time, but I can do some research on it and let you know.

19                   Talking to my supervisor, we initially decided  
20 to have that decision to say that TI was not a drinkable

1 water source in the ROD. And when we bring it to the  
2 Board, they may recommend something further that we do  
3 with it. I don't know what that will be, but I can keep  
4 you guys informed as to the policy changes that we will  
5 have to make.

6 MR. HEHN: I think that Dale brings up a very  
7 good point about the MTBE.

8 Has the MTBE ever been tested on any of the  
9 petroleum sites?

10 MS. KATHURIA: No.

11 MR. HEHN: Is there any thought of doing that?  
12 What about the service station, if they are still in  
13 operation now?

14 MS. KATHURIA: Well, if there is any release  
15 at Treasure Island after this date that I can't really  
16 recall, then we definitely require MTBE to be analyzed.

17 But so far, I think at these sites we are  
18 dealing with historical leaks, and so far, we haven't  
19 required it.

20 But if I come across a leak that's happened

1 within that time frame that I have been given by my  
2 management to look at, then I definitely will require  
3 that analysis be done.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For example, at the fuel  
5 farm site, the sources of leakage were the large 200,000  
6 gallon tanks which set directly on the ground. Those  
7 were taken out of service in the early '80s.

8 The station is currently serviced by half a  
9 dozen 10,000 gallon tanks which sit above ground in  
10 saddles, and none of those have had any significant  
11 leakage.

12 MR. HEHN: Any piping problems at any of those  
13 sites?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

15 MR. HEHN: I might just bring that up, if  
16 that's going to be something you might want to keep an  
17 eye on.

18 MS. KATHURIA: I agree.

19 MR. HEHN: And, I'm sorry, one other question,  
20 if I might.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And then I could comment,  
2 too?

3 MR. HEHN: Yes.

4 I just want to know what the response time is  
5 going to be on that CAP?

6 MS. KATHURIA: The law mandates us to do it  
7 within 60 days.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it's consistent with a  
9 major document in the CERCLA program.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would like to suggest that  
11 for those sites in either the CERCLA or the CAP process,  
12 where there has been product known to have been  
13 purchased or on the site in the 1980s, that those sites  
14 that have monitoring laws be sampled for MTBE as part of  
15 the regular quarterly or semiannual sampling events.

16 We know it's probably too late to go back and  
17 test the soil, but that's one thing we can do, I think,  
18 to address the MTBE issue that was very nicely brought  
19 up.

20 MS. VEDAGIRI: I would agree with that,

1 because it seems now we are basing it entirely on sort  
2 of a date with no single number to back up whether or  
3 not it's actually there.

4 MS. KATHURIA: I agree.

5 MR. HEHN: Some of our clients have gone back  
6 as early as the mid-'70s and found problems with that,  
7 and with the exception of only one site that I got just  
8 recently, they all had MTBE in some concentration.

9 MS. KATHURIA: Were they mostly gasoline  
10 sites?

11 MR. HEHN: Yes.

12 MS. KATHURIA: We are predominantly diesel  
13 here.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Gina.

15 Everybody ready for a break?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We may be able to finish  
17 up earlier today, unless we wanted to go ahead and talk.  
18 There may not be much discussion on this, but if we just  
19 want to get through this item.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That item being the

1 selection of a geographic site as a pilot for looking at  
2 the complete cleanup and reuse process. The last item  
3 on the BRAC cleanup.

4 MS. GLASS: I can hardly hear you. I don't  
5 know how he can hear you.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there is an interest in  
7 going through the next item, which is selecting a  
8 geographic site as a pilot, we can do that. We may not  
9 get very much discussion on that, but that might be  
10 another five or ten minutes.

11 MR. HANSEN: I so move.

12 MS. SMITH: Second.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. The reason we  
14 placed this item on the agenda, there has been a  
15 discussion, probably over the last six months, about  
16 looking at a pilot site or a site rather than continuing  
17 to try to look at all of Treasure Island, and maybe  
18 taking one area and looking at the whole cleanup  
19 process.

20 Originally, this item was listed on the agenda

1 for some time as selecting an IR site, but at the last  
2 interim meeting, actually, I think it was maybe the  
3 August interim meeting, we discussed it and we really  
4 came around to the realization that maybe what we were  
5 really looking for was to select a geographic area, and  
6 then look at all the elements of cleanup that occur  
7 within that geographic area as a way of kind of going  
8 through a small cleanup process in order to help us  
9 understand the big picture of cleanup process.

10           So the presumption is that we would look at an  
11 area that had perhaps petroleum, asbestos, lead based  
12 paint, and look at all the actions that need to take  
13 place to bring that piece of property to a cleanup stage  
14 where it can be transferred.

15           So there appeared to be interest, at least  
16 among the interim meeting attendees, in pursuing that,  
17 because I know from previous discussions on the  
18 compliance programs as opposed to the CERCLA program,  
19 there has been a lot of questions about, "Well, what are  
20 we going to do about asbestos?" And, "What are we going

1 to do about lead based paint?"

2           So this was going to be an opportunity to  
3 focus in on one site and look at those issues. So  
4 that's basically the background on this.

5           We wanted to initiate a discussion at a  
6 regular meeting as to what potential sites we might look  
7 at. Unfortunately, Martha Walters from the city is not  
8 with us tonight. She's on a convalescence leave. The  
9 city, I think it would be in our interests to have the  
10 city involved in this decision, too, to get their input,  
11 because we might be able to use it as a tool for those  
12 areas that they are more interested in now than later.

13           One suggestion I had -- so there is my own  
14 personal input into this -- perhaps we might want to  
15 look at parts or perhaps the whole housing area on Yerba  
16 Buena Island as a smaller model in place of looking at  
17 all of TI.

18           MS. SMITH: You are not talking about all of  
19 TI, are you?

20           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, in place of -- I can

1 restate that.

2           It seemed that perhaps Yerba Buena, being a  
3 smaller geographic area, and there appears to be and  
4 will probably in discussions between the Navy and the  
5 city over the next few months on leasing, interim  
6 leasing plans, it appears that maybe the use of Yerba  
7 Buena Island may be on a speedier track since it  
8 primarily consists of housing, than Treasure Island,  
9 which has a lot of different uses.

10           Maybe if there is going to be a potential  
11 early reuse of the housing area on Yerba Buena, which  
12 constitutes most of the use, then maybe Yerba Buena  
13 might be useful as a model.

14           MS. SMITH: What about site 12? I think it's  
15 12.

16           CO-CHAIR NELSON: The Bunker area?

17           MS. SMITH: Yes. That's excellent. But I  
18 wasn't thinking of that.

19           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Site 12 is the Bunker  
20 area.

1 MS. SMITH: Either that one or the old medical  
2 facility. What number is that?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the old medical  
4 building is one that we are going to propose a no action  
5 ROD.

6 MS. SMITH: I know, but you had silver in the  
7 soil.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right, which we removed  
9 during the course of the investigation because it turned  
10 out we discovered it was actually a concrete pad  
11 underneath the spill site that we didn't realize was  
12 there until we did the investigation. So it turned out  
13 to be contained.

14 MS. SMITH: Did you test underneath the pads?

15 MS. TOBIAS: The pad had no cracks. We took  
16 pictures of it.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: RAB will have an  
18 opportunity to look at it, as well as the regulators.

19 MS. SMITH: Site 12 will be excellent to have  
20 all sorts of natural stuff show up.

1 MS. GLASS: Is the area around either Building  
2 1 or those hangars, because they are already, I mean,  
3 obviously, the museum would love to know what kind of  
4 process there might be in cleanup around Building 1.  
5 And they desire to stay in operation continuously all  
6 through. So in some sense, they are not only early use,  
7 but they are already here.

8 Also, Building 1 is being used for other  
9 things that has asbestos and has some underground  
10 storage tanks close by, and has some, I would imagine,  
11 lead paint issues as well.

12 Am I correct on that?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Though it's not  
14 residential.

15 MS. GLASS: And it's also fairly high human  
16 use.

17 MS. SMITH: It's not as high as residential.  
18 That's a good point.

19 MS. GLASS: This is true.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Richard?

1 MR. HANSEN: Well, the concern about  
2 occupancy, I would think, for residential occupancy, I  
3 think you give greater emphasis to the old brig.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the old brig is  
5 gone. It's demolished.

6 And the city is proposing to use the new brig  
7 which was built in the 1990s.

8 MR. HANSEN: So lead is not an issue.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

10 I think we will probably find there is  
11 probably no one single site that has all the elements.

12 Like, for example, Dale suggested it's good on  
13 site 12, except all of the housing was built in 1968 and  
14 afterwards, so it doesn't have the asbestos and lead  
15 based paint issues that we might have at the older  
16 housing on Yerba Buena Island.

17 So we may not find an ideal site. I guess  
18 it's just a question of, what might be a useful site?

19 MS. SMITH: Well, what about the building  
20 where you have the sinking boat?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The trainer, the buttercup  
2 trainer.

3 MS. SMITH: Yes.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's not currently in  
5 any, it might be on the edge of the . . .

6 MS. SMITH: That's going to have the asbestos,  
7 it's going to have the lead based paint, and it may have  
8 some hydraulic fuel and petroleum.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's actually outside of  
10 our IR sites. It's not really in any specific  
11 investigative area.

12 MS. SMITH: So we are trying to pick something  
13 in an IR site?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we are trying,  
15 well, we kind of talked it out at the interim meeting.  
16 We are kind of trying to look at a site that has a  
17 number of different cleanup elements.

18 Maybe there won't be a site that has  
19 everything in it, but if there is a site that has some  
20 petroleum cleanup, some asbestos, some lead based paint,

1 enough to sort of be able to look at a lot of different  
2 elements of the cleanup process and what it takes to  
3 reach a state where it's clean for transfer.

4 Sharon?

5 MS. TOBIAS: Aren't there some USTs out there?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

7 Building 1, for example, it's a petroleum  
8 site. There is probably some asbestos issues. There  
9 may be lead based paint issues present, although what we  
10 would be saying is that, because it's not residential,  
11 we wouldn't be looking at them, other than just  
12 disclosing because of the age of the building, lead  
13 based paint may be present.

14 So we wouldn't have the lead based paint  
15 abatement issues that you would certainly have at the  
16 older housing on Yerba Buena Island. There, there is  
17 definitely some recommendations for abatement.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul?

19 MR. HEHN: One thing that I would recommend is  
20 that you pick a location or geographic area that the

1 reuse plan is fairly fixed, and that is what I think we  
2 need to interact closer with the city.

3                   If that be Building 1, or whatever, to  
4 remain in the current usage or housing at Yerba Buena,  
5 if those are fixed, so that what we're doing is not only  
6 going to the process for our own edification, but also  
7 helping to process along so that when we're done, we  
8 have sort of like a road map for how this will take  
9 place.

10                   Then we can say, yeah, Building 1, from  
11 our standpoint, is pretty well set up as far as where it  
12 will go in that process, even if it may not have all the  
13 issues that we are looking for, at least it takes us  
14 through that process to some beneficial goal at the  
15 other end.

16                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Dale?

17                   MS. SMITH: What about taking Admiral Nimitz's  
18 house to the far end of Yerba Buena where you have that  
19 hazardous site, which we did not go into, and you have  
20 that chunky little building down right on the bay,

1 which, I think, was a munitions building.

2 That pretty much should cover it without doing  
3 all of Yerba Buena, and it would fit Paul's needs, which  
4 would be something that is pretty fixed.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

6 Dale is talking about the Nimitz house complex  
7 here, so, basically, it would be kind of like the east  
8 tip of Yerba Buena Island.

9 MS. SMITH: And go through that place you said  
10 was off limits because there was some dumping done  
11 there.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, that's the IR site  
13 11, the landfill site.

14 So we have, in that area, we have two CERCLA  
15 sites remaining, IR-11 and IR-8, IR-8 being the sludge  
16 disposal area.

17 We have some home heating oil tanks, and,  
18 also, near the entrance to the Coast Guard base, we have  
19 some regular nonresidential USTs, and there is a piece  
20 of a fuel line that we are going to be closing in place.

1 MS. GLASS: And the lead paint from the  
2 bridge.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the lead paint from  
4 the bridge.

5 MS. SMITH: And then you have the bridge.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So that may be a good  
7 candidate, and the fact that the city is actively  
8 interested in leasing, initially leasing the Nimitz,  
9 what we call the Nimitz house complex, which is that  
10 grouping of nineteen hundred era housing.

11 MR. HANSEN: And it's a nice place to set up a  
12 staging area.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For what?

14 MR. HANSEN: For remediation work.

15 MS. JONES: It's noisy.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think I would  
17 propose that we take Dale's suggestion and maybe hash it  
18 out a little more at the next interim meeting when maybe  
19 a few other people who aren't here tonight are here. It  
20 appears that's a good choice.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do I hear a motion to  
2 discuss it further at the interim meeting?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Motion to focus on this  
4 site now, to have a little further discussion just on  
5 this eastern Yerba Buena site.

6 Conceivably, somebody who isn't here tonight  
7 might bring up some totally different site, but at this  
8 point now, this eastern Yerba Buena site seems to have  
9 the lead track.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think in terms of process,  
11 I would like some feel about, if it does go to an  
12 interim meeting for discussion, should we bring it back  
13 in the October meeting for concurrence by the RAB  
14 members?

15 MR. HANSEN: We need to bring it back because,  
16 as Jim said, we need to hear the city's input.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we will be having,  
19 between now and the October meeting, we will be having  
20 -- the Navy will be having at least several meetings

1 with the city, in fact one as early as this Friday.

2 MS. JONES: Well, I would be willing to  
3 suggest, to make a motion that we offer that portion of  
4 Yerba Buena, the eastern, the northeastern tip of Yerba  
5 Buena as the test site -- what do you call it, the  
6 geographic site as a pilot.

7 MS. GLASS: Would you be willing to make the  
8 motion, say, focusing on that but possibly including  
9 others or possibly changing?

10 MS. SMITH: At the moment, I would not be  
11 willing to accept an amendment to that extent simply  
12 because we are just in the negotiating phase. We can  
13 negotiate that later. Something has to get moved.

14 MR. HEHN: I think the critical factor is the  
15 input from the city on that.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Well, that  
17 appears to be the consensus.

18 We will proceed to further discuss the  
19 northeastern Yerba Buena.

20 MS. GLASS: Actually, it's not a consensus,

1 but I'm sure it's a majority.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I stand corrected.

3 But we will still entertain other suggestions  
4 at the interim meeting, and then bring it back to the  
5 full membership at the October meeting and, hopefully,  
6 reach a conclusion.

7 And, again, this is not saying that we are not  
8 going to look at all the other sites. It's just saying  
9 that we want to look at this site and spend a little  
10 more time with this site as a model that will help us to  
11 work with the other sites.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right. Well, I guess  
13 we're ready for a break.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will take a 10- to  
15 15-minute break or whenever the consensus is that we are  
16 ready to start, but no later than 15 minutes.

17 (Short break.)

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Well, we are  
19 attempting to go back through the action items and then  
20 onto organizational business, so, actually, we are a

1 little bit behind schedule.

2 In the interests of keeping the meeting on  
3 schedule, is there an interest in going over all the  
4 action items? I'm referring to page 7 and 8 of the  
5 meeting minutes from August. The action items are  
6 tacked onto the back of the meeting minutes.

7 So given the number of attendees, is there an  
8 interest in going through each one, or does anyone have  
9 any questions about specific action items? We have the  
10 action item listed, and then there is a brief update as  
11 to what its status is.

12 In some cases, some of them are to be  
13 completed, and in others, it's indicated as having been  
14 completed.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If I might suggest one, and  
16 then, Dale, you have one.

17 I think most of us received the notice from  
18 the DTSC indicating the budget cut, and I guess reduced  
19 participation in meetings with RABs. That related to, I  
20 guess, federal budget items, and there is a budget for

1 fiscal year 1997 update.

2 I was wondering if you can shed some light on  
3 that. I don't know if you want to take them in order or  
4 if you just want all of those acronyms.

5 Do you want Dale to?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe I will just take  
7 them as they come.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe as an action item,  
10 Sharon, we can number the action items.

11 MS. TOBIAS: All right.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I should have thought of  
13 that before, but, otherwise, it's hard to describe them.  
14 So action items, number the action items.

15 The action item, I think, we are talking about  
16 is about clarification on the status of funds. I'm just  
17 paraphrasing.

18 And the issue concerning the state related to  
19 an additional, a different funding source that provides  
20 funding from the Department of Defense to the State of

1 California to assist them in their oversight of our  
2 cleanup. That's really separate from the TI specific  
3 cleanup budget.

4 In fact, I think that money is allocated at  
5 the Department of Defense level, so it's not even  
6 allocated, I don't think, at the local level here. So  
7 it doesn't have, to my knowledge, it doesn't have impact  
8 on our immediate cleanup budget here.

9 But it is an issue between the Department of  
10 Defense and the State of California because it affects  
11 the state's funding that it uses to pay its employees to  
12 oversee cleanup.

13 I don't know, is there anything you want to  
14 add, Gina?

15 MS. KATHURIA: No.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dale?

17 MS. SMITH: My only comment was going to be,  
18 because I have been on strike for two months, I'm not  
19 going to comment on any action items. So if we could  
20 get through them.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Are there any  
2 other action items of concern?

3 Laurie?

4 MS. GLASS: The third action item concerning  
5 Dan McDonald.

6 I forget if there is any kind of time issue  
7 there, but it might be well to ask Dan if he has a  
8 continuing interest or a continuing availability to work  
9 on this.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. We were going to do  
11 that the next time we saw Dan.

12 MS. GLASS: It might be good to just call him.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can do that, too.

14 We will attempt to contact him outside the  
15 meeting.

16 What Laurie is referring to is the California  
17 Environmental Protection Agency Advisory Group, an  
18 ongoing organization at the state level.

19 Dan had an interest in seeing what linkage  
20 could be developed between that advisory group and the

1 Restoration Advisory Board.

2           So as an action item, we will contact Dan and  
3 see, clarify the status of whether or not he still wants  
4 to pursue that or not.

5           MS. GLASS: If he doesn't, maybe somebody  
6 else. I know his life has changed dramatically in the  
7 last few months, so he may be less available to fulfill  
8 commitments.

9           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Chris Shirley from ARC may  
10 have an interest in that, too, because I think ARC is  
11 involved with it, too, and actually, I think it's  
12 already a member of that advisory group.

13           Are there any other action items?

14           (No response.)

15           With that, we will just proceed to  
16 organizational business, and I will turn it over to Pat.

17           CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

18           Jim has been very nice to hand out a working  
19 calendar.

20           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sharon did it. I just

1 handed it out.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Sharon, and thank  
3 you, Jim.

4 As you all know, the IR report has been  
5 delayed in its release, and will be available to us on  
6 the 22nd of October.

7 That's going to be a pretty large document.  
8 We are going to need to schedule some meeting dates so  
9 that we can review that document.

10 And, in addition, and it might be part of the  
11 review of that document, the interim meeting dates, we  
12 have holidays in November and December, also, and to  
13 avoid conflict with Christmas and Thanksgiving, the RAB  
14 meetings have been scheduled here for the third Tuesday  
15 of those months.

16 I would like some feedback whether or not  
17 that's a good substitute for the fourth Tuesday.

18 I see some nods.

19 MR. HANSEN: I think it's a good schedule.

20 MS. SMITH: Yes.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right. Jim has  
2 suggested, and I agree, we should then go and look  
3 through each month, look at the meetings that are  
4 scheduled and what we would like to do to review the  
5 documents that are coming up.

6 Maybe we can start with October. We have an  
7 interim RAB meeting scheduled for the 8th. There is  
8 topics we would want to discuss there, the selection of  
9 this pilot site and other issues.

10 MS. GLASS: In my book, I have a notation that  
11 there might be a technical committee on the 1st, is that  
12 right?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That was relating to when  
14 we were planning to have the remedial investigation in  
15 August.

16 We had set up some tentative meeting dates  
17 over the next 60 days from August, so now this has kind  
18 of shifted two months.

19 MS. GLASS: Thank you.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It appears that probably

1 since the IR report will be delivered on the 22nd, that  
2 there will probably, other than the interim meeting,  
3 there may not be the need for additional meetings during  
4 that month.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would think so.

6 And then, one of the other things I would like  
7 to discuss here is what the agenda items will be at that  
8 meeting.

9 We know that we had a summary presentation two  
10 months ago, I think, of the RI report, and we will  
11 probably want a presentation at the October meeting,  
12 since it will be released on the date of our meeting.

13 MS. SMITH: Is this a sound date for the  
14 release?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's a firm date.

17 I see a lot of heads nodding.

18 So we should look at the interim between the  
19 22nd of October and the 19th of November. I think that  
20 would be the first order of business.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Let me jump in.

2 Maybe what we can do, at the same time we go  
3 through the months here, we can just kind of jump to the  
4 back page and look at the agenda items, as Pat was  
5 starting to do.

6 For example, for the October regular meeting  
7 on the 22nd, we will have a summary report on the  
8 remedial investigation because that's the date it will  
9 be available.

10 And then I would also propose we will have,  
11 for those who might not have attended the EIS/EIR  
12 Scoping Hearing, which you can mark on your calendar  
13 will be on the 9th of October, 7:00 p.m. at the Ferry  
14 Building. We can provide an update or a highlight of  
15 that hearing.

16 But I would imagine that the remedial  
17 investigation report, we will need quite a bit of time  
18 for that, so that will be the dominant item in our  
19 October meeting.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And, in addition, I think we

1 will want to ratify whatever pilot site in the October  
2 meeting we discuss at the interim meeting on the 8th.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So it seems to me, we would  
5 want to get some momentum building between the 22nd of  
6 October and the 19th of November, before the holidays,  
7 in review of the RI reports.

8 Originally, we had discussed at an interim  
9 meeting that we would have a technical meeting, either  
10 before or after the regular interim meeting, to start  
11 formulating comments that we could roll into the mix for  
12 the first subsequent RAB meeting since the release of  
13 the RI and finalized by the 60-day time limit, which, in  
14 this case, is going to be 23rd of December, which is  
15 leading up close to Christmas.

16 So I will put out for discussion that we might  
17 want to have an interim or technical meeting on the 5th  
18 of November to try to get ourselves organized to review  
19 the RI report, whether that means asking for volunteers  
20 to review certain sections of it, or carrying through a

1 certain portion of our pilot site analysis that would be  
2 up for discussion.

3           And then on the 12th, we can begin to  
4 formulate the types of comments, who's going to take  
5 what subject matter and get ourselves further organized  
6 before the RAB meeting on the 19th.

7           So we can carry that information to the larger  
8 RAB. Those are, essentially, two organizational  
9 meetings.

10           Discussion?

11           (No response.)

12           CO-CHAIR NELSON: And that's the first phase  
13 of review.

14           Paul, you might have some comments.

15           MR. HEHN: I'm wondering whether it's necessary  
16 to have had enough time to look at that RI report.

17           I think that, unless there are some other real  
18 burning issues on the 5th, you might want to figure that  
19 that's going to be that Scoping meeting to sit down and  
20 talk about what's on the RI and how we might want to

1 split those issues out.

2 I don't know whether it's necessary to have  
3 another one on the 12th. I would certainly suggest that  
4 we have another one on the 3rd of February, though, a  
5 week and a half, two weeks before, actually three weeks  
6 before the comments are due.

7 And then my question is, whether there is a  
8 need to have another one somewhere after that or just  
9 before that on December 3rd, if we need to get more  
10 clarification on any of the issues from PRC or the Navy.

11 MS. JONES: I was basically going to say  
12 almost the same thing as Paul.

13 I don't know how much we would be able to get  
14 done by the 5th, but I certainly was appreciative that  
15 the Navy and their consultants came to our last interim  
16 meeting and were able to talk to us about some of our  
17 issues, and either at the 5th or the 12th of November  
18 meeting, maybe we could schedule them.

19 I guess maybe on the 10th get together as the  
20 technical subcommittee or the interim meeting to hash

1 out how we will respond to this document. I mean, not  
2 hash out, start it, to bring this stuff together and try  
3 to fashion some kind of response at that time.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess my sense is, knowing  
7 the depth of this report, I think it might take more  
8 than one meeting to get ourselves organized in a  
9 direction so that we can have a useful meeting in a  
10 subsequent month to discuss what our technical comments  
11 are. That's my sense of the forthcoming document.

12 I could be wrong, but my concept, I guess,  
13 just to build on what's already been discussed, is that  
14 it might take two or so weeks to review and begin to  
15 formulate comments, and we would probably want to have  
16 meetings with the regulators and the PRC, maybe the 3rd  
17 or the 10th of December, before we start to document our  
18 comments.

19 My sense is, we might need a total of four  
20 meetings, two interim and two additional. I could be

1 wrong, but it could be it's going to be much simpler  
2 than that.

3 MS. JONES: I doubt it.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's up for discussion.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sharon, did you have some  
6 suggestion?

7 MS. TOBIAS: Well, to be perfectly honest, I  
8 don't think I reviewed an RI, I've only written them.

9 I would like to say that it could be very easy  
10 to review, but I guess I'm looking at, what is the  
11 easiest way for us to facilitate it or guide the review?  
12 We are not trying to control your review, but if you  
13 think of, in the next month, any ways we could help to  
14 facilitate it, we would be happy to. We don't want to  
15 get stuck on an issue for 30 days when it could be  
16 resolved after two weeks or something.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: My sense is, we might want  
18 to, at least, ink in two meeting dates, one in November  
19 and one in December with additional dates that could be  
20 activated if it looks like it's going to be a pretty

1 involved review, and that the second date, December 3rd  
2 or 10th date, would be a meeting at which we would want  
3 a full complement of the BCT.

4 MR. HEHN: I suggest probably the 3rd would be  
5 a better time for that to give us as much lead time  
6 prior to having comments in.

7 And I sort of agree with your premise that we  
8 might want to look at November the 12th and December the  
9 10th as possible additional dates, if necessary, but  
10 leave that open to discussion at the interim meetings.

11 MS. JONES: So November 5th and December 3rd?

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess the interim meeting,  
13 if we go from second to fourth to first to third, the  
14 interim would be the 5th of November, which I guess is  
15 election day, we might want to keep that in mind, too,  
16 and the 3rd of December.

17 MS. JONES: I would like to request, and I  
18 haven't gone through all my documentation in a long  
19 time, so I'm not certain that we have this, and I'm not  
20 certain that we don't, but I believe the regulators made

1 comments in the draft.

2           It would be nice to know that there is, I  
3 mean, I will be able to do that within the next week or  
4 so to look and see if we have comments on this draft  
5 document that the regulators made, but I would like to  
6 have copies of those comments as we go through the  
7 document, too.

8           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. What you're  
9 talking about is comments that the regulators have on  
10 the draft remedial investigation report.

11           MS. JONES: Right.

12           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Of course, we won't be  
13 getting their comments until, see, everyone is getting  
14 this document at the same time, the 22nd.

15           MS. TOBIAS: She's talking about the one the  
16 agency made comments on three years ago.

17           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry.

18           MS. JONES: Because that's what you're  
19 building on, right?

20           MS. TOBIAS: Well, where is the EPA when I

1 need them? Rachel says it so much better.

2           The agency has made comments on that document  
3 February 1994, a long time ago, and since then we have  
4 had a lot of changes to our whole approach to how to  
5 deal with ambient levels, background levels,  
6 groundwater, petroleum sites.

7           So what we agreed to do is set that document  
8 aside and the responses to comments, and we are starting  
9 from ground zero.

10           Yes, we are starting with that document, and  
11 we are trying to incorporate the comments that we  
12 haven't changed, but we are really starting from, I  
13 guess, the new RI.

14           MS. JONES: I'm sorry. I was on strike for  
15 two months, so I'm not up to speed, but there was  
16 another document that was so radically different than  
17 the first draft, you couldn't really compare the two  
18 documents to see where the updates were. Is this the  
19 same?

20           MS. TOBIAS: We got comments on it from the

1 regulatory agencies on the RI report, and we responded  
2 to them.

3           Since then, that was in 1994, since then, the  
4 response to change so radically, we stopped everything  
5 and said, "We will start from ground zero with the new  
6 RI report."

7           MS. KATHURIA: But you can't compare the draft  
8 RI report with the one coming in December. They are  
9 separate.

10           MS. TOBIAS: Two completely different reports.

11           And what the agency has actually said -- and  
12 Gina can say "yes" or "no," she can agree with me or  
13 not -- they weren't really going to go back and look at  
14 our original responses. They were just going to look at  
15 this report and see how our interpretations are.

16           MS. JONES: So is it still another draft?

17           MS. TOBIAS: This is a draft RI report of  
18 Treasure Island. That is it.

19           MS. JONES: It's a draft. So we can forget  
20 the first one.

1 MS. TOBIAS: When you get this one.

2 MS. JONES: All right. Then I don't need  
3 comments.

4 MR. GALANG: Yes. That is the reason we were  
5 calling it just one report.

6 MS. JONES: So it's a whole document. It's a  
7 big document.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What I would like to  
9 suggest is that maybe at this first meeting on the 5th  
10 of November, then maybe that's a meeting where the Navy  
11 needs to be present so that we can -- so that will be  
12 after you had the document for about two weeks, and then  
13 maybe that's the opportunity to initially clarify some  
14 questions and issues.

15 If it's a two-hour meeting, for example, maybe  
16 we would be there the first hour, or longer if  
17 necessary, and then you could proceed to make your  
18 assignments and have your internal discussion, but it  
19 may be useful for us to be there up front to be able to  
20 answer any general or basic questions so that you're not

1 spending weeks on something that we could have answered  
2 up front.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: At this point, I would also  
4 like to address the different levels of review, I think,  
5 in comments the RAB will be producing.

6 There is a group that would just like to  
7 review the executive summary report and provide comments  
8 at the meetings.

9 There is a group that, I think, will be part  
10 of this interim meeting that might not want to review  
11 the document in as much depth as those on the technical  
12 committee, so there might be three ranges of comments,  
13 and we need to prepare for how all those comments will  
14 be recorded.

15 And if the technical subcommittee elects to  
16 convene outside of the interim meetings, that is  
17 something that needs to be discussed then.

18 So the hierarchy is, the full complement of  
19 RAB here, and subset at interim, and maybe a sub-subset  
20 in a technical committee.

1           But this document is one in which the  
2 technical committee that's been reviewing these reports,  
3 which is really kind of an ad hoc of three or four  
4 people, is going to be much more than we can handle  
5 ourselves.

6           We need to have subscribing RAB members to  
7 review with us the technical portions of the document,  
8 and I think the first idea I have as to who that larger  
9 group is would be those that signed up for receiving  
10 this report.

11           I would hope that those members would show up  
12 at the interim meeting with their reports. We need to,  
13 as a group, draw on our own resources to get this work  
14 done, because this is just the first of a lot of  
15 documents that we are going to need to review and supply  
16 comments for the ROD.

17           I don't see anyone hiding under the table. I  
18 guess it's okay. I saw your hand up, Laurie.

19           MS. GLASS: It's not clear to me what dates  
20 you're talking about and for what purposes. Is that

1 still under discussion?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think it's under  
3 discussion, but I think we targeted for the interim  
4 meetings for the 5th of November and for December to be  
5 the 3rd of December.

6 I had suggested kind of setting aside the  
7 12th, and I would now also suggest maybe the 10th of  
8 December for subsequent meetings for possible additional  
9 meetings, but to pencil those in.

10 MS. GLASS: Thank you.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And we will leave  
12 Thanksgiving week sacred for those of us who need a rest  
13 from the documentary time to review.

14 Is there further discussion? And then our  
15 comments would be due on the 23rd.

16 I would like to suggest, if at all possible,  
17 we get written comments in by the RAB meeting of the  
18 17th. I really think that should be our target, and  
19 only in the event there really is a, shall we say, a  
20 vibrant issue, that we defer getting them in the 23rd.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Along with that, it's  
2 likely that we will have two FOSL drafts. We don't have  
3 a firm schedule yet, but probably sometime in late  
4 November, which would have a 30-day turnaround.

5 I'm using this schedule as kind of a starting  
6 point. I think in the meetings we have with the city  
7 over the next couple of weeks, I think we are going to  
8 firm up those dates.

9 The two FOSLs in question are one for the  
10 Nimitz house complex, if the city still intends to lease  
11 sometime in January '97; and then the second FOSL is for  
12 the fleet training center for possible uses as a police  
13 academy.

14 But we will be firming up the city's  
15 desirability dates for those properties over the next  
16 couple of weeks, and that, in turn, will drive a draft  
17 FOSL schedule.

18 It's likely there will be draft FOSLs probably  
19 sometime in late November or early December at the  
20 latest.

1 MS. JONES: A 30-day turnaround.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 30 days.

3 And then the -- I'm sorry -- and then the  
4 Corrective Action Plan will also be arriving on the 2nd  
5 of December.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And the turnaround on the  
7 Corrective Action Plan?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a 60-day document  
9 similar to the RI.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And the FOSL is a 30-day?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The FOSL is a 30-day.

12 There is really no regulatory specification  
13 for FOSL review dates, but we had been using about 30  
14 days. I think it will probably hinge more on what the  
15 desired occupancy date for the city is for those  
16 properties.

17 MS. NELSON: Do we want to look at agenda  
18 items quick for November and December?

19 One item in December we probably want  
20 discussion on or even November is the Corrective Action

1 Plan report, maybe summary presentation.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We wouldn't have it in  
3 November. We wouldn't be able to give a summary in  
4 November. That would have to be in December.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So there wouldn't be a draft  
6 or summary available two weeks prior.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think it's something we  
8 can look at. I imagine we will spend the balance of the  
9 November meeting talking about continuing discussion on  
10 the remedial investigation report, but we could talk  
11 about that internally and see if we can give you some  
12 prelude to the CAP.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: But at any rate, maybe we  
14 can identify that as a December item for sure.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It will definitely be a  
16 December item to introduce the CAP, especially since it  
17 would have been out for about two weeks.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I guess for the December  
19 meeting, we should have discussion of the RAB comments.  
20 In some way, take those comments of the RAB that we

1 would want to comment verbally at the meeting.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think just those two  
3 items in December, the CAP and RAB comments on the RI,  
4 are two big items.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other suggestions?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sharon?

7 MS. TOBIAS: I know you're trying to avoid it,  
8 Jim, but on the 16th, the RAB and BCT is doing the RAB  
9 cleanup plan update, and comments are due on January  
10 17th. So you might want to at least provide a little  
11 bit of update on what's changed in the BCT.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In December, you mean the  
13 December meeting?

14 MS. TOBIAS: Right, because at the time of  
15 review, comments are due within a month.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, you're exactly right.  
17 So on the December agenda, we would have to  
18 include a discussion of the BRAC cleanup plan update.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Then we could take February  
20 and March off, I guess.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We may want to even, I  
2 don't have a January calendar with me, but we may want  
3 to adjust the January RAB meet to more coincide with the  
4 BRAC cleanup plan.

5 The 17th is what?

6 MS. TOBIAS: It's a Friday.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So 21st?

8 MS. TOBIAS: So the third Tuesday is the 21st,  
9 yes.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I wonder if we could  
11 stretch the comment period for the BRAC cleanup plan to  
12 the 21st to pick up the comments?

13 MR. GALANG: The BCTs, I don't know if we  
14 could stretch that out.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we will look at  
16 that.

17 But, certainly, we will have a discussion of  
18 the BRAC cleanup plan updated at the December meeting,  
19 and then we will relook at what the due date is for  
20 comments.

1           But, currently, in order to meet the schedule  
2 for the completed document to be in Washington, and the  
3 whole driver for this BRAC cleanup plan schedule is to  
4 have a document that's finalized in Washington during  
5 the budget process. So that's why the dates become so  
6 set, because if the document isn't available, then the  
7 Navy and Department of Defense can't use it when they  
8 defend. They would be using it then to defend the '98  
9 and '99 budgets.

10           CO-CHAIR NELSON: Just a thought: If the RAB  
11 meeting will be on the 21st, the third Tuesday in  
12 January, then I would at least like to bring up at this  
13 time that we have an interim meeting scheduled on the  
14 7th to develop comments on the BCT.

15           MS. JONES: Yes.

16           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a good point.

17           CO-CHAIR NELSON: So I think the following  
18 weekend is the Martin Luther King holiday, so we will  
19 want to be sure to get comments.

20           CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the interim meetings on

1 the first Tuesdays in November and December and January.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If we do any more than that,  
3 we might have to change our operating procedures.

4 MR. HANSEN: You might lose the whole board.

5 Just to request, when you send the documents  
6 out to be reviewed, could you put a flier on them, you  
7 know, "This is a 30-day review," "60-day review," and  
8 which session you have scheduled to review them? This  
9 sounds like it's going to be overwhelming.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. Typically, we have a  
11 cover letter. I think almost every document we send out  
12 for review has a cover letter that indicates the date.

13 But maybe we can bold the due date on the  
14 cover letter just to make sure it jumps out.

15 MR. HANSEN: And indicate, again, the date  
16 that you're expecting to have discussions.

17 MS. JONES: That would come from us, not the  
18 Navy. You're mixing it up.

19 MR. HANSEN: Well, just a little flier that  
20 comes with it.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, what we can do is  
2 send out notices on the interim meetings, and we could  
3 try to put the schedule for that interim meeting into  
4 the notice. We will continue to do that.

5 And whatever else I can add onto the bottom of  
6 the agenda in the reminder section here, maybe we could  
7 add on some things, too, but that's a good point.

8 MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

9 MS. JONES: Well, actually, Ernie sends out  
10 something approximately once a month that says what  
11 meetings are to be held.

12 MR. GALANG: Progress reports.

13 MS. JONES: The meetings to be held, the  
14 documents to be released. We get that. It's something  
15 that we probably are just kind of filing, but we do get  
16 that document that tells us meetings for the Navy as  
17 well as reports from the Navy and from everybody else.  
18 So we do get that material.

19 MR. GALANG: But that's the interim RAB  
20 meeting.

1 MS. JONES: It lists reports.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I guess, in response  
3 to Richard, I certainly sympathize with him over the  
4 blizzard of documents, whatever opportunity we take to  
5 have reminders, we will try taking those.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I have a couple of more  
7 items under organizational business.

8 And I'm going to turn the remaining portion of  
9 the organizational meetings over to the co-chair, Paul  
10 Hehn.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Let me jump in.

12 We do have a night for membership. I don't  
13 think we need a lot of discussion for that now.

14 The generalization is, membership is going  
15 down. That's obvious. So I think we will probably have  
16 to discuss in the future interim and regular meetings  
17 what we may need to do to bring existing members back  
18 into a more regular attendance or to add new members,  
19 but it's definitely over the last couple of months the  
20 meeting attendance has gone down.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Which is a good way to segue  
2 into a proposal Paul is about to make.

3 MR. HEHN: There are two things. First of  
4 all, I received a letter today from Chloe Jue that I  
5 would just like to read in, if I might, to the RAB.

6 This is dated 9-20-96. It says:

7 "Dear Paul:

8 "This letter is to inform you and the other  
9 RAB members that I am resigning from the Treasure  
10 Island, TI, Restoration Advisory Board, RAB. I recently  
11 got married to an Australian and am moving to Australia  
12 this month.

13 "I enjoyed participating in the technical  
14 committee and working with the RAB members, Navy and  
15 regulatory agencies and consultants. I know the TI  
16 cleanup is in 'good hands.'

17 "Enclosed is my copy of the base realignment  
18 and closure cleanup plan that, hopefully, can be used by  
19 the new RAB member. In addition, enclosed is a document  
20 titled, 'Consensus Principles and Recommendations for

1 Improving Federal Facilities Cleanup, by the Federal  
2 Facilities Environmental Restoration Dialogue Committee.  
3 This document may be of interest to the TI RAB members.

4 "Best wishes to you and the others.

5 "Sincerely, Chloe Ju."

6 We had a little discussion during the interim  
7 at the break here tonight, too, with Pat and Jim and I,  
8 and we would like to make a motion to formally accept  
9 Laurie Glass as an institution member representing the  
10 Treasure Island museum. And I would like to try to get  
11 some input from people if that's acceptable, and get a  
12 motion towards that to that effect.

13 MS. GLASS: Could I just tell you something?

14 MR. HEHN: Sure.

15 MS. GLASS: I did meet with the Treasure  
16 Island Museum Association Board where they considered  
17 this idea. They had a lot of questions, and they were  
18 very interested in a cleaner process.

19 I felt it would probably be, you know, yeah,  
20 okay, sure, but it was a strong interest, so just to let

1 you know.

2                   And they also did say that they had a motion  
3 that was unanimously approved saying that they would  
4 like to have me as their representative. So it's clear  
5 on that side.

6                   MR. HANSEN: I think that's a really good idea  
7 and entirely consistent with the representative from the  
8 Treasure Island Yacht Club. They are a stakeholder and  
9 paramount institutional stakeholder.

10                   MS. VEDAGIRI: I'm curious: Is the museum not  
11 part of the Navy?

12                   MR. HANSEN: No.

13                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the Navy owns the  
14 museum, so to speak, but there is a nonprofit museum  
15 association separate from the Navy that hopes to, that  
16 is, currently working in the museum, and also hopes to  
17 continue the museum after the Navy leaves.

18                   MS. VEDAGIRI: I second the motion.

19                   Has a motion been made, actually?

20                   MR. HANSEN: You make it.

1 MS. VEDAGIRI: I move that Laurie Glass be  
2 deemed a representative.

3 MR. HEHN: Second it.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All in favor? Opposed?

5 (Whereupon, the motion passed.)

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Welcome.

7 MR. HANSEN: The usual initiation fee of \$500?

8 MS. GLASS: All right. I will make cookies  
9 the next time.

10 MS. TOBIAS: We got that in the transcript.

11 MR. HEHN: The other thing, at the TI RAB  
12 interim meeting, we had a very good discussion and a  
13 very good turnout last time.

14 We had 11 people in attendance, including, we  
15 had, Ernie Galang from the Navy and Sharon Tobias and  
16 Paul Bigelow.

17 We had a good discussion on the two documents  
18 to review that had to be commented on by that day, I  
19 believe, and they gave a real good give-and-take  
20 discussion of the documents on the toxicological and the

1 additional work on Phase IIB investigation.

2 I think it was very beneficial. We had a good  
3 discussion and put in good comments. And those  
4 comments, I think, are sent out to all the RAB members  
5 as part of the minutes that went out for last month,  
6 also, so you have those.

7 And one of the things we have asked of the  
8 Navy as a result of that meeting is that we try to get  
9 some feedback from the Navy on those comments whenever  
10 possible so that we know what the feelings are on those  
11 formal written comments that we submit.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

13 Environmental reports, I think we went over  
14 that.

15 And if there are no open questions or  
16 discussion, I think we are pretty close to the end of  
17 the meeting.

18 MS. VEDAGIRI: Question: Regarding the  
19 membership, are we proposing to try and bring on new  
20 members or what?

1                   CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we are proposing to  
2 have the Navy contact all known members of the RAB to  
3 determine the level of interest and whether or not they  
4 would like to participate again in the future, or if  
5 they would like to remove themselves from the RAB.

6                   And then based on that information, we will  
7 know what to do next.

8                   MR. HANSEN: I think that procedure is already  
9 well-defined, isn't it? If an individual misses more  
10 than three meetings . . .

11                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. We actually set up a  
12 very rigid procedure which, actually, we haven't been  
13 following. If we did, probably about half the members  
14 would have been gone, officially gone. I was kind of  
15 hesitant to do that.

16                   So I would like at this point just to pursue,  
17 informally contact them and see if we can bring some of  
18 those people back. Otherwise, I think we are probably  
19 going to end up reaching a conclusion, which is just  
20 through the attrition, like people leaving, like Chloe,

1 and people resigning, officially resigning for other  
2 reasons, that the membership has dropped, and we are  
3 probably reaching a decision soon to do a solicitation  
4 or otherwise bring some new members on board.

5 MS. JONES: But I do think that as part of our  
6 bylaws, the Navy, at some point, make these phone calls.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

8 Also, as we draw to a close, I want to bring  
9 to your attention three cleanup related seminars coming  
10 up in the next couple of weeks. We have some handouts  
11 on the back table there.

12 One of them is this Global Green USA, which is  
13 Mikhail Gorbachev's organization. They are going to  
14 have a forum entitled, "Moving Toward Sustainable Base  
15 Conversion." It features a keynote address by Mikhail  
16 Gorbachev on Friday, October 4th. I think there is a  
17 program, like a half day program on Thursday the 3rd.  
18 So there is information on that.

19 Then, secondly, there is a regional forum on  
20 military base cleanup technology, which is taking place

1 actually later this week, September 26th and 27th, at  
2 the Clarion.

3           The Gorbachev organization is meeting at the  
4 Presidio, but the meeting this week, September 26th and  
5 27th, in the handout in the back, is meeting at the  
6 Clarion Hotel near the airport in Millbrae. And that's  
7 sponsored by the Department of Defense, the U.S. EPA,  
8 California EPA, and several other organizations.

9           And, then, thirdly, there is an EPA sponsored,  
10 EPA Regions 9 and 10 sponsored hands-on forum on  
11 innovative characterization and modern technology.  
12 That's going to be October 7th at Stanford University.

13           So our next regular meeting is the 22nd of  
14 October.

15           The next mid month meeting is the 8th of  
16 October.

17           The EIS/EIR hearing will be the 9th of October  
18 at 7:00 p.m. at the Ferry Building.

19           And that's all I have.

20           So with that, unless there is any other

1 comments, we will bring the meeting to a close.

2 (No response.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you very much.

4 (The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.)

5 ---o0o---

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, the undersigned, a duly authorized Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that the within proceedings were taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction and supervision, and that this transcript is a true record of the said proceedings.

*Stephen Balloni*