

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

22 OCTOBER 1996

7:00 P.M.

CASA DE LA VISTA

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 26

---o0o---

COPY

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:

- JAMES B. SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
- ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
- HUGO BURTON (NAVSTA TI)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- SHARON TOBIAS
- STACEY LUPTON
- BARBARA SOOTKOOS

REGULATORY AGENCY:

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

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

- RICHARD HANSEN
- PAUL V. HEHN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)
- ALICE LA PIERRE
- KAREN A. MENDELOW
- PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)

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

2 COMMUNITY MEMBERS (Continued)

3 HENRY J. ONGERTH

4 DALE SMITH

5 JOSEPH J. ALCEDO

6 CHRISTINE SHIRLEY

7 GARY C. JENSEN

8 TI MUSEUM (LAURIE GLASS)

9 TI YACHT CLUB (HARLAN VAN WYE)

10 CLINTON J. LOFTMAN

11 TIMOTHY F. SUCH

12 ---o0o---

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our October
2 Restoration Advisory Board meeting in the Casa de la
3 Vista. It's likely we will probably continue to have
4 meetings here, at least through the winter months and
5 perhaps continue after that.

6 The first item is the discussion and approval
7 of the agenda itself. There is additional copies of the
8 agenda on the side table there.

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

11 (No response.)

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, there being no
13 comments, we will consider tonight's agenda to be
14 approved and move ahead to the meeting minutes of 24
15 September. There is also additional copies of the
16 September meeting minutes on the side table also.

17 Are there any comments or discussion
18 concerning the September 24th minutes?

19 MS. SMITH: Actually, I do have a point of
20 order for our Chair.

1 Is there not a good way to address the fact
2 that you make comments and they are not properly
3 responded to?

4 Two issues that I probably did ask the
5 questions, to which they were responded. However, they
6 didn't answer the question I asked, and that could have
7 been my fault as well.

8 So I don't know how we address those issues in
9 our minutes or our agenda. Would you have a chance to
10 go through quickly how to do that?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So you're saying the
12 written minutes are not reflecting --

13 MS. SMITH: What I asked and what you
14 responded to, but you didn't answer my question.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: At the time of the
16 meeting.

17 MS. SMITH: Well, I probably asked it wrong.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I guess if I
19 understand correctly, then, my response would be that if
20 we are not able to answer questions at the time, let us

1 know that we haven't addressed the question, and then we
2 will have to address it.

3 MS. SMITH: What I'm trying to say, maybe
4 there is a way, I mean, I haven't gone through Robert's
5 Rules, but there may be a way to revisit questions later
6 that weren't properly addressed.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would recommend maybe we
8 defer this item until the organizational business --

9 MS. SMITH: Okay.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: -- so that we can explore
11 it further, but we do want to address that.

12 Are there any other comments concerning the
13 September 24th meeting minutes?

14 (No response.)

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no further
16 comments, we will consider the September the 24th
17 meeting minutes approved.

18 We will now move to the public comment period.
19 This is a period we set aside at the beginning of each
20 meeting for members of the general public, who aren't

1 Restoration Advisory Board members, to make any comments
2 concerning the cleanup process.

3 Is there any public comment? I don't see any
4 members of the general public here.

5 (No response.)

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no public
7 comment, we will move into the program updates under
8 general updates.

9 Rachel is going to give us a briefing from the
10 BCT meeting in October.

11 MS. SIMONS: We had two BCT meetings. The
12 first one was October 7th, and that was to scope two
13 future FOSLs.

14 We had our monthly BCT meeting on October 8th.
15 The main topic covered the TPA toxicity testing, the
16 status of the investigation of sites 12, 17, and FOSL,
17 federal to federal FOSL for YBI for the Coast Guard
18 property.

19 And that was it.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, thank you.

1 Reuse issues --

2 MS. SMITH: Is there a possibility to comment?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sure.

4 MS. SMITH: Apparently, the U.S. Coast Guard
5 wants to expand their jurisdiction.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As part of the base
7 closure process, the Coast Guard, under federal agency,
8 can ask for federal property on closing bases.

9 There was a window of opportunity a couple of
10 years back for federal agencies to do that. At that
11 time, the Coast Guard had indicated that they were going
12 to ask for some of the former Naval station property.

13 So we are in the process of preparing the
14 transfer package. It's not a lot of property. It's all
15 on Yerba Buena Island. It consists of their vessel
16 traffic service, which is like their traffic control for
17 ships. It's a radar system. It's at the very top of
18 Yerba Buena Island. It's on Navy property, but it's a
19 Coast Guard building. So they asked for that property
20 to become part of the Coast Guard.

1 And, then, secondly, they asked for two
2 housing units, which are already on the south side of
3 quarters 8 and 9, already on the south side of the Bay
4 Bridge.

5 In general, most of the property to the south
6 of the Bay Bridge is Coast Guard, and most of the
7 property in the north is Naval stations. So they asked
8 for those two quarters, housing units which are already
9 adjacent to the rest of the property.

10 And, lastly, they asked for some property
11 outside their main gate. This is in the area
12 underneath, more or less, underneath the Bay Bridge near
13 the Nimitz house. Right now, they have a very narrow
14 road leading into their base. They asked for additional
15 property so that they could rebuild their front gate
16 area.

17 So we are in the process of preparing that
18 transfer package probably over the next six months or
19 so.

20 Now, there may be cleanup issues on those

1 sites to be transferred to the Coast Guard. We, as the
2 Navy, will continue to remediate those properties.

3 MS. SMITH: And the other one was the BTAG
4 update on sediment criteria.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I'm attending a
6 meeting tomorrow at EFA West. I expect to get more
7 information.

8 MS. KATHURIA: I think BTAG has a public
9 participation component.

10 Their intention with that public participation
11 is to get RAB's involvement and review of the sediment
12 criteria.

13 I don't know the manner or the time line of
14 that, but they are looking for RAB input.

15 MS. SMITH: You're currently preparing fact
16 sheets on toxicity reference values, so why don't we
17 have those if you want input?

18 MS. SIMONS: I know some of the people working
19 on that, and they are in the process of preparing that.

20 When were those -- when was that document,

1 very recently?

2 MS. SMITH: Very recently.

3 MS. SIMONS: As project manager, I'm not
4 reviewing it. I'm just having our people look at it.
5 The BTAG is getting it.

6 MS. SMITH: I think I can say that it's an
7 action item, then, for the Navy, particularly since we
8 are having a meeting on this issue tomorrow between the
9 Navy and the regulators.

10 I will clarify what the RAB participation
11 process is. So I should have that information prior to
12 the next interim RAB meeting.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Will you have information in
14 time for the interim meeting?

15 MS. SMITH: I should be able to take whatever
16 information I get tomorrow and have it at the interim
17 meeting or earlier. If I have some information I can
18 send it out.

19 MS. NELSON: Maybe we can have the information
20 available both at the interim meeting and the next RAB

1 meeting.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

3 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

4 MS. NELSON: I know that that was an issue a
5 couple of months ago when we looked at toxicological
6 risk assessment.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So as an action item, the
8 Navy will report out at both the interim meeting and the
9 November meeting, the information from tomorrow's Navy
10 regulator meeting.

11 Under "Reuse Issues," I don't want to put
12 Martha on the spot, but is there anything you want to
13 share as far as reuse issues?

14 MS. WALTERS: Not at this time.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have had a couple of
16 meetings between the Navy and the city, and we are
17 hoping, as part of November's meeting agenda, to be able
18 to discuss more of FOSL plans for fiscal year 1997.

19 Also, the Urban --

20 MS. NELSON: I think Tim has a comment.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry.

2 MR. SUCH: Yes. I think it might be
3 appropriate at that meeting to have some kind of a
4 report, either from the State, vis-a-vis the State Lands
5 Commission, or the counsel for the Navy, with respect to
6 determination of title. I believe it's still up in the
7 air.

8 I honestly don't know how one can prepare a
9 FOSL without knowing who owns the land.

10 And it also could have profound implications
11 with regard to reuse of this land in other ways.

12 I won't go into it now, but I think it would
13 be an appropriate time to have some of the parties state
14 the claims.

15 MS. WALTERS: Tidelands Trust?

16 MR. SUCH: Yes.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I understand what you're
18 saying, but I think the Tidelands Trust issue is, in my
19 opinion, is outside the purview of the RAB.

20 But let me say it's an action item that we

1 will clarify with our counsel, the people who are
2 working on the Tidelands Trust issue, to clarify how
3 that should interact with the RAB process, because,
4 quite frankly, I'm not sure.

5 In terms of leases, at least at this point in
6 time, we are still able to lease to the City of San
7 Francisco. Whether or not Tidelands Trust issues will
8 have some effect on the final transfer of the property,
9 I don't know.

10 MR. SUCH: I met with Navy counsel a few
11 months ago. They said they thought they were getting
12 close to resolving their position with regard to this,
13 so any information you can bring or any report they
14 could provide would be really helpful to the public.
15 It's a critical issue to know.

16 MS. WALTERS: Jim, I could follow up with
17 that.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I can work it
19 on the Navy side and Martha can work it on the city
20 side.

1 MR. SUCH: Thanks.

2 MS. NELSON: That's an action item to report
3 back at the next meeting.

4 MR. VAN WYE: Who is representing the State of
5 California on that, the State Lands Commission, would
6 that be the Attorney General's office?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I couldn't tell you
8 precisely.

9 MR. VAN WYE: I used to be with that office.
10 I'm just curious.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Also, the Urban Land
12 Institute report, final report, isn't out yet. This is
13 the study that the ULI did on the reuse plan.

14 They gave a verbal brief last month, but there
15 will be a written report coming out, we think, sometime
16 in November.

17 The Urban Land Institute is also having their
18 annual convention in San Francisco sometime in, I think,
19 in mid-November prior to Thanksgiving.

20 MR. HANSEN: Are those public meetings?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I am unclear. I haven't
2 seen any fliers on it myself.

3 MR. SUCH: It will be at the Marriott, I
4 believe.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. There may be some
6 public display portion of it.

7 I have never been to one of their meetings
8 myself, and I haven't seen any fliers yet.

9 MR. HANSEN: Maybe Martha would know.

10 If you get that information, could you
11 distribute it?

12 MS. WALTERS: Sure.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any other
14 questions or comments concerning reuse issues? I will
15 also, a little later, go into the EIS-EIR scoping
16 hearing.

17 (No response.)

18 There being no further reuse issues, I would
19 like to jump over review of action items right now
20 because I am not quite prepared to do that.

1 I would like to go ahead with your concurrence
2 into our remedial investigation report and summary
3 presentation. So unless there is any reason not to, we
4 will proceed.

5 Sharon Tobias from PRC will present a summary
6 presentation of the remedial investigation report.

7 We also have index cards. We would like to be
8 able to get through the presentation first, unless there
9 is clarifying comments or clarifying questions, and then
10 we will have open questions at the end. But if you
11 would like to make use of the comment cards, we
12 certainly encourage you to do so.

13 We are looking for both. We welcome both a
14 mixture of verbal comment and written comment. In some
15 cases, it might be easier to ask a detailed question on
16 a comment card.

17 MS. TOBIAS: You should have three pieces,
18 three documents in front of you. The first, on blue
19 paper, it's an abstract. People have questions, just a
20 one-page summary. That's about all you can get.

1 The second item is the presentation I will go
2 through tonight for you, and if you can't hear me, let
3 me know, because sometimes my voice wavers or
4 disappears, actually.

5 And the third thing is the executive summary
6 from the RI report.

7 For your information, the RI report is sitting
8 over on the table, and we do have copies of it for those
9 people who signed up for it. So at the break, we will
10 probably go out and hand out the RI report.

11 So, I'm Sharon Tobias from PRC Environmental
12 Management. I'm the project manager for the remedial
13 investigation being conducted at Naval Station Treasure
14 Island. PRC is the Navy's contractor. You probably
15 have seen me here a lot in the last year and a half.

16 I want to go over our outline of the report,
17 the presentation. What I plan on discussing is the
18 overview of the RI report, the structure of the report,
19 and then explain the recommendations and conclusions of
20 the remedial investigation report.

1 The remedial investigation includes a number
2 of items. The first thing is to develop objectives,
3 perform the field work, delineate the plume, the soil
4 and groundwater contamination, evaluate the data using
5 human health and ecological risk assessments to
6 determine if there are any problems at each site.

7 We then, with the results of those risk
8 assessments, we then determine the nature and extent of
9 the contamination, the fate and transport of those
10 contaminants of concern, and then we came up with our
11 conclusions and recommendations.

12 The report structure, there are 18 chapters in
13 this report. The first chapter is introduction, the
14 history of NAVSTA TI and the installation, restoration
15 program.

16 The second chapter describes the physical
17 setting -- the climate, the geology, the hydrogeology,
18 ecology, and conceptual model.

19 The third chapter starts getting interesting,
20 at least I think so. It's the methodology for how risk

1 samples are collected, the laboratory and quality
2 assurance program, how the human health and ecological
3 risk assessments were conducted, and how we estimated
4 ambient and background concentrations for metals on
5 Treasure Island.

6 Chapter 4 is the preliminary identification of
7 applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements.
8 What those are, are environmental laws that will affect
9 the cleanup at Treasure Island.

10 Chapters 5 through 17 are the bulk of the
11 report. These are the site specific chapters. We have
12 14 sites on Treasure Island. I want to reiterate, this
13 is an on-shore report. The offshore sites, the skeet
14 range, are not included in this document. The skeet
15 range will be submitted as a separate document.

16 The structure of each chapter is described as
17 site description and history of operation, any previous
18 environmental investigations, site conceptual model, and
19 RI field activities.

20 For review of presentations on the RI over the

1 last year, we conducted two phases. Phase I was
2 conducted in 1992. Phase IIA was just groundwater
3 sampling at the existing wells. We also did the tidal
4 study and aquifer testing. And then phase IIB was
5 conducted in 1995 for three quarters of groundwater
6 sampling conducted at the wells installed last year. So
7 that's what this report covers.

8 The next part of the chapter discusses the
9 field geology, what we saw when we were out at the site.
10 And also discusses the aquifer testing and how those
11 sites work.

12 And then we get to the meat, the analytical
13 results: The soil and groundwater samples, from both
14 monitoring well and hydraulic punch borings. The
15 baseline human health risk assessment. In case you
16 hadn't attended the meetings where we talked about human
17 health risk assessments, we evaluated three scenarios.
18 The first scenario is residential. That basically
19 considers the use of single-family homes where people
20 have gardens and are eating their homegrown produce.

1 That's conservative considering the city's reuse plan.

2 The second scenario is industrial/commercial,
3 and that is more appropriate for what the city has
4 planned for Treasure Island. That's from the Navy point
5 of view. Most of Treasure Island right now is
6 industrial/commercial, and it doesn't look like it will
7 change a lot in the future.

8 The third scenario is recreational. That
9 scenario considers the use of soccer fields. It's not
10 the theme park. The theme park would be considered
11 industrial or commercial.

12 And then we did the ecological risk
13 assessment. I wanted to reiterate that, at Treasure
14 Island and Yerba Buena Island, the terrestrial risk
15 assessment was different. As you can tell, Treasure
16 Island is pretty urbanized, so a terrestrial risk
17 assessment was not conducted.

18 However, a full risk assessment was conducted
19 on Yerba Buena Island, where you can tell that there is
20 a really wide habitat. There is lots of animals out

1 there and trees. There is more than just lawns. There
2 is a definite habitat for terrestrial receptors.

3 So the sites on Yerba Buena Island are handled
4 much differently than the sites are handled on Treasure
5 Island.

6 And then we went on to describe the nature and
7 extent of the contamination at the sites.

8 And, again, we have site specific chapters --
9 the fate and transport of chemicals of concern and our
10 recommendations and conclusions.

11 The last chapter in the report is the
12 recommendations and conclusions at the site. It
13 identifies the recommendations and conclusions based on
14 the current information available, and also identifies
15 the data limitations.

16 The data limitations that we have on this
17 document, this is a draft document, and the draft final
18 is due in February. There are a number of items that we
19 need information for. The first one is four quarters of
20 groundwater data from the phase II wells.

1 We collected groundwater samples in November
2 '95, February '96, June '96 and September '96.

3 The November and February are included in the
4 text document. They are discussed.

5 The June '96 are the appendix. The results
6 are recorded but they are not discussed. We didn't have
7 enough time to get them included in the entire document.

8 The September '96, we haven't received those
9 sampling results yet, but they will be included in the
10 upcoming report in February.

11 The groundwater modeling has not been
12 completed, and the TPH, the total petroleum hydrocarbon
13 testing all needs to be completed.

14 As you know, the Navy did additional sampling
15 at sites 12 and 17. Those results, we did that sampling
16 in September, and it has not been incorporated in this
17 report.

18 So all of these will be included in the draft
19 final RI report. Our recommendations and conclusions
20 that are in this report do not take into account any of

1 that information since it's not available.

2 So I wanted to describe how we came up with
3 our recommendations and conclusions. Sites were placed
4 for no action if the human health risk is within the EPA
5 target risk range and there was no potential ecological
6 risk.

7 Sites were identified for further ecological
8 risk evaluation and potentially going into the
9 feasibility study if the risk, the human health risk is
10 within the EPA target risk range for human health, but
11 there may be ecological risks to the bay.

12 So as you can see, the results of the
13 groundwater modeling, the four quarters of groundwater
14 data, and the total petroleum hydrocarbon toxicity
15 testing to determine what the impacts to be on the bay.

16 The last category is the sites that we pretty
17 much are very confident that need to go forward into the
18 feasibility study, when risk exceeds EPA target risk
19 range for human health or potential ecological risk for
20 terrestrial receptors.

1 And, finally, these are the recommendations.

2 I should reiterate, these recommendations are
3 the Navy's. The regulatory agencies have not reviewed
4 this report, and they may or may not agree with the
5 recommendations that we present here tonight. They are
6 getting the report the same time you are.

7 Sites 1 and 3 are the medical clinic and the
8 PCB storage area. Those sites have no contamination, so
9 they are pretty obvious to go into the no action.

10 Site 8 is up on the Yerba Buena Island. It's
11 the former Army Point sludge disposal area. It didn't
12 appear that there was a human health or ecological risk,
13 so we appended this as no action.

14 These are the gray area sites. These require
15 further ecological risk evaluation for potential impacts
16 to the bay.

17 Site 5 is the old boiler plant. This is the
18 site, if you remember, we discussed it a little bit. We
19 found some chlorinated hydrocarbons and went back to
20 site 17, which is adjacent, to continue sampling to see

1 if the contamination had migrated. So we need those
2 results.

3 Site 9 is the foundry, and, again, it's just
4 groundwater.

5 Site 17 are the tanks, 103 and 104. They are
6 adjacent site sample result.

7 Sites 21 and 24 are chlorinated hydrocarbon
8 sites.

9 21 is the vessel waste oil recovery area, and
10 24 is the dry cleaning facility. Those sites are all
11 groundwater related, and we need to do further modeling
12 to see if the bay is impacted.

13 And the last category for feasibility study,
14 with uncertainties, site 7 and 10, are the pesticides
15 storage area/bus painting shop.

16 Site 11 is the Yerba Buena Island landfill.
17 That site actually had human health and ecological
18 potential risks.

19 Site 12 is the old Bunker area, which is where
20 the housing is currently existing.

1 Sites 28 and 29 are the bridge on and off
2 ramps. Those sites have both potential human health and
3 potential ecological risk.

4 Sites 11, 28 and 29, are ecological risks due
5 to lead. We will be further evaluating that. We wanted
6 to help the RAB review this report.

7 As you can see, it's a pretty big document.
8 We don't want to overwhelm you, and what we thought we
9 would do is organize the sites. So if you like a
10 certain type of site, focus on those. One group could
11 take disposal areas and the other could take the
12 hydrocarbon sites. So in the order of interests --
13 well, not the order of interest but categorize.

14 The sites without chemicals of concern are
15 sites 1 and 3 in chapters 5 and 6.

16 The disposal area are sites 11 and 12.

17 Chlorinated hydrocarbons are sites 21 and 24.

18 That's purely groundwater.

19 The bridge on and off ramps are sites 28 and
20 29.

1 And then the miscellaneous sites, they don't
2 really fall into any other categories. They are small
3 sites.

4 So if you are interested in ecological risk
5 assessment, we would recommend, or I would recommend you
6 review the risks for the sites 8, 11, 28 and 29, because
7 those are the ones we did the risk characterization.
8 They were pretty interesting.

9 I wanted to explain, I don't have an overhead
10 for this because it would get really ugly, but in your
11 executive summary, there is a table. It starts on page
12 ES-8. I wanted to explain what the table with the
13 different columns are for.

14 In the first column, it's described as site
15 number, name and potential source. Do we know where the
16 contamination may have come from.

17 The next two columns summarize the human
18 health and ecological risk. They identify the chemicals
19 of concern. They are the ones that drove the human
20 health or ecological risk assessment. So they were the

1 risk drivers.

2 In the recommendations and conclusions, we
3 summarize what we think. That's what you will find in
4 recommendations and conclusions.

5 And the last column is the data limitations.
6 Those are the items for groundwater modeling and
7 sampling results. Those are included in the last
8 column.

9 This is supposed to be like an easy user's
10 guide, but it's a good reference guide if you're reading
11 the site and want to go back and get a quick summary.
12 This should provide you with some guidance.

13 I went over it all very fast. I don't really
14 have anything more.

15 Anyone have any questions?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any questions or
17 comments just concerning the presentation, items that
18 might need clarification?

19 Richard.

20 MR. HANSEN: Yes. Going back to the beginning

1 of it, page ES-8 for site number 3, you say, "not
2 evaluated," for PCB equipment storage.

3 That's because you didn't find PCB?

4 MS. TOBIAS: That's correct.

5 MR. HANSEN: No contamination above the
6 technical limit. It suggests you didn't look any
7 further.

8 MS. TOBIAS: That's a good point.

9 I guess our point was for human health risk
10 assessment. You can't evaluate it if there is nothing
11 there.

12 MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

13 MS. TOBIAS: I want to clarify something.

14 I have to apologize. We had a number of
15 notes, and they didn't seem to make this final copy.
16 They are in the report, though. They go along with the
17 table.

18 So what we will do is, when we send out the
19 meeting minutes, we will attach a new version that has
20 the entire document. I apologize for that because

1 you're missing site 29 as well.

2 MS. SIMONS: I have a question.

3 When you talk about the limitations, are those
4 actually, when you come to the sections in the report,
5 will you say, this will be included in the draft final?

6 MS. TOBIAS: In the recommendations and
7 conclusions section of each chapter, it says that we
8 need this information.

9 MS. SIMONS: And so that it's clear, not that
10 it's like, all of those are coming in between now and
11 the draft final.

12 MS. TOBIAS: Or they might disappear in the
13 draft final.

14 The groundwater modeling, you might put out
15 that explains the results or some of it the first time
16 you see it.

17 MS. SIMONS: And then also for the groundwater
18 modeling, you didn't have some data. I missed what
19 exactly, for the groundwater modeling, I wasn't sure
20 what parameters you didn't have yet. Do you remember?

1 MS. TOBIAS: No, I don't. I don't remember
2 saying that. I'm sorry.

3 MS. SIMONS: I know, for example, the TPH, we
4 don't have numbers yet. I was just wondering if there
5 was any other, to do it for some sites or not all of
6 them.

7 MS. TOBIAS: Well, it's hard to do it for the
8 TPH when you don't have a number.

9 MS. SIMONS: Right. Like solvent sites, were
10 you able to do it?

11 MS. TOBIAS: It's still underway. It did not
12 make it in time for the report. It's pretty expensive.

13 MS. SIMONS: Okay.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Question?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: Can you explain what you mean by
17 EPA target risk range?

18 MS. TOBIAS: I would be happy to.

19 In your executive summary, if you want to read
20 along, on page ES-3.

1 The EPA target risk range for carcinogenic
2 chemicals, the incremental lifetime cancer risk is
3 between 10 to minus 4 and 10 to minus 6.

4 For noncarcinogenic chemicals, it's a hazard
5 index that does not exceed 1.

6 And for the lead, it's a blood lead level that
7 does not exceed 10 micrograms per deciliter.

8 So what you see in this table is the, and you
9 don't have the note that says what you're seeing, are
10 the adult and child carcinogenic risk levels.

11 And then the other two are for the child, the
12 blood lead level and the hazard index for the child
13 because that's the most conservative scenario.

14 Does that answer your question?

15 MS. SHIRLEY: So when you categorize something
16 as, what, no action, or, well, no action, what end of
17 that did you use?

18 MS. TOBIAS: We use, if it falls within that
19 risk range, between 10 to minus 4 and 10 to minus 6.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: So if it was within that range,

1 if it was less than 10 minus 6 or within the range.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

3 And also what we did do, you will see on here,
4 that, for example, on site 5, which is on page ES-8,
5 which is the first table or the first page of the table,
6 after the 10 and minus 6 number, there is a footnote --
7 again, you are missing the footnote -- about what made
8 it so high or low or whatever, was beryllium, and there
9 is no source of beryllium.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, you see, that's my other
11 question.

12 MS. TOBIAS: So we made a risk management
13 decision, if the risk driver is beryllium and the
14 pathway is homegrown produce, there is no source of
15 beryllium at the site. And they are discussed in these,
16 in the conclusions.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: That was my second question.

18 Glancing through that table, it looked like
19 that no window source of beryllium cropped up often.

20 What are possible sources of beryllium?

1 MS. TOBIAS: That is a really good question.

2 The challenge for beryllium is the aim that
3 you detect. Our ambient level was right around the
4 detection, so any time we detected it, it drove the
5 risk.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: So that was the problem. Okay.

7 MS. SMITH: What is the source of beryllium?
8 What would be a source of beryllium?

9 MS. SOOTKOOS: It's Appendix L.

10 MS. SMITH: I don't have Appendix L. Can you
11 tell me what the source of beryllium is on that?

12 MS. SIMONS: Well, I would say that probably
13 beryllium is naturally occurring. It's from the soil.
14 It's not from the source, probably.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: Right. And what you just said
16 was that, you're so close to the detection limit that if
17 you used, what, half of it, and the risk is higher than
18 the detection limit or the risk -- what is that?

19 MS. TOBIAS: It comes up higher.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: The number used to detect the

1 risk is higher than the detection level.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: Okay.

4 MS. TOBIAS: And, also, we had a couple of
5 sites, like 5 and 24, that if you look at the table and
6 the risk, there appears to be a risk, but if it had to
7 do, if those sites had to do with petroleum, that
8 contamination is headed under the UST program and not
9 our program. We did clarify that in the text, the
10 recommendations and conclusions and in the summary of
11 the risks.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what I would like
13 to suggest is maybe we will take a break and give you
14 some time maybe to talk amongst yourselves, maybe for
15 about five minutes, and if there are other clarifying
16 questions, to come up during the formal discussion, we
17 could address those then and then we will come back.

18 If you have any comment cards, we can collect
19 them now and take a look at them during the break and
20 have more time to consider them.

1 So we will readjourn in about ten minutes or
2 regroup.

3 (Short break taken at 8:00 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.)

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we are ready to go
5 again.

6 Just an administrative note: Correct me,
7 Ernie, correct me if I miss it and don't explain this
8 correctly, but because of the weight of the boxes,
9 rather than haul all the boxes into here and then have
10 you haul them back to your car, what we would like to do
11 is, when you go to leave, we can transfer the boxes from
12 Ernie's van directly to your vehicle. So when we close
13 the meeting, we will do that transfer.

14 If, for some reason, you need to leave prior
15 to the end of the meeting, see Ernie before you leave.
16 If you were planning on getting the document, he will
17 transfer it on over.

18 MR. ONGERTH: On which lot is the van in, this
19 one or that one (indicating)?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The van is right over here

1 (indicating).

2 MR. ONGERTH: Okay.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Which is where most people
4 seem to have parked.

5 Also, the report for site 27, the skeet range,
6 will be going out in another day or two, and that will
7 be mailed out.

8 MS. TOBIAS: It's really light.

9 MS. SMITH: Jim, what about the periphery? I
10 made a note here. You're talking about the skeet range
11 as a sediment study as an IR site.

12 But you also mentioned the whole periphery of
13 the island has to be analyzed for offshore contaminants,
14 which may not be an IR site in and of itself.

15 But you have said, you will be analyzing that
16 and yet this is kind of a big hole that things fall
17 into.

18 Are you doing any documentation on that?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, site 27 is the skeet
20 range, and we had a specific analysis for lead shot for

1 that site.

2 But we also have site 13, which that site
3 number covers the outfalls around Treasure Island and
4 Yerba Buena Island.

5 The completion of that report is dependent on
6 doing some additional offshore sedimentation sampling
7 that won't be, we were unable to fund that in 1996, so
8 we are funding it this year in 1997.

9 So that report for site 13 is pending
10 completion of the offshore sediment sampling. So the
11 report, draft report for that will probably be sometime
12 in --

13 MS. TOBIAS: About a year.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably in the late
15 summer or early fall.

16 MS. TOBIAS: I think it is.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So what you have here is,
18 tonight here, we discussed 14 sites. And then site 27,
19 the skeet range, is the 15th. That report will be going
20 out shortly.

1 And then the 16th site is site 13, which we
2 won't have a draft for approximately a year.

3 And then the remaining 8 sites, to add up to
4 25, are those sites we moved from the CERCLA program to
5 the UST program. We will have the corrective action
6 plan on those sites. The draft will be available in
7 December.

8 MR. VAN WYE: Jim, do I understand site 13 to
9 be the rocks that surround the island?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, site 13 is basically
11 defined as areas around the storm water outfalls. We
12 have approximately 40 storm water outfalls that
13 basically cover the perimeter, the offshore perimeter of
14 Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, including a
15 number inside Clipper Cove.

16 So to look at sediment issues in Clipper Cove,
17 you would have to look at both the site 27 skeet range
18 report and the site 13 storm water outfalls report.

19 MS. SMITH: Do we have documentation anywhere
20 in our literature about where the outfalls are in

1 Clipper Cove?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think in probably phase
3 I.

4 In the phase I report, it has maps showing it,
5 and then the work plan for the offshore.

6 MS. SMITH: We don't have a copy of the plan.

7 MS. TOBIAS: The work plan for offshore came
8 out in April '96. It was an ecological risk assessment.
9 In there, it showed the sampling.

10 I want to clarify, it's not the entire
11 perimeter of the island. It's the areas where we count
12 the contamination.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. This is the phase II
14 of that.

15 MS. TOBIAS: Right. We are not targeting
16 every single outfall. We are targeting areas that are
17 concerned onshore, what could have gone offshore, okay?

18 MS. SMITH: Okay.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, Pat is going to go
20 ahead and read some of the written questions we have

1 gotten, so with those we can answer now with
2 clarification, we can do that.

3 Otherwise, we will take the written questions
4 and address them at another forum.

5 MS. NELSON: I think they should be entered
6 into the record. There are, I guess, nine of them.

7 I will go ahead and read them as best I can:
8 What are the dates for availability of the September
9 1996 groundwater sampling results, groundwater modeling
10 results and TPH toxicity testing? Can RAB get this
11 information prior to February 1997?

12 And then draft final release -- there is a
13 word inside, whoever wrote this, between the two that I
14 can't read -- draft final report release, maybe. That's
15 question one.

16 Question two is --

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Do them one by one.

18 MS. TOBIAS: I don't remember them all.

19 Groundwater modeling and the toxicity testing
20 and the additional sampling taken from sites, September

1 '96, if the reports, if the technical memorandums are
2 available before the draft final comes out, you will see
3 those.

4 If not, at this time, some of it you will see
5 ahead of time and some of it you will see at the time of
6 the IR report, again.

7 But if there is any way we can get it to you
8 sooner, we will.

9 The draft final, is that the second question?

10 MS. SIMONS: I think you answered the
11 question. I think that was a statement.

12 MS. NELSON: The draft final report.

13 MS. TOBIAS: The draft final report release
14 will be the end of February. That is based on, so you
15 know, the agency, we started a 60-day comment period.
16 If no one asks for an extension after the current period
17 ends, the Navy has 60 days to turn around the document,
18 to turn around the draft final.

19 That places us around February 25th, 1997. I
20 could be wrong on the date, but that sounds familiar.

1 MS. NELSON: I guess the question was on the
2 other information, the groundwater sampling results,
3 groundwater modeling results, and the TPH toxicity
4 testing.

5 Can we get this information to the RAB before
6 February 1997?

7 MS. TOBIAS: Like I said, I'm not sure that
8 will be available before, sorry.

9 MR. HEHN: Can I follow up on that?

10 MS. NELSON: Yes.

11 MR. HEHN: I was wondering, how is that going
12 to affect the consideration of some of the conclusions
13 as far as toxicity and that kind of thing, if you don't
14 have the groundwater modeling results? It's kind of
15 like putting the cart before the horse, if you determine
16 or reach a conclusion as to the possible impact on the
17 site.

18 MS. TOBIAS: The draft final RI?

19 MR. HEHN: Well, for the draft that we have
20 now. We won't have the groundwater modeling results

1 until February.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Right. What you have right now
3 is based on the existing conditions, and that's why we
4 created that category where we are not sure.

5 You will notice that sites that are adjacent
6 to the bay, for the most part, are in the feasibility
7 study, because they might impact the bay that's there.

8 That's pretty much in the report. We caveat
9 that these recommendations are based on existing, on the
10 current information, and as we get new information, we
11 will revise our recommendations.

12 Hopefully, perhaps the TPH toxicity testing
13 will show that the sites that are really far inland
14 don't need to be remediated or maybe they do need some
15 small action. I don't want to predict.

16 I know what I want the results to be, but I
17 can't make them come out that way.

18 MR. HEHN: If the groundwater modeling
19 drastically changes your interpretation, will you then
20 have to go back and reevaluate those particular sites

1 and come up with new conclusions and recommendations?

2 MS. TOBIAS: Well, for the most part, the
3 conclusions and recommendations from my point of view
4 are conservative, because they are sites that fell
5 within that middle category.

6 Does that answer your question?

7 MR. HEHN: Partly.

8 MS. TOBIAS: It's not the best role for the
9 Navy, but it's the most responsible pathway to take.

10 MR. HEHN: If the groundwater modeling does
11 change that, you would go back and reevaluate the
12 conclusions on that and have to come out with a new
13 draft revised version or something?

14 MS. TOBIAS: Well, the groundwater modeling
15 will be done before the next version. You may see five
16 more sites showing no action based on the modeling.

17 MR. HEHN: Okay.

18 MS. SIMONS: It sort of sounds like you're
19 saying, it's more likely these will go into no action as
20 opposed to, you know, you kind of assume that you would

1 have to take action.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

3 MS. SIMONS: And then there may be a chance.

4 If you didn't know what the results are, you assume we

5 would have to take action.

6 MS. TOBIAS: What we say in that table in the
7 document is that there is a potential for this site to
8 be carried into the feasibility study. Until we get the
9 results, it will be carried in.

10 MS. NELSON: Ready for question two?

11 Is there a map included in the report which
12 lays out recommendations/conclusions for each site?

13 MS. TOBIAS: A map? I'm sorry.

14 MS. NELSON: A map or a drawing.

15 MS. TOBIAS: Basically, it will be that table
16 that I showed you in the executive summary.

17 Were you thinking of a map that would show
18 like the whole island?

19 MS. LA PIERRE: Physical location maybe.

20 MS. TOBIAS: That's a really good suggestion,

1 and we could look at doing that.

2 MR. HEHN: One advantage of that, it gives you
3 a perspective on all the sites together.

4 MS. TOBIAS: Right. That's a good suggestion,
5 and I appreciate that.

6 MS. NELSON: Question three: Are the
7 investigation results all individual on one site map?

8 MS. LUPTON: Could you speak up?

9 MR. HEHN: Do you want me to read that for
10 you?

11 (Laughter.)

12 MS. NELSON: Paul, help me out.

13 MR. HEHN: Are the investigation results all
14 included on one site map? In other words, also, you
15 know, essentially, do you have all of the data, all the
16 TPH results or all the metal results or something
17 incorporated into one, you know, like all TI maps?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think the question may
19 be also related to the results when shown on a map of
20 each individual site.

1 MR. HEHN: One total site map.

2 MS. SMITH: Everything.

3 MR. HEHN: Not all contaminants of concern on
4 one map, but maybe like one map that shows all the TPH
5 gasoline results, or something like that, for all the
6 various sites.

7 MS. TOBIAS: No, we did not do that.

8 When you look at the results, you will see, or
9 when you look at the different maps, you will see that
10 it might have been more of a challenge to do it that
11 way. That will be a good suggestion for the next
12 version when we have more information.

13 What we have is, in each site chapter, we have
14 the maps. Those are pretty challenging to read. They
15 are pretty full on these sheets, so I think it would
16 kind of scare me to see the whole base.

17 We can look at it again for the next version.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: Paul, can I make a comment on
19 that, though?

20 I don't know if you wrote that question, but

1 at Hunter's Point, they did one map for every
2 contaminant. It made the report bulky. The map was
3 useless because how you managed the risk isn't chemical
4 specific. The risk was consolidated.

5 I don't know if this had anything to do with
6 your decision not to do it, but at Hunter's Point, we
7 had four volumes of maps, great big sheets with one
8 little circle. It was not useful.

9 But I agree, it would be nice to have
10 everything, it would be nice to come up with a map
11 that's useful. But that wasn't it.

12 MR. HEHN: Okay.

13 MS. TOBIAS: So maybe as you review the
14 document, you can figure out what it is that you do want
15 to see and work it out.

16 But these are kind of challenging, I have to
17 admit.

18 MR. HEHN: Okay.

19 MS. NELSON: Good, because the next question
20 is: Are there cross sections on a site-by-site basis

1 included?

2 MS. TOBIAS: Only for sites 21 and 24. Those
3 are the chlorinated hydrocarbon sites where we have
4 groundwater contamination at different depths.

5 For the most part, the sites are, you hit
6 groundwater at five feet, so there is not a whole lot to
7 see.

8 MS. NELSON: Next question: Did you review
9 all IR sites under all three scenarios? I guess that's
10 "risk scenarios."

11 MS. TOBIAS: Yes. All IR sites were put
12 through the process.

13 MS. NELSON: And did you estimate a background
14 risk for the IR sites?

15 MS. TOBIAS: I guess I don't understand that
16 question.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: I could clarify it.

18 There is a background level of meta^l
19 contamination. Did you estimate a background risk using
20 that?

1 MS. TOBIAS: What we did for Treasure Island,
2 we came up with ambient concentration for Treasure
3 Island and the fill.

4 For Yerba Buena Island, we developed
5 background concentration.

6 Any metal that exceeded its ambient level more
7 than ten percent at a time was carried through the risk
8 assessment.

9 We didn't do a background concentration risk
10 assessment. There are some tables that are in each site
11 specific chapter, and they state that, for example, back
12 to beryllium, if beryllium is the risk driver, and, you
13 know, it's at background level, basically.

14 MS. NELSON: There are two other questions,
15 and one is, I guess, very similar to the one asked
16 before:

17 Data outstanding for some sites in the IR
18 report, is there a contingency for reevaluating sites
19 for incoming data, for example, more contamination or
20 different contamination than has been observed

1 previously?

2 MS. TOBIAS: I feel I've answered that
3 question, but that's up to the person who asked the
4 question. I think I answered it.

5 MS. NELSON: Well, this is my question.

6 MS. TOBIAS: I'm sorry.

7 MS. NELSON: The one piece you didn't answer
8 before, what if something new shows up, like a chemical
9 that migrates?

10 MS. TOBIAS: Well, that might happen at site
11 17. We don't know if there were chlorinated
12 hydrocarbons beneath that site.

13 I think that site right now is in the mid
14 category and might go into the feasibility study at that
15 point.

16 I'm not answering your question. Maybe you
17 could explain it.

18 MS. NELSON: Well, if something else comes up
19 that hasn't been seen before, if the site got worse,
20 even though you used the most conservative assumption,

1 how would you address it?

2 MS. TOBIAS: Well, if something appeared in
3 the groundwater, or in the sites that we just went back
4 and sampled, we would take appropriate action. We would
5 reevaluate it based on the new information.

6 MS. NELSON: The last question is: MTBE was
7 not evaluated for any of the IR sites where there were
8 tanks within or adjacent to an IR site. Is that going
9 to be evaluated within the next six months? Would it be
10 included in this report?

11 MS. GLASS: Your voice is dying right about
12 there. It's not carrying. Could you put a little more
13 into it or possibly stand?

14 MS. TOBIAS: At this time, we completed all
15 the sampling we will be doing except at maybe a couple
16 of the sites where we may be installing wells.

17 So until we resubmit the final groundwater
18 monitoring work plan, we won't be looking at doing
19 analyzing for MTBE.

20 I can't tell you for sure if we are going to

1 actually analyze it, but we are looking into it right
2 now at all those sites where the fuel was there after
3 1980.

4 We never analyzed for it, so at this point we
5 can't reevaluate it. We can just monitor it in the
6 future, maybe.

7 MR. HEHN: Actually, if they have the
8 chromatograms for that, they can just go back and look
9 at the chromatograms. Even on older results, you don't
10 need to have the original samples to do that.

11 MS. SMITH: That's a good point.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Unless there is any other
13 immediate comments or questions, we will bring this
14 phase to a close.

15 Our next forum for discussing the remedial
16 investigation report will be at the interim meeting,
17 which is scheduled for Tuesday, the 5th of November.

18 And, also, as part of the administrative
19 organizational business, we will be discussing other
20 meeting dates. But at this point in time, the 5th of

1 November is the next meeting date for discussion of the
2 remedial investigation report.

3 Next, I would like to just briefly move into
4 the highlights of the EIS/EIR scoping hearing that was
5 held on the 9th of October. I want to thank the
6 participation of the RAB members. I think RAB members
7 made up at least half of the total community members
8 present at the EIS/EIR scoping hearing.

9 Basically, the purpose of the scoping hearing
10 is really to offer an opportunity for the public to
11 solicit concerns, and, at that point, at the scoping
12 hearing, we don't actually have a product to show, so
13 it's just the opening of the public process. So it was
14 a forum for members of the public to state their
15 concerns, and then those concerns will be addressed in
16 the draft EIS/EIR, which will be produced sometime in
17 the January, February time frame.

18 And then at the time of the publication of the
19 draft EIS/EIR, then there will be another public
20 hearing.

1 And, also, in addition to the public scoping
2 hearing, there is also a window of opportunity for the
3 public to submit written comments.

4 I think everyone probably received one or more
5 copies of the public notice. I think RAB members were
6 on at least one or more mailing lists. If you haven't
7 received a copy of the EIS/EIR public notice, there is
8 some additional copies on the side table also. It goes
9 through the process in pretty good detail in about 15
10 pages or so.

11 The meeting was fairly short, given the number
12 of public members attending. There was just a very
13 short overview of the EIS/EIR process, which is pretty
14 well covered in this document, and we had discussed it
15 also in previous meetings.

16 There were six members of the public who
17 spoke.

18 Also, the EIS/EIR scoping hearing, since it
19 was an official hearing, there will be an official
20 transcript produced. So we will eventually have a copy

1 of that available should anyone be interested in reading
2 the transcript, which shouldn't be too long, since the
3 meeting only lasted about an hour.

4 There were six members of the public speaking.
5 The first speaker was a representative from the San
6 Francisco Planning and Urban Research organization, or
7 SPUR.

8 These are just from my personal notes. Their
9 comments concerned the Marina operations, and, also,
10 encouraging the city to look at the Urban Land Institute
11 report, once it's published.

12 The second speaker expressed concern over how
13 the needs of military veterans would be addressed in the
14 reuse plan.

15 The third speaker was a member of TIHDI, the
16 Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative, and,
17 basically, wanted to make sure that that organization's
18 needs were addressed.

19 The fourth speaker was from the Golden Gate
20 Audubon Society and was concerned with opportunities for

1 nature viewing and wildlife to be addressed in the reuse
2 plan.

3 The fifth speaker was our own Harlan, who, I
4 won't steal your thunder, basically you spoke in favor
5 of the Marina operation.

6 MR. VAN WYE: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then the last speaker
8 was concerned with some legal aspects of the reuse
9 EIS/EIR process that I can't really clarify, couldn't
10 clarify in my notes.

11 Harlan, did you want to add anything?

12 MR. VAN WYE: I would just indicate, first of
13 all, the SPUR people were very encouraging about Marina
14 operations in their comments, which I was appreciative
15 of. I think the Audubon people even made some oblique
16 remark about that.

17 But I was encouraging them to look at the
18 reality of things in terms of operating a marina. You
19 are going to need to have parking adjacent to the
20 boatslips, and that wasn't really provided for in the

1 diagrams in the draft plan.

2 Automobile access is really very important in
3 that because you're always carrying things. Anybody who
4 has gone out sailing, you are always carrying things to
5 the boat and off the boat, and it's really unrealistic
6 to expect, it would be a unique marina in all the world
7 if it had slips but no parking.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: Easy to get a space, though, I
9 bet.

10 MR. VAN WYE: You wouldn't sell very many
11 slips.

12 Also on the fast track aspect, the people that
13 studied it for the Board of Supervisors to critique the
14 plan indicated that the Marina is one of the first
15 things to be developed and it should be a moneymaker.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any other
17 comments from anyone who was present at the scoping
18 hearing?

19 Laurie.

20 MS. GLASS: I just wanted to add, anybody who

1 had an additional comment or suggestion, the deadline
2 was the 28th. So anybody who is here who wanted to make
3 a comment or suggestion about the EIR/EIS.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And there was an address
5 to mail comments to that was in this public scoping
6 hearing announcement, which you should have gotten, but,
7 if not, there is additional copies on the side table.

8 MS. LA PIERRE: There is none over here. I
9 just looked.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. If you would like
11 one, talk to Hugo after the meeting and we will mail
12 them out.

13 MS. NELSON: Richard?

14 MR. HANSEN: Going back to the question that
15 Timothy Such raised as the meeting started, this would
16 be the right forum to raise the question as to who
17 really owns the land, is that not correct, whether it's
18 the Tidelands Trust or whether it's reverted by the Navy
19 to the city or some other agency.

20 MR. VAN WYE: It should be clear that the

1 Tidelands Trust is not an ownership thing. It's an
2 imposition of the restriction on top of the land,
3 irrespective of the ownership.

4 MS. GLASS: It restricts the uses it could be
5 put to. It doesn't talk about who owns the land.

6 MR. SUCH: There are different
7 interpretations, but it should be brought up in the
8 EIR/EIS process, definitely.

9 MS. GLASS: It will be.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm pretty sure it will
11 be.

12 Well, with that, the next milestone will be
13 the publication of the draft EIS/EIR, which will be
14 sometime in the February time frame followed by another
15 public hearing which, presumably, will be larger once
16 the document is in its draft form, and then, ultimately,
17 the EIS/EIR would be approved sometime in the fall of
18 1997.

19 And then the completion of the EIS/EIR allows
20 the city to complete its land use procedures as well as

1 paving the way for a lot of the final transfers of
2 property.

3 MR. HANSEN: Who is actually doing the EIS, is
4 that your office?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The EIS is the federal
6 document. The EIR is the state document. The Navy and
7 the city are doing it as a joint document.

8 The Navy has a requirement to do the EIS, and
9 the city has a requirement to do the EIR. It's very
10 common in those situations for a joint document to be
11 produced, so we are collaborating.

12 MR. HANSEN: And you, yourself, are a
13 principal?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm not directly involved.
15 I'm kind of tangentially involved on the environmental
16 side.

17 The EIS/EIR really covers the broadest range
18 of the term "environmental," including traffic issues
19 and socioeconomic issues.

20 I'm involved insofar as it relates to the

1 environmental portion, but that's actually only a
2 smaller portion of the overall document.

3 MS. GLASS: Is he asking who is going to write
4 it?

5 MR. HANSEN: Right.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we have a Navy
7 consultant. Basically, it's between Navy consultants,
8 Navy staff and city staff.

9 MR. HANSEN: And is there somebody who has
10 sort of a role like Laurie to pull the whole thing
11 together?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the city planning
13 department, and they have some specific individuals who
14 oversee the EIR studies.

15 So there is an EIR planning manager for the
16 city, and then we have our own planning manager for the
17 Navy.

18 MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next, I would like to move
20 into the topic of options for a geographic study site

1 for the cleanup process. This is something that evolved
2 probably over about the last six months.

3 It really began with discussing the ways to
4 look at a single site, and rather than look at the whole
5 cleanup process as a whole, focus in on a particular
6 site.

7 The original discussion was about looking at
8 an IR site, and looking at that, taking the opportunity
9 to look at and discuss it in more detail.

10 But over the last couple of months, our
11 discussion has kind of evolved to instead of looking at
12 an IR site, to look at a geographic site. The reason
13 being is that, in a given piece of property, since our
14 ultimate objective is to lease or transfer the property,
15 it's not only IR site issues, because we only have 25 IR
16 sites, but there is also underground storage tank
17 issues, asbestos, lead based paint and other programs.
18 So when you look at what's required to reuse a site, you
19 have to take more into consideration than just the IR
20 sites.

1 So why select this geographic site? Well,
2 one, a smaller set of Treasure Island is more manageable
3 to study. When you look at the remedial investigation
4 report, four volumes there, that's only covering 14
5 sites. So there is several additional volumes just to
6 get to the 25, what used to be the 25 original IR sites,
7 plus that doesn't even consider the asbestos report,
8 which is another several volumes.

9 I would imagine if you totaled up all of the
10 volumes to cover all of the investigations, we're
11 probably somewhere getting close to ten lineal feet of
12 space.

13 So rather than try to digest that entire
14 shelf, why not take a look at a smaller geographic area
15 and look at all the elements that go into the cleanup of
16 that site. I think we would be able to get a better
17 feel for the whole cleanup process by looking at it
18 through the eyes of one smaller geographic site.

19 The question is, what site? In our last
20 interim meeting, we discussed a couple of sites. And,

1 so, tonight, I was going to go into those in more detail
2 and, possibly, we might reach a conclusion on which site
3 to proceed on.

4 The five sites that were discussed were the
5 northeast corner of Yerba Buena Island, and that's the
6 area that includes the Nimitz House, the historic
7 housing complex, as well as our IR site 11, the
8 landfills, our IR site 8, the sludge area, as well as
9 the area underneath the bridge that we are investigating
10 for lead, and there is also underground storage tanks
11 here, so there is a number of things going on in the
12 site.

13 The second site --

14 MR. VAN WYE: Also, the historic torpedo
15 factory there at the end.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

17 And then the second site we discussed was
18 Building 1 here on Treasure Island.

19 The third site was IR site 12, which is the
20 majority of the family housing here.

1 The next site was site 27, the skeet range,
2 which is offshore here.

3 And, lastly, IR site 6, the old fire fighting
4 school.

5 So I took a look at those sites and this is my
6 own personal analysis. I put together some pros and
7 cons. I'm sure there is probably more comments that we
8 can make.

9 Looking at the northeast corner of Yerba Buena
10 Island, what are the pros of looking at this site?

11 Well, it's on the fast track for leasing and transfer,
12 at least the existing housing is, which is the majority
13 of the structures on this site.

14 The future reuse is mixed, both residential
15 and commercial. It has a little bit of everything --
16 CERCLA sites, USTs, a fuel line, asbestos, lead based
17 paint.

18 It's also adjacent to the only other property
19 owner on Naval station, the Coast Guard, and there is at
20 least some remedial actions that are required for

1 leasing, and, of course, transfer.

2 What are the cons on this site? Well, maybe
3 there is too many issues that are easily studied.
4 That's something that we will have to consider.

5 Also, probably the biggest con is that the YBI
6 geology is different from TI geology, so if geology is
7 going to be a consideration in the selection of the
8 site, then this site may have a negative being on YBI.

9 The second site, Building 1, what's the pros?
10 It's a small site. It's really just the building here
11 in the adjacent site.

12 The cons? There is really, the building is
13 leasable in pretty much in an "as is" condition.
14 Cleanup is not really a big driver as to leasing out
15 this building. It's a building we currently occupy as
16 well as the museum.

17 The only really significant cleanup issues are
18 underground storage tanks, and there is no residential
19 use in this area envisioned, only commercial and
20 institutional.

1 MS. GLASS: Jim, was I understanding that
2 there was some kind of possible lead paint and asbestos
3 with Building 1?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, all of the Naval
5 station buildings receive an asbestos inspection. Any
6 building of older vintage, like Building 1, has asbestos
7 containing materials.

8 Because it's an occupied building, our normal
9 maintenance program keeps the asbestos in good
10 condition. So we don't have any issues, really asbestos
11 issues, that need immediate addressing for leasing in
12 the property.

13 And because it would be used for commercial
14 rather than residential purposes, the standards by which
15 we assess the asbestos are going to be different than a
16 residential scenario.

17 Likewise, lead based paint. Lead based paint
18 is not a significant issue for nonresidential
19 structures.

20 MS. GLASS: I guess I thought I understood

1 that there was some kind of asbestos containing tile
2 wall, wall tile or something.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's correct. In all of
4 the older buildings, there may be asbestos containing
5 material, like in tiles and in some wallboards. That's
6 something that has to be taken into consideration by the
7 reuser, particularly if someone is going to do
8 renovation or demolition.

9 But in terms of being able to occupy the
10 building, asbestos is not a significant issue.

11 MS. GLASS: So you're saying that the
12 northeast corner of YBI has a different status than
13 Building 1?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, for asbestos and,
15 actually, more so for lead based paint than asbestos.
16 There is specific criteria for residential use as
17 opposed to a commercial use or nonresidential use.

18 MS. GLASS: Thank you.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: IR site 12 on TI. The
20 pros? That housing is also on a potential fast track

1 for leasing and transfers. There is interest in the
2 site.

3 However, there is really only one surplus site
4 there, although we do have some adjacent UST sites. So
5 there is not as much variety going on site 12 as there
6 is at other locations.

7 Also, the newer housing, since all of the
8 housing in site 12 is 1968 or later, it doesn't have the
9 same asbestos and lead based paint issues as you would
10 have on the older housing on Yerba Buena Island some of
11 which date back to 1900.

12 IR site 27, the skeet range.

13 MS. MENDELOW: But aren't some of the
14 chemicals in site 12, some of the more harsher chemicals
15 than in the other sites?

16 MS. SIMONS: Can I answer?

17 I haven't seen the data for site 12. I think
18 it's more complex in that it's, we are not, there is
19 different chemicals.

20 I don't think the levels are that high. And

1 there is also, one thing I know there might be some
2 lead, too, so it's kind of a mix of different things
3 because it was a disposal area.

4 So in terms of IR, I would say it's one of the
5 more complicated ones in terms of figuring out what to
6 do.

7 MS. SMITH: And it's also not fully
8 categorized. We don't have all the data for that site.
9 It gets slipped past that one.

10 The skeet range, the data is not in yet, so to
11 characterize it for this program wouldn't work because
12 we don't have data.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it gets to, what are
14 we trying to accomplish? There is something in this
15 discussion that's been an interactive process what do
16 you want out of this?

17 When we first started this discussion some
18 months ago at an interim meeting, it was to look at an
19 IR site. And in that respect, IR site 12 is a more
20 complicated site. So if the objective is to look at a

1 more complex IR site, then maybe site 12 would be for
2 consideration.

3 But if the objective is to really look at the
4 overall cleanup processes and the different programs,
5 then site 12.

6 We really don't have a lot of programs other
7 than the CERCLA program as opposed to the northeast
8 corner of Yerba Buena Island, for example, where we have
9 fuel lines and USTs, and both CERCLA and non-CERCLA
10 issues.

11 So the number of different cleanup programs at
12 site 12 is fewer. And the fact that in terms of like
13 looking at lead based paint abatement, the housing on
14 site 12 is newer vintage housing.

15 IR site 27, the Marina is also maybe on a fast
16 track for leasing and transfer, but it's only one site.
17 Actually, I wasn't sure whether that was a pro or a con.
18 It's only one site, so it's less complicated, but on the
19 other hand, it's only one site to look at.

20 And it's offshore only. There is no onshore

1 component to site 27. It's strictly the offshore
2 portion of the skeet range.

3 There is probably little that would prohibit
4 the leasing of the existing Marina. As far as the
5 timetable for Marina expansion, we don't really know at
6 this time.

7 And, then, lastly, IR site 12. Well, it's a
8 major cleanup site.

9 MS. SMITH: 6.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Site 6, I'm sorry.

11 IR site 6, it's a major cleanup site in terms
12 of the quantity, but the petroleum is really the primary
13 issue there.

14 And the timetable for development at that
15 corner, at this corner of the base is unknown, since the
16 development, at least in the reuse plan, is basically
17 starting from the south and working north.

18 So, in that respect, IR site 6 may not be as
19 good a candidate.

20 Yes?

1 MS. MENDELOW: How come site 6, okay, that's
2 petroleum only, so it's not an IR.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right. It would be in the
4 corrective action plan in December.

5 MS. MENDELOW: Okay.

6 MS. NELSON: Laurie?

7 MS. GLASS: You know, I'm looking at various
8 kinds of things here.

9 I'm wondering, how would you -- is it possible
10 to suggest yet another site tonight?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

12 MS. GLASS: I was looking at site 24. That's
13 the 5th Street fuel releases, the dry cleaning facility.
14 It's in the area where, there is more, I can't remember
15 exactly, but, I mean, it's in that portion of the island
16 where they are thinking about having more intensive
17 reuse, et cetera, et cetera. It's not housing, per se,
18 but what would you think of that?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it doesn't have, of
20 course, there is no existing housing there, so we don't

1 have the lead based paint issues, and I think that at
2 least the reuse, at least as far as I'm aware of at this
3 point, the leasing redevelopment in that area may be a
4 little bit further into the future.

5 Whereas the northeast corner of YBI, at least
6 in terms of the existing historic housing is a near term
7 lease and may be early transfer.

8 So this is kind of an open-ended discussion,
9 but it's really kind of leading to, where do we want to
10 go with this, and what site would we like to look at.

11 That doesn't necessarily mean to preclude the
12 fact that if we look at one site, we might not later
13 look at another site. This was meant to be a tool for
14 us to look at the cleanup process.

15 MS. NELSON: Richard?

16 MR. HANSEN: Just so we could move on, how
17 about taking a vote? How many people recommend your
18 first list as the highest priority?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, there was no
20 prioritization on my part involved. That wasn't the

1 intent.

2 MR. HANSEN: Right, but if you want to get a
3 sense of the RAB, throw it out for a vote.

4 MR. VAN WYE: As a straw vote.

5 MR. HANSEN: With all of the pros and cons
6 therein contained.

7 MS. NELSON: Okay. Any other comments before
8 we move into the straw vote?

9 MS. SHIRLEY: Just one comment.

10 Are we clear about the intent? That could
11 muddy the water a bit.

12 MR. HANSEN: Let's get our feet wet.

13 MS. NELSON: Maybe Jim could clarify.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

15 My understanding, at this point, unless we
16 want to change that, was to look at a geographic area
17 and look at all of the elements of the cleanup program
18 that go into preparing that property for lease and
19 transfer.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: That was my understanding, too.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As opposed to looking at a
2 complicated IR site and just looking at the CERCLA
3 issues.

4 MS. SMITH: Right.

5 MS. NELSON: Karen?

6 MS. MENDELOW: I want to clarify: The
7 northeast corner, is that site 11?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we didn't have a
9 real precise boundary, but basically it was intended to
10 include the historic housing, the Nimitz housing, the
11 adjacent houses, site 11, site 8, there is also a UST
12 site right at the entrance of the Coast Guard base, and
13 the area underneath the bridge, which is our lead
14 investigation site.

15 So it really picks up almost every program
16 just in this area, which is about maybe 10 acres or so,
17 10 or 15 acres.

18 MS. GLASS: Would the purpose of this be
19 served by having one kind of sign on Treasure Island and
20 one on Yerba Island, or would that be too complicated or

1 too confusing?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It might be more than we
3 might want to bite off at this point. It's not to say
4 we wouldn't look at other sites, too, but in terms of
5 taking the first step.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: I don't think it much matters in
7 terms of identifying the program whether it's on TI or
8 YBI.

9 MS. GLASS: I don't know. I just have the
10 idea that, geologically, they are so different.

11 MS. SMITH: But the geology has never been an
12 issue. For the entire time I've been here, I've been
13 trying to make geology an issue, and for two years I've
14 been told it's not an issue. So I'm not concerned with
15 it as a geological issue.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think that --

17 MS. GLASS: If I may just say something? I
18 don't know, Christine, you would probably be a good one
19 to say something about this, which is, it seems like
20 contaminations, you know, would behave differently in

1 different kinds of geological conditions.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I think that's why I
3 wanted to clarify the intent.

4 I don't think the intent is to talk about how
5 things move around so much as it is to identify the pile
6 of programs that are applicable.

7 MS. SMITH: So that we have a sense of --

8 MS. GLASS: So, in other words, how it behaves
9 doesn't really change which programs.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

11 MS. NELSON: I saw three other hands raised.
12 I will start with Richard and then Joseph and then
13 Harlan and then Paul.

14 MR. HANSEN: Well, isn't it true that the
15 driver on this, Jim, you intend to have FOSLs come out
16 because Willie Brown wants to use the Nimitz house and
17 have a FOSL go out, I mean, is it necessary we do this
18 anyhow before you consider the FOSLs?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we have FOSLs
20 underway and have done FOSLs at virtually all points of

1 the island now. Probably through 1997, we will probably
2 do FOSLs on many areas on Treasure Island and Yerba
3 Buena Island.

4 I think the fact that, you know, one factor in
5 the northeast corner is that the city has expressed
6 sufficient interest in the housing, and they also have
7 expressed in other areas, too. In fact, they already
8 are moving into the fire fighting school and other
9 areas.

10 So it's just one area that the city has
11 expressed interest in that's on a faster track than
12 areas that we don't have findings of suitability to
13 lease underway yet.

14 MR. HANSEN: But you've answered the question.
15 The city is on a fast track, and these considerations or
16 the possible hazards should be put on a fast track,
17 also.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I would answer that
19 by saying that, in looking at this site, it's something
20 that's more in a real time mode than in looking at a

1 geographic site where there may not be reuse for maybe a
2 period of several years.

3 MR. HANSEN: That's a good reason.

4 MS. NELSON: Harlan?

5 MR. VAN WYE: I had originally thought of 27
6 for parochial reasons, but during the meeting we had two
7 weeks ago, I was easily convinced that there were better
8 sites.

9 I have to think that the northeast corner of
10 Yerba Buena Island provides a lovely range of different
11 problems, and it's probably a fast track area that has a
12 lot of real interesting commercial uses without the
13 earthquake craziness that almost everything on Treasure
14 Island has.

15 And so I would favor us using the northeast
16 corner of Yerba Buena. That would be my vote.

17 MS. NELSON: Laurie?

18 MR. ONGERTH: Let's wrap it up.

19 MS. NELSON: Paul?

20 MR. HEHN: What I wanted to mention, I think

1 we would like to get some feedback from maybe Martha in
2 this case.

3 We really need to bring the city's views of
4 their priorities as to where they want to go, which
5 might help us in finding which site would be most useful
6 for us to do at this point, too, so we have a better
7 understanding where they are going with their
8 priorities, too.

9 MS. WALTERS: Well, I can't specifically
10 respond to you because I don't know everything that's
11 going on. I have been out the past month, so I'm not
12 really sure what's going on.

13 As you know, it's changed hands with the
14 redevelopment agency at the Mayor's office, and I have a
15 meeting Thursday.

16 So I don't mean to put you off, but I don't
17 know at this juncture what things are focused on. Even
18 when I was at the redevelopment agency, it would change
19 every week.

20 I'm sure it's gotten a lot more settled down

1 now, but as soon as I know, I would lend that to the
2 group.

3 MS. GLASS: I was just going to say, I was
4 going along with Harlan, I think I was a proponent for
5 using Building 1, but I think it would be more
6 interesting to have some kind of housing involved in
7 this, whichever it ends up being.

8 I think it would be good to include some type
9 of housing.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, in the interests of
11 maybe bringing this to closure, all of this was meant as
12 we envisioned to be another tool to get our hands around
13 the cleanup process. This isn't that momentous a step.
14 We are not going to create a huge multi-volume set.

15 This is really just a way of being able to
16 look at one smaller site, and, in a series of maybe
17 meetings and short briefings, brief the site and get
18 everyone comfortable with the cleanup process.

19 So making this decision is not really that
20 momentous, and it doesn't keep us from looking at other

1 sites in the future.

2 I would propose that we adopt this site, and
3 then we will be in a position in the next meeting to
4 kind of discuss it, or during the interim meetings, how
5 to proceed with this. It may really be just a couple of
6 briefings and some briefing sheets. It will not really
7 launch a giant study.

8 So is everyone all in favor?

9 MS. NELSON: Richard, do you have a question?

10 MR. HANSEN: I just wanted to bring it to a
11 vote. I think we all feel the same way.

12 MS. NELSON: Straw vote.

13 Those in favor of taking up the northeast
14 corner of Yerba Buena Island as a site to study for the
15 process, raise your hands.

16 Eight.

17 Votes for other sites?

18 Karen?

19 MS. MENDELOW: I vote for site 12.

20 MS. NELSON: Okay.

1 MS. MENDELOW: I think lead based paint and
2 other lead issues under bridges and things are already
3 things that are covered by -- that have been done among
4 other areas.

5 I don't think that -- I think that there is a
6 standard procedure that they use for those things,
7 whereas some of these other mixtures of chemicals and
8 things are a little more tenuous.

9 I'm not an expert. I'm just giving my
10 opinion.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This won't preclude us
12 from looking at that site. In fact, we will be starting
13 a FOSL for that site. So as part of the FOSL, we will
14 go through the same process for site 12.

15 So I think we will be able to address some of
16 your concerns.

17 MS. MENDELOW: Two other issues with it: It
18 seems, since it's directly adjacent to the bay, there is
19 issues there, since there are people already living
20 there. That has an impact as well.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

2 MS. NELSON: Good point.

3 Any other sites proposed?

4 MR. ALCEDO: I like 12, too.

5 If the city is actually serious in terms of
6 housing various commercial or high exposure sites, like
7 the Nimitz house and Building 1 and so on, which are
8 more showy, but if they are serious about housing,
9 housing is there, housing can last, under normal upkeep
10 conditions, at least another 20 years, give or take.

11 But this is going to need new standards, look
12 at new standards, because lead standards are going down
13 again, and where there is any asbestos at all, whether
14 it's in tiles or flashing or anything else, that needs
15 to be looked at, too.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And this is part of what
17 we would do. That's the whole purpose of doing this.

18 We would take a look at the site and we would
19 say, "What is everything that applies to this site," and
20 we would work through that. That's the only reason for

1 doing that.

2 MR. ALCEDO: That asbestos remediation is
3 expensive, too. That's the other side of the coin.

4 MS. NELSON: Just to clarify: Your suggestion
5 was for site 12, too?

6 MR. ALCEDO: 12.

7 MS. NELSON: All right. Are there any other
8 sites?

9 MS. GLASS: Can I vote two times?

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. NELSON: We can all agree to study these
12 two sites in the process. There is no limitation on one
13 or the other.

14 MR. VAN WYE: I just resist getting things too
15 big.

16 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

17 MS. NELSON: Paul?

18 MR. HEHN: That's why I vote for Building 1 as
19 a first start on this. It's simpler and easier for us
20 just to go through and make sure we cover all the bases

1 and take up completion in a short period of time, so
2 that there is a success there. The building will be in
3 existence most likely for the duration.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I think we
5 basically kind of covered this issue, and we need to
6 move on.

7 MS. NELSON: I think we got what we wanted in
8 the process. Thank you.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next, we will speed
10 through the rest of the program since we are way, way
11 behind schedule.

12 Organizational business.

13 MS. NELSON: Yes. I guess the one thing most
14 important is the schedule for the next couple of months
15 so that we can review the report.

16 We have an interim meeting set up for the 5th
17 of November, which is also Election Day. We wanted to
18 see if that would be a hardship for people to attend in
19 the evening.

20 Some people are shaking their heads.

1 MR. VAN WYE: It's not a good time.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We could switch it to
3 Wednesday the 6th.

4 MS. NELSON: Wednesday the 6th.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That way, you won't have
6 to think about the election.

7 MS. NELSON: We could talk about the results
8 the next day.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any problem moving it to
10 Wednesday the 6th?

11 MR. HANSEN: I so move.

12 MS. NELSON: All right. And what we had
13 envisioned at this meeting was the availability of PRC
14 and the agency reps to answer some of the questions we
15 developed in the next two weeks as we review the
16 document.

17 Those of you who signed up, please go to the
18 van and get your volumes and know that you will have
19 some of your questions answered by the staff at hand.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess the other question

1 is whether or not to make any commitment to having a
2 second meeting in November or just base that on the
3 meeting on the 6th.

4 MS. NELSON: We had kind of identified the
5 12th of November as an open date, the technical
6 subcommittee, being defined as those people interested
7 in discussing the documents further. Is that
8 acceptable?

9 MS. GLASS: What date?

10 MS. NELSON: The 12th.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Tuesday the 12th.

12 MS. NELSON: Tuesday the 12th.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: I think we should keep it and
14 then reassess it on the 6th.

15 MS. NELSON: Okay.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So then we will make it a
17 go, no-go on the 6th. That will barely be enough time
18 to get anything in the mail.

19 MS. SMITH: We will be reading this. We will
20 be there. The people who don't attend aren't doing

1 their part anyway.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the 12th is the
3 tentative meeting date.

4 MS. NELSON: Right.

5 And then we will have another opportunity on
6 the 19th at the full RAB meeting to ask questions before
7 we start committing our comments and questions to paper
8 for submittal in December.

9 And in December, we set aside two dates again.
10 The first is the 3rd of December for another interim
11 meeting.

12 And then the 10th is for an open technical
13 discussion, for those of you who would like.

14 The comments are due on the 23rd. What we
15 were envisioning was coming together either on the 10th
16 or the 17th with some draft written comments to submit
17 at the RAB meeting on the 17th -- excuse me -- yes, the
18 17th. Thank you.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So that's the same
20 situation where we definitely have a meeting on the 3rd,

1 the first Tuesday, and then the 10th would be optional.

2 MS. NELSON: Optional.

3 MR. HEHN: Can I make a comment on that, just
4 on the review of that?

5 There are those people who are just going to
6 be reviewing the executive summary, or maybe part of one
7 volume or whatever, and this might be of interest to
8 them.

9 We also talked about possibly getting together
10 an hour earlier on the regular RAB meeting evenings for
11 some people who might want to discuss that. We would be
12 more than happy to arrange that and attend that as well,
13 and have a discussion preliminary to the regular RAB
14 meeting for those who don't want to come to the interim
15 meeting. That's why we wanted to get their comments in.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So that would be at 6:00
17 p.m. on both the 19th of November meeting and then the
18 17th of December meeting.

19 MS. NELSON: And I think we could have pizza
20 and beverages catered in for those who would like that.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

2 THE REPORTER: Excuse me. I have to change
3 paper. It will just take a second.

4 (Pause in proceedings.)

5 MS. NELSON: We wanted to address Dale's
6 questions on the minutes of the last meeting.

7 I think if there are questions about responses
8 as they are transcribed and reflected in the minutes, my
9 recommendation or suggestion would be to address them as
10 soon as possible, as soon as they are identified.

11 Would you like to go through that?

12 MS. SMITH: Sure. I only had two.

13 I had asked if the RAB had received copies of
14 ULI's report.

15 What you responded was, yes, that the report
16 is public, is a public document. But that doesn't mean
17 the RAB gets a copy, and I need a sense of
18 clarification.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will just clarify that
20 if RAB asked for copies of the document, then we will

1 provide copies to the RAB members.

2 MS. SMITH: That asked for copies.

3 And then my other comment or my other question
4 was misanswered by the Water Board, because floating
5 product at site 6 is not a UST issue.

6 You answered that every UST that's pulled is
7 clean, and floating product is not a UST issue.

8 I wanted to know how the floating product was
9 going to be handled.

10 You said under the UST program when the tank
11 is removed, but it's not a UST program.

12 MS. KATHURIA: I understand the UST program
13 deals with petroleum.

14 MS. SMITH: This is a petroleum issue not a
15 tank issue.

16 MS. KATHURIA: Right.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The program tends to be
18 generically referred to as the UST program when,
19 perhaps, it might have been called the petroleum cleanup
20 program.

1 MS. SMITH: But her answer referred to tanks.
2 There is no tank involved in site 6.

3 MS. KATHURIA: There used to be one.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There used to be four
5 tanks on the site that were pulled.

6 MS. SMITH: But I also understand, from your
7 discussion two years ago, that it was routine to pour
8 gasoline onto the ground and have the fire fighting crew
9 attempt to control that.

10 That has nothing to do with the underground
11 storage tank. It has to do with the training program.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sharon?

13 MS. TOBIAS: They would have a mockup airplane
14 they would light on fire, but it's on a concrete pad for
15 the most part.

16 The floating product that is present at site 6
17 is from the tanks that leaked.

18 MS. SMITH: So it is from the tanks?

19 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, it is.

20 MS. SMITH: All right.

1 MS. NELSON: I wanted to point out there are a
2 couple of issues we will not cover tonight in the
3 interest of adjourning. Those are the technical
4 committee and membership committee reports. I guess
5 action items I was going to bring up again.

6 I also wanted to point out, miraculously,
7 during the break, page ES-12 was handed out. I don't
8 know if it was promoted, but it was handed out. That
9 was the missing page on the previous executive summary
10 that was distributed; so, thank you.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Finally, moving to the
12 back page briefly, upcoming reports.

13 We have two documents coming up in November.
14 That's the finding of suitability to lease the Nimitz
15 house complex and also to lease the fleet training for
16 use as a police academy.

17 Both of those documents are going to have very
18 short time periods. In fact, I didn't get the dates
19 clarified until today, so they are not written into the
20 agenda.

1 The Nimitz house complex will be available on
2 the 11th of November, but we need comments by the 25th
3 of November.

4 MS. SMITH: That's shorter.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And this is due to the
6 City's, to the City's date for when they would like to
7 have the site available.

8 And then the fleet training center, a similar
9 schedule. We expect the draft on the 8th of November
10 and comments on the 22nd of November.

11 Now, what this basically means is, in
12 November, during the November 17th meeting, which is
13 still within the comment period, we will have a
14 presentation on these documents.

15 So there will be an opportunity for questions
16 and answers at that 17th of November meeting.

17 And then the comments due, comments due will
18 be over the next week after the November meeting.

19 MR. HANSEN: What's the anticipated duration
20 of the leases, for how many years?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I believe the standard
2 leases are like one year with options to review.

3 So it's anticipated for both that it would be
4 some period of years.

5 MR. HEHN: What's the due date on that?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The due date for the fleet
7 training center is the 22nd of November, and for the
8 Nimitz house complex it's the 25th of November. It's
9 within a few days of each other.

10 We will have a sign-up sheet.

11 Hugo, could you put a sign-up sheet on the
12 side there?

13 MR. BURTON: Yes.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We just need one for the
15 Nimitz house and one for the police academy.

16 And then the BRAC cleanup plan will come out
17 in December as well as the corrective action plan.

18 There is also the federal registered notice
19 for codification of the RAB process, the public comment
20 period, the written public comment period for that ends,

1 I believe, on the 28th of this month or sometime.

2 MS. WALTERS: November 4th.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: November 4th.

4 Any other comments concerning documents?

5 Also, I put a note in there. If you have any
6 unused documents that you would like to return to us, we
7 would be happy to get them and add to our library.

8 In some cases, it would be useful to have
9 extra copies of older documents, particularly people who
10 asked for them and didn't receive them at the time.

11 So don't throw any documents away. We are
12 more than happy to take them back from you.

13 Open questions and discussion. I think we had
14 quite a bit of discussion.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: I have one thing, though: The
16 people sitting on that side of the room, turn around and
17 look outside the window. It's just spectacular out.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. SHIRLEY: I've been enjoying the view all
20 night.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Proposed agenda items for
2 the next meeting.

3 In November, we will continue discussion on
4 the remedial investigation report. We will have a
5 presentation on the FOSL on the Nimitz house and the
6 police academy.

7 We hope to have a presentation on our FOSL
8 plans for other areas of the base during '97.

9 And there was a request -- and I'm not sure,
10 we haven't had time to really look into this -- there
11 was a request by Pat about this new USEPA cancer risk
12 guidance. I've gotten some documentation in the mail,
13 but I don't know much about it.

14 MS. SIMONS: I can ask.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: And, also, isn't there a
17 conference coming up, October 30th?

18 MS. SIMONS: Next week, yes.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: I'm going, if anyone wants to.

20 MS. GLASS: Where is it?

1 MS. SIMONS: At EPA.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then in December, we
3 will continue discussion on or close the discussion on
4 the remedial investigation report.

5 We will have presentations on the corrective
6 action plan, as well as the BRAC cleanup plan.

7 And then we have a number of currently
8 unscheduled agenda items.

9 But I think we have a pretty full schedule for
10 November and December without really adding anything
11 major.

12 That brings us to the close of the meeting.

13 So our next regular meeting is the 19th of
14 November. That's on the third Tuesday because of the
15 Thanksgiving holiday.

16 We will be available starting at 6:00 p.m. for
17 those people who want to come in and talk about the IR
18 report at 6:00, ahead of the regular meeting at 7:00.

19 And then our next mid-month meeting, we just
20 made a decision to switch that from Election Day to the

1 next day, Wednesday, the 6th of November.

2 So with that, we will close the meeting. The
3 sign-up sheets for the police academy and the Nimitz
4 house are on the side. Hugo will take care of those,
5 and Ernie will take care of the distribution of the
6 documents.

7 So thank you very much.

8 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 9:35
9 p.m.).

10

---o0o---

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 Ballboni