

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

19 NOVEMBER 1996

7:00 P.M.

COPY

CASA DE LA VISTA

TREASURE ISLAND

---o0o---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

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

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

JAMES B. SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)

ERNIE GALANG (RPM)

HUGO BURTON (NAVSTA TI)

AMELIA DUQUE (EBS)

LARRY RAMOS (EBS)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

SHARON TOBIAS

THORSTEN ANDERSON

STACEY LUPTON

MARTY WALTERS

REGULATORY AGENCY:

CHEIN KAO (DTSC)

GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)

RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

JAMES ALDRICH

JOHN ALLMAN

CHRIS SHIRLEY (ARC Ecology)

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

2 COMMUNITY MEMBERS (Continued)

3 PAUL V. HEHN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)

4 GARY JENSEN

5 ALICE LA PIERRE

6 CLINTON LOFTMAN

7 DANIEL MC DONALD

8 PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)

9 HENRY J. ONGERTH

10 DALE SMITH

11 THOMAS THOMPSON

12 BRAD WONG

13

14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 SUZANNE VON ROSENBERG (GAIA)

16 JUNIPER NEILL (Clearwater Group)

17

18

19

20

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I think we are
2 ready to begin tonight's meeting.

3 Welcome to our November Restoration Advisory
4 Board. We are having it on the third Tuesday of the
5 month because of the Thanksgiving holiday next week.

6 Also, as a reminder, we will be scheduling the
7 December meeting also on the third Tuesday of the month
8 because of the Christmas holiday.

9 And then we will propose and we will decide on
10 that at the end of this meeting, we will propose to hold
11 the January meeting also on the third Tuesday so that it
12 better coincides with the end of the comment period for
13 the remedial investigation report.

14 And then probably after January, we will go
15 back to the fourth Tuesday of the month.

16 We offered the opportunity at the beginning,
17 6:00 p.m., for an optional discussion period for
18 community members to use the room and be able to have
19 discussions on the RI or other topics, for those people
20 who might not be able to get to the interim meetings.

1 We will do this also next month.

2 So next month we will have the building,
3 although it doesn't look like it's going to be this
4 building. Whatever site we will be at, we will also
5 have that open at 6:00 p.m. for an optional hour of
6 informal discussion among the community members. And
7 then we will begin the regular meeting at 7:00 p.m.

8 Our first item is the agenda. There is
9 additional copies of the agenda in the back of the room.

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

12 (No response.)

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no comments,
14 we will consider the agenda approved and we will move to
15 the discussion of an approval of the October minutes.

16 There is additional copies of the minutes also
17 on the back table.

18 Are there any comments concerning the October
19 22nd meeting minutes?

20 (No response.)

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, there being no
2 comments, we will consider the October 22nd meeting
3 minutes approved.

4 We will move into the public comment period.
5 This is a period we have at the beginning of each
6 meeting for members of the general public, if they are
7 present, to make comments.

8 Are there any public comments from members of
9 the general public?

10 (No response.)

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I don't see any members of
12 the general public here tonight, so we will close the
13 public comment period and move into program updates.

14 The first item, the BRAC Cleanup Team, we held
15 a BRAC Cleanup Team meeting this month, but the primary
16 discussion was on the update of the BRAC Cleanup Plan.
17 So we went through most of the BRAC Cleanup Plan as a
18 working session during the BRAC Cleanup Team meeting.

19 I don't think there is anything else we can
20 really add. It was primarily a working meeting.

1 I haven't seen the minutes. The minutes
2 haven't come out yet.

3 MS. SMITH: Jim?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

5 MS. SMITH: Will we be getting, for those of
6 us who have asked for those minutes, be getting those
7 minutes?

8 I am a little bit remiss on reading the
9 snowball that I have that's called my mail.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Me, too.

11 MS. SMITH: But I assume that we are still
12 getting the BCT minutes.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Ernie, the BRAC Cleanup
14 Team meeting minutes are going out to everybody?

15 MR. GALANG: Yes.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

17 Yes. Since we just had that meeting a couple
18 of weeks ago, it will be another week or two for those
19 minutes to get out.

20 Next, under reuse issues, there being no one

1 here from the city tonight, I don't have much to say on
2 that, although I do have, I did obtain a copy of the
3 final ULI report, and I have five copies of that report
4 here tonight.

5 Actually, we should probably just send it out
6 to everyone. It's not very large. I think it makes a
7 good complement to the reuse plan. So there is five
8 copies here tonight, but then we will mail copies out to
9 everyone else.

10 MR. ALLMAN: What is the ULI?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Urban Land Institute
12 is a nonprofit organization. They were asked to come in
13 and do an independent review of the city's reuse plan
14 and make recommendations.

15 In some respects, they agree with the plan,
16 but they also make some other suggestions, too.

17 Are there any comments or questions concerning
18 reuse issues?

19 (No response.)

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We discussed the -- well,

1 the EIS/EIR public scoping hearing was last month, and
2 so we are in the process of writing the draft EIS/EIR,
3 which, I believe, will be available sometime in the
4 February-March time frame.

5 And then following the availability of the
6 draft EIS/EIR, there will be a formal public hearing to
7 take comments on that. So we will have additional
8 information on that as it develops.

9 Next is review of action items. I'm working
10 from the list that was in the meeting minutes of 22
11 October. That's the action items that are listed on
12 page 9 of the meeting minutes.

13 I will briefly go through all of them since
14 there are only ten, well, plus two new ones. We don't
15 necessarily have progress on all of them, but I will
16 comment briefly on each one.

17 Number one is, the Navy will inform the RAB of
18 its progress in incorporating Phase I and Phase II RI
19 data into the Geographic Information System.

20 We are currently working on a scope of work

1 for a data management program that will potentially
2 incorporate a Geographic Information System. We will
3 have a scope of work on that in about the next 60 days.

4 So we will have more to report on the status
5 of a GIS in the next 60 days.

6 Dan, I don't want to put you on the spot, but
7 you've been on the second item. I don't know if there
8 is anything you want to add on the report concerning
9 participation in the California Environmental Protection
10 Agency Advisory Group?

11 MR. MC DONALD: I don't have anything to add.
12 I have been out of the loop on that for four months.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I want to take this
14 opportunity to welcome Dan back to the RAB.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess, Stacey, the
16 Advisory Group is currently not meeting anyway?

17 MS. LUPTON: Yes. It's on hold because of the
18 funding reductions in the DOD/State Memorandum of
19 Agreement.

20 The DOD, basically, provides the State, there

1 is a memorandum of agreement between the DOD and the
2 State to fund the State for its oversight
3 responsibilities.

4 The Advisory Group is paid for through that
5 funding. Because that funding is uncertain, it's been
6 put on hold pending decisions on what is going to happen
7 with the funding.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

9 MR. WONG: I would like to make a motion,
10 then, that we let Dan off the hook and just remove that
11 action item.

12 (Laughter.)

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would agree.

14 Unless there is any other comment, we will
15 delete item number two.

16 Number three: The Navy will provide
17 clarification on the status of projects for which funds
18 were requested for FY '96, which were not funded and not
19 submitted in the '97 funding request.

20 We have an agenda item next month to talk

1 about budgeting and planning for FY '97, so that will be
2 in the December program.

3 Because of the discussions of the RI and the
4 FOSLs, we won't be able to -- having the budget
5 discussion in December fits in a little bit better.

6 The Navy will prepare an explanation of the
7 information that belongs in the administrative record
8 and the retention time for raw data.

9 The Navy will make a presentation on the
10 subject at a future RAB meeting.

11 We were kind of waiting to see what other
12 actions, John, that your subcommittee might have.

13 MR. ALLMAN: We have none to date, but is that
14 really needed before the, because I look at that as
15 useful for the subcommittee to use that information for
16 determining what modifications we would recommend to the
17 retention system.

18 It seems kind of backwards for us to say,
19 "This is what we would like to see," and then you tell
20 us what you are going to do.

1 It's easier for us to use that as, someone
2 says, "Well, why are we keeping this and not this?"

3 Is that possible? I know we had discussions
4 about it.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think so. I think we
6 can put together some more specific information to
7 answer that question, you know, between now and the next
8 meeting.

9 MR. ALLMAN: It might generate a little more
10 interest. We haven't done a lot of productive work on
11 that subcommittee, yet, so it might help us along,
12 actually.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So we will help to
14 jump-start that.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Did I hear that the
16 subsequent meeting is December or January?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we can provide
18 information for John prior to the December meeting.

19 MR. ALLMAN: Even if it's informal, because
20 basically, to discuss the criteria that you use, whether

1 it's a CERCLA site versus a non-CERCLA site.

2 We do have a list of the database that you
3 have of what you retain and just getting any information
4 in repository.

5 But the reasons why would be useful for us,
6 about why you give those designations in your
7 spreadsheet. It would be a good help for us, too,
8 something like an informal list.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Then what I would suggest,
10 then, between you and your subcommittee, and then Pat
11 and I will just decide to figure out what the best time
12 is to make a general presentation before the whole RAB.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Sure.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. The Navy will
15 provide copies of the completed FY '97 budget. We will
16 do that in December. So December, we will cover budget.

17 The Navy will provide RAB members with a copy
18 of the Executive Summary from the RI report, and that
19 was done. It was handed out at the meeting, and it was
20 also an attachment to the minutes.

1 Brad?

2 MR. WONG: If we could go back to 4 for one
3 second, I don't want to bog us down here, but I would
4 just like to clarify a little bit more what we are
5 looking for there.

6 We had a very good presentation from, I think,
7 it was your lawyer or somebody's lawyer.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: From our attorney, Marvin
9 Norman (phonetic).

10 MR. WONG: Yes. It was kind of a legislation
11 of the laws, or whatever goes in there.

12 Essentially, what came out of that, it's the
13 discretion of, I think, the Navy, or whoever, to decide
14 what goes in, and, just in general, it has to be
15 relevant to the decisions that were made.

16 I think what prompted this was, okay, given
17 that that tended to be a bit broad, and there is a lot
18 of discretion, we were looking to see if there weren't
19 specific criteria being used here at Treasure Island
20 that are being used to determine what is relevant

1 information to the decision.

2 So we are looking for something very specific,
3 if my memory serves me correctly, because there is
4 information repository that exists. We have that very
5 nice printout. And it identifies what is IR, what is
6 AR, so there must be some criteria that's used to
7 evaluate that.

8 So that, I think, specifically is what we are
9 looking for, because we have already done the other
10 part.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

12 MR. WONG: I don't know if that's Ernie's
13 criteria or whose, but that's what it is that we are
14 looking for.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. The more specific
16 decision making process for TI.

17 MR. ALLMAN: And, Jim, we had talked about
18 maybe getting the data downloaded to an Excel file or
19 something, so that we can sort of pull out all the
20 letters, or pull out all the certain type of information

1 to make it easier for us. Instead of going through, I
2 think, it's like 28 pages or 23 pages, is that something
3 we could do?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Or we could do that with a
5 DBO file, too.

6 MR. ALLMAN: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Ernie, we should be able
8 to provide the data that's the same as the printout.

9 MR. GALANG: I don't know. I will have to
10 check with Gil's section. They are the ones doing that
11 for us.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will check on that. I
13 don't see a specific issue because it's the same as
14 what's in the printout. We will check on that.

15 MR. ALLMAN: Most data base programs allow you
16 to export.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

18 Okay. 6 was completed.

19 7: The Navy will maintain a list of all
20 published IR and environmental compliance program

1 documents.

2 Now, the IR documents are already included in
3 the information repository.

4 And, Ernie, can you clarify for me: The sites
5 that have moved from the CERCLA program, out of the
6 CERCLA program, those IR sites, do we know yet how we
7 are going to handle that yet in the information
8 repository?

9 MR. GALANG: Okay. Those sites, it will just
10 be under the information repository.

11 It will not be on the record, because we are
12 going to the Corrective Action Plan, and there is no
13 requisition for those sites.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we will continue to
15 have the Corrective Action Plan in the information
16 repository.

17 MR. GALANG: Yes. It will be part of the
18 information repository.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So those sites which
20 started out as IR sites, even if they moved out of

1 CERCLA, will continue to have the information in the
2 information repository, and the other half of the action
3 item is putting together a list of those non-IR sites,
4 like the UST sites that are not in the IR program, the
5 fuel line, asbestos, lead-based paint things of that
6 sort.

7 And we have never had, since it wasn't a
8 CERCLA requirement, we have never had a data, a list of
9 all those documents. So we are still in the process of
10 putting that together.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Could I have a clarification,
12 now?

13 On the sites that went from CERCLA to
14 non-CERCLA, you are no longer required to keep those as
15 part of the administrative record.

16 But, presumably, the reason that they were
17 able to be removed as a CERCLA site and transferred over
18 to non-CERCLA site was because some decision was made
19 based on the CERCLA type data, and it was determined
20 that they are either non-detects or there were problems

1 that were serious and they couldn't be moved to a
2 non-CERCLA site?

3 Refresh my memory about what the reason was
4 for a lot of the CERCLA sites to be transferred over to
5 non-CERCLA sites.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, because they were
7 petroleum and didn't have CERCLA contaminants which
8 would be nonpetroleum.

9 MR. ALLMAN: So why were they originally on
10 the CERCLA list?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because we originally
12 started the program looking at all of the significant
13 sites regardless of the source of contaminants, and we
14 just followed the CERCLA program.

15 And, then, over the last year, we discussed,
16 well, why do we need to continue these in the CERCLA
17 program when they are technically not CERCLA
18 contaminants and we can speed up the process by reducing
19 the amount of paperwork. That's what is really driving
20 this.

1 MS. SMITH: Jim, can I ask a question, because
2 now you have me confused.

3 By removing items from the CERCLA program, you
4 are allowed to not maintain the data and the background
5 material in the administrative record that supported
6 that transfer?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The information up to the
8 point of decision would still remain in the
9 administrative record.

10 That's something that we may have to clarify.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Especially if you reclassify it,
12 you remove the information out of the AR and into the
13 IR.

14 MS. SMITH: Yes.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's something
16 we will have to clarify.

17 MR. GALANG: I think for those sites, there is
18 no record, so we don't have to provide a record file.

19 But, anyway, those sites are included in most
20 of the sites that we are working on. The documents are

1 still there. They are still part of the admin record
2 for the rest of the sites that we are investigating.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we would still have to
4 maintain the documentation to support the Corrective
5 Action Plan, or whatever other program that we were
6 operating under. We are dealing with regulatory
7 agencies. We still have to have the volume of
8 information.

9 MS. SMITH: Why wouldn't it be in the
10 administrative record, then, if you have to maintain
11 that documentation rather than the IR?

12 MR. GALANG: Because the petroleum site
13 program, we don't have to provide a record file. It's
14 just for information. It's still available for you.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's an interesting
16 situation that's developed as part of the base closure
17 process, because the administrative record and the
18 information repository was set up under CERCLA for
19 CERCLA sites, and there isn't another comparable system
20 for non-CERCLA sites.

1 MR. ALLMAN: Is it possible to get, or do you
2 have an idea, it would be nice to get like we have all
3 these maps with different overlays.

4 Could we get a color coded map that shows the
5 areas that are CERCLA and non-CERCLA, just to get an
6 idea?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the map that we
8 handed out has both, the maps that we distributed over
9 the last couple of months list the IR sites and then the
10 UST sites. They are coded by numbers. Maybe not
11 necessarily by color. We will have updated drawings and
12 a new BRAC Cleanup Plan. That may be a very valid point
13 to make in the updated BRAC Cleanup Plan.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So item 7 is
15 ongoing.

16 I think we will pledge to have at least an
17 initial draft, it may not be every document, but an
18 initial rough draft of the compliance program, the major
19 compliance program documents by December.

20 I know it's kind of dragging out, but we will

1 take our best shot at having at least an initial list in
2 December of the major compliance documents.

3 Then 8: Status of development of sediment
4 screening levels. That's ongoing.

5 MR. GALANG: That's ongoing.

6 PRC is still working on the draft. It will be
7 reviewed by the agency sometime in, I think, February?

8 MS. SIMONS: They haven't received them, not
9 yet.

10 MS. KATHURIA: No.

11 MR. ALLMAN: These are sediments within the
12 bay?

13 MS. SIMONS: Yes.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. When we are talking
15 about sediments, we are talking about offshore
16 sediments. I know it gets a little confusing.

17 So that's ongoing, 8 is ongoing.

18 9: Status of RAB membership. We sent out a
19 memo along with the meeting minutes, and so we are still
20 getting comments back. I hope in the next couple of

1 weeks to have either comments back from those people who
2 aren't here but who would like to continue, but we will
3 know who isn't responding at all.

4 Yes, Ernie.

5 MR. GALANG: I got a call from Fred Hagen this
6 morning on my voice mail.

7 Because of his job, he's too busy, so he's
8 resigning. He will send a letter, a formal resignation
9 to Jim sometime this week.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So it sounds like
11 by the December meeting, we will at least have some
12 listing of members who would either indicate that they
13 want to continue or resign.

14 MR. GALANG: And, also, I might mention that I
15 got a call from Dan McDonald. He's still with us and
16 that's why he showed up today.

17 (Laughter.)

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 10 was sending out notices
19 for interim meetings, and we have been doing that.

20 As far as I know, any time we have a meeting,

1 we will send out a notice, and so I think that's
2 working.

3 Then new action items, opportunities for RAB
4 involvement in the BTAG. And, Stacey, I think there is
5 an opportunity down the road for public comments, but we
6 just haven't reached that point yet.

7 MS. LUPTON: Yes. There is a subcommittee set
8 up to look at how to get the public more involved, but
9 it's been languishing, so that needs to be sort of
10 renewed.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But the government
12 decision process, I mean, the government hasn't made
13 any --

14 MS. LUPTON: No.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: -- so there isn't any
16 defined window of opportunity for comment yet.

17 MS. LUPTON: No. It's still being discussed.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And, lastly, under new
19 items, Martha will clarify issues, and we will clarify
20 issues associated with the Tidelands Trust and Treasure

1 Island.

2 Martha wasn't able to be here tonight, so I
3 will defer that until the next meeting.

4 And there is also continuing to be meetings
5 between the Navy and the City and the State, so this is
6 still an open issue.

7 MR. ALLMAN: Which part of the State?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The State Lands
9 Commission.

10 That covers the action items from the last
11 meeting, and then we will add to that as appropriate
12 during this meeting.

13 Now I will move into the presentations. The
14 first presentations we have are on the FOSLs for the
15 police academy and the Nimitz House Complex. We will do
16 the police academy first.

17 That document, the police academy FOSL was
18 just published yesterday and we are making it available
19 tonight. So we have, I think, about ten copies. We
20 will have a presentation. I guess anyone who would like

1 to pick up a copy, there is copies in the back. Maybe
2 while we get ready for the presentation in the next
3 minute or two, anybody who would like a copy, it's on
4 the back piano there. There is ten copies.

5 MR. HEHN: Is that actually going to be
6 reviewed November the 22nd, in three days? The time
7 frame gets shorter all the time.

8 (Laughter.)

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. That was a typo.

10 No. It's going to be due, I think, on or
11 about the Friday after the next interim RAB meeting.
12 The 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th.

13 So the slides are all covered in the handout
14 so you don't have to squint at the screen if you don't
15 want to.

16 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Can everybody see the
17 screen?

18 I apologize. The glass is missing in the top
19 of this overhead, so the slides might look a little bit
20 funny. I will wait a minute until everybody has had a

1 chance to stretch.

2 (Pause in proceedings.)

3 MS. VON ROSENBERG: My name is Suzanne Von
4 Rosenberg. I'm with GAIA Consulting. We are preparing
5 the site specific environmental baseline survey and
6 finding of the suitability to lease.

7 As Jim just told you, we just wrapped up the
8 document. Actually, Jim said published yesterday. It
9 was published today, so it is hot off the press for
10 everybody. We wanted to give you an overview of our
11 findings and continue to ask questions.

12 So I'm going to talk about, well, talk about
13 two areas, and, then, like I said, give you an
14 opportunity to ask questions. I will give you a little
15 overview of the area and then talk about the proposed
16 reuse and the results of the risk evaluation that we did
17 pertaining to that reuse.

18 While doing one site specific EBS for FOSL, we
19 are really talking about two separate areas: We are
20 talking about what we call the EBS area 1 and EBS area

1 2.

2 EBS area 1 is -- Jim is going to get the map,
3 which will make it a lot easier -- is the location of
4 the current gym and fitness center. I don't know if you
5 can see where I'm pointing. It's right here, this chunk
6 right here (indicating). Parcel 81 is the open space,
7 and then parcels 82 and 83 are the two buildings within
8 the open space of parcel 81.

9 And then EBS area 2 is this stretch up here
10 right along the shore (indicating). And parcel 109 is
11 down here (indicating). Parcel 110 is building 461. And
12 this is parcel 111 (indicating).

13 The two combined are about 12 acres, fairly
14 evenly split, and, in both cases, about 20 percent of
15 the open space in the EBS areas is covered by buildings.

16 Right now, what we are looking at in terms of
17 the proposed time frame for the reuse is that EBS area 2
18 is going to be turned over to the police first, and that
19 will be probably sometime in January.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Sometime in late December,

1 early January.

2 MS. VON ROSENBERG: And the Navy is going to
3 be vacating this area sometime in the summer, so it will
4 be turned over to the police at that point.

5 I've already mentioned EBS area 1 contains the
6 gym and the fitness center, and EBS area 2 was,
7 essentially, the training facilities.

8 There was just a classroom building, classroom
9 administration building and tear gas training facility,
10 and some outdoor training structures.

11 The area of parcel 111 was occupied by the
12 fire training command, and they did some fire training
13 exercise on mockups of structures out there.

14 But unlike a lot of other facilities where
15 there was fire training, here the fuels were not
16 discharged to the ground. So we had a big advantage
17 there compared to a lot of other facilities.

18 We do have some IR sites in the area. In
19 fact, and I'm getting a little bit ahead of my next
20 slide, but all these parcels are considered BRAC

1 category 1, so they are suitable for transfer based on
2 our current evaluation of the concerns of those parcels.

3 This IR site, IR site 12, which is the whole
4 landfill area, IR site 06, which is the former fire
5 training school, and then we have IR sites 10 and 07 up
6 here.

7 We evaluated both of those. They are not
8 immediately adjacent. But they are potentially
9 upgrading it, so we looked at those as well.

10 Any questions so far?

11 MS. SMITH: Yes, I have one.

12 If the proposed fire training does not include
13 the release of fuels to the atmosphere or to the soil,
14 how is the training done?

15 MS. VON ROSENBERG: They are actually, from
16 what we --

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually, maybe I
18 could clarify.

19 I think we are talking about, and not to
20 confuse it, but this is the old fire fighting school

1 here (indicating). This is IR site 6.

2 This area up in the upper corner here was used
3 for pump and hose training, not actual, there weren't
4 any actual flames. They were just practicing handling
5 the hoses and pumping the water.

6 MS. VON ROSENBERG: There were a couple of
7 steel mockups and a mockup of a ship up here
8 (indicating). They called it the U.S.S. PANDEMONIUM,
9 and the cement foundation is still out there, so a
10 little bit of a sense of humor there.

11 So we did our risk evaluations. I told you
12 already, the EBS area 1 is considered suitable for
13 transfer.

14 EBS area 2, soil, groundwater and air sampling
15 results were reviewed, so we looked at all of those.

16 And when we looked at the potential exposure
17 pathways, portions of this area unpaved, it's mostly a
18 grassy, decorative planted area. It's not, per se,
19 exposed soil, I think. A large fraction of this area is
20 paved for parking, and this whole area where the

1 training occurred is also paved.

2 But the pathways that we identified for the
3 compounds of concern included dermal contact and
4 ingestion of soil; dermal contact and ingestion of
5 groundwater; and inhalation of volatiles migrating
6 through the subsurface. That could be the migration of
7 volatiles into indoor or outdoor air.

8 When we looked at the nonvolatile compounds,
9 we found that the only constituent that was even
10 potentially of a concern is arsenic, but it's present
11 below the ambient concentration level for Treasure
12 Island, and we do have data directly on our parcels
13 here.

14 The nonvolatile compounds are not considered
15 to be a concern, and, also, there is not expected to be
16 a lot of contact with soil in any case under normal
17 operating conditions because the areas that are unpaved
18 are landscaped, and the landscaping is in good
19 condition, and it's fairly limited.

20 MR. HEHN: Question: What is the ambient

1 concentration for arsenic on Treasure Island?

2 MS. VON ROSENBERG: The median -- Sharon, help
3 me out here, I'm not sure I know the number correctly --
4 but I believe the median is 5.6 parts per million, and
5 the 95th percentile is 9.5. The highest concentration
6 we saw in this area was 8.2.

7 MS. TOBIAS: The ambient concentration is then
8 9.5 for Treasure Island.

9 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Okay. When we looked at
10 the volatile constituents, we did find some concerns in
11 groundwater right near the parcel boundary here
12 associated with IR site 6.

13 A few volatile constituents were detected at
14 low concentrations on parcel 109. Those concentrations
15 are fairly low, and so were not considered to be of
16 concern.

17 But we did find some elevated concentrations
18 specifically of benzene. That was the compound of
19 greatest concern at IR site 6.

20 And in the area where we found the highest

1 concentrations, it was also the area that the Navy has
2 done air monitoring, outdoor air flux chamber
3 monitoring.

4 So to get an accurate idea of what was
5 actually getting into the atmosphere, what our actual
6 exposures would be, we used the flux chamber information
7 to evaluate potential risks, associated with both indoor
8 and outdoor air.

9 And so we had to do a little bit of modeling
10 to evaluate what the data meant.

11 For the flux chamber results, we found in
12 outdoor air we were usually less than .1 percent of the
13 ambient air PRG for all of the volatiles we detected.
14 So very, very small concentrations actually getting into
15 the outdoor air.

16 For the indoor air, we had to think a little
17 bit about how we would evaluate the data because all the
18 samples we took, obviously, were outdoors.

19 So the way we modeled that, we pretended that
20 our sample was actually taken inside the building, and

1 that's equivalent to pretending that the building has a
2 dirt floor, which it doesn't, so we are overpredicting
3 concentrations.

4 And then we looked at how often is the average
5 building ventilated, and there are some values in the
6 literature for that that are widely used.

7 And given that, we estimated what would that
8 concentration mean. So if we picked up our building
9 here (indicating) and put it over the worst case
10 concentration, what kind of concentrations would we get?

11 And when we did that evaluation, we found that
12 we were usually less than a tenth of the ambient air PRG
13 even in the indoor air.

14 So while there is a little bit more potential
15 for accumulation, we are still well below the threshold
16 of safety.

17 So those were risk evaluation results, and
18 based on that, we concluded that there was not a concern
19 for either indoor or outdoor use of the facility.

20 And I want you to know, ambient air PRGs are

1 designed for residential use. This is not a residential
2 use facility. It's commercial use essentially, so the
3 exposures are actually lower. We don't have children.
4 We will not let the police train children at the
5 facility.

6 So our actual exposures and our actual risk
7 levels are lower than what I've just told you. So we
8 feel quite confident that the area is safe.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Question: Do you know the
10 ambient levels for Yerba Buena for arsenic? Treasure
11 Island, all the soil was brought in from somewhere to
12 build the island.

13 MS. VON ROSENBERG: I do not know for Yerba
14 Buena.

15 Sharon might know some information.

16 MS. TOBIAS: It's in appendix F, which is
17 volume 4. It has all the ambient and background
18 concentrations.

19 MR. ALLMAN: Actually, do you know in
20 comparison to TI?

1 MS. TOBIAS: I try not to notice Treasure
2 Island.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. ALLMAN: My concern is, yes, I mean, all
5 the soil was brought in, but, theoretically,
6 contaminated soil could have been brought in with high
7 levels of arsenic.

8 MS. SMITH: Absolutely.

9 MR. ALLMAN: We have this problem on our
10 campus in Berkeley. We have, I think, 4 ppm in the
11 soil, and the City of Berkeley is very concerned that
12 that's very high, so we are trying to do background
13 studies of ambient arsenic levels in the East Bay.

14 Here you have all the soils brought in, so you
15 are averaging some soil from this site, that site and
16 the other site.

17 MS. VON ROSENBERG: I have to say that I don't
18 really agree with you that the soils were brought in,
19 because it was hydraulic fill. It was taken out of the
20 bay, so it is actually local material.

1 MS. SMITH: It's local material, but it could
2 have had heavy concentrations of lead arsenic already in
3 it. It is outwash. It is Temescal Creek outwash, and
4 that came down from the hills.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will address the
6 ambient issues on Yerba Buena in another forum, but we
7 will address your question.

8 As far as the PRGs go and as far as risk
9 assessments go, we don't believe that there is a risk.
10 But we will address your question about ambient levels
11 at another time. We will do that.

12 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Aside from the
13 concentration, we don't think there is going to be
14 significant contact with the soil because the area is
15 mostly paved, and the areas that are landscaped are in
16 good condition and, obviously, are going to be
17 maintained.

18 And we will not likely have children playing
19 around, digging up the dirt or anything like that, at
20 least we hope the police are mature enough not to do

1 that.

2 So under normal operating conditions, we don't
3 expect that there is a great potential for ongoing
4 contact with the soil.

5 And when you look at the PRGs, they are based
6 on the assumption the area is completely bare soil, so
7 that there is, Dale, ongoing contact with the soil. We
8 will not have anything like that.

9 MS. SMITH: But in terms of the whole island,
10 this is a very big issue because you do have residential
11 areas.

12 MS. VON ROSENBERG: You know, I can't speak
13 for that.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will be able to address
15 those issues, too.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a quick question.

17 Will there be high speed vehicle training
18 going on out here?

19 MS. VON ROSENBERG: High speed vehicle
20 training?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we are evaluating
2 this facility from just an environmental standpoint, as
3 far as the use of the buildings and the site.

4 I don't have any direct knowledge of what type
5 of training activities.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: But it may create a pathway.
7 High speed vehicles create dust.

8 MS. VON ROSENBERG: The only areas that are
9 unpaved out here are really strips along the sidewalk
10 leading to the building, or a planted area in front of
11 the building.

12 And, also, the area itself is not very big.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

14 MS. VON ROSENBERG: It's not really suitable.
15 You know, you might be able to do 180s out there, but
16 that would be about it.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MS. VON ROSENBERG: 360s, I guess.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I see your
20 point. The size of the site is really not such that it

1 would be like a track.

2 MR. ALLMAN: One more concern -- well, I will
3 wait until the next topic.

4 MS. VON ROSENBERG: So when I said the
5 nonvolatile compounds are not a concern, as in any
6 commercial or industrial release at TI, we prohibit the
7 use of groundwater, so to the degree that there are
8 metals present in the groundwater, we want to be sure
9 that people don't drink the water.

10 In this area, particularly, I don't believe
11 that people will drink the water, even if you let them,
12 because it would turn salty really fast if you started
13 pumping it, and not taste very good.

14 Again, we are going to require the Navy's
15 approval on any construction activities involving
16 subsurface intrusion.

17 And then we have the other standard lease
18 restrictions regarding operations. You have to manage
19 your hazardous waste properly if you're going to
20 generate them, and you have to maintain asbestos in a

1 safe condition, et cetera, et cetera.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Housekeeping.

3 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Yes, housekeeping
4 operational. The standard things that any business or
5 entity would have to do to run its business in
6 accordance with environmental recommendations.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do you have any plans to do
8 any indoor air monitoring?

9 MS. VON ROSENBERG: No, not in this case.

10 We really have such a big margin of safety on
11 our numbers, and we really considered the worst case
12 situation, which is the highest the plume is going to
13 move underneath the building, that we don't believe it
14 is necessary.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Now, the RAB is receiving
16 this at the same time as the regulatory agency. So we
17 have not yet gotten any comment from the regulatory
18 agencies.

19 MS. VON ROSENBERG: We are right there on the
20 cutting edge.

1 MR. ALLMAN: And the edge of the island.

2 My other question was related to the use,
3 because once they start leasing, they will set up the
4 program and use the buildings.

5 If DTSC, I guess, would be the agency that
6 would be interested in the soil arsenic and lead levels,
7 will they then clear them off of sections, for example,
8 if the end use ends up being, say, a day care center,
9 where kids might come in contact with and eat 200
10 milligrams of soil a day, will they then evict the
11 police academy to be able to remediate the site?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, if the use of the
13 site changes, we would have to reevaluate that in either
14 a FOSL or what is being proposed for transferring.

15 And even if the reuse doesn't change, we will
16 have to update the FOSL at some later time anyway in
17 order to become a transfer document.

18 MS. VON ROSENBERG: You know, some of the
19 other standard lease restrictions do include allowing
20 access for our program activities.

1 MR. ALLMAN: Yes, but that's usually, when
2 I've asked questions about that, it's regarding being
3 able to do further sampling, and whatnot, and some
4 remediation, I guess.

5 So are the leases -- because we never see the
6 part beyond the FOSL -- but are the leases yearly leases
7 or are they open-ended and variable or what?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, initially, they
9 have been year to year. I don't have as much specific
10 information.

11 They are not as long term. They are
12 considered to be interim activities because the future,
13 final use of these sites may be different from what the
14 current use is.

15 Yes, Brad.

16 MR. WONG: Since this all reverts over to the
17 city, what, next September, October 1st, something like
18 that?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually, not. If I
20 could clarify.

1 Well, basically, at the end, 30 September '97,
2 what happens is, the Naval Station, Treasure Island, is
3 gone as a military installation.

4 But the property is still owned by the Navy
5 and will be administered by Engineering Field Activity
6 West. Engineering Field Activity West have already
7 taken over, for example, Hunter's Point and the former
8 Mare Island Shipyard.

9 And so the Navy will continue to, what we
10 call, caretake this property until the final real estate
11 transfer is completed.

12 In some cases, maybe the whole property would
13 go to the city or to somebody.

14 In other cases, different pieces of property
15 may go to different organizations, like the Department
16 of Labor's job corps center. At some point, the title
17 of that may transfer to the Department of Labor for just
18 those 35 acres.

19 MR. WONG: Okay.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I'm sorry, I might have

1 missed this, but has the asbestos that's been noted in
2 the EBS been remediated?

3 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Well, currently, what's
4 slated to be done is that everything will be addressed
5 before the police get the building.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there is any damaged,
7 friable material, it will be, what we meant to say in
8 there was that prior to actual occupancy, if there is
9 any damaged, friable asbestos, it will be repaired.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The repair to the interior
11 space cleansed so that it doesn't become airborne or
12 how?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, if the material was,
14 in general, and this is a generalization, in general,
15 those buildings which we occupy, like these buildings,
16 the asbestos material is maintained on an ongoing basis,
17 and so we don't normally find problems.

18 Where you will likely find more problems is in
19 the area of a building that might be vacant and might be
20 deteriorating, or in an inaccessible area, like the

1 crawl space of a building.

2 But in a building like these that we are
3 considering, the asbestos issues are minor, and so we
4 expect to make any necessary repairs prior to the
5 occupancy.

6 If there was significant damage to the
7 material, to the point that we felt fibers might have
8 been released into the building, then as part of that
9 asbestos repair or abatement, we would have to do
10 cleaning and possible confirmation air sampling.

11 But, in general, if it is a minor repair, we
12 probably wouldn't feel the need to do an air
13 confirmation.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right now it's not really
15 clear in the EBS material if there is or to the extent
16 that asbestos is a problem.

17 But I would think that the modeling of the
18 interior air quality wouldn't adequately address that
19 condition.

20 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Well, asbestos is

1 considered a disclosure issue, which means that,
2 especially under a commercial lease, the Navy is
3 required to let the tenant know where it's located and
4 to repair the material to the degree that it's damaged
5 and accessible, damaged, friable and accessible, so that
6 will be done.

7 Walking through the building, it was in good
8 shape, in general, but the air modeling would address
9 the pathways that we can't control through lease
10 restrictions.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: But, briefly looking at it
12 in the EBS, it wasn't addressed in your presentation.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think that's a good
14 point that Pat has. If you need to, we will clarify the
15 wording on asbestos abatement.

16 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Yes, and we will do that.
17 There is a section in the FOSL.

18 MR. ALLMAN: What's the PRG for the lead in
19 water, in groundwater?

20 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Lead in groundwater is 4

1 ppb, 4 parts per billion.

2 Tap water PRGs, which is what we compared the
3 data, two years, very conservative measure, are
4 typically less than the maximum contaminant levels
5 allowable under the Safe Drinking Water Act. I just
6 wanted to mention that. We used the lower of the
7 published values.

8 MR. ALLMAN: So what is the suspected source
9 of the lead that's in the groundwater?

10 MS. VON ROSENBERG: You know, it's brackish
11 water. It's quite possible that it's present naturally.

12 As long as we prohibit the use of the
13 groundwater, there won't be an exposure to it. So under
14 our lease, we are not really concerned about that.

15 MR. ALLMAN: So as far as intentions for
16 future samplings, all leases in effect, for example,
17 there is mention in here about the paint being in good
18 condition even though it slightly contained lead because
19 the buildings are old, but at least the building is in
20 good condition.

1 I have had a concern for a while about, for
2 example, these buildings in the housing areas where
3 there is lead-based paint abatement plans going on for
4 the paint in the walls of the building, but I still have
5 yet to hear of any work being done to abate paint that's
6 within the soil. If it gets carried from rainwater from
7 gutters, that's what I want to know.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, that particular
9 issue is ongoing between the Navy and the regulators,
10 and I think we will have more information on that in the
11 near future, and we will also have a discussion in a
12 future meeting on our lead-based paint program.

13 MR. ALLMAN: For soils as well as paint
14 itself?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we can address that.
16 It's still kind of an ongoing issue of discussion
17 between the Navy and the regulators.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Okay.

19 MS. SMITH: Can I have some verification
20 again?

1 This is not the brig that we are talking
2 about?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. This is former
4 buildings, 461, 462 and 463, which were part of the
5 Fleet Training Center, basically, like a community, a
6 small community college.

7 And then the other part of this site, which is
8 not contiguous, is the gymnasium and the fitness center,
9 which the police would like to use as part of the
10 academy.

11 So the police department wants to come in and
12 use this as a training facility.

13 The brig, which is just actually one block
14 away from this proposed police academy, would be run by
15 the sheriff's department as an actual incarceration
16 facility, and that was covered in a separate FOSL.

17 MS. SMITH: I understand that, but that was a
18 new building and these are older buildings.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: These are older in terms
20 of 461, 462 and 463, which were built in about the 1968

1 time frame.

2 So it was still a time, for example, some
3 lead-based paints might have been used, whereas the brig
4 was constructed and opened in about '92. So it's
5 virtually brand-new.

6 MS. SMITH: So I don't recall, I yammered
7 about getting asbestos documentation, but I don't recall
8 getting any lead documentation because it's not an IR
9 program. It's a different program.

10 How much soils testing was done on lead
11 contamination around those buildings?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, currently, there is
13 no requirement.

14 The lead-based paint testing is driven by HUD
15 Title X, which covers residential.

16 There is currently no specific regulation that
17 covers lead-based paint testing for nonresidential
18 structures, although if there is a significant enough
19 release of lead from whatever the source, conceivably
20 that could become a CERCLA issue.

1 I think that's something we could cover in a
2 future agenda item on lead-based paint and lead related
3 issues.

4 I understand what you're saying.

5 MS. SMITH: Because the Army and the
6 Presidio --

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, and we are even part
8 of the same discussion with the Army and the regulators.

9 So it's still an ongoing issue.

10 MR. HEHN: There are a number of things, and,
11 granted, I haven't had a chance to read through this
12 whole thing, but there are a number of things that show
13 up in the EBS, and that is, photographic chemicals,
14 solvents, empiric nitrates, and a PCB-containing
15 transformer on parcel 109.

16 Have those been determined whether or not
17 there are any impact from any of those particular
18 sources, either EBS or Phase 2-B?

19 MS. VON ROSENBERG: Sort of two partial
20 answers to that question:

1 The photographic chemicals, and so forth, were
2 used in small quantities, and they were used primarily
3 inside the building. So that's one issue.

4 There was one transformer that leaked, but the
5 available documentation shows that the spill was cleaned
6 up properly and it never actually hit the soil. So
7 that's part A of the answer.

8 Part B of the answer is, there was some
9 sampling that was done associated with this IR site in
10 this portion of the parcel (indicating), and none of the
11 soil or groundwater samples really showed any
12 constituents of concern.

13 MR. HEHN: Where they were tested for those
14 particular constituents?

15 MS. VON ROSENBERG: They were tested for
16 metals, so they would have tested the nitrates, and they
17 were tested for USTs.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Metals in records?

19 MS. VON ROSENBERG: For mercury.

20 The metals analysis includes analysis of

1 mercury, standard analysis.

2 MR. ALLMAN: But how does it give you
3 nitrates?

4 MS. VON ROSENBERG: No, it doesn't give you
5 nitrates.

6 When I looked at mercuric nitrate as a
7 potential concern, I'm looking at the mercury.

8 And, so, like I said, the photographic
9 chemicals that were used in the building, there is a
10 hazardous waste as to material storage area in parcel
11 111. It's bermed. It's paved, bermed, it's got
12 cabinets in it. It's a secondary contaminant. It's in
13 very good shape.

14 I have talked to the woman who manages that
15 facility and there has never been a spill.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And it's only been there
17 for about the last four or so years.

18 MS. VON ROSENBERG: So we didn't see a
19 concern.

20 There was one in '94 and nothing significant

1 was identified then, either.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you.

3 Next, we have Larry Ramos here from EFA West
4 to make a presentation on the Nimitz House Complex.

5 There are also copies of the FOSL for the
6 Nimitz House in the back there.

7 MR. RAMOS: I'm Larry Ramos. I work for EFA
8 West in San Bruno. I did the FOSL for Nimitz House.

9 I wanted to show you the location on Yerba
10 Buena Island right here (indicating), and I have a
11 blowup section here on my next view (indicating).

12 This is actually in Figure 2 of your handout
13 on the FOSL, and, generally, it outlines the areas here,
14 the FOSL area, you could see that.

15 The Nimitz House is actually, this is the area
16 that we will lease out. It's quarters 1 -- there are
17 six quarters -- 3, 4 5, 6 and 7. We will do the FOSL in
18 case there is a potential lease later on sometime, so we
19 look at this area right here (indicating).

20 And the different issues that we went over

1 pertain to lead in paint, lead in dust, lead in soil. I
2 don't know if you had time to look at the FOSL. We had
3 some concerns in quarters 1 for requiring, we had high
4 levels of over 400 ppm, requiring some type of action to
5 work on that quarter 1 area. And it's actually
6 throughout the complex we found high levels of
7 lead-based paint.

8 Lead and dust, we also found in quarters 1 and
9 also lead in soil in all of the different quarters
10 there.

11 Our plan, I don't know, Jim, you may want to
12 go over that, what the plan is for. We will go over it
13 later on.

14 For the asbestos, we did a survey on quarters
15 1, and we require some remediation and abatement for
16 quarters 1 and for other quarters in the future.

17 We plan to do actually abatement on quarter 1
18 this month, and we will perform abatement prior to any
19 lease on other quarters, also, that require it.

20 As far as the PCBs, let me go over a little

1 bit here. We have a quarter, 200, which is actually a
2 transformer house with PCBs in there, but they are below
3 5 ppm, so there is no action part for that one.

4 We had a copy of the EBS. There was a mistake
5 there. Quarter 5 actually had a transformer.
6 Investigators said it was actually a mistake. It was
7 actually located somewhere else on Yerba Buena Island.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is base wide.

9 MR. RAMOS: Right, base wide.

10 So that's a mistake. It's below 5 ppm.

11 We also looked at the UST, and, generally,
12 what we had here, we had heating oil and diesel fuel,
13 heating of these homes right here (indicating).

14 What we are going to do there, we closed in
15 place, and the Water Board was instrumental in the
16 closure of that. We got the letter from them. I got it
17 here. In January of '95 or '96, excuse me, that we
18 closed those tanks. There are seven tanks for each of
19 the homes here (indicating).

20 And the fuel pipeline between the homes and

1 running throughout this facility, there is a plan in '97
2 to actually remove those pipelines. That's also
3 addressed in the FOSL.

4 And the IR site here (indicating), I don't
5 know how clear this is, you see the IR site 29 where the
6 bridge is located? This area here is part of the FOSL
7 area here, this section here (indicating). It overlaps
8 our FOSL area.

9 Generally, we require some type of mulching or
10 something because, what happens on the IR site, I guess,
11 they did an investigation checking for lead or paint or
12 emission done for this bridge area, and it overlaps our
13 FOSL site here.

14 So it will require some type of mulch or bark
15 actually here before the lease can have any occupancy on
16 this parcel, so that's a requirement there.

17 Are there any questions on this at all?

18 MR. WONG: I think I get the gist of what
19 you're trying to do.

20 If I'm right, the Nimitz House is closest to

1 that, right? It's the biggest building there?

2 MR. RAMOS: Right.

3 MR. WONG: I could see what the Mayor has in
4 mind for that.

5 I think there is a lot of lead or something
6 from the bridge, or something like that, so is mulching
7 enough for that type of thing, or is that something
8 that's fenced in, you know, and people don't go in? It
9 looks like it's yard or something.

10 MR. RAMOS: Actually, right now, it's an
11 interim control. It's not a solution. We could use it
12 under the HUD guidelines. We're allowed to use that as
13 an interim control.

14 In fact, I have pictures here where you can
15 get a better idea of that area.

16 MR. WONG: I guess, conceptually, I know that
17 might be an interim control, but my understanding is
18 that the State and the Navy, and God knows who else,
19 will probably never comes to grips and clean up the
20 bridge there, so it's a long interim.

1 So, again, even though that meets the minimum
2 HUD standards, it might not be wise to fence off that
3 area.

4 MR. RAMOS: Actually, this was a low level
5 they found. It's like 75 ppm.

6 So, you know, we are taking precautionary
7 action even though it's low and it's underneath the
8 bridge. This is actually farther away from the bridge.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think that's a good
10 comment. It's to clarify how we address any lead that
11 might be present on the site.

12 MS. SMITH: I'm a little concerned about that.
13 The Golden Gate Bridge, which is only used for
14 recreational purposes, is fenced, because the lead is so
15 serious in the soil. You have one boring and that's all
16 you have done in this area.

17 CalTrans had many, many more over at the
18 Golden Gate Bridge, and they decided to fence it.
19 Mulching was not an option. That was fenced off,
20 rerouted, because it's a toxic waste site and you have

1 one sampling area.

2 MR. WONG: I don't understand all the ppms and
3 stuff, but it seems to me, if you want the public input
4 into these things, this will be a high profile, hot,
5 political hot potato here, because it's basically being
6 seen as somebody's castle.

7 It seems prudent to put 1,000 bucks worth of
8 chain link fence in there or something, or require to
9 keep kids out of the area. Whether you do it or not, is
10 something else.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think it's a valid
12 comment to make sure if there are any significant risks
13 that we are adequately protecting the lessee from that.
14 That's a valid comment. We need to take another look at
15 that.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And perhaps perform some
17 additional sampling to the extent that the risks have
18 been identified.

19 MR. WONG: I guess I look at it differently.
20 I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but

1 this is a finding of suitability for lease. There is a
2 list of restrictions, lease restrictions.

3 It just seems to me that one of them could be
4 that you require them to fence off that area and to keep
5 it there until, I mean, I don't think you will solve the
6 lead problem until I'm old and gray, but as a lease
7 restriction, as part of this, you're going to have to
8 fence off this area until we can figure out what to do
9 with it.

10 I can't imagine that the city lawyers would
11 agree to that.

12 So that's how I'm looking at it. It's an
13 opportunity to put something in as a lease restriction
14 down the road.

15 MR. RAMOS: Actually, that's a grassy area,
16 that section.

17 MR. WONG: Exactly, so, you know, I can see
18 kids running around out there, running over to play with
19 the mulch and the chip bark. It might be easier to
20 fence it off.

1 MR. HEHN: The question is, is that the only
2 place where there is a lead problem, though? It seems
3 there was a lead problem throughout the FOSL area.

4 MR. ALLMAN: Within 35 feet of the housing
5 quarters.

6 MR. RAMOS: Most of it is pavement, and it's a
7 really small, landscaped area that we are talking about.
8 If you look at the pictures, you can see and tell, a lot
9 of it is paved.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, let me clarify.
11 There are basically two sources of lead at the site, or
12 near the site, and one is the bridge. That's why we are
13 investigating that IR site.

14 And, secondly, it's the buildings themselves
15 because of their age and the fact they have been painted
16 with lead-based paint.

17 So under the HUD Title X guidelines, you test
18 the perimeter of the building to determine whether
19 flakes from painting operations have settled in the soil
20 around the perimeter of the building, and that's what we

1 did during the lead-based paint inspection on both the
2 inside and outside of the building.

3 MS. SMITH: How deep was the lead found in the
4 soil? The Army found it down a foot deep in a building
5 the same age in the Presidio.

6 MR. RAMOS: I could look it up for you.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We definitely did find
8 lead in the soil around the perimeter.

9 MR. ALLMAN: My question is, how is CalTrans
10 maintaining that section of the bridge now? Are they
11 replacing the paint with a nonlead-based paint? Or
12 might they come back while the lease is in effect and
13 sandblast and repaint that section of the bridge or
14 what?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, CalTrans has
16 converted to a nonlead paint, and in their future
17 painting operations, they provide a containment as they
18 paint in order to prevent older paint from being
19 released.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Because the big problem with the

1 Golden Gate Bridge, as they were sandblasting the bridge
2 to remove the old paint, it was the old paint that was
3 getting sandblasted that fell down to the beaches.

4 And I'm wondering, so when they do the
5 painting and have the containment, it's pretty difficult
6 to contain a mist.

7 Do they sandblast or do they cover up the old
8 layers?

9 MS. SMITH: No, no, they do. They house or
10 cocoon the whole section.

11 The problem with the Golden Gate Bridge is
12 it's in the soil. To remove the soil on the same kind
13 of terrain -- although that soil is serpentinite and
14 this soil is Franciscan -- to remove the soil is
15 extremely difficult and doesn't work very well.

16 That's why they fenced off the Golden Gate
17 Bridge, because you can't walk anywhere near that
18 contaminated soil.

19 MR. JENSEN: But we don't have the results to
20 show that they are the same soil conditions.

1 We have one result of 75 ppm, and the PRG is
2 400 ppm.

3 MS. SMITH: We have one sample.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think that Dale's
5 comment is good. We should be making sure that if there
6 is a problem we deal with it appropriately.

7 MS. SMITH: Or there is no problem.

8 For some reason, this bridge doesn't have the
9 same problem the Golden Gate Bridge does.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And it may not. There may
11 be some reasons as to why. That's why we will complete
12 the FS on these lead sites.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Peregrine falcons like lead
14 paint. They eat it.

15 MR. HEHN: Can you address this mediation
16 method of mulching, what that does and how that's
17 handled?

18 MR. RAMOS: Actually, that is in the HUD
19 section. I'm not real familiar. We have a lead person
20 that could describe the actual requirements.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, and, actually,
2 I couldn't give you a complete answer, too.

3 Basically, the whole purpose is really to
4 provide a barrier between the occupants and lead, and
5 that could be done with ground cover. But the whole
6 objective is to provide an adequate barrier.

7 MR. HEHN: Mulching mixes it up more.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think you're adding
9 additional material into the soil.

10 MR. ALLMAN: Lawrence, do you have the contour
11 plot, figure 3?

12 I wonder what the grade is coming down,
13 because that's one problem with putting a surface layer
14 or something over the soil. There is a grade just to
15 the right from Building 1.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That lawn area has a
17 general grade going down.

18 MR. ALLMAN: So is that an area that's going
19 to be mulched?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, you can walk on it.

1 It's not super steep, but it's not flat either.

2 MR. ALLMAN: But is that an area that's going
3 to be mulched?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's one option.

5 MR. ALLMAN: Because the problem with that,
6 if there is a grade, then storm runoff could carry mulch
7 down the hill.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's right. If the
9 mulching doesn't adequately work on that kind of a
10 slope, we wouldn't do that.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Plant sunflowers.

12 MR. HEHN: One of the problems that shows up
13 in the FOSL was that there seemed to be a problem with
14 access to quarter 7. That didn't get addressed in this.

15 Will that be addressed now or will it be
16 addressed prior to or between the FOSL?

17 MR. RAMOS: Yes. That is addressed in the
18 FOSL.

19 It's required that we do a survey like for
20 asbestos and for lead-based paint. So those surveys

1 will be required prior to occupancy.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because of the interest by
3 the city getting into quarters 1, basically, we had
4 to -- now I'm looking for the word -- build, well, not
5 contingency, but qualify the FOSL, so we may be taking
6 action in the future, but we are qualifying it in this
7 FOSL.

8 MR. HEHN: Like quarter 7?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

10 MR. RAMOS: Any other questions?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And, of course, all of
12 this would have to be rebuilt into an eventual finding
13 of suitability to transfer.

14 MR. RAMOS: Is there any other questions?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. RAMOS: Thank you.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: With that, we got a little
19 behind schedule, but we will take a quick break and come
20 back for the remedial investigation report.

1 And I apologize for the lack of heat in the
2 building. It was working great last month, and,
3 apparently, it decided to go out.

4 (Short break taken at 8:45 p.m.)

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This will be our first
6 real discussion on the Clipper Cove report, which came
7 out several days after the main remedial investigation
8 report.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Did everybody get a handout?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is a handout of the
11 slides that you should have just gotten.

12 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Thorsten Anderson.
13 I'm with PRC representing the Navy.

14 I will be discussing two things today.
15 First of all, on the Clipper Cove skeet range and the
16 ecological risk assessment done there.

17 And, second of all, I will do a brief
18 presentation on the remedial investigation report that a
19 lot of RAB members have been reviewing, and, then, after
20 that, we will open it up for questions.

1 The Clipper Cove skeet range is this site
2 right here (indicating). It's a small area within
3 Clipper Cove. It's actually part of the offshore
4 operable unit, and, therefore, it was submitted as a
5 report separate from the remedial investigation report.

6 Since it was submitted about the same time as
7 the RI report, we wanted to do a presentation and give
8 you some of the results of the report and make sure that
9 it didn't get overlooked.

10 The two main points of my discussion will be
11 to present why the investigation was completed and,
12 also, present some of the conclusions and
13 recommendations for the site.

14 In 1993, the Water Board issued an order to
15 Naval Station Treasure Island to investigate the skeet
16 range in Clipper Cove. This was part of a larger action
17 by the Water Board to investigate all kinds of similar
18 sites, similar target ranges.

19 The primary contaminants in the skeet range
20 are, first of all, lead, which comes from the lead shot

1 used by the guns.

2 And the second contaminants are polynuclear
3 aromatic hydrocarbons, or PAHs, and the source of this
4 contaminant is the clay pigeons that were used as
5 targets.

6 The purpose of the investigation was to
7 determine the extent of these two contaminants in the
8 offshore sediments, as well as the water in the Clipper
9 Cove area.

10 And, also, a second purpose of the report was,
11 if any contaminants were found, to determine whether
12 they were bio available to the receptors.

13 A brief outline of what's contained in the
14 report: It includes the site history. How long the
15 skeet range was used and over what time period. It
16 discusses the ecological characteristics of the site.
17 What kind of organisms lived in the sediment and the bay
18 in that area. It talks about the sampling and
19 methodology that was used for the investigation.

20 The report also discusses the screening

1 criteria that were used as part of the ecological risk
2 assessment that was done, kind of what the
3 concentrations were compared to.

4 The report presents the results of the
5 chemical analysis which is presented as the nature and
6 extent of the contamination.

7 It also presents the results of the toxicity
8 testing that was done.

9 Finally, it presents the conclusions and
10 recommendations based on the ecological risk assessment.

11 There were two main findings of ecological
12 risk assessment: The first being that the lead and PAHs
13 in the surface sediments, which were considered less
14 than, well, actually the surface sediments were the
15 first three feet of sediment. The lead and the PAHs in
16 these areas do not pose a risk to the receptors in the
17 bay water or the sediment.

18 Basically, the concentration of lead and PAHs
19 were less than the screening criteria used.

20 The second finding of the ecological risk

1 assessment was that some of the lead concentrations in
2 some of the deeper sediments, deeper than three feet,
3 were above the screening criteria. This poses the
4 question, if dredging occurred in this area in the
5 future, possibly, that those concentrations of lead that
6 would be dug up would pose a possible risk to receptors
7 in the area.

8 The final recommendation, however, at this
9 time is for no action at the site, because in its
10 current state, it doesn't pose a risk.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Question: Is the reason that the
12 contaminants are deeper because they have these things
13 going down at high speeds that penetrates the sediment,
14 or is it because sediments go over the top?

15 MR. ANDERSON: We are not exactly sure which
16 of those two is most likely, but since three feet is
17 fairly deep, it's probably new sediment that has been
18 deposited on top of the old.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Brad?

20 MR. WONG: Approximately how deep is the water

1 there?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's fairly shallow. I
3 couldn't give you an exact depth, but it's more like ten
4 feet.

5 MS. SMITH: Four feet at low tide, trust me.
6 It was hard to get samples.

7 MR. WONG: So it's shallow?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. It's not like 30 or
9 40 feet.

10 MR. ALLMAN: And does anyone have a history of
11 dredging there?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have not dredged in
13 that area because it's not in the current, it's not in
14 the area of the Marina.

15 The only areas that we have dredged in the
16 past were at the southeast corner of the base where pier
17 one is our main ship pier, and then I think there had
18 been some dredging in the vicinity of the Marina, but
19 not in this location.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Is Harlan here?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

2 MR. ALLMAN: I'm wondering if they might have
3 dredged there because you have to go through there to
4 get to the Marina.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. The channel kind of
6 runs off there a little bit.

7 I think it's a valid comment, a valid point,
8 that should the city or someone else choose to develop
9 this particular area, that this could be an issue.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dale?

11 MS. SMITH: If this is going to be developed,
12 and if this is going to be dredged and the Marina is
13 going to be extended, it does need to be deepened
14 because the shoals are there over a course of time, and
15 it's somewhat of a problem for some of the bigger boats
16 that come in.

17 The yacht club doesn't want to expand. The
18 city reuse plan has them expanding. They do want to put
19 in more slips.

20 It's an interesting concept to say, "No

1 further action is needed at this time," but that's not
2 something that's going to be viable because Harlan has
3 worked very hard on this, and expanding the Marina has
4 been part of the reuse plan since the beginning.

5 And so there will be dredging, there will be
6 new slips, and there is sedimentation that occurs
7 because of the nature of that waterway.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, basically, what we
9 are saying here, in its current condition, it doesn't
10 pose a threat to human health and the environment.

11 It will come down to further discussion
12 between the Navy and the city on how to proceed.

13 And also, this report is really a subset of
14 the offshore remedial investigation report, this same
15 material. So we are not completing this report, per se.

16 When we finish the offshore sediment sampling,
17 which will take place over the next some months and
18 produce that draft remedial investigation report, that
19 report will include this same material.

20 MS. SMITH: Including the no action

1 recommendation?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, including, well,
3 including whatever recommendation is made as far as all
4 of these offshore areas are concerned, including the
5 skeet range.

6 So in other words, this is not a window of
7 opportunity for comment that's necessarily closing,
8 because we are really holding this in abeyance until we
9 complete the remainder of the offshore work, which
10 includes other areas of Clipper Cove.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Go ahead and we will get
12 Chris.

13 MR. HEHN: Two questions, actually.

14 One, in looking at the risk have you also
15 looked at the future of the lead shot, and, secondly,
16 what were the screening criteria that you established
17 and how were they established?

18 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. For the first part of
19 your question, are you talking about the leachability
20 from lead to the soil?

1 MR. HEHN: Yes.

2 MR. ANDERSON: We actually found very little
3 solid lead in the sediments.

4 We are not really sure why that was. We were
5 definitely in the right area because the onshore
6 buildings are still there.

7 So we kind of assumed that all the metal or
8 the lead had leached already into the sediments.

9 MR. ONGERTH: Are you saying, then, that the
10 lead levels measured were actually in the form of shot?

11 MR. ANDERSON: No.

12 Basically, that lead, the lead measured, was
13 in the form of the leached lead.

14 MR. ONGERTH: All you were measuring was the
15 leachate.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

17 MR. ALLMAN: I don't know the range of these
18 rifles, but they have a certain momentum going into the
19 soil. They may be down 10, 15, 20 feet embedded into
20 the sediment, so when you say greater than three feet,

1 how deep did you bore to get the samples?

2 MR. ANDERSON: As deep as six.

3 MR. ALLMAN: As deep as six, okay.

4 So I don't know if anybody studied how far you
5 fire into a sandhill.

6 You will find out, going 15 to 20 feet,
7 especially if there is deposition later after the shot.
8 You may find shot leaching out over years down the road,
9 where it might not be there at the surface.

10 MR. ANDERSON: That wouldn't really change the
11 recommendations, then, because we are still basing the
12 recommendation on the fact that the surface sediments
13 aren't --

14 MR. ALLMAN: Well, it goes back to Paul's
15 question, where you assume you don't find lead shot in
16 the surface. It's leached out. But as part of the
17 offshore sampling, will that include deep boring into
18 the sediment?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. As part of the
20 general long term sediment sampling, we have another

1 boring in this area, and it's going to be --

2 Sharon?

3 MS. TOBIAS: I'm sorry. This is a bad excuse.
4 We are trying to do one deep bore, and I don't know how
5 deep it is.

6 MR. ALLMAN: Has anybody been out there with a
7 metal detector? You will find the skeet probably
8 directly below where you're shooting the skeet. But you
9 will find the lead shot probably further away because of
10 the direction.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: There are two questions on
12 the floor. Chris has one and then Brad has one.

13 Chris?

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I was just wondering if
15 the depth of the sediment varies seasonally or over the
16 course of years?

17 MR. ANDERSON: I'm not really sure. I don't
18 think we have looked at the sedimentation patterns at
19 all.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad?

1 MR. WONG: A general comment. I want to kind
2 of get a feel for what you are saying.

3 Somebody who has shot a lot of shotguns or
4 done this type of stuff, I can guarantee you, 4 feet, 10
5 feet, the way you shoot skeet, the pellets aren't
6 riveting down into the sediment, because you shoot up
7 and out. So they basically go up and they can't go any
8 further and they drop.

9 It's not like from a rifle, you know, it's 100
10 yards or something like that. It's pretty easy to
11 define the pattern.

12 So that means, in my mind, anyway, the lead
13 shot, basically, just floated down and rested on the
14 bottom, maybe it sunk in a couple of inches or
15 something, depending on how it is.

16 But the thing I'm not clear about is, there
17 weren't any pellets. You guys are saying "leached."
18 What does that mean? I guess I would have thought there
19 would have been a lot of pellets. So I guess I don't
20 know. What's a leach?

1 MR. ANDERSON: Well, we expected to find a lot
2 of pellets, but we didn't. We don't really know why,
3 either.

4 The pellets dissolved over time or they
5 fragmented into small enough pieces that we weren't able
6 to see.

7 MR. WONG: It must be a chemical reaction with
8 saltwater. Batteries in boats and stuff corrode.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It also might be that,
10 since this wasn't a commercial gun club, I think that
11 the level of activities was probably less than might be
12 at a --

13 MR. WONG: But still, a lead pellet is a lead
14 pellet.

15 So what I'm trying to figure out is what
16 "leach" means?

17 MR. ANDERSON: It basically means dissolved.

18 MR. WONG: Okay, it dissolved. So there is
19 still a lead derivative in the soil, is that it?

20 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, that would be the case.

1 MR. WONG: Okay. You didn't find pellets, but
2 there is a lead derivative in the layers of the soil
3 here?

4 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

5 MR. WONG: Okay, I got you. I didn't know
6 what that meant.

7 MR. ANDERSON: I didn't answer your second
8 question about the screening criteria used.

9 The primary one affects the range value. It's
10 developed by NAOO. It's a common sediment screening
11 criteria.

12 MR. HEHN: Can you explain that?

13 MR. ANDERSON: Can I explain how it's
14 relevant?

15 MR. HEHN: How you conducted the criteria.

16 MR. ANDERSON: I'm afraid I can't.

17 We can have someone get back to you if you
18 would like more explanation. It's explained a little
19 bit in the report itself. I don't think it goes into
20 much detail.

1 MR. HEHN: Is the criteria you used for
2 establishing the toxicity, et cetera, is this a basic
3 criteria that's now pretty well accepted by the regional
4 board for all skeet ranges, since there are others that
5 are being examined as well?

6 MS. KATHURIA: The Water Board looks at the
7 NOAA values as a benchmark.

8 We also have some other criteria that we are
9 currently developing, too.

10 We are looking at monitoring data that we take
11 around the bay to establish background values. Those
12 numbers are created in-house

13 MR. HEHN: Will the values that you're
14 establishing or in the process of establishing now
15 change the results of this study, do you think?

16 MS. KATHURIA: No.

17 Looking firsthand at a stolen copy of the
18 background, they seem to be the same, the same
19 concentration.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Actually, we have some

1 preliminary background values as well that we compared
2 our data to.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think it would be nice if
4 you could share those with the RAB so we know what
5 you're talking about at some point.

6 We have at least two other questions on the
7 floor, and then there is another part to the
8 presentation.

9 If there are any other questions after Dale
10 and Brad, proceed.

11 MS. SMITH: PRC is also working on Mare
12 Island. Is there a skeet range there? Did they find
13 leachate or did they find pellets?

14 I mean, that's not your department. You're
15 here and PRC has somebody else up there.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I don't think there is.
17 There is a rifle range there but it's on land.

18 MS. SMITH: But that's on land.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad?

1 MR. WONG: Kind of for general info, one of
2 the things I notice with a lot of skeet ranges, why they
3 got shut down is because of the pellets. They switched
4 to steel because a lot of ducks and a lot of waterfowl
5 ate them.

6 I know you did a thing about ecological
7 characteristics, so I just wanted to comment that it's
8 really interesting that there is no pellets out there.

9 So I assume you're not worried about ducks
10 eating pellets, or maybe they swam away with them all.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. WONG: Maybe this leachy get mixed in with
13 the soil.

14 Part of the biggest things about these things
15 is that ducks and water fowl and stuff eat them, and I
16 guess that's not an issue here.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Not at this point.

18 MR. WONG: Okay.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Carry on.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Now, the second part of

1 the presentation will be fairly short.

2 It's a clarification, actually, on some of the
3 information in the remedial investigation report.

4 At the last interim meeting, there were a few
5 questions about the purpose of the RI report, kind of
6 what information it contains, and what information it
7 doesn't contain, and, hopefully, in the next few slides,
8 it will clarify some of those questions.

9 The RI report does contain a lot of
10 information, but it shouldn't be viewed as containing
11 all the answers to environmental questions.

12 One of the things the RAB has been talking
13 about has been looking at a site and kind of bringing
14 all of the issues together in one place, the compliance
15 programs, the USTs, the asbestos, things like that, and
16 that isn't really the purpose of the RI report.

17 So, actually, what I will do is go through and
18 try to clarify what the purpose was, and, also, discuss
19 where some of the additional information can be found.

20 There are other reports, and kind of looking at them

1 together will help you answer some questions.

2 The RI report was mainly investigation of 14
3 IR sites that were originally identified in the PASI.
4 Actually, the PASI was completed in 1988, and it was
5 kind of an initial assessment of the base and some of
6 the environmental problems there.

7 Initially, 26 sites were identified and
8 investigated during the PASI. Mostly, the report looked
9 at the operational histories of each site to try and
10 determine any hazardous waste releases and uses at the
11 site.

12 It did only collect a limited number of
13 samples, so there were really not that much sampling.

14 But based on the site histories, 22 sites were
15 identified for inclusion in the RI report. And that
16 number was actually changed as more information was
17 gathered about the sites. They were moved to other
18 programs.

19 So in the end, the RI report discusses 14 of
20 those sites.

1 The goals of the RI are listed on page 1 dash
2 5 of the RI report, and also included, as the last page
3 of your handout, two of the most important goals include
4 the characterization of the nature and extent of
5 contamination in the soil, the groundwater, the surface
6 water or the air, so the second important goal of the RI
7 is to gather information for the human health and
8 ecological risk assessment.

9 The overall objective of the RI was to
10 identify which sites present possible risks and require
11 further evaluation.

12 The sites that are identified for further
13 evaluation get carried over to the feasibility study,
14 which evaluates possible remediation techniques based on
15 the contaminants that were found at the site.

16 There are a few things that the RI report does
17 not cover. Since it only looks at information
18 pertaining to a particular site or area, it is not
19 considered a fence-to-fence assessment of the bays.

20 The RI report also does not discuss the

1 history or the possible contaminants at sites or at
2 areas that are off of the RI sites.

3 And, thirdly, the RI report does not discuss
4 any of the issues related to compliance programs.

5 Now, a lot of the things that I said that the
6 RI report does not cover are covered in other reports
7 that have been submitted, the primary report being the
8 Environmental Baseline Survey or EBS. The EBS was
9 actually meant as a face-to-face -- sorry --
10 fence-to-fence assessment of the environmental condition
11 of the property, all the property on the base. It
12 reviewed the history of each building from when it was
13 built to when it was torn down or to the present. It
14 looked at past and present chemical storage at each
15 site, and this is probably the most extensive coverage
16 of sources of the island.

17 A lot of the information contained in the EBS
18 is repeated as FOSLs and are done for individual parcels
19 like we had earlier tonight.

20 Two other important sources of information

1 that cover the entire base include the aerial photo
2 survey. We haven't had them recently.

3 And there is another historical report that
4 discusses the history of all the buildings that have
5 been on Treasure Island. Those have been available for
6 some time.

7 If you have questions about areas that are not
8 covered by the IR sites, those are good places to go.

9 Now, I would like to open it up for questions
10 about the RI report.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Let me say that we
12 probably won't spend as much time on it here, especially
13 since the RI report review period has been extended
14 another 30 days to the 22nd of January. So we still
15 have two more months of review time of this document.

16 We will, if requested, we will also be present
17 at the next interim meeting in December in order to
18 further answer more specific questions. So we can use
19 this time for further clarification or to get into some
20 questions, but our time tonight is somewhat limited.

1 Questions?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Questions? Paul?

3 MR. HEHN: I have a question about the
4 follow-up for those sites that are going to need further
5 review.

6 Does that entail an additional amount of Phase
7 2-B work, or is that part of the feasibility study, and
8 does that seem like an appropriate place to do that?
9 Should it be in the feasibility study or prior to that
10 stage?

11 MR. ANDERSON: I'm not quite sure I understand
12 your question.

13 MR. HEHN: Okay. Those sites you said that
14 you determined that are possible risks to those sites
15 that need further review, is that done prior to the FS
16 or is that part of the FS?

17 MR. ANDERSON: Well, if you have enough
18 information to determine whether or not the site is a
19 risk, then at that point, it can go on to the
20 feasibility study, and if you need -- correct me if I'm

1 wrong -- but if you need additional information at that
2 point, there is another chance to collect additional
3 information.

4 MS. TOBIAS: I'm sorry. I was just so
5 engrossed in your response.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess the question
7 you're asking is, is there going to be additional
8 sampling.

9 MS. TOBIAS: Not that we planned to do.

10 Actually, the idea of further review, it would
11 be reviewed further than FS. If we can make a decision
12 at this time for no action, it stops now. If we can't
13 make that decision at this time, it goes on to a
14 feasibility phase.

15 So, hopefully, I mean, at this time, we don't
16 plan to do any more sampling, other than just some
17 groundwater monitoring.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Well, the assumption is, the
19 feasibility study turns out to be feasible, right?

20 I mean, to me, the idea of a feasibility

1 study, you want to find out if the remediation technique
2 is feasible for the site.

3 MS. TOBIAS: You identify a number of
4 alternatives. You determine the most feasible
5 alternative to do.

6 One alternative to look at is no action. So
7 you weigh that. You look at a number of things, like
8 effectiveness, implementability and cost.

9 And there are other things you look at. Also
10 state, local acceptance, and community acceptance. You
11 evaluate each one against the criteria, and whichever
12 one gets ranked the best is the one you select.

13 MR. ALLMAN: I think I was confusing it with
14 the treatability study.

15 MR. HEHN: The question is not what happens in
16 the feasibility study, but if you have enough
17 information to move into the feasibility study.

18 If you don't have enough to go to feasibility,
19 then what happens before that, do you do that study, as
20 part of the feasibility study?

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It seems to me there were a
2 couple of sites waiting for lab data, and I think the
3 PRC was also going to look into the MTBE.

4 MS. TOBIAS: Right. We will look at that more
5 in the interim groundwater monitoring plan. We will be
6 looking at that as implementing that during the interim
7 groundwater monitoring plan.

8 What that interim groundwater monitoring plan
9 is for, until the decision is made that the site is to
10 be remediated or the site has no action, but I think
11 none of the sites in the RI report that had groundwater
12 contamination were recommended for no action. I could
13 be wrong.

14 MR. HEHN: Excuse me, let me finish up on
15 this.

16 If there are still issues as part of the Phase
17 2-B draft review that are still outstanding that are not
18 resolved, then what happens to them at that point? They
19 can't go into feasibility because they are not ready for
20 it.

1 MS. TOBIAS: Well, for example, we did do
2 additional sampling at sites 12 and 17. So that is not
3 in it, but it will be in the draft final RI report.

4 We are currently looking at those results and
5 evaluating where to install monitoring wells.

6 In my mind, the only sites that may pose a
7 question are the bridge sites, because that was the
8 first time anyone went out and sampled them. And those
9 are kind of another problem altogether with who is the
10 owner of those sites.

11 So I don't think there is anything to prohibit
12 a site to go on the feasibility study.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess that's based on your
14 understanding, but I think part of Paul's question, and
15 I may be wrong, but if the RAB or the agency determines
16 that there is not sufficient information to go onto the
17 next step, feasibility study, how will that be
18 addressed?

19 MS. TOBIAS: I think it will be a case-by-case
20 basis and see what the concerns are of the RAB and

1 regulatory agencies to see how we can best address them.

2 At this time, I can't say we will not go out
3 and do more sampling, but we can't plan on it. We will
4 wait and see.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul?

6 MR. HEHN: Thank you.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad?

8 MR. WONG: Maybe getting at it a different
9 way, but if I understand what you said, there are two
10 separate parts. There is an IR and an FS, and the
11 feasibility study, the ability to develop alternatives,
12 the quality of those alternatives can only be as good as
13 the information in the RI. Am I right about that, the
14 data in the RI? If I read this, that's what I'm
15 reading, is that the feasibility study alternative is
16 based on the information in the RI.

17 MS. TOBIAS: That's correct.

18 MR. WONG: So it follows, then, the quality of
19 the alternatives you develop in the feasibility study
20 are based on the quality of the information in the RI.

1 So since we are at the comment stage for the
2 draft RI that are due in January, I guess my question
3 will be, do you feel that the information in the RI is
4 complete, thorough and of high enough quality to develop
5 good alternatives in the feasibility study?

6 MS. TOBIAS: Well, of course I do, Brad.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. WONG: That's all I wanted to know.

9 Okay. Then why are we talking about going out
10 and possibly addressing individual sites? Maybe I'm
11 missing it, but the RI should be a complete, accepted
12 thorough document by the end of January, or whatever,
13 and from that, you develop the feasibility study.

14 But what I think I'm hearing you say, well, we
15 might have to go back.

16 MS. TOBIAS: We went back at two sites.

17 MR. WONG: Oh, you've gone back.

18 MS. TOBIAS: We went back and did the sampling
19 in December at sites 12 and 17. We are currently
20 looking at those results.

1 Those results, you will see them in the draft
2 final remedial investigation report that will come out
3 in approximately two months after we receive the agency
4 and RAB comments.

5 MR. WONG: So you don't anticipate major
6 changes to the RI, either regulatory or RAB comments?

7 MS. TOBIAS: I have my fingers crossed.

8 MR. WONG: All right.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Sharon, you said that you don't
10 see any reason to do any more sampling in the monitoring
11 wells.

12 I thought you said this won't require further
13 investigation?

14 MS. TOBIAS: The only sampling we had planned
15 in the future is sampling at the monitoring wells.
16 That's what the interim groundwater monitoring plan is.

17 If you do further sampling, either quarterly
18 or semiannually or annually, at specific wells to
19 monitor any migration of contaminants until a decision
20 is made to either (a) no action, or, (b) that remedial

1 action is in place.

2 MR. ALLMAN: And are there any plans to close
3 out any of the monitoring wells or will they remain open
4 until the final feasibility study is complete?

5 MS. TOBIAS: That will be addressed in
6 December, the end of December, when we present our final
7 interim groundwater monitoring plan, and it will be
8 addressed in there as well, which wells might be closed.

9 I haven't seen the final determination, so it
10 will be addressed in there. It will be addressed in the
11 feasibility study.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Chein?

13 MR. KAO: From the portion that I read on the
14 RI report, two or three major items are missing that you
15 mentioned, the groundwater monitoring data, the
16 groundwater modeling efforts, and TPH toxicity tests.

17 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

18 MR. KAO: From what I understand, you were
19 trying to incorporate those into the draft final report.

20 Is there a way to have that in some sort of

1 supplemental report to the draft RI?

2 The reason I said that is that, if you are
3 putting in the draft final report, that will be the
4 first time we see that portion of it, and then we are
5 left, if we have problems with that, based on our
6 effort, we would be left with no choice. There will be
7 no informal consultation between the draft and draft
8 final.

9 So my suggestion is to have that put into some
10 form of supplemental report as part of the draft RI so
11 we can all review and come up with comment, and you go
12 back and do a draft final.

13 MS. TOBIAS: That's a really good point, and
14 based on the extension, you will be receiving the
15 results of the additional sampling at sites 12 and 17
16 and the results of the groundwater modeling and that
17 interpretation.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: When will those be
19 available?

20 MS. TOBIAS: I don't have hard dates for you.

1 Hopefully at the December meeting I will, when all those
2 documents will be available.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: When we are in the process
4 of review, it would be nice to know.

5 MS. TOBIAS: I don't think you will have, I
6 don't think you will have any of them before you
7 complete your review, actually.

8 MS. SMITH: So we won't get them before the
9 end of January?

10 MS. TOBIAS: I don't believe so, but I will
11 check on that. I will go back and look at the
12 schedules.

13 MR. WONG: Isn't that just backwards?

14 MS. TOBIAS: Well, you know, I'm really sorry.

15 MR. WONG: Well, don't apologize. I'm trying
16 to help you out.

17 MS. TOBIAS: The idea -- this is what I
18 foresee. This is my vision. It's not my dream but my
19 nightmare.

20 (Laughter.)

1 MR. WONG: It is now, right?

2 MS. TOBIAS: My vision is that, okay, we will
3 receive your comments and we'll understand that it's
4 based on the fact that you have the data that we
5 presented at the RI.

6 It's not complete because you don't have the
7 groundwater modeling. You don't have the four quarters
8 of groundwater data. You don't have the TPH toxicity
9 testing. And I'm sure there is something else you don't
10 have. I don't know what it is at this point.

11 But what we will do is, what my vision is, we
12 will receive your comments. And around the same time,
13 we will be giving you the, you know, perhaps the
14 technical memorandum on how we plan on, you know, these
15 are the results of the groundwater modeling, this is how
16 we will end up incorporating it, this is how we will
17 address it.

18 MR. WONG: I appreciate all that, but I guess
19 I'm reacting to Chein's comments. A lot of this is all
20 spelled out legally.

1 If I understand what Chein said, why would
2 anybody want to do something that is going to force
3 something to dispute resolution?

4 That just seems to me to not be good policy,
5 and as a community member, I want to just step totally
6 out of this and say, boy, why would somebody want to
7 drag this down by sending it into dispute resolution
8 because there is no other alternative?

9 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

10 MR. WONG: So it's not like I want to read a
11 lot of documents, it just doesn't make good sense.

12 MS. TOBIAS: Well, what I was actually hoping
13 we could do is, as we submit each of these, and before
14 we submit the draft final RI, go through each site with
15 the regulatory agencies and, if it needs to be done in a
16 supplemental, I mean, we would do a technical memorandum
17 on how the results of all these different tasks or
18 different data, how it affects each site, and this is
19 the basis of our, it changes our recommendations and
20 conclusions.

1 My plan was to go through that with the
2 agencies before they see that in the draft final RI.

3 MS. SIMONS: I would like to also point out,
4 we work as a team. We don't want a dispute. We will do
5 everything, we can set up working meetings and maybe
6 interim deadlines to avoid that.

7 MR. WONG: It's between you all, but all I
8 know is, from my standpoint, I'm superfluous to this,
9 but there is a legal binding contract that got
10 renegotiated in the FSSRA, and I don't know if that's
11 the way to do business. I think that document is
12 between two entities, the Navy or DOD and Cal-EPA, if
13 I'm not mistaken, and to a certain degree, with all due
14 respect, EPA and the others are tangential to that.

15 So, again, I will let it go after this, but
16 that seems backwards how to do this. I am commenting on
17 public policy here, not the merits of methodology.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, I think the point is
19 well-taken and something that can be worked out probably
20 best with BCT, but the RAB would also like to be

1 involved in review at a reasonable time so that we are
2 not close to the wall either to get the thing pictured
3 here.

4 And I think Paul had a comment, and then John.
5 Chein, did you?

6 MR. KAO: No.

7 MR. HEHN: Chein probably covered my concerns
8 about reviewing that prior to the draft final, and I
9 think I agree, we need to get some time to put that into
10 context, review it and comment on it before it goes
11 final.

12 But what I would like to suggest as an action
13 item, we put down that we do need to get that schedule
14 as soon as possible from you as to when those will be
15 available, and then look at the schedule as to when that
16 draft final will be available and what kind of comment
17 period we will have.

18 MS. TOBIAS: Well, I mean --

19 MR. HEHN: And the regulators.

20 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: John?

3 MR. ALLMAN: Well, since the regulators are
4 working with the Navy, and I assume we are seeing the
5 data as it's being collected at some point before, do
6 the regulators see the data as it comes out, or do they
7 just see the final report? Because a lot of the time,
8 it seems to me, is in developing the report and editing
9 it.

10 Is there a possibility of seeing the
11 groundwater data to be considered in context with the
12 data that's presented in the RI draft while you're still
13 working on your conclusions that you're drawing from the
14 data?

15 MS. TOBIAS: Well, the four quarters of data
16 will be presented in that final groundwater monitoring
17 plan as an appendix.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Right. Can we get that appendix
19 ahead of time so at least we can see it and know where
20 the sites are?

1 And then we can see if there are changes to it
2 if anybody has an interest in trying to do that.

3 MS. TOBIAS: You know, at this time, I don't
4 think we can release it ahead of time. I think it's
5 still being validated.

6 The last quarter sampling was completed in
7 September. It's currently being validated. We are
8 currently working with unvalidated data to try and get
9 this other report out, you know, the other work plan
10 out.

11 So that's as early as we can get it to you is
12 the end of this year. I haven't seen the data for
13 September, so I'm just hoping it's nondetect.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any others? We have time
15 for one more question or comment, and then I think if
16 anybody else also comments, you could put them on an
17 index card and we will take them.

18 Dale?

19 MS. SMITH: I just wanted to make a comment to
20 the federal EPA.

1 I don't think the RAB members are particularly
2 interested in having the regulators compromise with the
3 Navy. I think the idea here is to do a good job of
4 seeing to it that federal and state laws are
5 implemented.

6 I'm more sympathetic with Chein and his
7 concerns than I am in bending over backwards to help
8 somebody not meet their federal guidelines that were
9 negotiated by the federal government.

10 And by -- well, the federal government with
11 the federal government.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think the comments
13 made, you can have an antagonistic relationship with the
14 regulators or you can have a partnership where you work
15 together.

16 MS. SMITH: But when you get into a legal
17 situation where you have no other alternatives and you
18 have no options other than to go that one particular
19 route.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, that's always the

1 regulators' option. We hope it will work not to get
2 into that situation.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Well, I guess we are
4 ready to move into organizational business.

5 The first item is the scheduled process for
6 community review for remedial investigation report.

7 And to date, we had two meetings to review the
8 RI report and I guess another meeting will come up on
9 December 3rd.

10 I guess I would like to propose that being in
11 an alternate location rather than on Treasure Island.
12 At the last meeting, because of bridge traffic and other
13 things, it became difficult.

14 And, certainly, if there is an interest in
15 meeting in San Francisco, the PG&E conference room is
16 available.

17 MR. ONGERTH: I'm sorry, Patricia, for which
18 meeting, the interim?

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The interim.

20 MR. ONGERTH: The interim meeting.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The interim, December 3rd
2 meeting.

3 MR. ALLMAN: It's also possible that I could
4 get space in -- I don't know if anybody is interested in
5 meeting in the East Bay, but I'm right off, my building
6 is right off a BART station. It's a possibility to meet
7 there, if there is an interest in switching sides. I
8 know a lot of the people are from the East Bay.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right. So there are two
10 possibilities.

11 Discussion, please?

12 MS. SMITH: Sounds good.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. MC DONALD: I think either works for a lot
15 of people because BART is the preferred alternative for
16 so many people to transit from the East Bay to the West
17 Bay, and this is a very difficult location to get to at
18 6:00 or 6:30 or 7:00.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Jim has suggested that we
20 try PG&E. I can certainly make that commitment if maybe

1 John can look into his.

2 MR. ALLMAN: I can look into the availability
3 for a later meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So once the arrangements
5 are finalized, Pat and I will get out a notice for
6 precise information.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Another question we had, and
8 this is, I guess, a question to the PRC and the Navy, as
9 we develop our technical comments, do you want them as
10 we develop them or would you like them submitted all in
11 one package? We seem to be going through volumes, and I
12 don't know how you plan on responding or collecting the
13 comments, but it could be done either way.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Can I address that?

15 I think we are better off doing it all at
16 once, because as you go through the document, from my
17 experience, you go through it in layers. And as you go
18 through the layers, the story starts to make sense. If
19 you submit comments too early, you may have to revise
20 them before you get to the end of the process, in your

1 mind, anyway.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I will take the
3 middle ground and say, I agree with, I understand what
4 Chris is saying, but at the same time, at least the
5 comments can come out in an informal or maybe even in a
6 formal written matter as we go. It helps us to address
7 them and maybe even to clarify along the way rather
8 than, you know, completely withholding it to the end.

9 So I think that's kind of the way we started
10 dialoguing these interim meetings. We continue that
11 dialogue even if your formal comments don't end up being
12 received until the end of the period.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So I guess we can do both.
14 All of the above.

15 MS. TOBIAS: Well, if it's something that
16 really affects every single site, you know, you have the
17 same question like, why did you do this at every single
18 site? Maybe to clarify it, it might put a piece of the
19 puzzle together for you.

20 It's really obvious for us, but we are awfully

1 close to it.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul, anything to report
3 from the technical committee?

4 MR. HEHN: No, because I wasn't there.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, it seems to me that
6 people are in various stages of reviewing the report,
7 and, to date, Paul and I talked and have started to list
8 out various comments, but, certainly, it's not a broad
9 view.

10 So I think we will withhold any report other
11 than to say that we are reviewing it and look forward to
12 getting other RAB members' comments.

13 If you have comments but are unable to attend
14 the interim meeting, please give Paul or I a call,
15 because we have fax machines or take notes over the
16 phone so that your comments can be included in those
17 that are transmitted formally by the RAB.

18 I think we covered membership, and we will
19 move on to the next.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Briefly, on

1 the back page reports, so we extended the RI report
2 until the 22nd of January.

3 The draft report on the skeet range is still
4 on the 22nd of December, but, again, that staff report
5 is going to be incorporated into the offshore remedial
6 investigation report later next year, so that's why we
7 wanted to keep the same due date for that because we
8 will see the same material at a later date.

9 I erred on the next two that the draft FOSLs
10 will be due the end of the week after the interim
11 meeting, so instead of the 22nd of November, it should
12 read 6th of December.

13 So the comments for both FOSLs are due at the
14 end of the week after the next interim meeting, the 6th
15 of December, and that's in order to meet the city's
16 desire to start using these two facilities.

17 The BRAC Cleanup Plan will be available in,
18 sometime in mid to late December. We don't have a
19 precise date on that yet. That will be a topic of
20 discussion.

1 The update will be a topic of discussion at
2 the next meeting.

3 The Corrective Action Plan, we don't have a
4 firm date on that. It probably will be in the February
5 time frame, but we will have a firmer date on that the
6 next month or so.

7 And that's all the documents that are
8 currently available.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Was the skeet range mailed, was
10 that mailed?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It was sent out to Pat and
12 to Paul and to a couple of other people and the rest of
13 them were upon request.

14 MR. ALLMAN: Okay.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If you would like to get a
16 copy?

17 MR. ALLMAN: Yes.

18 MS. SMITH: I would, too, and I think probably
19 Harlan would.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think Harlan got a

1 copy.

2 MR. GALANG: That's not the skeet range but
3 his interest.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Dale would like a copy and
5 John would like a copy?

6 MR. ALLMAN: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, you can fight for
8 the one that I have here tonight.

9 MR. GALANG: We have copies available now we
10 can give to John and Dale.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I think, given
12 the length of the meeting, unless there is any general
13 open questions or discussion, we will move ahead to the
14 agenda.

15 The proposed agenda for the December meeting,
16 we will continue the discussion on the remedial
17 investigation report.

18 We will also have a presentation and
19 discussion on the budget, tie up the loose ends on that,
20 and, also, if Martha is here, we will present our plan

1 for other FOSLs during '97, and then we will discuss the
2 BRAC Cleanup Plan update.

3 The BRAC Cleanup Plan update, we are on a
4 tight time frame because it needs to be completed by the
5 March time frame in order to sync with the President's
6 budget submission to Congress.

7 And then in January, we have the RI report
8 discussion concluding, and then we wanted to get back
9 into this geographic study site, and then update on the
10 UST and fuel related programs, and then possibly
11 integrate with the interim reuse and cleanup plan.

12 January looks like it might be getting a
13 little busy, and then we have some unscheduled items for
14 the future.

15 Are there any comments concerning specifically
16 December's agenda or possibly January's?

17 MR. HEHN: What's the time frame on the BTAG
18 update?

19 MS. SIMONS: Well, I guess they haven't
20 started looking at the screening levels, so I don't know

1 what their schedule is. They have been waiting for the
2 last three or four months. Maybe after they look at
3 them.

4 I don't think, unfortunately, anything has
5 happened.

6 MR. HEHN: Still waiting.

7 MR. ALLMAN: Was the background levels for
8 arsenic on other areas, like Yerba Buena, that's going
9 to be available?

10 MS. TOBIAS: It's in appendix F.

11 MR. ALLMAN: But you said that's going to be
12 covered in December.

13 Is that part of the RI report discussion?

14 MS. TOBIAS: I never said it will be
15 discovered in December.

16 MR. ALLMAN: I thought you did. I'm sorry.

17 MS. TOBIAS: We did background sampling on
18 Yerba Buena Island during Phase 2-B, RI, and those
19 results are presented in appendix F.

20 MR. ALLMAN: In F, okay.

1 MS. TOBIAS: That's Volume 4.

2 MR. ALLMAN: Okay.

3 MR. ANDERSON: They are also in Chapter 3,
4 just the tables with the values.

5 MR. ALLMAN: Oh, okay. Good.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So our next regular
7 meeting is, again, it's going to be the third Tuesday in
8 December, the 17th.

9 We will change locations again in search of
10 heat. We are going to move to the BOQ Conference Room,
11 Building 369. I will include a map, which is just down
12 the street. It's next door to the Nimitz Center. I
13 will include a map on that also.

14 We will also have the room available beginning
15 at 6:00 p.m., from 6:00 to 7:00, for those community
16 members who want to come for an informal discussion,
17 specifically on the RI report.

18 And then our meeting in January will also be
19 on the third Tuesday in order to sync with the comment
20 period for the RI report.

1 And then the interim meeting will be on the
2 3rd of December, tentatively at PG&E. Pat and I will
3 put out a flier on that.

4 Are there any other comments?

5 (No response.)

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will close the meeting.

7 Thank you very much and have a good
8 Thanksgiving.

9 (The meeting adjourned at 9:45 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 Balboni