

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

---o0o---

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

18 FEBRUARY 1997

7:00 P.M.

CASA DE LA VISTA

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 30

---o0o---

ORIGINAL

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

639

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

A T T E N D E E S

U.S. NAVY:

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

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- SHARON TOBIAS
- THORSTEN ANDERSON
- STACEY LUPTON
- RICHARD KNAPP

REGULATORY AGENCY:

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

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

- (ARC Ecology) CHRIS SHIRLEY
- RICHARD HANSEN
- PAUL V. HEHN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)
- DANIEL MC DONALD
- PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)
- THOMAS THOMPSON

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

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

COMMUNITY MEMBERS: (Continued)

BRAD WONG

ALSO PRESENT:

DARLENE B. BROWN (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc.)

SANDRA LUNCEFORD (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc.)

LISA PEROT-WOOLFOLK (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc.)

SAM DYSON (NAVY)

---o0o---

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we can call the
2 meeting to order now. We started about a half hour
3 late.

4 Welcome, Jim.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you. Sorry for the
6 delay. With the base closure ongoing, things are going
7 to become more and more hectic. Our meeting space will
8 probably bounce all around the base. I don't know where
9 it will be six months from now, but we will proceed.

10 Welcome to our February meeting. The first
11 item is discussion of approval of the agenda.

12 Does anyone have any comments on tonight's
13 agenda?

14 For those of you who may not be aware, at the
15 interim meeting, which used to be on the second Tuesday
16 of the month, and now, because we moved the general
17 meeting to the third Tuesday of the month, the interim
18 meetings, they are not quite mid-month meetings anymore,
19 they are held on the first Tuesday of the month. We do
20 go over the draft of the agendas. For those who are
21 interested in helping to plan the agenda, that is a
22 regular topic of the interim meeting, which is normally

1 held in Building 1.

2 There being no comment on the agenda, we will
3 proceed.

4 The next item is public comments. Though I
5 don't see any members of the general public, if there
6 were any members of the general public, we provide this
7 opportunity at the beginning of the meeting for them to
8 comment on any issues related to the environmental
9 cleanup of Treasure Island.

10 (Off-the-record discussion between Co-Chair
11 Nelson and Co-Chair Sullivan.)

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. Discussion and
13 approval of the January meeting minutes, is there any
14 comment on the 21 January meeting minutes?

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I noticed that there was an
16 omission in it, and the omission was the comments by
17 Christine Shirley on the RI report.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The written comments.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The written comments.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We received a fax of the
21 comments the day after the meeting.

22 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Can those be provided

1 to the RAB members?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They were mailed out with
3 the agenda for this meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: No, they weren't, at least
5 not mine.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think you already had
7 it.

8 MR. GALANG: I mailed you a copy. I mailed
9 you and Paul a copy.

10 MR. HANSEN: Some of us got copies. At least
11 I did.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

13 A lot of times we have done a shotgun mailing,
14 so some of you get more than one copy of things.

15 This time, for those people who knew, already
16 had ARC comments from Shirley, we didn't mail a second
17 copy out.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I got my copy from Chris. I
19 didn't receive a copy from either you or Ernie.

20 I guess if you could, just be sure in the
21 future, a shotgun mail approach might be better than
22 Ernie sending a set.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. We will go
2 back to a little more conservative approach, and so
3 that, on occasion, you might get more than one copy.
4 But we will make sure you get at least one copy.

5 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I think that at least Pat
6 should get everything mailed. She knows what's on
7 there, but I appreciate getting duplicates.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we will try not to
9 duplicate but make sure we don't omit.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: But Pat should get everything so
11 she could keep track of what's going on.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other comments on the
13 21 January meeting minutes?

14 (No response.)

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being no other
16 comments, we will proceed into program updates.

17 Last week, on the 11th of February, we held an
18 RPM, Remedial Project Manager, and BRAC Cleanup Team
19 meeting. It was hosted by the City by Martha Walters at
20 the Redevelopment Agency.

21 We spent most of the meeting discussing
22 comments received from both the community members and

1 the agency's on the Remedial Investigation report.

2 We also briefly discussed the update of the
3 BRAC Cleanup Plan, because we have gotten all comments
4 on that now, and we are proceeding to finalize that for
5 publication in March of 1997.

6 We had an update on the environmental baseline
7 survey sampling that's been conducted over the last
8 couple of weeks.

9 Those sites, as a result of the base wide EBS,
10 we needed to take some additional sampling work because
11 we had data gaps that weren't otherwise provided in
12 either the IR or any of the other compliance programs.

13 And then we planned for tonight's RAB meeting.

14 We also had a presentation by a company,
15 Biotech, which uses plants to remove metals from the
16 soils, lead being one, but also other heavy metals, too,
17 and I understand this technology is being looked at at
18 the Presidio. I don't know if any firm decisions have
19 been made.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: I have no idea.

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But they were in town also
22 to make a presentation.

1 MS. SHIRLEY: Okay.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then we discussed,
3 lastly, we discussed the imminent award of the large
4 zoned FOSLs which, it turned out, that project was
5 awarded for contract this last Friday.

6 So that provides the plans for FOSLs for about
7 three quarters of the base for what we are going to call
8 zones 1 through 4.

9 The first zone FOSL, the draft will be
10 available sometime in the, I believe, the April time
11 frame. It's scheduled to be completed for the first
12 zone, I think, in the June time frame, with subsequent
13 FOSLs to be scheduled at about 30-day intervals from
14 that so that we complete the four major zones by the end
15 of the fiscal year, approximately September.

16 That's the approximate schedule. The contract
17 was just awarded Friday. I haven't seen the final
18 contract.

19 MS. WALTERS: Who was awarded the contract?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: PRC.

21 Actually, maybe PRC doesn't know about it. I
22 was told this morning.

1 But those were the major items that we
2 discussed at the 11 February meeting.

3 (Off-the-record discussion between Co-Chair
4 Nelson and Co-Chair Sullivan.)

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Pat asked about what the
6 areas were in the zones.

7 Since the contract was just being finalized at
8 the end of last week, there were still some adjustments
9 to the map being made.

10 I passed out a draft of the map, but it was
11 still being adjusted, so I haven't seen the final, final
12 map.

13 So now that the contract has been awarded, and
14 will be imminently awarded, we can provide a final
15 version of the four zones.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Can I ask, I guess, for the
17 RAB, that the sites, the IR sites, the CAP sites that
18 are within or around these zones be identified on the
19 drawings that you might provide in the future so that we
20 know which sites are affiliated or associated with the
21 various zones covered in the FOSLs?

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's a valid

1 request.

2 As part of this four zone project, we are
3 doing an initial assessment of the issues, and I'm not
4 sure what the format of that is going to be in, but
5 there will be at least some handout, I believe.

6 MS. TOBIAS: A technical memorandum.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, a technical
8 memorandum that will discuss the issues of each zone,
9 and it may very well have a map.

10 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If it isn't already planned,
12 can we make it an action item?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we can make it an
14 action item. At least in the draft FOSL, the IR sites
15 will be identified.

16 MS. TOBIAS: They will definitely be
17 identified in any FOSL. You will see the sites.

18 But what you're talking about, you would like
19 a map now.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, at least at the
21 interim meeting, it showed the different zones.

22 It would be nice if our drawing here could be

1 revised with an overlay showing the zones and the IR
2 sites and CAP sites that are in or around those zones to
3 be covered in the FOSL, so that we know, when we are
4 reviewing, what sites and what information to become
5 familiar with that we aren't already.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. I think we are
7 at least provided it in the draft FOSL.

8 I'm not sure, at some point, the map gets kind
9 of busy, but we will look into it and report back at the
10 interim meeting.

11 But at the very least, a draft document will
12 be the first document you will see on the zone FOSL, and
13 it will have all the pertinent information identified.

14 MS. TOBIAS: I think we were also going to
15 include it in the final BRAC Cleanup Plan. The Navy was
16 going to provide it, and we could overlay the IR sites
17 on top of it.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it would just be the
19 similar 11-by-17 map that we have in the BRAC Cleanup
20 Plan only it would have the reuse zones overlay.

21 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, and we could put the IR
22 sites on top.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It sounds like an action
2 item.

3 So preparing a graphic that shows the
4 relationship between IR, CAP sites and the zones,
5 however you do it.

6 Within a month's time? Is that reasonable?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it sounds like we
8 are planning something similar or exactly that in the
9 BRAC Cleanup Plan.

10 MS. TOBIAS: That's correct, but we need to
11 talk.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

13 We are about to go to publication. I think we
14 still have time to insert that. We will have to get
15 back. If it's not in the BRAC Cleanup Plan, then in
16 some other mapping handout.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The action item has been
18 accepted. Schedule to follow. Sounds right?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, either in the BRAC
20 Cleanup Plan or separately.

21 MS. SHIRLEY: Will we get a schedule in
22 advance when each zone will be . . .

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

2 Actually, if the contract has been finalized,
3 which I have been told it was, then we should be able to
4 extract the schedule out of the contract.

5 MS. WALTERS: But also that schedule is
6 subject to change.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

8 It's just helpful to have as much information
9 as we can up front so I can schedule my time.

10 MS. WALTERS: Right.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And these will be by far
12 the largest FOSL documents that we have ever reviewed.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: That's the reason.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So then we have two action
15 items: One is the map and the other is the schedule
16 which will be modified from time to time.

17 MS. WALTERS: Yes.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Reuse issues,
19 update on the Nimitz House FOSL.

20 We are still mobilizing to do the soil removal
21 that we had around quarters 1, the Nimitz House, that we
22 had said that we would do, and our intent is to do the

1 soil removal in those bare soil areas that are part of
2 the Nimitz House area, and then to incorporate that data
3 into the final draft FOSL.

4 So we expect to get the field work done over
5 the next couple of weeks. We were delayed a couple of
6 weeks ago because of the rain, and then by some other
7 scheduling conflicts. But we expect to get back out
8 into the field in the next couple of weeks, and that
9 will give us the data, we feel, to finish the Nimitz
10 House FOSL.

11 Other FOSLs, we've already discussed the zoned
12 FOSLs.

13 We may be doing a special interim FOSL on
14 Building 1 ahead of the zoned FOSL. That is to in order
15 to assist the museum and the city. That will be a basic
16 safety check for people to occupy the building in an
17 office environment, which will be a much more simplified
18 analysis than the complete findings of suitability.

19 So maybe we expect the zoned FOSLs to be the
20 major documents, but there may be some other interim
21 documents as we try to work with the city on any
22 unforeseen leasing opportunities that they might have.

1 MS. WALTERS: Right.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then I had in here,
3 city briefing to the Planning Commission. I don't know
4 if anyone went to that. I wasn't able to attend myself,
5 but I heard that it was a fairly brief meeting. I don't
6 think anything of note came out of that.

7 Did anyone here attend the Planning Commission
8 meeting?

9 It was billed as a meeting to discuss updated
10 information on the Treasure Island reuse plan, but what
11 I heard, it was a fairly short meeting with no new
12 information.

13 If we do hear later that there is some other
14 information that came out of that, we will share it.

15 There have been a few articles in the
16 Chronicle and Examiner, I think, over the last couple of
17 weeks, that were associated with that Planning
18 Commission meeting.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Speaking of which, in the
20 article maybe last week on Wednesday, I think it was,
21 there was some mention of a Mayor's Committee. Do you
22 know anything about that?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, I haven't heard
2 anything about that.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: I haven't tracked that down.

4 There was one paragraph and nothing said. It
5 was like a one sentence little paragraph.

6 Well, if you hear something about that, it was
7 like a seven or eight person appointed committee to
8 oversee.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think they may be
10 referring -- and I don't have much direct knowledge of
11 it -- to the Treasure Island Development Authority or
12 something? I heard something about that.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: Maybe that's it.

14 Keep us up to date on that if you run across
15 that.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If I get any information
17 about it.

18 Any other questions or comments concerning
19 reuse issues?

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I just had a question about
21 the Nimitz house FOSL.

22 Are we going to see that again in the new

1 addition?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we will.

3 They will probably have a pretty short time
4 frame, but we intend to issue a draft finding that will
5 incorporate the data that we have gotten from the field
6 work.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Would that be a March or
8 April item, do you think?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I really hope to finish
10 the field work in the next couple of weeks, and so we do
11 want to -- originally we hoped to finish the FOSL by the
12 end of February, and we probably won't, so it will
13 probably be a March item.

14 Maybe by the interim meeting, but probably
15 not. It's probably somewhere in the interim meeting and
16 the next general meeting. You might see a week or so
17 ahead of the regular March meeting.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Would you want comments back
19 by the March meeting or the April interim meeting?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we would like to
21 finish it up as soon as we can, so I think we would like
22 to have an expedited comment period.

1 Basically, what we feel we are doing is,
2 addressing the issues that were raised in the previous
3 draft, specifically the lead exposure. So we expect to
4 be able to show in the data table the results from the
5 soil removal action.

6 We are really taking a conservative approach
7 in removing a lot of soil, removing soil rather than
8 doing a lot of sampling, and then doing selected
9 removal.

10 So we are doing a general removal of the
11 exposed, of the bare soils, and then some combination
12 samples below that.

13 MR. HEHN: What about the soil?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we are going to load
15 it into a hazardous waste bin, and then we are going to
16 take a composite sample to determine whether or not to
17 characterize it as a hazardous waste or not.

18 MR. HEHN: So you don't know when it will be?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

20 It will probably go to controlled landfill.
21 It may not be classified as hazardous waste, but it may
22 not be suitable for general fill.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So you think about a week
2 turnaround time?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we would like to
4 get that because it will be pretty much focused on the
5 lead issue.

6 It's possible we may have at least some
7 information, maybe not in the final form, but by the
8 interim meeting. That's two weeks.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It will be helpful to have
10 that.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next item, action items.

12 We spent the last interim meeting, we took the
13 last six months of meeting minutes and went through the
14 action items from, I think, about June through December.

15 Although a lot of them were repetitive, I
16 identified what seemed to be the major action items. I
17 wanted to present a more detailed update at this
18 meeting.

19 The first one is what we are going to call
20 data management. We had a long discussion about use of
21 a geographic information system for Phase I and II
22 Remedial Investigation data.

1 We are using the term data management and EFA
2 West, and we are planning -- it's in the budget -- we
3 are planning to award, probably in March, as soon as I
4 finish the scope of work and give it to Ernie, an award
5 for a data management project.

6 Now, what that will finally look like, we
7 don't know yet. The purpose of the data management is
8 to find out how data is handled and also displayed. It
9 may be some sort of a full-blown visual system or maybe
10 more limited than that.

11 We will present information to the RAB as this
12 project moves forward, but the intent is to have a good
13 program for data management that will probably involve
14 at least some visual data. But that is in the budget
15 and it will be awarded.

16 In addition, we are planning to award in March
17 a GIS demonstration project. This is outside of the IR
18 program, using some selected non-IR UST sites, such as
19 YBI 270. So that will be focused more on visualization.
20 We are going to start with the UST sites.

21 So that may move along more quickly and help
22 to serve as a demonstration project for data

1 visualization.

2 We do have the funding, we are writing the
3 scope of work, and we do expect an award within the next
4 30 days or so.

5 Administrative Record/Information Repository.
6 I think we have gone around a lot on this issue. What I
7 would like to do is meet with interested community
8 members, even if it's just one community member, so that
9 we can map out the specific issues and set some basic
10 milestones.

11 So I'm open to either an interim meeting or
12 some other forum to just take some basic steps on this,
13 even if it's not addressing the entire issue, at least
14 making some headway on it.

15 Related to that, although not officially part
16 of the Admin Record/Information Repository, we have been
17 working on a listing of UST and other fuel-related
18 documents. I used it in part to develop a presentation
19 tonight on the UST program. It's still in progress
20 because we never have had a complete listing of
21 documents in this program.

22 So I don't want to make a commitment that we

1 will provide it at next month's meeting, but I feel,
2 since it is in progress now, we can make a commitment
3 that we will provide it at the April interim meeting.
4 So it would be about six weeks from now.

5 And then I think, once we have that done, and
6 the bulk of the non-IR documents are in the UST and
7 fuel-related areas, and we can also provide a draft
8 listing of the other BRAC compliance documents. That's
9 going to be primarily asbestos and lead-based paint at
10 the May meeting, about 30 days later.

11 Budget, there is also going to be a lot of
12 action items related to the budget. We can present an
13 update on the budget at next month's general meeting.

14 And then we will also, in order to address
15 some comments that have been made, we will also identify
16 work that could possibly be done but may not be budgeted
17 or expected to be funded.

18 Originally, we went into the '97 budget
19 feeling that we had budgeted for all items that we
20 thought needed to be done or could be done in 1997. We
21 are going to take another look at that, and, also, look
22 at the reality of the government's budget year, because

1 as we proceed, sometimes we don't always get the full
2 funding that we expect to get at the beginning of the
3 year. So there may have to be a new look or another, a
4 fresh look at the budget that we can present at next
5 month's meeting.

6 And, then, we are also starting to work on the
7 '98 budget. We will involve the RAB as early as
8 possible on that. But I don't think, probably we won't
9 have anything to present on '98 for a couple of months
10 yet.

11 BTAG, that's been an ongoing issue. We will
12 keep the RAB informed of BTAG developments, but there
13 isn't any new information. The Navy is still developing
14 data for submission to the agencies, but, to my
15 knowledge, we haven't submitted that yet.

16 And then RAB membership. The current mailing
17 list is now 21 community members. If the RAB concurs,
18 the Navy will place advertisements in Bay Area
19 newspapers to solicit for new members and also conduct
20 mailings, using the previous applications list and other
21 mailing lists that we might have access to, like the
22 city's reuse mailing list or the EIS mailing list. Then

1 we will also use the upcoming EIS hearings in the next
2 couple of months to promote the Restoration Advisory
3 Board. Hopefully, there will be a big turnout at that
4 meeting.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess, with regard to the
6 RAB membership, that will also be covered under
7 organizational business.

8 But I want to thank Jim.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is one more page.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Oh, there is one more page.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Reuse.

12 The Navy will ask DTSC to provide a briefing
13 on current property transfer procedures.

14 We expect to have a major presentation on
15 reuse-related issues on the FOSLs in the next one to two
16 months associated with these zoned FOSLs, and,
17 hopefully, use that opportunity to get the DTSC to
18 provide information on what the current property
19 transfer procedure is, which has changed slightly to
20 allow some transfer prior to completion of cleanup.

21 And then the Navy asked the city to clarify
22 issues that might be associated with the Tidelands

1 Trust.

2 And, then, lastly, USTs and cleanup, the Navy
3 will work with the regional board and other agencies to
4 present more information on the UST cleanup decision
5 making process. A lot of questions have come up, and
6 the Navy can work with the agencies to put together a
7 future presentation on that. The RAB needs to decide
8 when we want to have that kind of a more detailed
9 UST-type presentation.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess what I was going to
11 say earlier -- I'm sorry I interrupted you -- when we
12 went through the action items that have been carried
13 over the last six months, there was a repetitive quality
14 to them.

15 At the interim meeting, what we decided to do
16 was keep these items on an agenda list. These are
17 topics that come up on a regular basis that the RAB
18 would like updates for.

19 And Jim has been very nice in also giving us
20 an update of those issues as he's been making his
21 presentation.

22 But what we had determined, if we can, when we

1 identify action items, short term or long term, if we
2 can think about the issue we bring up is something with
3 periodic interest. That will be very helpful when we
4 write up the minutes.

5 So thank you, Jim.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next, as a result of the
7 comments that we received on the Remedial Investigation
8 report, we spent a lot of time during the last RPM/BCT
9 meeting, as well as the Navy has spent time outside of
10 the meeting, to read through all the community member
11 and agency comments.

12 What we wanted to do tonight was to present
13 our interpretation of the comments in order that we can
14 better address them, and, also, our proposal for a
15 process for response to comments.

16 This may have a little bit of a laundry list
17 quality to it, but what we would like to do is use this
18 opportunity to capture any comments or clarifications on
19 our interpretation of the comments received so that we
20 can better address them.

21 We went through the six or seven comment
22 documents that we had received and then collated them

1 into this list. So this is limited to strictly comments
2 concerning the Remedial Investigation report.

3 There are three main areas of RAB concerns.
4 One -- as we interpreted it -- one was the incorporation
5 of historical operations and data.

6 Two, the sampling and analytical procedures
7 that were used in our work plan implementation.

8 And, lastly, the way that the data was
9 evaluated and presented in the Remedial Investigation
10 report. I will go into that in a little more detail.

11 Insufficient review of historical operations
12 at sites. There was concern that possible contamination
13 associated with historical operations was not adequately
14 considered in developing a sampling plan.

15 There seemed to be a feeling that the Remedial
16 Investigation was focused too much on World War II era
17 operations and not on post-World War II to date
18 operations.

19 And, also, that we had not adequately
20 addressed the MTBE issue, which has to do with fuels
21 that have been used since about the 1980s, considering
22 the fact that we still have, to this day, an operational

1 gas station.

2 Also, that the preliminary assessment site
3 investigation, the Phase I and the Phase II data, was
4 not completely integrated into the document.

5 It was not always clear how the data from all
6 of these various sources was incorporated into the RI
7 report. So mainly it's an issue of integration of data.

8 There was also a concern that our sampling was
9 biased, which may have unnecessarily limited the RI
10 evaluation, and that it needed to be coupled with more
11 random sampling.

12 There was concern over the use of
13 immunoassays. The results of the Millipore BTEX
14 analysis were not presented to the RAB, and there was
15 concern by community members over the high rate of false
16 positives and false negatives that might question the
17 data validity.

18 And then also concern that the immunoassay
19 tests are not sensitive enough.

20 There was concern about the amount of
21 information on the immunoassays presented in the report.

22 There wasn't a summary of where the

1 immunoassays were used and how the samples were
2 analyzed, nor information, comparative information with
3 laboratory results.

4 There was concern that the geoprobe technique
5 was not capable of collecting representative samples.

6 Moving over to groundwater, there was concern
7 that only a limited number of monitoring wells,
8 approximately 11, were used in tidal influence, and
9 there weren't other sites included.

10 And that the effects of tidal influence needs
11 to be addressed further.

12 There was concern that there was not adequate
13 evaluation of the interaction in migration between the
14 adjoining sites, like, for example, between a CERCLA
15 site and an adjacent UST site.

16 And one site identified as an example was Site
17 12, the old bunker area, which is currently housing; and
18 then Site 6, the fire fighting school, which is
19 immediately adjacent to Site 12.

20 There was concern over the sites with
21 primarily petroleum hydrocarbons; that some sites were
22 identified for no further action or for no action

1 without a clear enough rationale.

2 And there was not an adequate explanation why
3 some sites were transferred from the CERCLA program to
4 the UST program.

5 Also, that the migration of -- well, here it
6 says, "Migration of TPH contamination from UST sites to
7 CERCLA sites was not evaluated," but that was discussed
8 in the previous one.

9 And, then, also, concern that sites
10 transferred to the UST program were using these
11 immunoassay and geoprobe sampling techniques.

12 Another issue is background concentration for
13 metal. There was concern that the way that the Navy
14 calculated the ambient and background concentrations
15 might be too high.

16 And that we should be using samples from areas
17 that might be less impacted by site activities.

18 There was a question concerning at what
19 concentrations do the essential nutrients become
20 hazardous if they are in too high of a concentration.
21 There was a concern that that issue was not specifically
22 addressed.

1 Concerning Exposure Pathways/Future Land Use
2 as applied to FOSLs and FOST, there was a concern that
3 there was a lack of discussion concerning interim and
4 final reuses that affects the exposure pathways and
5 potentially creates gaps in the human health and
6 ecological risk assessment.

7 That these pathways need to be more adequately
8 addressed.

9 That variation of flora and fauna were not
10 adequately evaluated.

11 Concerning the interaction between the
12 Remedial Investigation and the feasibility study, there
13 was concern that the site needs to be adequately
14 characterized before the feasibility study can be begun.

15 That a remedy feasibility study cannot be
16 adequately selected without an accurate estimation of
17 the amount of soil that might be required for
18 remediation.

19 Which leads to a general opinion expressed in
20 the comments that the majority of the sites are
21 incomplete, especially because items such as groundwater
22 modeling, the petroleum toxicity tests and the sampling

1 we're doing at Sites 12 and 17 was not incorporated into
2 the draft RI.

3 So the general opinion was that the document
4 was incomplete for the majority of the sites.

5 What's the next step? Well, this is the
6 Navy's proposal, so we are here tonight to get your
7 comments and opinions and other ideas.

8 What we propose to do is to set up some
9 focused informal meetings to discuss the RAB's areas of
10 concerns.

11 It's hard to discuss a lot of detailed,
12 specific detailed issues in a general meeting, like
13 tonight's, but we have had some success in the past in
14 having some focus meetings for those individuals who are
15 interested in particular meetings and can attend in a
16 less formal atmosphere for more one-on-one discussion.

17 We are proposing three meetings:

18 Meeting 1 will start with the sampling
19 methodology and rationale, the way we conduct the
20 investigation.

21 Meeting 2 would concern data evaluation and
22 presentation, including the incorporation of previous

1 data as well as the interaction of the sites.

2 And then meeting 3 would focus on risk
3 assessment and future land use on pathways, background
4 concentrations, essential nutrients and biased versus
5 random sampling.

6 So those are the three meetings and the topics
7 that we are proposing, and we are here tonight to get
8 your comments or suggestions on whether we can adopt
9 this approach, make some changes to it, or whether there
10 is some other approach that we may want to take.

11 So at this time, I would like to open it up
12 for comment, or we can take a break and comment
13 afterward.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we could decide
15 whether or not to take a break.

16 What happens after the meetings?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the intent of the
18 meetings is to -- right now, we feel there is a gulf, a
19 fairly wide gulf between the Navy and the community
20 members.

21 What we want to do is, to the extent possible,
22 reach a common understanding and, hopefully, reach some

1 common agreement on what actions we might take.

2 I can't promise that we are necessarily going
3 to agree, but I would hope that we would at least get to
4 the point where we could agree to disagree.

5 But right now, I think we have a chasm between
6 us, and we need to be able to at least understand each
7 side of the chasm, and, hopefully, bring that as close
8 together as we can.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is this an alternative to
10 responding to the RAB's comments in writing?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In part.

12 I think when we initially, when we initially
13 started the RAB process, and this issue has come up at
14 other RABs, too, we didn't anticipate doing a written
15 response to every comment.

16 In the case of the agencies, we have to do
17 that.

18 In the case of the RAB, we would like to at
19 least respond to, in general, the comments, and then
20 address specific comments.

21 But I'm not sure that we necessarily want
22 to -- this is our opinion -- that we necessarily want to

1 devote the resources to respond to each and every
2 comment blow by blow.

3 I think we can still address the nature of the
4 comments, but it might be in a slightly different way
5 than the way we address them with the agencies, and,
6 also, drawing a distinction that the agencies are in a
7 regulatory mode, whereas the community members are in an
8 advisory and consultative mode.

9 That's one reason.

10 Second, I think, having this series of
11 meetings and this interaction is going to be a lot more
12 productive than if we were going to respond with any
13 kind of written document and end up having an exchange
14 of documents. That would be a lot more time consuming
15 than if we were to have several meetings in which we
16 could air out concerns and have an exchange of
17 information and ideas.

18 What final form the written response takes, I
19 think we will benefit from this kind of informal,
20 focused meetings.

21 CO-CHAIR NELSON: What is the time frame for
22 the meetings?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we would like to
2 conduct them over about the next four to six weeks.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And when are the responses
4 to the comments due to the agencies?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm not sure.

6 Is it 30 or 60 days?

7 Ernie, for the draft document, it's 60 days,
8 isn't it? It's only 30 days for the draft final.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So the comments were due
10 from the agencies on the 19th of January. We would be
11 in the 19th of March, then, as a response to the
12 agency's comments as expected.

13 MS. TOBIAS: I couldn't hear you.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the comments from
15 the agencies received right prior to the last meeting,
16 the last RAB meeting, so it would be approximately 60
17 days, so about mid-March.

18 MS. TOBIAS: Except the actual response to
19 comments are due with the draft final report which won't
20 be given to the agencies until March 22nd.

21 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And when is that report due?

22 MS. TOBIAS: We haven't scheduled it because

1 we are submitting the agenda at this time.

2 We want to get concurrence on the agenda
3 because we will start generating a draft final.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And is the agenda also going
5 to be submitted to the RAB?

6 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And when will the agenda be
8 submitted to the RAB?

9 MS. TOBIAS: We gave you a preliminary
10 schedule at the last meeting. I don't have a revised
11 schedule at this time.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do you know off the top of
13 your head?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I think Pat
15 raises a good line of questioning.

16 I think that the scheduling for these kinds of
17 meetings needs to be integrated with our schedule for
18 completion of the Remedial Investigation. Right now,
19 our specific schedule for finishing that is still not
20 firm.

21 So that what we probably need to do is to,
22 probably by the time of the next interim meeting in two

1 weeks, we will have a better idea of what our schedule
2 will be for the RI report so that we can come to the
3 interim meeting with a proposed schedule.

4 Yes, Brad?

5 MR. WONG: I think that's a good idea, but I
6 guess what is missing for me is a qualitative statement
7 here.

8 From what I can tell, it was captured by Pat
9 and Paul what they had written out and presented at the
10 last meeting.

11 I get no sense on whether you just think, do
12 you agree or disagree with the comments? Are they wrong
13 or are they correct? Do you plan on incorporating any
14 of the changes?

15 I get no sense on whether you agree or
16 disagree with the findings.

17 MR. HEHN: We don't know.

18 MR. WONG: Were the comments right or were
19 they wrong?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think probably, at
21 least, you know, my personal opinion, I think there is
22 things I agree with and things I don't agree with.

1 I think some of the things that I certainly
2 agree with are data presentation comments, because we
3 had intended to, the way we ended up in the RI process,
4 though, it has turned out more complicated than we
5 thought.

6 We ended up providing a draft RI that didn't
7 have all of the data. We made a decision to go ahead,
8 and we thought at the time it was the right decision.

9 So I feel in the draft, in the final RI, and
10 in the FS, we will end up addressing some of these
11 issues, but we weren't able to address them in the
12 initial draft document.

13 There may be some issues that we, you know,
14 possibly such as the immunoassay, that we might continue
15 to be in some disagreement, and we wanted to at least
16 try to address, have some more one-on-one discussion on
17 some of these more contentious issues so that we can
18 maybe try to reach some common ground or get closer
19 together.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think this might be a good
21 time to take a break, but maybe a couple of more
22 comments before we do.

1 MS. WALTERS: Will the agencies participate in
2 these meetings?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They would certainly be
4 invited to. They did participate in the meetings we had
5 on the Remedial Investigation work plan. IT's primarily
6 to the extent that the agency would like to participate,
7 and I can't speak for them.

8 MS. SIMONS: This is the first time we heard
9 about it.

10 MS. WALTERS: Well, given, especially her
11 comments pretty much, it's the same wavelength as the
12 community's concerns. It would seem like it would be
13 appropriate.

14 The BTC/RPM meeting seems to be on the same
15 wavelength, and it seems to be a good, focused way to
16 get a lot of issues resolved.

17 MR. CHAO: That's what I was going to suggest.
18 Maybe a lot of issues discussed here are sent to the
19 agencies, and at least we should coordinate so we all
20 reach the same consensus.

21 Certainly you would want agreement with the
22 community group. So that probably would be, certainly

1 be willing to participate in these meetings, but, also,
2 a major part of the issue, I think, that didn't get
3 answered here, is incompleteness of the RI report, that
4 there is certain information not come in yet, as far as
5 the departments.

6 Our comments have not been finished yet,
7 because I'm still waiting for data package to come in so
8 I can have a more, have a better overall picture as to
9 what your interpretation of the data is, and your
10 recommendation. A lot of the sites or issues in the
11 report really did not conclude, have a recommendation.

12 So I'm still waiting for that in order for me
13 to complete my comments, and I don't know where that
14 fits into the three meetings.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I saw two other hands up and
16 the RAB and the agencies might want to caucus at the
17 break.

18 And before I forget, it was Hugo's birthday,
19 which is why we have the carrot cake. So everybody wish
20 him a happy belated birthday.

21 But Chris and Dan, did you have a question or
22 comment?

1 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I had a question.

2 Do you envision that, resulting from these
3 meetings, there will be a written document that
4 summarizes the issues brought up in the meetings?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, and it would probably
6 be more detailed, but it would at least be similar in
7 nature to a document that we wrote during the Remedial
8 Investigation work plan discussions where we kind of
9 summarized our Navy position and how we were planning to
10 address the RAB's concerns, but, yes.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: And would that become part of
12 the RI report or staying in the administrative record?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I couldn't answer that
14 right now.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I think we need to be sure
16 that's the case.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It would certainly be a
18 document that would be relative to the cleanup decision
19 making, so it would certainly be in the record.

20 Whether it would be physically bound into the
21 Remedial Investigation report or not, I'm not sure. It
22 could be.

1 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I would like to have that
2 issue resolved before we do the meetings so that we
3 understand what the boundaries are so I don't waste my
4 time going to meetings that amount to nothing,
5 basically.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.
7 Dan?

8 MR. MC DONALD: I would like to echo what
9 Chris and Brad suggested, that, before these meetings
10 take place, in which we may find that we sit down to
11 talk about a series of issues at one of these meetings
12 and find that we all agree, so, therefore, why have it?

13 I don't know if that's the case, but it seems
14 to me there are going to be a number of cases where the
15 Navy should be able to say, "Yes, we agree with the
16 comment. We will take some specified action to beef up
17 the report."

18 The second answer could be, "No, we disagree
19 vehemently, and we see no reason to pursue that line of
20 work."

21 And, third, "Gee, you know, your report
22 comments have some validity. We're thinking about doing

1 'X,' 'Y' and 'Z,' and what do you think, will that
2 satisfy your concern?"

3 Some of these are technical qualitative issues
4 that will require some discussion, but unless we know
5 what you're proposing ahead of time, I think it's hard
6 to come to a meeting and hear for the first time, in
7 response to a very technical issue, what your response
8 is that you are asking for closure from the community
9 members or the agencies in response to that suggested
10 remediation of the report.

11 So there is a lot of preparatory work that
12 would seem to be very useful to take place prior to
13 these meetings.

14 I think they could be very useful, but sort of
15 a soft give-and-take without anything in front of us
16 ahead of time would certainly tend to, in my opinion, to
17 lessen the use of our time.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As I recall, in our own
19 internal discussion, we had intended to come in and
20 start, our initial thought was to come in and start such
21 a meeting with kind of an initial presentation, informal
22 presentation, of where we thought we were about with

1 regards to specific issues.

2 And that's a good point, you know, rather than
3 just come into a room and start talking. So we had
4 given some thought to coming in with some prepared
5 documentation.

6 Yes, Paul?

7 MR. HEHN: I guess I'm really unclear as to
8 what the result of these meetings are going to be.

9 If it is determined that, for instance, the
10 immunoassay sampling testing does not adequately
11 characterize a site, is the Navy then prepared to go out
12 and do additional work to fully characterize the sites?

13 Or what is the result of this whole exercise
14 to be? Is it going to be productive? Is the Navy
15 willing to do more if that's determined by consensus
16 that that's what is needed, that there isn't enough
17 information, that the sites aren't fully characterized,
18 and risk assessment, is that a fair result of these
19 meetings?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think I would not so
21 much use the word, I don't think you can use the word
22 consensus because the RAB was meant to be advisory.

1 But I think, I would hope that we would at
2 least reach some understanding, and, then, also, in our
3 responses to working with the agencies, there may be
4 some additional action we take which may also be issues
5 that the community members have, too.

6 I just can't promise that we will agree on
7 every issue, but I hope that we can agree to disagree.

8 Probably there will be some issues that we
9 will remain in disagreement over, but I hope we will end
10 up with a better product because of this.

11 MR. HEHN: I understand that, but I see that,
12 you know, I guess maybe I misspoke about "consensus."

13 But at least so that we know that there is a
14 reasonable result that's going to come out of these
15 meetings, so that the RAB will feel like their concerns
16 have been addressed in trying to resolve the issue and
17 moving forward with the investigation and
18 characterization of Treasure Island and YBI, and so that
19 the end result is getting fully characterized and move
20 into the FS phase, and if that is going to be the result
21 of these meetings, then what does that do to the overall
22 scheduling?

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess the schedule is
2 going to crop up, particularly since there are sections
3 of the RI that haven't been submitted to the agencies or
4 the RAB.

5 So this schedule seems somewhat open-ended
6 until we see the data forthcoming for the sampling and
7 also for the groundwater modeling.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The overall schedule for
9 the CERCLA sites could be subject to change as a result
10 of the discussion with the RAB and with the agencies.

11 MR. WONG: Well, the schedule, when does the
12 clock start ticking?

13 If DTSC doesn't have all the information to
14 evaluate things, does the clock start ticking? So like
15 from tonight forward, we have 60 days as well as,
16 whatever, January forward?

17 It seems with regard to these different issues
18 in it, these meetings, it seems to me there are two
19 groupings of things here.

20 Some of this is what I would call just kind of
21 format issues, maybe filling in the blanks. For
22 instance, maybe it would be agreed that we could put in

1 more information about past historical uses of sites or
2 something like that.

3 To me, that's time and money, and you dig a
4 little bit more in the archives. Slap it in there. No
5 big deal. Maybe it is.

6 What I am concerned about are the substantive
7 issues. The assumption, for instance, of the validity
8 of immunoassay testing versus more traditional lab
9 testing. This gets at the core of whether or not this
10 is a relevant document and a complete document.

11 And there, I would suspect, we are not going
12 to get agreement on that, but what I would expect is a
13 very good understanding of give-and-take as to not only
14 why we think, because I think it's been laid out that
15 that was not an adequate methodology to start grinding
16 conclusions from, but equally important, a very clear
17 and concise explanation from you all as to why you think
18 it is valid.

19 And what I would like to see, in writing as
20 well, because, to me, that's a true response to the
21 concern: Yes, we heard what you said. Your arguments
22 are well founded. But, look, we have been doing this.

1 We know better. Here's why we decided to do this.

2 I would be happy with that as long as it was
3 documented.

4 For me, that is a good outcome of one of these
5 meetings. I want to know what the basis for the
6 decision was, and, in fact, data is what has to go into
7 the administrative record.

8 That captures the information that is relevant
9 to the decision making process.

10 So, for me, that's what I would like as an
11 outcome of the meetings.

12 We don't have to agree, but I would like it
13 very clear, direct, and in writing why you decided to
14 make decisions for the substantive things.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I concur with that. The
16 Navy ought to be adequately able to explain why we did
17 what we did.

18 MR. HEHN: Are we talking about a general
19 review and discussion about immunoassays or
20 investigation or well placement, or are we going to get
21 down to the nitty-gritty, site by site, or how do you
22 envision these things happening?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The way I envision it,
2 there is no way we could go through blow by blow through
3 all the data. It's just physically impossible.

4 What I envisioned we would do is, discuss the
5 issue and then site specific issues with specific items
6 of data, but we wouldn't necessarily be in a position to
7 go over all the data from each and every site.

8 But we would be prepared to discuss or ready
9 to discuss data from various sites that people may have
10 interest in.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any more questions before we
12 break?

13 MR. HEHN: One more, Pat.

14 I was going to mention, if we do this for the
15 CERCLA sites -- and Pat brought up the question about
16 whether or not some of the CERCLA sites should be in the
17 CAP or not -- what will the program show?

18 It would be very valuable, then, to have
19 Rachel aboard so we can talk about the position between
20 the two programs and what is valid.

21 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess an adjunct to that,
22 we have to have a full discussion of that issue.

1 It would be very helpful to have the data that
2 was considered when those CERCLA sites went into the CAP
3 sites, and the sooner that is distributed among the RAB,
4 then we can have that discussion. But I don't know if
5 that's available.

6 Is that something available to the RAB?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the same data that
8 is in the RI for the CERCLA sites is a similar vintage
9 of data that is used for the Corrective Action Plan.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: But for the six CERCLA
11 sites, can that information be made available to the
12 RAB? I think that's one of the issues that we would
13 want to discuss.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we would have to
15 consider that.

16 My Navy feeling on this issue of moving the
17 sites into the CAP is that I would prefer that we
18 completed the CAP and address comments as part of the
19 CAP rather than to bring up or consider yanking them
20 back into the RI.

21 But I certainly think any substantive, any
22 comment relating to whether or not they should be even

1 considered in the CAP could be brought up at the CAP.

2 But I would rather allow the CAP process to
3 proceed -- it's pretty far along now -- and address
4 those comments for those specific sites when we have a
5 direct CAP.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad?

7 MR. WONG: One last comment before the break.

8 I would like to kind of dispell the notion of
9 us or them, the community versus the Navy, the RAB
10 versus whoever.

11 In fact, we are all members of the RAB,
12 including the regulators. It just so happens that we
13 are composed of community members, regulators, the Navy,
14 and I would like to echo what Martha said: Have
15 everyone at the table, including the regulator members
16 of the RAB, because it's not us and them. They are part
17 of the RAB.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's a good point. We
19 should break and come back in 15 or so minutes.

20 (Short break.)

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we are running about
22 30 some minutes late, but we wanted to end this

1 discussion on the RI with taking any additional
2 comments, especially as both the Navy and the community
3 members have had an opportunity to discuss things during
4 the break.

5 If there is any additional commentary on our
6 process to respond to comments for the Remedial
7 Investigation report.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, I think, Jim, that the
9 proposal to have meetings is of interest to the RAB.

10 However, I think there are some items that
11 will need discussion.

12 The first is the proposal by the RAB back to
13 the Navy in response that there be a meeting at which we
14 establish ground rules for these meetings so that all
15 parties will understand what the agenda for each meeting
16 is, what the outcome of each meeting is, and having a
17 method of putting in writing ahead of time for all
18 parties interested in attending the meetings, a list of
19 those comments that the Navy either agrees or disagrees
20 with as a basis for agenda, development session to be
21 held at this first meeting.

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that was generally

1 along the line of what we were thinking that, basically,
2 we were already starting to rough out a schedule.

3 Well, initially, we would propose to have a
4 rough draft schedule by the next interim meeting in two
5 weeks.

6 The way we kind of see the schedule happening
7 is that we won't have the additional data, the Sites 12
8 and 17 data and the other data until about the end of
9 March.

10 And then there will be another 60-day comment
11 period based on that data, so that we will really start
12 another commentary period during the months of April and
13 May.

14 What we are probably going to propose is to
15 have this first meeting in early to mid-April. That
16 will, one, give us time to prepare for it, and, also,
17 give us time to get this other data in at the end of
18 March.

19 So, actually, we are probably working within a
20 fairly large or, I think, an ample enough window,
21 because we will have additional data at the end of
22 March; another 60-day comment period, and then following

1 comments received on that additional data. There will
2 be another 60-day period for the Navy to respond and
3 prepare the draft final RI. So we are actually already
4 taking about a four- to five-month window in which we
5 could have discussions.

6 So we are prepared to, in two weeks, at the
7 interim meeting, to have, at least our rough draft of
8 what we think a schedule could look like that would also
9 incorporate the additional data submittals and the time
10 periods.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: RAB review and agency
12 review?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Agency review and RAB
14 review.

15 So that would give us a complete schedule.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think this should be an
17 item for the next interim meeting, but what is important
18 to the RAB members is that all of our comments be
19 responded to in writing.

20 That can happen as a result of discussing
21 these items at these meetings, and then having those
22 comments documented in the transcript, or by having

1 those items addressed separately in writing.

2 And an example of those items separately in
3 writing would be those items that the Navy might agree
4 with that wouldn't become agenda items at any of these
5 meetings.

6 And I will invite, at this time, any comments
7 by the RAB members, if there are other expectations.

8 MR. WONG: As a point of, I guess, process to
9 move this along, what I would like to recommend is,
10 there is an interim meeting, I think you've talked about
11 on March 4, where you would like to produce a schedule,
12 and that's fine.

13 I think what we are talking about, we want to
14 discuss content and outcome.

15 So I would like to recommend, given the time
16 frame you just kind of roughed out, that there is an
17 interim meeting on April 1st, and in the economy of
18 time, I would like to recommend that to be a really kind
19 of a spec meeting, where we can see if we agree or
20 disagree on the content, the form, how the meetings will
21 be conducted and what the expected outcomes are.

22 And if we can come to agreement on April 1st,

1 we know that we can move ahead with the series of the
2 other three meetings, because we have agreement on the
3 format and what the expected outcomes are.

4 If we can't on April 1st, then I would like to
5 recommend that there is no sense to do the three
6 meetings, because we are at loggerheads, and it would be
7 a waste of everybody's time.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: Unless we could resolve them.

9 MR. WONG: Well, sure, we could agree at that
10 time.

11 But to kind of move it along, I would like to
12 recommend something like that, since we are not looking
13 at a schedule, we are looking at content and outcome.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: At the April 1st meeting.

15 MR. WONG: Right.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we come in with a
17 draft, with a rough schedule on March the 3rd, and at
18 the following month's meeting, we would be ready to give
19 you our thoughts on content and ground rules that we
20 would work out at that meeting.

21 MR. WONG: And vice versa, and see if we can
22 come out with some agreement.

1 Otherwise, it's not worth holding the three
2 meetings.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I agree. I think that's a
4 good idea.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do I hear a motion and a
6 second?

7 MR. WONG: I will make that a motion.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do I hear a second?

9 MS. SHIRLEY: I will second.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All those opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All those in favor?

13 (Unanimous)

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Thank you very
15 much.

16 I think we brought what we were hoping to
17 accomplish tonight to closure so that we can proceed
18 from there.

19 Next item, UST update. It's been proposed, in
20 the interests of time, that I may just want to hand out
21 handouts.

22 I'm up to whatever, whatever the consensus is

1 of the RAB.

2 What I did is put together about ten pages on
3 where we stand with the UST program. I think it's
4 reasonably self-explanatory. I just wanted to address
5 where we were in the program and where we were heading.

6 We will have specific presentations at future
7 meetings on the actual documents we produce, so this is
8 really just a report on the program (indicating).

9 It's not as detailed as providing a specific
10 schedule. Basically, I was just identifying the
11 distinction between the former CERCLA sites that are now
12 in the UST program and the other USTs and ASTs and fuel
13 lines, and that we have 74 tank sites that we have
14 investigated, and, of those, 58 are outside of the IR
15 program.

16 So those 58 sites are being addressed by
17 contract, some of which by consultants other than PRC,
18 and in different sets of documents, other than the
19 Remedial Investigation or the Corrective Action Plan
20 that we are producing for the former CERCLA sites.

21 I can address any specific comments, but,
22 basically, we will be seeing UST documents within the

1 next several months.

2 As an action item, I wasn't able to do it
3 before this meeting, but we can put together more of a
4 schedule, specific schedule for delivery of UST and
5 other remediation documents.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would like to propose that
7 become an action item, so maybe by the next meeting you
8 could have a schedule for that.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

10 MS. WALTERS: Sounds good.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: With that, we are moving
12 to organizational business. I would be happy to turn it
13 over to Pat.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We have, again, as an agenda
15 item the membership.

16 But before we get into the membership, I
17 wanted to bring up, I guess, an item that I didn't catch
18 when we were going through the agenda.

19 But, Jim, you had indicated that we would be
20 losing our court reporter, and this is borne from a new
21 contract for the meeting support under public
22 participation contract.

1 But I would like to open that up for
2 discussion. I think we have been very happy with our
3 court reporter, Steve, and the quality of the minutes
4 that we have been getting since we had a court reporter.

5 We have been through a general summary meeting
6 transcription before and there were all sorts of
7 problems.

8 Is that agreeable, that we discuss that at
9 this time?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I mean, if you would
11 like to.

12 Well, let me clarify, actually, let me clarify
13 briefly. We weren't necessarily -- well, maybe I should
14 give the opportunity for our community relations
15 consultants to introduce themselves, if they haven't
16 already, if you wouldn't mind?

17 MR. WONG: Before we do that, I don't know
18 what that just meant.

19 Is there a proposed change in the
20 administration of the RAB?

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, in the way that
22 the -- there is a change in the way that the Navy is

1 going to produce the minutes. We are still going to
2 produce minutes.

3 But we, at least for the next several meetings
4 after this, we won't have a court reporter.

5 What we will have is a tape, a cassette tape
6 of the meeting that will still allow us to produce
7 accurate minutes, but we won't have a typed verbatim
8 transcript as we have.

9 And the reason for that is that the Navy has
10 switched to a community relations contract separate from
11 PRC's cleanup investigation contract.

12 Now, that contract was written for all of the
13 Bay Area bases. It turned out that we were the only one
14 using a court reporter. So they took the general
15 approach of providing minutes, but not necessarily with
16 the court reporter.

17 However, this contract does have flexibility,
18 and should there be a strong enough desire to have a
19 court reporter, that is an additional service we could
20 provide.

21 But under the initial implementation of this
22 new contract, we won't have a court reporter, but we

1 will still be producing the minutes. We are still
2 responsible for producing adequate minutes.

3 MR. HEHN: How will the minutes be produced,
4 recorded?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the meeting, in
6 addition to -- actually, the way we have been producing
7 the minutes is that, to date, is that we have been
8 taking notes during the meeting, and, actually, the
9 initial draft of the meeting minutes gets written up
10 before we even have the transcript.

11 The transcript is used to cross-check and make
12 any adjustments before the final draft minutes are
13 issued.

14 But in the case of the new contract, we will
15 have a cassette tape of the meeting that, technically,
16 is going to be turned over to the Navy, or will be
17 turned over to the Navy by the contractor that we would
18 retain if someone would want to listen to it.

19 But it wouldn't necessarily, it wouldn't
20 automatically produce a written transcript from that
21 cassette tape.

22 But that is an additional service that we

1 could choose, that we could agree to provide.

2 MR. WONG: I'm sorry. Have contracts gone out
3 Bay Area wide for all the Navy RABs to capture the
4 minutes differently?

5 I saw a facilitator here, et cetera, so I
6 would like to -- I'm not sure I caught a clear
7 distinction on what is changing here.

8 So I guess I would ask you to say that again.
9 We are going to switch from Steve to just a cassette
10 deck, and then somebody will transcribe the cassette
11 deck at some other time and those are the minutes?

12 MS. WALTERS: No.

13 They are not going to transcribe it, right?

14 MR. WONG: Well, you have to attach the
15 minutes, right?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, basically, what we
17 have been doing, even to date, capture the minutes in
18 notes during the meeting, and actually start to write
19 the draft of the minutes, because the actual transcript
20 doesn't arrive until two weeks or so after the meeting
21 approximately, two weeks?

22 THE REPORTER: Five days.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Five days. With Steve,
2 maybe.

3 But the transcript is then used to augment
4 that notetaking and make any final adjustments.

5 MS. SHIRLEY: How would that happen with a
6 tape?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, really, the same
8 way, or somewhat similar way.

9 You can write the minutes from notetaking, but
10 the writer of the minutes will have access to the
11 cassette tape to re-review.

12 MS. SHIRLEY: But I know from experience that
13 that takes a lot longer than having a printed
14 transcript, because you have to listen to the tape in
15 real time. And you can read the transcript a lot
16 faster, scan a lot faster.

17 MR. HANSEN: And the tape doesn't know who
18 says something.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, that, too.

20 MR. HANSEN: It blurs it.

21 MS. SHIRLEY: I just know from experience,
22 from having been in the business of taking notes for

1 technical meetings, that a tape takes a lot longer to
2 cross-check with. It's unlikely to be used.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It sounds like a great
4 convenience, but it does takes time.

5 And the acoustics in these rooms are not the
6 best. I would be very surprised if there was much real
7 voice recorded that's understandable.

8 MR. WONG: My understanding is these
9 transcripts and all go into the information repository.
10 Would the tapes go there as well? God forbid, if we
11 have a Watergate situation here, or something, where
12 they are put too close to a magnet and they tend to
13 erase themselves.

14 So if there is a provision in the contract to
15 allow for the court reporter, then I would just like to
16 make a motion now that we retain our court reporter and
17 keep doing what we are doing, and let the contract just
18 ride.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dan, you had your hand up.

20 MR. MC DONALD: It sounds to me if we are
21 going from a system that is efficient, works well and is
22 well-liked by the RAB, to a system which is apparently

1 less efficient, more prone to mistakes and not clear of
2 its intent, like, if it's not broken, why fix it?

3 MS. SIMONS: Jim, do we have an option with
4 the court reporter?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we do.

6 MR. HEHN: I might mention, when we got the
7 court reporter a couple of years ago, the reason we got
8 him, because the method of taking the notes was not
9 working. We didn't feel that we were adequately
10 capturing the conversation, the discussion, whatever,
11 during the RAB meetings, and we got the court reporter.

12 It seems to me like we are going backwards if
13 you go back to that system again, so I would suggest
14 that we maintain the court reporter.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually, to my
16 knowledge, we are the only Navy RAB --

17 MR. WONG: We are trailblazers.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, part of it,
19 admittedly, is cost. I mean, there is a cost difference
20 between having a trained professional here, I mean,
21 trained professional just doing the recording versus the
22 cassette tape. I mean, it is a cost difference between

1 the two ways of taking notes.

2 MR. MC DONALD: But if it's less efficient for
3 someone to listen to a tape, compare it to the notes
4 they've handwritten and then try to update that, I have
5 a hard time understanding how much less cost efficient
6 it is, what the magnitude of that difference is.

7 It may be that the people who are going to be
8 in charge of listening to the tapes aren't the same
9 people as the court reporter.

10 So we may have an allocation of costs, but not
11 necessarily a huge rise or drop in the costs.

12 MS. WALTHERS: Why don't we just retain the
13 court reporter?

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I heard a motion. Did I
15 hear the motion?

16 MR. HANSEN: I will second it.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard?

18 MR. HANSEN: I support the motion. I second
19 it.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: You second it. All right.

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Then we will investigate
22 with our contractor and contracts office how we can

1 retain the court reporter in our contract.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So you will consider our
3 request, but we should be prepared for bad news? You'll
4 investigate some?

5 MR. MC DONALD: One should not hold one's
6 breath.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I can't guarantee what the
8 outcome will be a month from now.

9 I think, ultimately, we can get things worked
10 out, but I can't guarantee it.

11 MS. WALTERS: What is the big concern? I
12 don't understand.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I mean, it seems we have
14 four new faces in the audience, and certainly those are
15 four times any hourly rate.

16 MS. WALTERS: Exactly.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It would have to equal at
18 least one if not two of our court reporters. I mean,
19 there is an apparent inefficiency there.

20 MS. BROWN: Could I introduce myself?

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

22 MS. BROWN: My name is Darlene Brown. I'm

1 with Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Incorporated, out of Phoenix,
2 Arizona. I have my colleagues here, Sandra Lunceford
3 and Lisa Perot-Woolfolk.

4 We are here on behalf of the Navy. We are the
5 contractors with the new community relations program.

6 What I can say is, basically, we are
7 responsible to the request of the Navy as to what
8 services and items they have asked us to take care of.

9 As the contract stands now, a stenographer or
10 court reporter is not included in the contract. So
11 that's why we did not negotiate that portion.

12 However, that certainly is a possibility, if
13 that's what you want. If it comes through Mr. Sullivan,
14 through the contracting office, we can make that
15 available.

16 But as the contract exists right now, there is
17 certain things we can and cannot do.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Are you here from Arizona?

19 MS. BROWN: Yes.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So the travel budget would
21 cover the cost of the court reporter.

22 MS. BROWN: Well, let me mention a couple of

1 other things to clarify.

2 We will be establishing an office here,
3 probably within the next few weeks, and I will be
4 located here, and we will have staff to service the Navy
5 bases on this contract.

6 And, secondly, you mentioned that we have
7 three people here. Well, that's the terms of the
8 contract that we were asked to respond to, that we have
9 three people at each RAB meeting, and that's what we
10 have done.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, what is the purpose of
12 three people in the meeting?

13 MS. BROWN: I can't answer that. We are only
14 supporting the Navy's wishes.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we will probably
16 have to bring it back.

17 MS. WALTERS: It's a waste of money.

18 MR. WONG: I have one other problem.

19 I heard a phrase that I haven't heard before.
20 Let me know if this is the time to do it.

21 But my understanding is, you are a contractor
22 for the new community relations program, and "new" is

1 the operative word.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, new contract.

3 Actually, I don't want to put our consultants on the
4 spot with their first appearance here.

5 MR. WONG: Well, they are here and they are
6 participating. That's all right.

7 But the thing is, is this gearing up for the
8 community relations responsibilities moving into RODS
9 and things of that sort that needs to happen? I may not
10 have a great picture of this.

11 But my understanding is that's separate than
12 the RAB, and so maybe I need some clarification here.
13 But if we are moving into what needs to be done under
14 the laws or whatever to gear up to ensure proper
15 community input, I would think that's where the RAB is
16 coming from.

17 So I don't want to blend the two if that, in
18 fact, is not the case.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

20 MR. WONG: Do I make myself clear?

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

22 MR. WONG: Because somebody is doing planning.

1 PRC was doing planning for a community outreach game
2 plan moving into the ROD, and I see that as separate as
3 the RAB process.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's correct.

5 MR. WONG: So I wouldn't want to blend the
6 two.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what we have done
8 is, take the community relations portion, there are some
9 specific things that we have to do for community
10 relations, as far as the ROD goes, and the whole CERCLA
11 process. That stays with our CERCLA contractor, with
12 PRC, in this case.

13 But what we have done is take all of the non,
14 all of the general, all of the other community relations
15 related activities, including the RAB, and place those
16 into a -- actually, let me restate that.

17 I think this is basically a RAB, predominantly
18 a RAB supported contract. And so we have taken the RAB
19 support from PRC and placed that within a contract
20 that's devoted to RAB and other related community
21 relations support.

22 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard?

1 MR. HANSEN: This kind of rings a bell.

2 We received in the mail a couple of weeks ago
3 some experts from the Congressional record pointing out
4 that certain technical supports are now available to the
5 RAB, if that's the way I interpret it.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's different.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's different.

8 MR. HANSEN: It seems to me that the community
9 members are saying that the technical support that we
10 seem to feel is necessary is the retention of the court
11 reporter.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

13 It seems that there is a bit of a disconnect
14 here between what we perceive the need to be and what
15 the Navy might see as a shift, breaking out the public
16 relations from PRC into another group.

17 Certainly four public relations consultants to
18 cover this meeting is excessive, in my view, and I don't
19 think it hits on -- I think what the RAB needs, and
20 maybe you have other needs, but it would be really
21 helpful, I think, if before new contractors show up,
22 that in the meeting prior, or two or three meetings

1 prior, that this is introduced to the RAB as a meeting
2 rather than having the RAB show up cold to a meeting,
3 have new faces, and have a facilitator wandering around
4 saying, "Yeah, I'm going to be doing this," and you
5 haven't had the courtesy to advise the RAB or get
6 feedback from the RAB whether or not these are
7 necessary.

8 And if you feel they are necessary, and we
9 feel they are not necessary, maybe we should have a
10 discussion at an interim meeting to go over it.

11 Certainly, you have, I think, needs to help
12 set up the meeting and do some administrative and behind
13 the scenes work, but what I think the RAB is saying here
14 tonight, we want accurate minutes, we want our comments
15 accurately recorded, and we want our comments responded
16 to in writing. It's very simple, I think.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The end result, I mean,
18 our intent was to keep the end result the same.

19 I think we definitely will pursue keeping the
20 service in the contract. It's just that, for the
21 general contract that was written for the entire Bay
22 Area Navy, this was not something that was being done

1 elsewhere.

2 But the contract has some flexibility for us
3 to mold it to each individual RAB.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So I would like to propose
5 an action item that, at the interim meeting, you come
6 with an explanation of what all this is trying to
7 achieve so that we can discuss our needs and your needs
8 and make some sort of concept to discuss at the next RAB
9 meeting what it is we are trying to achieve.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, Pat, maybe at the interim
11 meeting, Jim can report on progress about retaining the
12 court reporter, because it seems the RAB wants to retain
13 the system as we had rather than drag it out into
14 another month of discussion.

15 MR. HEHN: Can I ask a question?

16 I would like to find out, what does
17 community's relations support for the RAB mean and what
18 does that entail?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, probably, it would
20 be easiest for us to come to the interim meeting in two
21 weeks and be prepared to discuss what this new contract
22 is, because, quite frankly, it's relatively new to me,

1 too, and so I need to read through it more thoroughly so
2 I can be able to brief everyone about what's in the
3 contract and what is not in the contract.

4 Basically, the contract is meant to provide
5 support to these meetings, and, especially as we move
6 toward the closure of the Naval station where there may
7 be fewer Navy personnel available in the post closure
8 periods, the basic mechanics of the meeting will need to
9 rely more on the contractor for assistance.

10 MR. HEHN: Do you mean producing the minutes,
11 copying and mailing out the minutes, et cetera, is that
12 the support you're talking about?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And setting up a room and
14 all the mechanics -- some of which we are doing now --
15 that we may no longer have personnel to do.

16 MR. WONG: So the issue may not be so much who
17 as to how it's getting done.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Well, it sounds to me like
19 there is a what here, too.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think I need to get
21 more familiar with this new contract that I just was
22 briefed on a couple of weeks ago, or just had the

1 opportunity, or was just awarded a couple of weeks ago.

2 I could come prepared at the next interim
3 meeting to discuss it while at the same time pursuing
4 the keeping of the court reporter services.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other discussion?

6 (No response.)

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We were going to discuss
8 membership, hopefully, for the last time.

9 We were going to have a tally of the existing
10 RAB members. We seem to have 7 to 10 that regularly
11 attend out of the 21 that Jim had mentioned previously
12 are still on our mailing list.

13 And so I think with Ernie and Hugo and Jim's
14 help, we can get that down to the 10 or 12 that
15 regularly attend, and notification needs to be made by
16 the Navy to those that are going to be removed from the
17 list, and then we need to advertise for new members.

18 At the last interim meeting, we discussed the
19 schedule of advertising for new members in March.

20 So between now and the next meeting, those ads
21 will be placed.

22 We will need a committee, of course, to review

1 the applications and make some selection.

2 So that's something.

3 I'm looking over at Dan, because he did that
4 last time we recruited new members.

5 MR. MC DONALD: Yes, I would be happy to do
6 that.

7 I worked with Jim on the advertisement, I
8 believe, because there were some changes in the wording
9 that we agreed upon, based on the fact that the RAB was
10 ongoing, and there needed to be some additional
11 information given out to the public so that they would
12 understand what they were looking at.

13 I think we formed an ad hoc subcommittee, I
14 think there were three or four of us who met one night
15 at my office, and we went over all the applications. I
16 think we had 50 or 60 applications for the last round,
17 and we chose 16, 17, I believe.

18 We could go through and use those again, talk
19 to the same people who weren't chosen, and maybe some
20 people who are still interested.

21 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right. Ernie or Hugo,
22 did you come up with our final list, or do you want to

1 do that at the end of the meeting?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we whittled it down
3 to the 21 who we're continuing to mail them to, and
4 these were people who at least showed up at some time or
5 haven't told us that they've quit.

6 But, I guess, maybe the decision point is
7 whether we want to strictly enforce the meeting
8 attendance standards that we originally set up, in which
9 case we probably would, we would reduce that number by
10 eight or more.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think it's time to.

12 MS. SHIRLEY: I think so, too, because the
13 discontinuities are difficult to deal with.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any objections, discussion?

15 (No response.)

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, maybe by the interim
17 meeting, we will go over, again, the attendance for the
18 last six months and identify those people who were not
19 attending the majority of the time.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And you will contact them to
21 confirm that they have no further interest.

22 And if they have no further interest, that's

1 an easy message to give them, that we will be dropping
2 them from the RAB.

3 But you might want to remind these parties
4 when you call them that two consecutive absences,
5 without any indication, they are automatically dropped.
6 I think that's the way our procedures work.

7 Absent any -- I think it was November we put a
8 memo in the mail out, and that precipitated some
9 feedback, a timetable, to get on with things here.

10 So the next interim meeting is March 3rd.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Can I make a suggestion?

12 Having the community relations contract in
13 place reminded me of a suggestion I made earlier about
14 recruiting RAB members for all of the RABs.

15 Maybe by putting a table in a trade show or a
16 fair, just coordinating with other RABs to recruit
17 members.

18 We may not be able to do it this time, but I
19 know that there is always an ongoing need for RAB
20 members at other bases, and it would be nice if we could
21 coordinate the effort.

22 We could draw from a larger group and have

1 access to it.

2 MS. LUPTON: I didn't hear a word you said.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I was suggesting that the
4 Navy coordinate among the bases to recruit the RAB
5 members, so if we all do it at once in one drive rather
6 than piecemeal.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we wouldn't necessarily
8 be able to do that at this time, but it would be
9 something that the Navy might consider for future, to
10 basically build up a pool of RAB members.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Exactly.

12 There might be venues where we could set up a
13 table and introduce all of the faces at all of the RABs
14 and people who are interested in signing up more
15 information.

16 I just think it would be useful so each RAB
17 recruits on their own.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right. I'm still
19 checking my calendar. March 4 is the next interim
20 meeting.

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I screwed up the
22 dates. I must have been looking through the wrong

1 calendar.

2 The next interim community member meeting is
3 Tuesday, the 4th of March, and sometimes I manage to
4 mistake the date of the April meeting, too, which is the
5 tax date, the 15th of April.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dan has graciously
7 volunteered to help out on the new member committee.

8 Any others?

9 Tom?

10 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other volunteers?

12 Brad.

13 I certainly would be.

14 And Paul.

15 Richard.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: I would be happy to help, too.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right.

18 MR. MC DONALD: We will meet one night for
19 soda and pizza in my office.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That sounds pretty good.

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The back page, actually,
22 upcoming report schedule.

1 I had thought I was going to have a table of
2 documents of schedules tonight, but actually most of
3 them, especially now, since we've discussed the Remedial
4 Investigation report, is kind of subject to some change
5 now, but I still, I think we still need to rough out a
6 table of schedules, even if the dates aren't firmed up
7 yet.

8 So that's one thing we still need to do as an
9 action item, to provide an updated document schedule as
10 part of the meeting agenda for next, either in the
11 agenda or as a separate handout.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Could you explain this, the
13 air sampling, what we are supposed to do with this
14 (indicating)?

15 I don't know that other people have gotten
16 these reports. It's a space ecological risk assessment
17 quality plan, and there's an air sampling technical
18 memorandum.

19 I was asking Jim, are comments due on this?
20 What did he want the RAB to do?

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the technical
22 memorandum is normally not commented on. It's basically

1 a presentation, and the work plan has already been
2 filed.

3 MR. GALANG: Definitely, and that's the
4 results of the air sampling, and that's incorporated
5 into the RI.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The air sampling plan?

7 MR. GALANG: Yes, the draft RI report.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The air sampling.

9 MR. GALANG: Yes.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's part of the RI.

11 MR. GALANG: And then the other, it's a
12 supplement for the ecological work plan that we are
13 going to initiate before the end of the month, the
14 sampling.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it's a final work plan
16 for the offshore sediment sampling.

17 MR. GALANG: We decide on the plan, the
18 quality assurance plan.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So one of these is a
20 technical memorandum, which is basically providing
21 information, and the other one is a final work plan.

22 MR. GALANG: Yes.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So comment isn't required
2 on either one.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right. It would be
4 helpful if the cover memos said, "No Comments Required,"
5 rather than just, "For Your Information."

6 MR. GALANG: It's just for your information.
7 There is a document for the plan.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the suggestion is to
9 maybe even add in the phrase, "No Comments Are
10 Required." Maybe put it in bold.

11 MR. GALANG: So we put it in. We need your
12 comments by such and such a date. I can put that in.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It would be helpful.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. Proposed
15 agenda items for the next meeting.

16 I think we may have to spend some time at the
17 interim meeting rethinking our schedule for March or
18 April because of the other ongoing issues, so I'm not
19 sure that we want to settle that here tonight.

20 But we do have a pretty good list of potential
21 meeting topics for the next couple of months, and we
22 certainly want, you know, the community member input at

1 the interim meeting when we prepare the draft agendas.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Unless there is any
4 additional comment, I think we can bring the meeting to
5 a close.

6 If there is no further comment, thank you very
7 much. We have had a productive meeting on a variety of
8 topics.

9 So the next interim meeting is Tuesday the 4th
10 of March, and that will be in Building 1 on the second
11 floor.

12 And the base closure ceremony, I'm told, is
13 pretty well locked in on the 8th of May. We are trying
14 to get some VIPs, so, potentially, that date could
15 change a little bit.

16 But I think you could, if you wished to, plan
17 to attend. Pencil in the 8th of May for the base
18 closure ceremony. It will probably be in the evening
19 around 6:00 o'clock.

20 MR. HANSEN: The base closure, does that mean
21 the next day there will be no Naval personnel living on
22 the base?

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

Actually, it's a ceremony. The actual complete closure of the base as a Naval station won't be until 30 September.

We decided to have a ceremony in May while there was still people here to have a ceremony with.

(The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.)

---o0o---

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