

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

15 APRIL 1997

7:00 P.M.

ORIGINAL

CASA DE LA VISTA

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 32

---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

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- SHARON TOBIAS
- STACEY LUPTON
- RICHARD KNAPP
- REBECCA SUGERMAN

REGULATORY AGENCY:

- MARY ROSE CASSA (DTSC)
- GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)
- DAN MURPHY
- RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

- JAMES ALDRICH
- JOHN ALLMAN
- (ARC Ecology) CHRIS SHIRLEY

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

2 COMMUNITY MEMBERS (Continued):

3 RICHARD HANSEN

4 GARY JENSEN

5 CLINTON LOFTMAN

6 KAREN MENDELOW

7 PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)

8 HENRY ONGERTH

9 DALE SMITH

10 TI MUSEUM (LAURIE GLASS)

11 TI YACHT CLUB (HARLAN VAN WYE)

12 USHA VEDAGIRI

13 ALSO PRESENT:

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

15 SANDRA LUNCEFORD (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc.)

16 BARRY GUTIERREZ (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc.)

17 NICOLE PEIRCE (Uribe & Associates)

18 LYNNE SRINIVASAN (Uribe & Associates)

19 WINNIE ZHANG (Uribe & Associates)

20 STEPHEN BALBONI (Court Reporter)

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our April
2 meeting.

3 I guess there is probably some significance
4 as to why so many people are sitting on that side of
5 the room. And, actually, it's probably a fortunate
6 choice. This probably will be our last use of this
7 room. This building, the Casa de la Vista, is closing
8 at the end of the month. The Navy is closing it.

9 Next month, we expect to be back at the
10 Nimitz Center for one month.

11 MR. VAN WYE: Until the Nimitz Center
12 closes.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Until the Nimitz Center
14 closes at the end of May.

15 And then it's likely, at least through the
16 summer, we will be at the Bachelor's Quarters
17 Conference Room, which is next door to the Nimitz,
18 until it closes, and then we are still determining
19 what our future may be as far as locations after 1
20 October, because the Navy and the City haven't firmed

1 up plans yet for the use of the spaces after the 1st
2 of October.

3 MR. VAN WYE: I think I can volunteer the
4 club facilities.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, you mentioned that.
6 That was a good alternative that we have, if we need
7 it.

8 MR. VAN WYE: On top of which, there is a
9 bar.

10 Dale can tell you.

11 MR. ALLMAN: Do we sail during the meeting?

12 MR. VAN WYE: I sail through all these
13 meetings.

14 Seriously, we could use the club. And it's
15 our understanding that the club will remain as a
16 functioning entity throughout the transition.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we should then
18 officially note the offer from the TI Yacht Club, and
19 we may very well be taking you up on it.

20 MR. VAN WYE: You can take it as an official

1 offer, since I have now been appointed to the board of
2 directors.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Harlan.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And, also, I want to
5 mention, and before we get too far along, that the
6 base closure ceremony will be on Thursday, the 8th of
7 May. That's three weeks from this Thursday, at 6:30
8 p.m. Invitations will be going out. They haven't
9 gone out yet, but you will be getting them.

10 And we will also mention that at the interim
11 meeting in May, which is a couple of days before the
12 ceremony. So that will be the 8th of May, 6:30 p.m.
13 in front of Building 1, right across the street here.
14 That will be our formal closing ceremony.

15 In actuality, the Naval station will still
16 be here on the 9th of May, and we actually will
17 officially be closing on the 30th of September. But
18 we've reached the point where a lot of our operations
19 have ceased, and we are holding this as a ceremonial
20 note of the upcoming closure of the station.

1 MR. ALLMAN: Will we get another notice in
2 the mail about that?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. There should be an
4 official invitation. I know they haven't gone out
5 yet. I think they are going out later this week.

6 MS. SMITH: Is it appropriate that people
7 other than RAB members can attend?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think there was a
9 limitation on the number of people who could be
10 accommodated, so it's not a general, open to the
11 public ceremony.

12 MS. SMITH: It's not like the closure of the
13 Presidio.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think probably
15 for space reasons we are limited. So it's limited to
16 invitees, but everyone should be getting an invitation
17 within the next week or so.

18 Our first item, then, is the discussion and
19 approval of the agenda. There is additional copies of
20 the agenda on the side table.

1 One change that we would like to make is to
2 reverse the first two FOSL items and do the Reuse Zone
3 1 first followed by the 1400 series housing second,
4 and that will allow us to provide -- because the 1400
5 housing is actually in Reuse Zone 1, so we will be
6 able to provide an overview of the whole zone,
7 including background information on the 1400 housing,
8 and then follow that with the specific discussion of
9 the 1400 housing.

10 So unless there is any objections to that,
11 we will make that one change.

12 And if there is not any other discussion of
13 the agenda, we will proceed.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I do have a note on the
15 agenda, and that is that we are trying to start the
16 meetings at 7:00 and end at 9:30.

17 There has been some discussion at the
18 interim meeting of methods to try to keep the meeting
19 moving, be sensitive to everyone's comments, to be
20 sure that they are recorded.

1 One of the solutions that we came up with is
2 to ask one of the RAB members to be a timekeeper and
3 kind of help me moderate the discussion.

4 And if there is some discussion that needs
5 to be captured on index cards so it can be addressed
6 either in the meeting minutes or at another time
7 during the meeting, we would like to use that as an
8 alternative so that we can keep the agenda moving.

9 I would like -- I see some people nodding
10 their heads, and I'm certainly open to suggestions,
11 but I think we have a commitment here to get people
12 home at a reasonable hour, and also conduct our RAB
13 business.

14 Any questions or comments? We do have index
15 cards. I believe they are on the table, on the side.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we are using the
17 index cards. If time doesn't permit or you would like
18 to write your comments rather than speak it, you are
19 welcome to use the index cards and we will be able to
20 either address the index cards at the meeting, if

1 possible, or address them in another forum. But the
2 index cards are a good way to capture comments that
3 might not otherwise get into the meeting.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess I need a volunteer
5 for timekeeper, if I might rally one from the RAB?

6 MR. VAN WYE: I will be glad to help.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

8 MR. VAN WYE: I love to impose discipline on
9 my friends.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

11 MR. VAN WYE: I have the official watch here
12 (indicating).

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess we are all in
14 agreement, then, we will proceed with that method.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. The first item,
16 then, is the discussion and approval of the
17 February-March minutes.

18 We held the February minutes in abeyance
19 because Paul had a question concerning whether or not
20 a comment on the use of the facilitator had gotten

1 into the 18 February minutes.

2 I looked at both the transcript and the
3 meeting minutes, and there was kind of an extended
4 discussion during the organizational business about
5 how the Navy is providing administrative support to
6 the RAB. Paul had made a comment concerning a
7 facilitator, or he commented concerning the
8 facilitator.

9 That comment hadn't been captured in the
10 minutes. Although I don't have a revision of the
11 minutes now, I guess it's a question of whether or not
12 we want to include that as part of that extended
13 discussion.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is that captured in the
15 March meeting minutes? I didn't quite see that.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, I don't think so.

17 MR. ALLMAN: So what's your question? Do we
18 want them to be accurate?

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we want them to be
20 accurate minutes.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There was basically an
2 extended discussion on administrative support, and one
3 of the comments made was concerning a facilitator --

4 MS. SMITH: Could you move me to which page
5 on our minutes you are discussing this item?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, it's the 18
7 March minutes.

8 MS. SMITH: I understand.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Or 18 February minutes.
10 It would be on page 6 under RAB support contract, but
11 it's not there, and that was Paul's comment.

12 And so I went back to the transcript. There
13 was a comment concerning whether or not the Navy
14 should bring in a facilitator without discussion with
15 the RAB, and that didn't get into that page 6.

16 MS. SMITH: But it did come into the March
17 minutes, did it not? We had an extensive discussion
18 of that.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, actually, there is
20 discussion and approval of the January meeting

1 minutes, under which the February meeting minutes is
2 described.

3 Although the discussion isn't captured
4 verbatim, I think it is addressed in the March
5 minutes, and I would propose that we approve both
6 months' meeting minutes.

7 MR. ALLMAN: I have a couple of corrections
8 in March.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Relative to that item,
10 and then if there are any other comments or
11 corrections regarding the 18, the rest of the 18 March
12 minutes.

13 MR. ALLMAN: My comments are responsive to
14 March.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 MR. ALLMAN: Could we have a distinction put
17 in between Jennifer Smith and Dale Smith? There is
18 Ms. Smith's everywhere. If there are two people with
19 the same name at a meeting, I think they should be
20 distinguished.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's a good
2 point.

3 MR. ALLMAN: And the other is, on the first
4 page, RAB members in attendance included, and we have
5 a mixture of everybody here. So that's a minor thing.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry?

7 MR. ALLMAN: On the first page here
8 (indicating), we have a list. It says, "RAB members
9 in attendance included."

10 It would be more accurate to say, "people
11 here included," because there are -- only half of
12 these people are RAB members, and a couple of other
13 people.

14 For example, you're here, and Rachel is
15 here, and these other people.

16 MS. SMITH: Actually, that would echo
17 Dr. Kao's comments, which, for the BCT meeting, was
18 that he was not happy with the random assessment of
19 comments.

20 So it would be very, very good for you to

1 start identifying very closely who made comments and
2 whether or not there was discussion.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other comments,
4 John?

5 MR. ALLMAN: Well, those two, and I was just
6 reading. It says, RAB community members in
7 attendance. I guess we are all RAB members, but maybe
8 not. Maybe it's not important.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will note that to
10 make sure that we are distinguishing.

11 MS. SMITH: I think it's very important to
12 distinguish who's who.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Well, I mean, the problem here,
14 like the transcript so far doesn't get retained but
15 these do get retained.

16 And so if we don't retain both, the
17 information has to be accurate here or we have to have
18 the source, the original source retained.

19 For example, the problem with the February
20 minutes. We went back to the transcript and see that

1 this is correct.

2 But if Paul had not brought that up, then
3 you would have never even checked that, and that, in
4 so many years, would have been gone.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we are going to
6 continue to have the full transcript copy in the
7 repository, at least until we get to the ROD and
8 reassess the documents in the repository.

9 But at least from now until that point,
10 sometime in '98, we will continue to maintain the
11 monthly, not only meeting minutes, but the full
12 transcript. So it will be available as a resource if
13 anyone would like it.

14 MR. ALLMAN: And then one other comment.
15 It's on page 6 under "RAB." Second paragraph.

16 "Mr. Allman asked if the Navy may be called
17 back to clean up asbestos later. Mr. Sullivan stated
18 that when the material is still contained within the
19 structure it is not considered a release."

20 I'm trying to remember exactly how to phrase

1 the question, but in general, for example, if asbestos
2 tiles were discovered on the floor, will they then
3 have to be removed by the City, who owns it, or will
4 the Navy come back and say, "We missed these tiles."
5 This should have been removed in the first go-around
6 because they are not contained.

7 So that's sort of my general question that I
8 keep bringing up. If things are missed now, will the
9 Navy be liable to clean up later?

10 So I'm not sure. I could go back and look
11 how that is, but I think I was asking a general
12 question, for example, if asbestos is found in the
13 buildings, or whatever.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And that wasn't
15 accurately stated?

16 MR. ALLMAN: I'm not sure. I don't think it
17 was phrased the way I intended.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. For that item, we
19 will go back and look at the transcript.

20 MR. ALLMAN: All right.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I think the two
2 sentences there lack a bit of context. I think that's
3 what that's related to.

4 I just had one comment on the attendance
5 list. The sign-in sheet is appended to the back of
6 the minutes always. I don't know that it's necessary
7 to identify as part of the body of the minutes who was
8 in attendance, because it can be --

9 MR. ALLMAN: No, I misread this. So as far
10 as this list not being accurate, the list is accurate.

11 I was thinking community members. I
12 misconstrued the wording in my head.

13 I think of the regulators, BCT and the RAB
14 as the community people. But then I realized,
15 thinking about it, the whole thing is RAB.

16 But as far as the "Smiths," Ms. Smith, that,
17 I think, needs to be clear.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I agree.

19 I guess my point is, the attendance list is
20 appended to the back, so there is no reason in the

1 meeting minute format to identify in the body of the
2 minutes who attended. It can be made by reference.

3 MR. ALLMAN: Not even have this at all.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Not even have that at all.

5 I think this is the first time I've seen it,
6 and it's redundant.

7 MS. SMITH: Yes, and my problem was, I
8 didn't sign in last month, although I was here, and I
9 did make comments.

10 I was just wondering why this other
11 Ms. Smith was making comments.

12 But that's fine. She can make all my
13 comments for me.

14 MR. VAN WYE: She's your evil twin.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is there any more
16 discussion on the minutes?

17 It sounds like we have a few amendments to
18 make to the March minutes before they are approved.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So what I'm hearing is
20 that we are going to go ahead and approve the February

1 minutes, and then the March minutes will be approved
2 but with these amendments.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

4 MR. VAN WYE: Excellent. We are also 22
5 minutes behind schedule.

6 Shall we move on?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. The next item is
8 public comment, and if there are any members of the
9 public, we provide five minutes at the beginning of
10 the meeting for any comments by members of the general
11 public.

12 I don't see any members of the general
13 public, so unless anyone would like to comment, we
14 will close the public comment period.

15 MR. VAN WYE: Fabulous. We just bought four
16 minutes.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our next item, we will
18 move into the cleanup process, and we have a couple of
19 presentations.

20 Our first presentation will be on the zone,

1 Reuse Zone 1 FOSL. This document is going to be
2 issued in draft form within the next couple of days on
3 Friday, and so this will provide us with an overview
4 presentation, because the comment period for this
5 document will be closing sometime just a little bit
6 after the next meeting.

7 MS. SRINIVASAN: Hi, everyone. My name is
8 Lynne Srinivasan. I represent Uribe & Associates. We
9 are the team contracting with PRC and the Navy. We
10 have pieced together the site specific environmental
11 baseline survey for Reuse Zone 1 and associated FOSL
12 along with that.

13 Nicole Peirce and Winnie Zhang, who work
14 with me, are passing out copies of what I will present
15 to you along with the zone map.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And this is the famous
17 colored map that we talked about over the last two
18 meetings.

19 MS. SRINIVASAN: I think everyone had been
20 requesting IR sites and petroleum sites and things

1 labeled on the map, and they are all on there now.

2 So, hopefully, everyone will be able to find

3 everything they need.

4 One of the first things I wanted to do is
5 basically just highlight the reuse zones. We will go
6 through that in a minute.

7 After that, I would like to talk about the
8 definition of the environmental condition of property
9 categories. They changed a little bit from the
10 baseline EBS, not too much, but a little bit. Things
11 have been re-categorized. I will explain how that
12 happened.

13 And after that, we will go into discussion
14 of Reuse Zone 1 and how we split that up.

15 And, hopefully, I will talk fast and we will
16 get back on schedule.

17 Reuse Zone 1 is on the map in yellow. Most
18 of it is going to be slated for commercial and
19 recreational use, and we divided it into five subzones
20 primarily based on geography.

1 The Reuse Zone 2 is ultimately going to be
2 commercial. We divided that into three subzones.
3 That's green on your map. Again, that was divided
4 because of geography.

5 Reuse Zone 3 is purple, YBI housing.

6 And Reuse Zone 4 is blue, and that's the
7 Treasure Island housing.

8 You will probably be seeing these reports as
9 we progress, starting at the end of this week, and
10 then every month thereafter, you will see another one.

11 As you may recall, the baseline EBS, we had
12 BRAC area types 1 through 7.

13 Based on the 1997 Appropriations Act, they
14 were changed to environmental condition of property
15 area types.

16 Primarily what that did was, it put storage,
17 which was originally in category 2, into category 1.
18 And as long as things were stored, there was no
19 release. It could be classified as category 1.

20 Category 2 then became petroleum releases

1 only. So things got rearranged a little bit because
2 of that.

3 Category 3 pretty much stayed the same. It
4 means that we have detected something, but the things
5 that we have detected are below action levels.

6 Category 4 is similar to the BRAC
7 classification. All remedial action has been taken.

8 Category 5, there was no contamination, but
9 remedial action is underway.

10 Category 6, there was no contamination but
11 the remedial action has not yet started.

12 And category 7 requires further evaluation.

13 MS. SRINIVASAN: As we talked about before,
14 Reuse Zone 1 has been split up into subzones 1-A
15 through 1-E, and they are on the map.

16 1-A, we talked about first, is the really
17 big parcel.

18 1-B is above that. 1-C, 1-D and 1-E.

19 Reuse Zone 1-A is comprised of 13 parcels.

20 And they are listed here, but they are the big yellow

1 strips there at the bottom of the map.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Which does include this
3 building.

4 MS. SRINIVASAN: Which does include this
5 building with a lovely view.

6 ECP area types in Reuse Zone 1-A, type 1
7 parcels, are parcels 1, 30, 32, 33. Those parcels,
8 again, no release or disposal, and, therefore, they
9 are eligible for unrestricted lease.

10 ECP area type 2 parcels are parcels 31, 34,
11 and 35.

12 Parcel 31 formerly contained UST 227. It
13 has since been removed.

14 We believe that in order for this lease,
15 there will be no soil or groundwater exposure. It is
16 primarily paved underneath the ground. The
17 contamination is pretty deep underneath the ground.
18 We don't use water here at Treasure Island, as you
19 know. We don't expect any groundwater use or
20 exposure.

1 We did look at a potential health threat
2 from inhalation of any of the volatile organic
3 compounds, similar to what you guys saw for the police
4 academy FOSL.

5 We did not find any potential risk of
6 inhalation from volatile organic compounds.

7 We are going to have a lease restriction,
8 recommending a lease restriction that there will be no
9 invasive underground activities here.

10 Parcels 34 and 35, category 2, based on fuel
11 lines that are there. They are scheduled to be
12 removed this year, FY '97.

13 Again, we are going to have a lease
14 restriction there, so there is no invasive underground
15 activities, and we don't expect anyone who is using
16 the property to be exposed to anything that's there.

17 Area type 7 parcels, Reuse Zone 1-A, include
18 parcels 2, 3, 4, 28, 29 and 118.

19 Parcels 4 and 118 were originally
20 categorized as ECP 7, because of the potential

1 sediment contamination beneath the piers.

2 We don't anticipate that anyone is going to
3 be actually underneath the piers in the sediment.

4 However, we are going to have a lease
5 restriction that says there is no dredging in these
6 areas.

7 MR. VAN WYE: What is the basis for that
8 assumption that nobody is going to get down there and
9 muck around in the sediment?

10 MS. SRINIVASAN: Directly underneath the
11 pier? Partially, because we think it's dangerous.

12 MR. VAN WYE: Why?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think you have, I
14 mean, I understand what you're saying, but what we may
15 need to do is maybe clarify that a little more.

16 I think while it may, you know, possibly
17 someone may go over the side on their boat or
18 sometimes be in the water adjacent to the pier, we
19 wouldn't expect anyone on a regular basis to be
20 churning up the sediment.

1 MS. SRINIVASAN: Right.

2 And you will see it in the document, if you
3 want anything clarified that's not clarified in the
4 document.

5 MR. VAN WYE: I think, as you can tell by my
6 name tag, I'm particularly concerned about the pier
7 area there.

8 MS. SRINIVASAN: Right.

9 MR. VAN WYE: There is obviously the
10 possibility of routine maintenance.

11 And, in fact, the yacht club has submitted a
12 proposal to the City of San Francisco that we take
13 over the operation of the entire marina when the Navy
14 leaves.

15 We have identified approximately \$249,000
16 worth of deferred maintenance, some of which is really
17 fairly crucial on what needs to be done. And so that
18 in undertaking the deferred maintenance, I suspect
19 that there might be some underwater activity.

20 So there seems to be an implicit assumption

1 that there isn't going to be any, and I don't know
2 that that's consistent with the facts.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think, and I
4 understand what you're saying, and I think what my
5 initial response to that would be is that the initial
6 focus of this FOSL was to allow the continued use of
7 the marina in its existing provision, strictly on a
8 lease basis, you know, and if the City or a lessee
9 proposes to make changes to the marina, we would have
10 to evaluate that at the time.

11 We haven't finished the characterization of
12 this area yet, too, so that's part of it.

13 This may be a case where we may end up going
14 through more than one FOSL phase. This is the initial
15 FOSL to continue the operation. There may need to be
16 another FOSL later on that evaluates the specific
17 proposal for construction in the area.

18 MR. VAN WYE: Let me indicate I'm very, very
19 happy with the idea of a FOSL that's going to allow
20 continued operation, because there is hundreds and

1 hundreds of people that are affected by this directly,
2 and many thousands that are indirectly affected.

3 I don't think that there is going to be any
4 substantial subsurface work at this point, but
5 something that would absolutely preclude any emergency
6 repairs to subsurface areas using, obviously,
7 appropriate environmental safeguards would perhaps be
8 counterproductive.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Well, the general pathways, for
10 example, for soils, breathing in the dust and all of
11 that, and I would agree that for the marine sediments,
12 if you're down there in scuba gear, and you're working
13 underwater, you're not going to be ingesting any
14 sediments.

15 But it's a little bit different, I think,
16 than the situation you are talking about, an exposure
17 level on the ground.

18 MR. VAN WYE: I think that's true. I just
19 wanted to get it out clearly at this point.

20 MR. ALLMAN: When you talk about

1 maintenance, do you mean maintenance on the piers
2 themselves?

3 MR. VAN WYE: Well, who knows what's going
4 to have to be done?

5 MR. ALLMAN: Because that may be something
6 else that you can throw in here as far as with
7 dredging or no dredging or removal of a certain amount
8 of dirt.

9 MR. VAN WYE: There is no contemplation, in
10 terms of the maintenance that's needed now, to keep
11 the marina in a safe operating condition.

12 There is no indication that I have had, as
13 somebody who has followed this pretty closely, that
14 there is going to be any dredging contemplated.

15 But I can anticipate that an individual
16 piling might have to be replaced, and the replacement
17 of an individual piling which is somewhat similar to a
18 big telephone pole that goes down and is anchored in
19 the water, there might be some disturbance, albeit
20 minimal.

1 I just want to make sure that we undertake
2 this, and let me just say, I'm very positive about a
3 FOSL that says, "Let's go for it," because there is a
4 lot of people that are looking to go through this
5 fairly quickly.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we can take that
7 as a comment.

8 MR. VAN WYE: A comment.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And at least look at the
10 issue of minor maintenance.

11 MR. VAN WYE: Yes. I think that's a good
12 way to summarize it, Jim.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right.

14 MS. SRINIVASAN: Parcels 2, 28 and 29 have
15 been categorized as ECP 7, based on potential
16 contamination with storm drain lines.

17 Those lines were cleaned in FY '96.

18 Soil sampling which was collected in
19 February, the results are not yet in. Hopefully, they
20 will be in for the next version of the FOSL. They

1 will be in there when we get your comments back.

2 For now, there is going to be, again, a
3 lease restriction on invasive underground activity.
4 So we don't really expect anyone to be exposed to
5 soils underneath, directly underneath the storm drain
6 line, which is where the storm sampling took place.

7 There were former USTs on parcel 2 with
8 potential contaminant migration on parcel 3.

9 There was a whole chain of USTs, A through
10 F, USTs 1-A and 1-E, in particular, that they found
11 contamination beneath those USTs, and the USTs have
12 been removed.

13 Again, the contamination is deep. There is
14 going to be no surface exposure whatsoever.

15 Again, no groundwater exposure at all.

16 We did look at inhalation of VOCs, similar
17 to how we did with the police academy. We found that
18 there was no threat when we compared.

19 And, also, we are going to have a lease
20 restriction again. No underground activity there,

1 either.

2 Reuse Zone 1-B is comprised of seven
3 parcels.

4 The one parcel in Reuse Zone 1-B that's
5 categorized as ECP area 1 is parcel 63. Again, that
6 is then eligible for unrestricted use.

7 ECP area type 2 parcels are parcels 52, 53
8 and 54, and as we discussed previously for Reuse Zone
9 1-A, those are categories in areas because of
10 underground fuel lines. Those fuel lines are
11 scheduled to be removed in '97, and, again, there will
12 be a lease restriction.

13 One ECP area type 6 parcel is parcel 56. We
14 are just a portion of parcel 56 that's co-located on
15 IR Site 24.

16 We are going to be leasing buildings 96, 99
17 and 260. Those buildings are going to be used for, I
18 believe, warehouses by Muni. They are completely
19 surrounded by asphalt and concrete, so there will be
20 no soil exposure whatsoever. Again, groundwater is

1 not used.

2 We did do a simple box model similar to the
3 police academy. You will see that. We found that
4 there was no potential risk of inhalation of VOCs,
5 and, again, no underground activity there.

6 Parcels 59 and 60 were categorized as ECP
7 area type 7 for two reasons: For potential
8 contamination beneath the storm drain lines, and,
9 again, as we talked about before, they were cleaned in
10 '96. We just took some samples there. We'll have
11 data when we get them, and, again, there is a lease
12 restriction.

13 The second reason those two parcels were
14 categorized in parcel 7 was from potential contaminant
15 migration from IR Site 24.

16 Again, there is no soil exposure or
17 groundwater exposure. Paved.

18 There is no threat of inhalation of VOCs.

19 However, we do think that there might be a
20 potential effect from these areas when the remediation

1 activities actually do start, which won't be for a
2 while, but because of all the construction and
3 everything, we expect that will be destructive to
4 whoever was in the building.

5 We're going to have a lease restriction
6 based on underground activity, and we were going to
7 make the leases relatively short, so that when we do
8 start construction, nobody will be there.

9 Reuse Zone 1-C is comprised of one parcel,
10 parcel T-27. It's classified as ECP area type 1, and
11 it's eligible for unrestricted lease.

12 Reuse Zone 1-D, parcels 94 and 98, also ECP
13 area type 1, and eligible for unrestricted lease.

14 Reuse Zone 1-E is comprised of one parcel,
15 parcel 73. Parcel 73 has been classified as ECP area
16 type 7. Primarily due to the potential migration from
17 IR Site 22.

18 Again, this area is paved. There will be no
19 soil exposure. Groundwater isn't used.

20 We did look again at the box model for the

1 threat of volatile inhalation exposure. There won't
2 be any.

3 Again, there is going to be a remediation at
4 IR Site 22, I believe, within approximately 18 months.
5 So that will have to be a short-term lease as well,
6 because we think there will be construction activity
7 effects from people that are leasing the building.

8 We are going to require that there is no
9 invasive underground activity there either.

10 And that's all the reuse zones.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any questions or
12 comments?

13 John?

14 MR. ALLMAN: With the UST testing that we
15 did, if I recall from the police academy, when the
16 soil was sampled, it was basically done in the field
17 at the site, if I remember right.

18 I remember VOCs were tested by putting them
19 in a Ziploc bag and putting them on a dashboard to
20 warm up, and then punching a hole and measuring.

1 MS. TOBIAS: That was a discussion we had at
2 an interim RAB meeting, and that is not how we conduct
3 our sampling.

4 MR. ALLMAN: This was some sampling that was
5 done. It was at a general meeting that this was
6 brought up, I think.

7 MS. TOBIAS: No, it was at an interim
8 meeting where we discussed the work done on Sites 12
9 and 17.

10 This is actually a flux chamber sampling
11 that we collected in, I guess, August. So we actually
12 conducted the sample before we had the meeting.

13 What we did was, in the technical
14 memorandum, we explained the sampling methodology that
15 we did.

16 We were trying to determine if the emissions
17 were coming from the soil or groundwater into the flux
18 chamber, or off the soil to determine emission rates,
19 and determine, if there was any, what the constitution
20 would be of outdoor air.

1 So that's the sample that we conducted.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So this work was really
3 done, this air monitoring work was really done as part
4 of IR Site 6, and we used that data.

5 MS. TOBIAS: And 22 and 24.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And 22 and 24.

7 MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So this was used as
9 part, we were already conducting this sampling as part
10 of the air sampling as part of the IR program. And so
11 we used the data, since it was available, for the
12 police academy FOSL.

13 MR. ALLMAN: All right.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: A clarification here.

15 We have an upcoming document scheduled that
16 identifies April 18th as the date the draft Zone 1
17 FOSL will be released.

18 Will the draft Zone 1 FOSL contain the
19 analytical data on which these recommendations were
20 based, and include the data that was collected in

1 February that was reported would be available sometime
2 in the future?

3 MS. SRINIVASAN: It has the data in it that
4 we use for our calculations, yes, for the Site 24 flux
5 chamber, and how we calculated the model and
6 everything else.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's my understanding that
8 this is just a presentation for our information on the
9 Zone 1 FOSL, that we will have an opportunity to fully
10 review the document and the data.

11 MS. SRINIVASAN: Correct.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right. The document
13 will be out later this week, and then we will have an
14 opportunity to discuss it at the interim meeting, and,
15 if necessary, at the next meeting, though at the May
16 meeting, we will also have the preview for the Zone 2
17 FOSL. So we may have overlap for the next couple of
18 months.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And will the data that was
20 generated as part of the UST program, which the RAB

1 has not been privy to up to this point, also be
2 included in the FOSL document?

3 MS. SRINIVASAN: What we always had to write
4 the FOSL document, yes.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And that will include the
6 UST data.

7 MS. SRINIVASAN: Yes.

8 We reference everything we do, site, certain
9 concentration, yes.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: For the record, we have,
11 as a Restoration Advisory Board, not been able to
12 review any of the data that's been generated as part
13 of the UST program.

14 MR. ALLMAN: A question related to details
15 here.

16 The fuel line schedule in fiscal year '97,
17 the funding came through? It might be '96 that I'm
18 thinking of.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Originally, we tried to
20 work the fuel line removal in '96, but didn't obtain

1 funding, and we have funding now.

2 And, in fact, we were negotiating the
3 contract and are hoping to award it soon.

4 But we fully intend to award the fuel line
5 removal in '97, although, when we get into the future
6 discussion of that, the caveat is, we are removing the
7 major fuel lines. There is some small diameter fuel
8 lines that we are investigating this year, and we may
9 either be removing those this year or next year.

10 But the bulk of the fuel lines will be
11 removed or closed in place. The contract will start
12 this year.

13 MR. ALLMAN: And does the removal budget
14 include testing the site afterwards to see if any
15 further fuel has migrated in preferential pathways in
16 the area where it's located?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, the project
18 includes quite an extensive sampling program, and
19 depending on the distance that there may have been any
20 migration from, you know, perpendicular from the fuel

1 line, we may be able to remove it all with the fuel
2 line removal.

3 But we will identify areas where it might
4 have expanded beyond the width of the excavation, and
5 if we are not able to get it during the fuel line
6 removal, that area will be flagged for future
7 investigation.

8 MR. ALLMAN: And if you find that new fuel
9 line has migrated to the site when you actually remove
10 the piping, are you going to go back to the area and
11 have the smaller diameter piping, to make sure that if
12 you leave it in place, you still have a pathway
13 existing, will you have to check to see that nothing
14 has migrated into there at the same time to see if it
15 should be removed, and can the abandoned ones, then, a
16 decision will be made to remove those because they are
17 allowing fuel to migrate?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, all the fuel
19 lines on Treasure Island are being removed, and most
20 of the fuel lines on Yerba Buena Island are being

1 closed in place because they are in good condition.

2 There is a small section of fuel line on
3 Yerba Buena that's being removed, but there is pretty
4 much a distinction between areas where it's being
5 fully removed on TI, and where it's being
6 predominantly closed -- cleaned, capped and closed in
7 place on Yerba Buena Island.

8 MR. ALLMAN: My concern is not a pathway
9 through the inside of the pipe, but through the outer
10 wall of the pipe.

11 If there is anything there that the fuel can
12 move along easily through the soil.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the areas that the
14 fuel lines are in on Yerba Buena are pretty much
15 nonindustrial fuel lines. I mean, it was there in
16 part to serve the housing area, so it's not a lot of,
17 there is not really much investigative activity in the
18 areas of the fuel lines that are being closed in
19 place.

20 On TI, where the fuel lines cross into many

1 areas of investigation, the fuel lines are being
2 completely removed.

3 MR. ALLMAN: And is there going to be a work
4 plan for that coming out, which are removed and which
5 are closed in place?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We had a presentation,
7 this is getting to be over a year ago now, and we did
8 have a presentation on the fuel line program.

9 The contract is already written, but there
10 will be reports generated out of the removal that
11 we'll be able to share.

12 MR. ALLMAN: Well, I mean in the
13 presentation, we see a map with lots of dotted lines
14 around the island, but it's a little different than
15 having something that you look at, this section is
16 going to stay, and this section is going to go, so we
17 can compare it to the hot spots where cleanup was
18 done.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, on Treasure
20 Island, it's all being removed, a hundred percent.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Question? Dale.

2 MS. SMITH: Yes.

3 I'm not happy with your statement that
4 something was done a year ago, or two years ago,
5 because I'm trying to look at these documents that are
6 three or four years ago to find the FOSL is accurate.
7 I'm getting documentation that I go through the EBS
8 that says: Lead abatement has not been tested.
9 Asbestos has not been tested. These documents are
10 forthcoming.

11 We have never gotten those documents. So
12 I'm working on FOSLs and going back to the EBS, and I
13 have, I don't have full documentation.

14 So I think the process changes. I don't
15 think it's fair for you to tell John that you did this
16 a year ago and that was done and gone with, because in
17 my experience, it's not done and gone with, and you
18 change the process.

19 My other concern is, Yerba Buena is a more
20 natural facility, and we have gotten, and this is

1 going to be a major complaint that you will hear from
2 me, my yapping constantly, you don't do research on
3 that island which is more sensitive, naturally, than
4 Treasure Island is.

5 And you're going to close pipelines in
6 place, and you're going to close underground storage
7 tanks in place, and you're going to close sewage lines
8 in place, and you're just going to plug that place up.
9 That's a natural island, and that's inappropriate
10 behavior on the part of the Navy, I think.

11 But I have never been able to get any kind
12 of response from the Navy, or PRC, as to whether or
13 not you really consider Yerba Buena to be a
14 significant portion of your operation, because it's a
15 historic operation. It is not your major operation.

16 So those are my two major kvetches on this
17 conversation.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think a kind of
19 a general response to both Dale and John is that,
20 there is a number of programs that feed into the FOSLs

1 and eventually the FOST.

2 The IR program, in general, we spent a lot
3 of time on it. The UST and fuel line program, we
4 haven't spent as much time on.

5 But I will be, in fact, I will be passing
6 out the UST and fuel line documents later during this
7 meeting.

8 But in the end, regardless of the amount of
9 time that we may have spent in the past, it all comes
10 out in the FOSL.

11 So, I mean, the FOSL needs to fully support
12 the action. If you have any comments concerning the
13 adequacy of the information in the FOSL, I mean,
14 that's, you know, the FOSL, is the opportunity. There
15 is still a window of opportunity in the FOSL, and even
16 the FOST, to make any sort of comment.

17 Basically, the FOSL and FOST is fair game
18 for any comment concerning any part of the
19 environmental program to feed into it.

20 So I don't want anyone to feel slighted that

1 we may not have, for whatever reason, have not covered
2 one subject or another in the past.

3 But if you don't feel it's adequately
4 commented on or adequately evaluated in the FOSL,
5 please make that your comment, and we will address
6 that in the FOSL.

7 And even if you end up not being fully
8 satisfied with the FOSL, all of this property that's
9 FOSL'd is still going to have to come to a finding of
10 suitability to transfer.

11 So that's the final opportunity to make any
12 comment whatsoever concerning whether you feel that
13 property is adequate for transfer.

14 MS. SMITH: I think this goes back to the
15 issue that Pat raised a few months ago, how seriously
16 are you taking our comments? We have been arguing, I
17 think, very politely about the fact that we are not
18 certain that, you keep saying we are just an advisory
19 board, and you're not going to take our comments -- I
20 consider them -- seriously.

1 Pat has been saying this over and over
2 again, so you tell me now to make comments, but you
3 tell her we are not, our comments are not going to be
4 taken seriously.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. I mean, we take
6 all, I mean, we take in all of the RAB comments.

7 In fact, many of the comments are reflected
8 in our documents, but we don't always, we may not
9 always agree with the community members. Many times
10 we do, sometimes we don't, and that's really the
11 distinction between an advisory board and a board that
12 has regulatory authority.

13 We hope that we can address as many comments
14 as we can. However, there may be times, and there has
15 been in the past and there will probably be in the
16 future, where we have to agree to disagree.

17 But, in general, I think we have been able
18 to, you know, address, in my opinion, which might not
19 be shared by everybody, we have been able to address
20 many community member comments, and we hope to be able

1 to continue to do that.

2 MR. ALLMAN: Personally, I feel that the
3 direction we have been going the past couple of months
4 with review of the comments, I'm happy with how that's
5 going. I think we will get a feeling that they are
6 taken more seriously because we are getting responses
7 back.

8 My concern is more in terms of, if we have a
9 presentation on the fuel lines, that's not really a
10 period to comment on what's going to be reviewed and
11 what's going to stay. We're basically told: This is
12 what we're going to do.

13 To me, that's different. If the FOSL is
14 going to state that these sections of pipeline, these
15 are the sections that are going to be removed, and
16 this is the sampling that will be done on those
17 sites -- which doesn't even seem to be part of the
18 FOSL, because you're saying that when the FOSL comes
19 out that's going to give us the details that I'm
20 asking about, and I don't think that's really what's

1 going to happen.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. I think when the, I
3 guess my general comment is, the FOSL is put together
4 for the purpose of determining whether this property
5 is suitable for use in the limited manner that this is
6 in the lease as opposed to ownership.

7 We are asking for your comment as to whether
8 or not you think that we have addressed it adequately.
9 If you feel that there is an issue, say, a UST air
10 issue that hasn't been adequately addressed in the
11 draft FOSL, please make that comment. We will respond
12 to it.

13 And then further on down the road, in fact,
14 there may be another FOSL, as there might be at the
15 marina on the same property. But, ultimately, it will
16 come to a finding of suitability to transfer, and
17 that's still another comment period.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Let's take one more
19 comment and invite our RAB members to summarize any
20 others they may have on index cards so that we can

1 address them at another time.

2 Karen?

3 MS. MENDELOW: I have mine on the card, if
4 you want to go on.

5 But I'm curious, so do you want to go on?

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Go on with your question.

7 MS. MENDELOW: Yes. I have a question.

8 There is a Site 22, the last thing that was
9 mentioned in the presentation of the UST site, and it
10 says: Potential effect from remedial activity.

11 I just wondered, is there not different
12 kinds of options for remedial activity, or is there
13 something that's already been decided and I don't
14 know?

15 If they say, "potential effect from remedial
16 activity," maybe should there be something that says,
17 these are the potential types of remedial activities
18 that might happen, and these were kind of what the
19 effects could be?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, I understand what

1 you're saying.

2 What we are trying to deal with is the
3 potential that a piece of property might be leased,
4 but, then, one to three years later, we may be
5 conducting a soil removal action next door, and that
6 soil removal action may be part of the IR program, or
7 it might be part of the UST Corrective Action Program.

8 Right now, we may not have a specific
9 remedy, since we haven't reached the feasibility
10 stage, or the Corrective Action Plan.

11 So what we are trying to do is address the
12 fact rather than, what we don't want to have happen is
13 for the city or its sublessees to move into a building
14 and think that, you know, they are going to be there
15 for the long term, and then a couple of years later,
16 the bulldozers start up next door and there is not
17 only issues of dust and noise, but even maybe
18 potential impact.

19 And so we want to flag those sites where
20 remedial activity is going on, even though at this

1 stage right now, in Zone 1, we don't have a lot of
2 specifics about what that remedial activity might be.

3 But we want to flag those sites as sites
4 where we feel they should only be leased for short
5 term so that a lessee doesn't come in and make
6 improvements to the property and expect to be there
7 long term and then be surprised a couple of years
8 later.

9 So there may be lessees who may be suitable
10 to be in a space for a few years and then be moved
11 out.

12 MS. MENDELOW: So that would be played out
13 in a longer explanation in the actual FOSL, okay.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For those sites, and I
15 don't think it may come into play very much in these
16 initial zone FOSLs, at least not in Zone 1, but where
17 we do have a specific remedial activity planned, we
18 will be able to note that and, more specifically,
19 address the potential impacts.

20 But right now, we are still too early in the

1 remedial planning stage.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Can I say something?

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Sharon, you have the
4 floor.

5 MS. TOBIAS: I wanted to respond to Dale's
6 comments a bit about Yerba Buena Island.

7 It's my understanding that what the Navy
8 chose to do for the fuel lines on Yerba Buena Island
9 was to abandon the majority of them in place. There
10 is about 1,000 feet that they will remove because it's
11 covered with asbestos, so that piping will be removed.

12 But the fuel lines they are leaving in place
13 is because the fuel line, the majority of it is
14 enclosed in like a concrete vault along up near the
15 housing area.

16 If they went out and removed the actual fuel
17 line, there were other issues to take into
18 consideration, like habitat, and they were worried
19 about the cliff. There wasn't room to actually
20 conduct work to remove the fuel line.

1 MS. SMITH: Are they going to pump the lines
2 dry?

3 MS. TOBIAS: Well, they will pretty much
4 clean them out and grout them, so it will never be
5 able to be used as a conduit.

6 MS. SMITH: For example, in Castillo
7 (phonetic), they pumped almost 10,000 gallons of fuel
8 out of lines. Now, it's a bigger area, but, still,
9 there is fuel that lies within lines, and you don't
10 call it -- it's not historic. What is it called,
11 antiquated fuel, what's the term?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Weathered.

13 MS. SMITH: Weathered.

14 It's not called weathered fuel. It lies in
15 the lines. What are you doing about the fuel lines?
16 None of the documentation discusses the fuel.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Dale, let me just
18 briefly say that we were treating the fuel line the
19 same as we would treat an underground storage tank
20 closed in place, and that involves the cleaning of the

1 line so that there is no fuel residue left in the line
2 and the capping of the line.

3 So we are applying the same process used to
4 close a UST.

5 And Sharon brought up a good point
6 concerning the locations of the lines, and some of
7 these are in very difficult terrain, and we have to do
8 potential excavation with potential damage to the
9 existing contours of the island in order to remove
10 these lines. So that definitely got played into it.

11 But even if the terrain is difficult, that
12 still doesn't preclude us from being able to clean
13 those lines out, so that all that should be left is an
14 empty tube.

15 MS. SMITH: You're not going to fill it?

16 MS. TOBIAS: They will fill it. Grout it.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Could I ask a very quick
18 question?

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: No. We are off schedule,
20 Please, use your index card.

1 I will exercise my authority, and I think
2 it's time to move on to the next agenda item, which is
3 the finding of suitability to license 104 units of the
4 1400 series housing.

5 MS. SUGERMAN: I'm handing out copies of the
6 slides I will be showing you.

7 A draft of this document is already ready.
8 A couple of people in the RAB have received copies.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We sent a copy out to
10 seven people, people whoever usually comment on
11 documents.

12 But if anyone, if you haven't received a
13 copy of the 1400 housing now, we didn't send one to
14 you.

15 But if you would like one, I have three or
16 four of them here. I could give one to you tonight,
17 or Pat will send a copy to you after the meeting.

18 MS. SUGERMAN: Jim mentioned earlier the
19 1400 series housing is part of Reuse Zone 1. It's
20 actually part of Reuse Zone 4, which is the blue area

1 (indicating).

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry.

3 MS. SUGERMAN: And in Reuse Zone 4, you
4 won't be seeing a site specific environmental baseline
5 survey or FOSL in this entire area until the summer.

6 This is one parcel, parcel 299, which you
7 should see on your maps, too, which we are doing a
8 little bit earlier than the Zone 4 stuff, because the
9 city is interested in using the housing for use by the
10 people who are transient.

11 There is 18 units on the site. They were
12 constructed in 1989, and, like I said, there is plans
13 to lease to the city.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So there is 18
15 structures with six units, six two-bedroom units per
16 structure, so that's a total of 104 individual
17 apartments.

18 MS. SUGERMAN: It's an ECP area type 7,
19 which Lynne went through earlier what a type 7 is,
20 requires further evaluation.

1 The reason for that categorization right
2 here is because it's next door to IR Site 20, and
3 that's specifically because it's close by, and also
4 because there are storm drains on the parcel.

5 The auto hobby shop next door, you probably
6 have seen some documentation on this previously. It's
7 primarily groundwater contamination. Groundwater is
8 restricted in the lease, so we are not expecting
9 groundwater contamination to impact the parcel 299 at
10 all.

11 The groundwater flow is away from the
12 parcel. It's west towards San Francisco Bay. It's
13 mostly paved. It's surrounded by a brick wall fencing
14 and a locking gate.

15 So we are not expecting, there is no access
16 to Site 20 regardless of the groundwater
17 contamination. We are not expecting Site 20 to impact
18 this area at all.

19 You might notice on the map, there is
20 another adjacent IR site. IR Site 12 is located next

1 door.

2 The IR sites on your map, the boundaries
3 that are shown in red. So the blue area, don't be
4 distracted by the blue area thinking that's the IR
5 site. That's the reuse zone, and the IR site is a
6 little bit within that reuse zone.

7 It covers a little bit of T100, which is
8 next door this way, about half of that, and T101 sort
9 of catty-corner to it -- kitty-corner?

10 The majority of contamination at Site 12 is
11 over 1,000 feet away. The hot spots are down in this
12 area (indicating).

13 IR Site 12 is not expected to impact the
14 lease area in any way.

15 Lease restrictions for this FOSL: Use of
16 groundwater is prohibited. Subsurface intrusion will
17 be prohibited. And other standard lease restrictions
18 regarding operations.

19 That's the end of my presentation.

20 I have already received comments on this.

1 They are actually due Thursday -- is that right --
2 from the RAB?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If we end up in the
4 grid, the reason for the schedule, well, let's address
5 the comments, and then I will close with a brief
6 discussion of the schedule, if we want to make any
7 changes to it.

8 MS. SUGERMAN: I just wanted to quickly say
9 that agency comments were due Monday. I have received
10 a couple of the comments, one from the DTSC
11 representative.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard?

13 MR. HANSEN: You say it has a locking gate,
14 which means you can lock it.

15 Is the gate locked permanently, and are
16 there signs that say, "do not enter"?

17 I'm thinking that if we rent these houses
18 out there will probably be kids.

19 MS. SUGERMAN: Currently -- is this
20 correct -- is the auto hobby shop still operational?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The auto hobby
2 shop is operational, but it has a staff. So it
3 wouldn't be used as a playground.

4 It will probably be closing within about
5 the next two months, and then it will remain a locked
6 compound until we conduct further cleanup on the site.

7 MR. HANSEN: Are there signs that say, "do
8 not enter"?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, basically, it's a
10 locked fenced-in area.

11 MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Dale?

13 MS. SMITH: That was also my concern, if
14 you're renting this out as a rental area or even a
15 leasing area. I went back and looked through the
16 draft EBS, which is not complete and is inconclusive,
17 and there was lead, arsenic, mercury, a whole bunch of
18 heavy-duty metals that were in IR 20.

19 Are you planning to sign that wall that
20 says, "do not trespass, toxic area"? You have to do

1 it if you're renting it out as residential housing, in
2 my book.

3 You cannot just allow kids to -- and
4 parents. Parents won't know that this is a problem
5 area.

6 The other thing that I had concern about is
7 that building 414 had transformers in it. You tested
8 them in '94 for PCBs. You haven't tested them since.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, for PCBs, the
10 presumption would be that we have tested them and
11 determined whether the transformer fluid contains
12 PCBs.

13 If it doesn't --

14 MS. SMITH: It did. It did.

15 So are you going to test them again?

16 MR. ALLMAN: Why test them again if you
17 know?

18 MS. SMITH: Well, because they say it's not
19 a problem and it's by a residential area. This is in
20 the residential area, actually. There is a building

1 in the residential area that had PCBs in the past.

2 MR. ALLMAN: So you're saying that they
3 should be checking the grounds to see if anything else
4 has leaked?

5 MS. SMITH: Well, I don't know. Is this
6 going to be rented out to people without ever double
7 checking since '94?

8 In '94, they didn't know what they were
9 going to do with the property. In '94, they owned the
10 property. Now they are going to use it for housing.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I understand what
12 you're saying. I think it's a valid comment. If
13 there is a transformer containing PCB liquid, we
14 should at least inspect it and make sure that it's not
15 in a leaking condition.

16 MS. SMITH: Or if it is, or if it's not,
17 have signs up.

18 And then Building 162 had a sump in it, and
19 this is not so much for leasing, but I have found
20 historically that sumps are rather bad places. They

1 are like deep grottos with monsters in them.

2 I believe, not so much for a FOSL, but for a
3 FOST, you are going to have to admit to the fact that
4 you have a sump, and you didn't clean it up for four
5 years, are you going to have to admit to the fact?

6 MS. SUGERMAN: Can I ask you a quick
7 question: Are you talking about IR Site 20 for those
8 two items?

9 MS. SMITH: No. I'm talking about the
10 release site.

11 MS. SUGERMAN: Okay.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Zone 1, or Reuse
13 Zone 1.

14 MS. SMITH: 1-D.

15 When I went back through the EBS, it said
16 that Building 162 had a sump in it.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You're talking about the
18 building.

19 Just for clarification, the building that
20 was formerly on the property before the housing was

1 built.

2 MS. SMITH: Right.

3 The building is gone. The sump isn't. At
4 least according to the EBS.

5 But I only have the draft, and it's two
6 years old. I don't know if you checked the sump. You
7 have a sump there.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I think it's a
9 valid point, and we need to clarify the sump.

10 MS. SMITH: That's not so much for a FOSL.

11 But, I mean, if you're going to transfer and
12 you have a sump, I've always found those things to be
13 creepy crawly.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: This is a FOSL, and I
15 guess the larger question on the floor is whether or
16 not disclosures and signing will occur related to
17 areas where concentrations of hazardous substances
18 have been observed as a result of some testing,
19 environmental testing in the past?

20 Is that the broad concern here?

1 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: With the concern of IR 20
3 and Building 162 and the transformer?

4 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Having read the FOSL
6 myself, there is no environmental data.

7 There is reference to February testing. We
8 don't know when the February testing results will come
9 back.

10 We don't know whether or not it will be
11 included in the FOSL, although we presume that it will
12 be.

13 But I guess what I'm hearing is that the RAB
14 has concerns that environmental data is disclosed.
15 Those areas that are storage or other areas where
16 hazardous substances have occurred are appropriately
17 signed, and that disclosures are made probably to all
18 tenants of the 104 units to be leased.

19 We have two. Usha and then Chris.

20 MS. VEDAGIRI: I can write my comments out.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I was trying to summarize.
2 Let's have these two comments.

3 MS. VEDAGIRI: Okay. For Site 20, where it
4 says the primary contaminants, are there any VOCs
5 included in Site 20?

6 MS. TOBIAS: Off the top of my head, I don't
7 think so.

8 MS. SUGERMAN: The petroleum program.

9 MS. TOBIAS: If it's VOCs, it's petroleum
10 related.

11 MS. VEDAGIRI: The reason I'm asking, there
12 is a reference here to a risk assessment here for Site
13 12, which is the other adjacent site, and you're
14 extrapolating from the results of that risk assessment
15 to the fact that you don't expect any problems for
16 this parcel.

17 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

18 MS. VEDAGIRI: For Site 20, which is right
19 next door, if there is no reference to risk assessment
20 having been done in Site 20, I don't see how you

1 address the inhalation issue for the parcel, because
2 if you have VOCs right next door, and this is the
3 closest residential receptor, and it's just across the
4 IR site.

5 There may not be a problem there, but it
6 doesn't say, when you say the pet hydros were the
7 primary contaminants at Site 20, it doesn't say if
8 VOCs are there or not.

9 If they are, then you haven't shown that
10 inhalation will not be a problem in the housing.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: You don't have to respond
12 to that right now, Sharon.

13 MS. TOBIAS: Thank you.

14 I understand your point. Thank you.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And Chris?

16 MS. SHIRLEY: There is additional sampling
17 being done on Site 12.

18 Where is that in relation to these housing
19 units?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It would not be on the

1 site itself, because these housing units themselves
2 are outside of IR Site 12.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: Where is it in relation to
4 that parcel?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You will see that --
6 well, the work plan will be out about the end of the
7 month, but I think probably within a block.

8 There is probably at least some sampling
9 sites within a block of the housing, but we are not
10 proposing to sample in this parcel.

11 We don't have any reason to believe that
12 there has been any migration beyond the current
13 boundaries of Site 12.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I think if there is
15 going to be testing within a stone's throw of the
16 leased units, there would be some disclosure to the
17 tenants of those units, which, I guess, would be
18 another item for the disclosure.

19 John, we will take your comment.

20 MR. ALLMAN: I was just wondering, the lease

1 restrictions here, the standard ones, I just wanted a
2 clarification with the Zone 1 FOSL coming out. These
3 tables list lease restrictions, no underground
4 activities.

5 Are there also going to be the other
6 standard lease restrictions, too?

7 MS. SUGERMAN: Yes. Those were just the
8 unique ones.

9 MR. ALLMAN: And there were a few others.
10 We are used to seeing several.

11 MS. SUGERMAN: Right.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Richard?

13 MR. HANSEN: With regard to the PCB
14 transformers, you probably know better than I, as an
15 employee of PG&E, I think it's permissible to continue
16 to use PCB transformers as long as they are not
17 leaking, and whoever maintains the electrical system
18 is mandated to do what, monthly inspections?

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I believe whoever owns
20 and operates them are required.

1 MR. HANSEN: And that's regardless whether
2 it's PG&E or the Navy or a contractor for the Navy, so
3 the presence of PCB transformers, per se, is not a
4 problem.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, there is an
6 ultimate federal regulatory date for removal of PCB
7 equipment above a certain parts per million, and most
8 of the equipment with high concentrations of PCB has
9 been removed from the island.

10 But you're right in that some equipment may
11 remain with lower levels of PCB containing oil.

12 MR. HANSEN: But it will be continuously
13 monitored on a mandated basis, so that's not a major
14 concern.

15 MS. SMITH: The reason I brought that up is,
16 in the past this site has never been tested. We just
17 have been told it's okay. I have no documentation
18 that shows any kind of . . .

19 MR. HANSEN: For electrical transformers?

20 MS. SMITH: For testing for PCB

1 contamination.

2 The only document I have says that it was
3 surveyed in '94.

4 MR. ALLMAN: You're talking sampling the
5 soil where the building was.

6 MS. SMITH: Exactly.

7 Nothing, and that's why I brought that up,
8 is because all my documentation, and I have almost six
9 feet now, nothing in any of it indicates research.
10 Just sampling in '94. That's why I brought it up.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. I think I'm going
12 to invite all those people that have written comments
13 on index cards to pass them forward to Jim and myself.

14 And I just have an observation that we have
15 many responsibilities, and one of them is to look at
16 the islands systemically for environmental concerns --
17 the UST program, IR programs, lead, asbestos.

18 The FOSLs get down into finer detail, and
19 because of the way the data gathering has been going,
20 we are getting data and field tests on an ongoing

1 basis rather than having nice neat packages to look at
2 ahead of time before we could have all the FOSLs, so
3 there is data coming in. There is an old data that
4 hasn't been revised.

5 So I think it would be helpful, if I can
6 propose an action item, is to just get a handle on
7 when the February test results will be coming in for
8 Sites 12 and 17, to get a handle on all of this so
9 that when the Zone 1 FOSL comes through, we will know
10 the data that we do have, the data that we are
11 expecting, and the data that may be in progress.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So I think what I'm
13 hearing is that what you would like us to do and which
14 I agree is to be clear in the status of the data in
15 the FOSLs so it's clear as to what's been done, what
16 will be done and when will it be done, so that the
17 package is more complete.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What we need to do to
20 close out this issue is decide whether we are going to

1 continue with the current schedule or not.

2 The reason, the whole reason we are doing
3 this FOSL for the 1400 housing area is because the
4 city has requested to lease it to, on a transient
5 basis, to employees of studios who would otherwise be
6 living in hotels for three to six months.

7 So the population here would not be, you
8 know, long-term family residents, but really
9 short-term adults who essentially will be using it as
10 a hotel.

11 MR. HANSEN: Or who might bring their
12 families. There might be children.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a possibility.
14 And that's something we would have to consider,
15 whether or not we felt we needed to put a restriction
16 on that.

17 But that's a valid point. That was not the
18 initial intent, but it's something that we may need to
19 consider, whether or not we want to put a lease
20 restriction on.

1 But the fact that we are doing this FOSL now
2 for these units, this same area is still being
3 included in the Zone 4 FOSL, and the reason that we
4 are doing it now is because the Zone 4 FOSL for all
5 the TI housing, the draft, that document, the draft
6 won't be out until August and wouldn't be finalized at
7 the earliest until September.

8 The city wanted to be able to make these
9 units available, at least to the studios, at an
10 earlier time. So we were trying to accommodate that
11 reuse request.

12 So, really, this is a more limited use of
13 the housing, and the same area will be covered in the
14 Zone 4 FOSL. And there would be no residents who
15 would move in here and expect to be living here two or
16 three or four or five years. It would strictly be for
17 transients.

18 MS. SMITH: It should still be signed.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we can look into the
20 issue of signage.

1 I think the question we have to consider is
2 whether or not the detection of contaminants by itself
3 warrants signage, or whether or not that signage
4 should be for those areas where there is an imminent
5 threat to human health.

6 MR. VAN WYE: We are now approximately
7 either a half hour or 40 minutes behind our schedule,
8 depending on how one reads it.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess to wrap up the
10 comments, I notice that the comments are due today,
11 and if Steve's transcripts can, in addition to the
12 comments we receive on the index cards for this FOSL,
13 be considered the RAB's comments, then maybe we can
14 consider the comment period closed this evening.

15 MR. ALLMAN: You mean for all future use?

16 MR. VAN WYE: No.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For this FOSL.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: For the 1400 series
19 housing FOSL.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, actually, I only got it

1 today. I was out of the office on Friday.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's why I wanted to
3 bring it up.

4 So we have some flexibility that the city,
5 although they initially wanted to take occupancy on 1
6 May, and that's what was driving the whole schedule,
7 was 1 May, it's not likely that that was going to
8 happen.

9 So if there is a need to have the rest of
10 the week, or whatever time, reasonable time is
11 suitable, we can --

12 MS. SHIRLEY: I would prefer to have the
13 rest of the week to actually read it, so I can
14 comment.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So would Friday be an
16 acceptable date to close the comments?

17 MS. SHIRLEY: That works for me.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Well, I would be
19 happy to receive people's comments by fax to submit to
20 Jim.

1 If you would prefer to submit your own
2 comments to Jim independently, that would be fine by
3 Friday, close of business.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we will extend the
5 comment period to the end of Friday, and that will
6 adjust the final release of the FOSL to around the end
7 of the first week or the beginning of the second week
8 in May.

9 My understanding is it doesn't affect the
10 City's plans at this time.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Our next item is
13 to -- unless you want to take a break. The choice is
14 whether to take a break now or to continue into the
15 next item.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Does anybody have a
17 preference?

18 MR. HANSEN: Next item.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Next item?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next item is a brief

1 introduction to our first addendum to the remedial
2 investigation report, and that's the Contaminant Fate
3 and Transport Modeling, otherwise known as the
4 groundwater document, and that's this document here
5 (indicating), which was issued about a week ago, or
6 less than a week ago.

7 MS. TOBIAS: When was the 10th?

8 MR. GALANG: April 10th.

9 MR. ALLMAN: Why is it the brown water
10 document, because of the water being brown?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Groundwater.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Groundwater.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Oh, groundwater.

14 (Laughter.)

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then we wanted to at
16 least mention the other two documents coming up in the
17 next couple of weeks, and that's the addendum to the
18 additional investigation in Sites 12 and 17, which I
19 think is coming out in a couple of days.

20 MR. GALANG: Today.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Today.

2 Ernie has copies of it, and the
3 toxicological testing for petroleum.

4 MR. KNAPP: Sharon is passing out a handout.
5 It's a double sided page.

6 And what Jim said about the schedule with
7 this one here, I wanted to revisit this just to make
8 sure that everyone is aware of the framework of the
9 addenda we are generating to the RI.

10 All of you received at least a synopsis of
11 this first addendum, number 1, and the transport
12 modeling. Some of you received the report. But about
13 five days ago is when this one came out.

14 Following that, we have one that we have a
15 synopsis, and there is copies for you, additional
16 characterization of Sites 12 and 17.

17 And then the other two which haven't been
18 issued yet are ecotoxicological testing, which will
19 come out this week as well.

20 And then finally, addendum number 4. This

1 one looks at every site of the RI and reviews their
2 conclusions and recommendations in that document.
3 It's based on the results of this other work that's
4 been done.

5 So April is a real busy month and a lot of
6 stuff has been coming out. Hopefully, it will be
7 helpful information to look at these various aspects.

8 So I just wanted to briefly talk about the
9 first two of these tonight, addendums 1 and 2, and,
10 again, probably most of you had a synopsis on this
11 first one.

12 What it was, there was an initial cut or
13 screening modeling effort that was done. We wanted to
14 see, are there contaminants that can come from RI
15 sites and be transported to the bay, and with those
16 concentrations of contaminants that manage to reach
17 the bay, can they be high enough where they would
18 exceed the EPA ambient water quality criteria
19 concentrations.

20 So because our model was fairly first cut

1 screening, apparently, conservative type of approach
2 where we didn't consider such things as chemical
3 transformation or biological degradation, things that
4 might tend to break down contaminants before they
5 would get to the bay, that sort of thing, really, all
6 we did was, we looked at absorption, that is, the
7 attachment of chemicals to surfaces and things of that
8 sort, and the dispersion of chemicals as they are
9 transported.

10 So those were about the only things that we
11 looked at that might tend to attenuate or keep
12 chemicals from progressing along the ground on a
13 gradient.

14 So the sequence of steps that we took was,
15 number one, we looked at concentrations in the
16 groundwater and said, "Okay, do we have concentrations
17 that are greater than this ambient water quality
18 criteria concentrations?"

19 For those that did exceed those
20 concentrations, we would model. So we would then try

1 to see, okay, does it seem like that chemical reached
2 the shoreline of the bay, and what would this
3 concentration be if it did?

4 So the chemicals whose predicted
5 concentrations if it did reach the bay were less than
6 that, we did not evaluate further.

7 So we were left, really, with a certain
8 number of chemicals that the concentrations at the
9 shoreline were predicted to be greater than the water
10 quality criteria for aquatic receptors.

11 Those chemicals will be further evaluated in
12 the feasibility study or the Corrective Action Plan.

13 I have a visual here. It's on the back of
14 your handout here. It shows those chemicals that the
15 modeling did, in fact, show would, using this very
16 conservative approach, reach the bay at concentrations
17 greater than the ambient water quality criteria, and,
18 thus, might pose a risk to the ecological receptors in
19 the bay.

20 So these are the sites, and with asterisks

1 by the petroleum-only sites. You can see several of
2 the sites here, none of the chemicals reached the bay
3 in concentrations to be an ecological or chemical
4 concern.

5 However, several petroleum related compounds
6 did, in fact, show those site concentrations, some
7 metals at Site 11 and some salts and stuff at Site 24.

8 So that's kind of the gist of the report. I
9 know there are lots of technicalities to it and so
10 forth, but at this point in time, hopefully, I wanted
11 to lead you through the process and kind of show you
12 the results.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: Can I ask a question now?

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Are you ready to take
15 questions?

16 MR. KNAPP: Let me go through 12 and 17.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: These are related.

18 Did the modeling include tidal influence?

19 MR. KNAPP: Actually, we did not consider
20 the effects of tidal dispersion, and that's actually

1 the conservative approach because the tidal effects
2 actually tend to, if you will, consider the
3 contamination coming out towards the bay.

4 The kind of oscillating or pushing of the
5 high tides tends to spread contamination, actually
6 tends to make it more diffused. It reduces the
7 concentrations while it increases perhaps the vertical
8 extent, so we didn't actually model that.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: And did you model the
10 preferential pathways, like pipelines and trenches?

11 MR. KNAPP: No, no, we didn't.

12 I think for the first cut screening effort,
13 this is okay not to try and really do that. For one
14 thing, Treasure Island, in general, is so homogeneous
15 compared to most geological settings because it's
16 mostly sound. It's not like you have a lot of very
17 tight clays and so forth, and you have backfill around
18 pipelines to make very preferential pathways.

19 So I don't think it's something that is too
20 much of a concern, at least for the screening approach

1 right now.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other questions?

3 Henry?

4 MR. ONGERTH: What will your use be of this
5 screening evaluation?

6 MR. KNAPP: Essentially what we will do is,
7 we will look at these chemicals in the FS or the CAP,
8 as far as things that probably, or at least could pose
9 a threat to aquatic receptors, and, somehow, we might
10 remediate or try to diminish the effect, try to keep
11 them from getting to the bay, if you will.

12 MR. HANSEN: This modeling is all based on
13 the chemicals going down the storm drains?

14 MR. KNAPP: It's based on what we saw during
15 the remedial investigation. It's based on that data,
16 the soil and groundwater data reflected as part of the
17 investigation.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is not specific to
19 the storm drains. This is a result of the overall
20 groundwater monitoring.

1 MR. KNAPP: Right.

2 MR. HANSEN: Okay.

3 MR. KNAPP: The whole groundwater regime, if
4 you will, of Treasure Island.

5 MR. HANSEN: And then you compared your
6 model with your observation.

7 MR. KNAPP: We calibrated the model with the
8 data so that we used a release over a period of the
9 industrial use of the site that was in sufficient
10 quantity to give us the concentrations, the highest
11 concentrations that we saw in the remedial
12 investigation data.

13 MR. HANSEN: And the period for industrial
14 use was World War II?

15 MR. KNAPP: It varies per site, but it's
16 typically '42 to '70.

17 MR. HANSEN: Okay.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: One more question and we
19 will let him proceed with the presentation.

20 Dale?

1 MS. SMITH: Can you explain why the old
2 bunker site had silver concentrations extremely high,
3 and that you chose silver for that site when the whole
4 bunker site, historically, did not have silver
5 content?

6 MR. KNAPP: We didn't choose silver.

7 What we did, we looked at the metals that
8 were higher than the ambient water quality criteria.

9 So all those metals were put through the
10 model, and because of various factors, the longevity
11 of silver, if you will --

12 MS. SMITH: Why would an old bunker site
13 have silver?

14 MS. CASSA: Can I address that?

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Sure.

16 MS. CASSA: The old bunker site was
17 constructed with fill that came out of San Francisco
18 Bay. It's been the repository for sediments coming
19 out of the mountains.

20 MS. SMITH: It's not been documented that

1 the site -- they will not allow that kind of
2 documentation to be presented here, so I don't know
3 why you're presenting it now.

4 MS. CASSA: The documentation of the
5 geological history of San Francisco Bay?

6 MS. SMITH: Yes, but we are not allowed to
7 consider such things as that here, so I don't
8 understand why you're bringing it up now.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe I will just answer
10 Dale at this time.

11 Even though we call Site 12 the old bunker
12 site, in reality, it was a historically open part of
13 the base where materials were stored and vehicles were
14 parked.

15 And, so, in reality, what we are really
16 examining is an open space where a variety of
17 activities went on. So we may not know exactly why
18 the materials are here, but it has been identified,
19 and, so, we are continuing to evaluate it.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Has it ever been determined

1 where the photographic waste went that didn't end up
2 around the outside of the old x-ray building? That's
3 the only silver I have seen on the island so far.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We would review the data
5 base.

6 Do you have another part of the
7 presentation?

8 MR. KNAPP: Right.

9 I don't have an overhead, but it's a memo
10 that's coming out today. It's out today. Sites 12
11 and 17, additional sampling, and this was kind of to
12 follow on to sample data that was obtained during the
13 RI.

14 Site 12, first of all, specifically, there
15 was an area up in this region (indicating), that there
16 is some hydrocarbon contamination near well 16 up
17 there.

18 We didn't feel comfortable that it had been
19 fully delineated in the RI, so that we felt we should
20 go out and do some additional sampling.

1 What we did is, we took several soil and
2 groundwater samples around this area that we
3 identified as requiring more investigation.

4 We took eight locations where we obtained
5 soil and groundwater samples, and, essentially, the
6 soil had low concentrations of diesel and motor oil.

7 The groundwater samples, seven out of eight
8 of them, had some hydrocarbon contaminations, but they
9 were all very local, less than .25 milligrams per
10 liter.

11 The results of this investigation was, we
12 feel that this is worth a regional low level
13 groundwater plume rather than a specific, something
14 specifically related to what we saw in this well up
15 here (indicating).

16 So we didn't feel the need for additional
17 wells to define the site or that important site up
18 there.

19 And then Site 17, this region up here
20 (indicating), Site 17 was mostly hydrocarbon

1 contamination. But in the course of the investigation
2 of Site 5, just west of it, Site 5 had some volatile
3 organic compounds affected.

4 So we went back into Site 17, and looked at
5 what, if any, extent from Site 5, VOCs went to Site
6 17.

7 So a similar type thing, where we took soil
8 and groundwater samples in that region. We took
9 samples from nine different locations and three
10 different depths at each location for groundwater.

11 We didn't find any chlorinated solvents in
12 the soil samples.

13 And the groundwater samples we found were
14 low detection. By that, I mean, less than 10
15 micrograms per liter in the shallow intermediate
16 zones.

17 But it looked like there was some low level
18 VOC contamination very near the boundary of Site 5 and
19 tended to extend to the Site 17 area.

20 So we didn't put in any more monitoring

1 wells. And that summarizes the work that was done
2 there.

3 We have two more addenda items coming out to
4 reflect the information regarding the RI.

5 So definitely more to come.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Will your addenda also
7 include the data that previously has been collected
8 for Sites 12 and 17, or just focus on the data that
9 was just gathered?

10 MR. KNAPP: What we did was, in this Site 13
11 area, we do show previous data. We don't say, go way
12 out in Site 12.

13 But we show all the previous data that's
14 relevant to this area we investigated, so there is
15 several 11-by-17 figures with chemical results.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And similar for Sites 5
17 and 17, it would show the data that's relevant
18 including historical data?

19 MR. KNAPP: Yes.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: John?

1 MR. ALLMAN: Quick question. I brought it
2 up at the interim meeting a couple of weeks ago.

3 Was the agency comments due before? I
4 assume that's the date that we also have to have our
5 comments in.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For the addenda, yes.

7 MR. ALLMAN: And I would ask that the
8 meeting stick to a 30-day schedule.

9 These addendum 2 and addendum 3 are both due
10 one or three days before the next general meeting.

11 I would ask we move those dates for comments
12 after the meeting, in case we either discussed them,
13 or amongst ourselves, or discussion at the meeting;
14 otherwise, we don't meet en masse before the comments
15 are due.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The 20th of May rather
17 than the 19th for addenda 3 and the 16th for addenda
18 2.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think we can
20 accommodate a few days.

1 What's driving the schedule overall is
2 getting to the draft final document, which, for
3 budgetary account type receipts, we have to finish
4 earlier in the summer than anticipated.

5 So that the period of time for comment for
6 these documents are less than what we had originally
7 planned.

8 But on the other hand, we expect there will
9 be a longer period of time for comments between the
10 draft final and the final.

11 MR. ALLMAN: But we were told, I think, last
12 month that people had to be reviewing, due to the
13 etiquette of reviewing and commenting on things.

14 Once we comment, we miss commenting on
15 something in the addendum. It's not polite or proper
16 to comment on the draft, because you already have the
17 opportunities to complete it.

18 So what you're saying, nobody will cry foul
19 if we comment on something that showed up in here that
20 was then brought up at the meeting on May 20th that

1 inspired somebody to bring up a comment they wouldn't
2 have thought about before going into a discussion
3 about it.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we try to take a
5 reasonable approach to this.

6 I think we try to avoid having a really
7 major comment, or sort of an obvious comment that
8 could have been made in the earlier document brought
9 up in the end.

10 I don't mean to preclude anybody's comments,
11 but we want to try to get the comments earlier rather
12 than later because we can still make changes in a
13 draft to draft final.

14 But is it getting more difficult to make
15 major course corrections in between the draft final
16 and the final?

17 MR. ALLMAN: My feeling is, during the
18 meetings when we talk about these things makes me
19 think about things, so it's helpful.

20 MR. VAN WYE: We are now 52 minutes behind

1 schedule.

2 MS. TOBIAS: I want to clarify a comment
3 that Ms. Smith made regarding Treasure Island.

4 The information that DTSC reported is in the
5 RI report. It's important to have it constructed and
6 the Navy recognizes there could be a metal source that
7 took place 100 years ago from the delta into the bay.

8 MS. SMITH: It's not in your documentation.

9 MS. TOBIAS: It's in the RI report. The
10 geological information under that.

11 MS. SMITH: It's not the silver content.
12 The only silver content was as Mr. Allman pointed out,
13 was the medical facility.

14 Up to this point, the only silver source was
15 shown to be the first medical facility, Site 1, which
16 has been cleaned up.

17 All of a sudden, Site 12, which you did not
18 want four years ago to be considered an RI site --

19 MS. TOBIAS: It's been considered an RI site
20 for seven years.

1 MS. SMITH: Earl Rhinert (phonetic), when we
2 went around on the first tour, said, "Oh, my God.
3 This is not being considered a significant site."

4 MS. TOBIAS: An RI site since 1988, so
5 that's actually nine years.

6 MS. SMITH: All of a sudden it comes up as
7 the source of silver on the island. That strikes me
8 as odd.

9 Why isn't there silver anywhere else?

10 MR. ALLMAN: That's exactly my question.
11 Why only near the bunkers?

12 MS. SMITH: Exactly.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can take that comment
14 as a comment.

15 I wanted to point out, we did, in this
16 addenda 1, include --

17 MR. VAN WYE: With deference to Dale and
18 John, I think that's more than a comment. I think
19 it's really a question that needs to be possibly
20 resolved.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it's a question
2 that, it's a question we can address.

3 MR. VAN WYE: Good.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In the interest of time,
5 I didn't want to try to address it here now.

6 MR. VAN WYE: I understand.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The good news, we will get
8 new information on Sites 12 and 17, the historical and
9 the current new data, so we will have more than enough
10 to consider and ponder this, and other questions that
11 have come up.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And I wanted to point
13 out, we have included in the addenda a synopsis, a
14 one-page synopsis, and that was in response to some
15 comments made in the past to create a synopsis
16 document that captures the essential elements without
17 having to read through the whole document.

18 And if you have any comments on how this
19 could be improved, we would be happy to hear it.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: How about if we take a

1 five minute break?

2 (Short break taken at 8:55 to 9:15 p.m.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. We will try to
4 expedite the next couple of items. The next item
5 actually is not a full presentation. This is wanting
6 to update you on the Nimitz House and the lead in the
7 soil.

8 The work is still in progress. What I do
9 have is the handout. I think I have about 20 copies
10 or so for those who are interested. We could have it
11 in the minutes, too.

12 What we have done to date is to take samples
13 from around the house, basically, the flower beds and
14 around both the main house and the guest house, which
15 is also the garage.

16 Whereas, initially, there was about four to
17 six samples taken, we took about, I think, about 20 to
18 30. So we have a much higher amount of data to work
19 with and did confirm that the lead level in the soil
20 was, I think on the average, about 7500 parts per

1 million.

2 MS. SMITH: How deep did you go?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That was a surface
4 sample.

5 So what we have done since then is excavate
6 the top six inches of the flower beds, and we have
7 taken confirmation samples at the bottom of the
8 excavation, but we have yet to get the data back.

9 MR. HANSEN: What are the levels?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we are working at
11 this point with the HUD guideline of 400 parts per
12 million.

13 MR. HANSEN: And this was 7500?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This was 7500, so this
15 was considerably above the HUD guidelines.

16 But not unexpected in a house that was built
17 in 1900, and that had been painted and scraped
18 continuously during that period.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: And painted white, too.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

1 MR. ONGERTH: How far out from the house did
2 you sample?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, we were
4 limited by the depth of the flower beds.

5 The building actually has asphalt all around
6 the building, so the flower beds are approximately, I
7 think, about three to four feet in width, and it ends
8 at the asphalt.

9 So what we have done is, we have removed the
10 soil. We've taken confirmation samplings. I don't
11 have the data yet back. I may by the interim meeting,
12 or certainly by our next month's meeting.

13 In addition to that, we are taking
14 additional samples out on the lawn so that we can
15 differentiate between the condition at the building
16 that may be due to the paint specifically on the
17 building, and the lawn areas away from the building
18 that might be due to other factors.

19 This was due to a comment made by Brad, and
20 I think by several other RAB members, who were

1 concerned about not only the lead level immediately
2 adjacent to the corridors, but what might be present
3 on the lawn or in areas where children might be
4 playing or present.

5 So we will be taking additional samples that
6 will basically cover the grounds, both the front and
7 the backyard.

8 MR. HANSEN: Well, this is contamination
9 from the overlying bridge, isn't it, where they
10 scraped the paint off the bridge?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, that's something
12 that we are going to have to evaluate as to whether at
13 what point, you know, at what point is it being
14 influenced by the house itself, and at what point may
15 be influenced by the bridge.

16 That's a question we have yet to answer.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Can you point out where it is
18 again?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The Nimitz House is, it
20 is right here (indicating). So this is quarters 1.

1 It's right on the edge of IR 29.

2 And, in fact, IR 29 kind of cuts across the
3 corner of the lawn, the corner of the front lawn, a
4 small portion of it.

5 And then we are going to use this data. The
6 initial reason for this was to get the quarters 1
7 leased. But we did produce a draft FOSL to cover all
8 seven of the older quarters. But we have yet to
9 sample the other six quarters. We wanted to sample
10 the Nimitz House and take cleanup action where
11 necessary because the city wants to use that earlier
12 on.

13 And then we will use, probably, I feel we
14 are kind of oversampling for Nimitz House, and then we
15 will use that data to plan sampling around the other
16 six quarters, or in some cases, we may want to
17 presume, given the levels of lead that we are seeing
18 in the flower beds in quarters 1, we may just want to
19 presume to remove soil at the other six quarters, or
20 take substantially less number of samples because we

1 kind of expect there to be high levels there.

2 MR. ALLMAN: So these are all -- which are
3 the sides on quarters 1 closest to the bridge?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, the front.
5 Maybe the front.

6 MS. SMITH: No.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, I'm sorry. You're
8 right.

9 MS. SMITH: The south.

10 MR. VAN WYE: The south rear.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The south side of the
12 building.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Quarters 1, side 1, 2, 3 or 4
14 is closer to the bridge?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would have to look
16 back.

17 MR. ALLMAN: This picture in this map
18 (indicating).

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, the samples
20 are numbered. The samples all have sample numbers on

1 the diagram.

2 For example, samples -- let me get my
3 bearings.

4 MR. VAN WYE: Areas around 9 and 10 would be
5 closest to the bridge.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's correct. Yes.
7 6, 7, 8, 9 would be closest to the bridge.

8 MR. ALLMAN: The reason I'm wondering, they
9 are pretty high all around it looks like.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think in this
11 flower bed, really, the dominant influence is the
12 house itself and not the bridge.

13 MR. ALLMAN: But then these are in different
14 sites.

15 But if you are doing more sampling, I might
16 suggest if you work away from the house, if you see a
17 sharp decrease in the lead levels, then that's a
18 pretty good indication it's from the paint.

19 But if it's around the same range you work
20 away from the house, then it's more likely to be from

1 the bridge.

2 MR. VAN WYE: John, you won't see much of
3 that. If you remember, he said there is a lot of
4 asphalt around there. You won't have any continuous
5 soil around.

6 MR. ALLMAN: But there is no continuous soil
7 around the building to sample.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. It's actually, I
9 mean, there is a ring. Basically, it circles the
10 building, 360 degrees.

11 But, I mean, in basic response to your
12 question, I mean, we are sampling both the front and
13 back lawn.

14 I think the end result, we will have a
15 fairly good data set, probably getting close to 80
16 samples between the flower beds and the front and back
17 lawn.

18 MR. ALLMAN: Right, but when you go over
19 past the driveway, 12 or 20 feet, whatever it is, you
20 hit soil again.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If you go past beyond
2 the driveway, you end up back in landscaping.

3 Now, most of that is actually covered by
4 shrubbery and grass, but there are bare spots under
5 the shrubbery, and in some areas where there is less
6 light, where the grass isn't growing as much, a lot of
7 our samples are taken -- we wanted to make sure to get
8 the bare soil areas, and then we are going to take
9 some samples, too, in the grass areas, below the
10 grass, even though, technically, right now, the grass
11 is masking those soil areas.

12 But I think we will certainly have a good
13 enough body of data, actually, given the size of this
14 site, the front and back lawn, I think we will have
15 pretty high concentration of data points to be able to
16 look at.

17 But our initial thrust was to take care of
18 the flower beds and to sample those bare soil areas
19 where someone, you know, children on the site could
20 come in more imminent contact.

1 We will have to consider a little more
2 carefully how to deal with soil below the grass, below
3 grassed areas that might have elevated levels.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we have two
5 comments, if you could make them quick.

6 MR. HANSEN: We have an array of FOSLs.
7 Have you given us a FOSL yet for the areas
8 where the homeless people will occupy?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, those areas
10 have not been specifically defined yet.

11 As part of the McKinney Act, the homeless
12 providers, which formed a consortium call Tie-Dyed,
13 have indicated a preference for certain areas, but
14 those exact buildings is yet to be worked out between
15 them and the city.

16 MR. HANSEN: I'm just concerned about why
17 there is so much urgency about this building, the
18 Admiral Nimitz house, rather than for the homeless.

19 MR. VAN WYE: Have you ever heard of Mayor
20 Brown?

1 MR. HANSEN: I have.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, predominantly,
3 because, I mean, the urgency was that this was the
4 first building that there was a desire to lease.

5 We would have the same, I would have the
6 same urgency for any older house that we were
7 preparing to lease, and right now, this is the only
8 one, this is the furthest, the oldest house that's
9 furthest along in the lease process.

10 For example, this 1400 area housing, which
11 was built in 1989, we don't expect to see, you know,
12 lead in the soil due to the housing structure.

13 MR. ALLMAN: Well, what about the structures
14 there previously, though, where they went down and
15 rebuilt the housing.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We still have another
17 question on the floor, and could you capture that,
18 please, in an index card?

19 MS. SMITH: My question was that at the
20 RPM-BCT meeting, we were discussing with the

1 regulators, encouraging CalTrans to take
2 responsibility for the offramps and the lead
3 contamination caused by that.

4 If you do this further characterization out
5 from the Nimitz House itself, would there be a
6 possibility for CalTrans to accept responsibility for
7 lead contamination? They have done this in the
8 Presidio.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, that's a
10 possibility, and that was brought up by the city, who
11 had experience working with CalTrans on Doyle Drive.

12 MS. SMITH: Yes.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And so that's a
14 possibility.

15 We are still in initial discussions with
16 CalTrans over all of the issues relative to the bridge
17 and the retrofit and the potential new bridge and
18 Yerba Buena Island.

19 But we have already indicated that lead in
20 the soil, as a result of bridge operations, is an area

1 of interest that we have in the negotiations.

2 MS. SMITH: Absolutely, and you should.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any other questions or
4 comments before we move on?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So I expect to have more
6 data for both the interim meeting, and I'm hoping to
7 get to the point of having the draft final FOSL for
8 these seven quarters by the time of the next meeting,
9 but I don't have as firm a schedule on that.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: You say the next meeting?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next general
12 meeting.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. So there is more
14 data to come?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All right.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next item is
18 discussion of process for resolving RI comments.

19 I think, basically, we are opening the floor
20 as to whether or not there is any comments or

1 questions concerning the draft document meeting
2 schedule that we have provided.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: In going through the
4 schedule that had been provided, there are three
5 schedules that have been provided, so you might want
6 to help us out here.

7 And for those that didn't attend the interim
8 meeting, the Navy has graciously indicated that they
9 will be responding to the RAB comments in writing, and
10 that there would be several meetings to discuss
11 topical issues after the draft comments are made
12 available to the RAB for their consideration at these
13 meetings.

14 I don't see a schedule of those meetings
15 among the documents that we have.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, what we are
17 aiming to do is to produce an initial response.

18 In some cases, we may be able to deal with
19 some areas more specifically, and some more generally.
20 But they have an initial response to the RAB comments

1 on the remedial, draft remedial investigation report
2 at the beginning of May, and then to use that as the
3 starting point for the first of a series of meetings
4 in May.

5 The draft response would provide food for
6 thought for the community members prior to having the
7 first meeting. That was a comment made by the
8 community members, to have some document in hand with
9 the Navy's initial responses prior to having any
10 discussion meetings.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I did just find the
12 proposed RAB RI discussion meetings that had been
13 discussed at the interim meeting.

14 I will just read to the RAB what those are
15 so they can be captured in the transcript:

16 The preliminary written response to the RAB
17 would be available on the 1st of May.

18 There would be an interim RAB meeting on the
19 6th of May. Of course, we have all these addenda to
20 also consider at an interim meeting as well. So we

1 have an option here of discussing the reports that are
2 out for review or the preliminary response to the RAB
3 at the 6th of May meeting.

4 There are two possibilities for meeting
5 dates if we elect to have them on Tuesday evenings, as
6 has been our habit, and one would be the 13th of May,
7 and another would be the 20th of May.

8 An option that we had discussed was maybe
9 consolidating these two meetings on a Saturday, either
10 the 10th or the 17th of May, so that we can go from
11 soup to nuts on the written responses to the RAB and
12 resolve in conference with the Navy and PRC our
13 responses to theirs.

14 And, I guess, what we have is an option here
15 to accept these as meeting dates or refine them or
16 discuss them at the next interim meeting, which would
17 be the 6th of May, and then schedule subsequently.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: What would Saturday be, did we
19 pick a date?

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It was either the 10th or

1 the 17th.

2 And do people have a preference of meeting
3 on a Saturday to discuss the responses to the RAB
4 comments?

5 MS. SMITH: It gives us more time.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: I prefer Saturday.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Preferences?

8 MR. HANSEN: Not on Saturday.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Not on Saturday.

10 MS. SMITH: Saturday is good.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would propose that we
12 discuss the addenda that are available at the interim
13 meeting on the 6th and finalize the schedule for maybe
14 two meetings, maybe one on a Tuesday and another on a
15 Saturday.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: Or maybe we can send a piece
17 of paper around and have the people just write down
18 what date they prefer, Tuesday or Saturday, because
19 there may be -- I'm flexible.

20 I mean, I could do either time, at the will

1 of the group. If it goes Tuesday, that's fine, but if
2 we had that information, we could use it.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right, or we could do a
4 show of hands if there is a preference for Tuesday or
5 Saturday.

6 Want to do a quick straw poll?

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, do that, and maybe go
8 twice, too, really, for those people that are
9 flexible.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: For those people that are
11 flexible.

12 Okay. Let's vote on a Saturday, either the
13 10th or the 17th.

14 So we have three for Saturday.

15 And for Tuesday, either the 13th or the 20th
16 or both?

17 So seven for Tuesday.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: And then flexible. I didn't
19 raise my hand for either one.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

1 MR. ALLMAN: Well, it's clearly Tuesday, I
2 think, 7:30.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's probably going to be
4 Tuesday. Okay. That's easy.

5 Meeting location? I would like to offer
6 PG&E offices. We are at the end of the BART line in
7 the Embarcadero if people would like to meet there
8 because it's easier.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Or Building 1 can
10 continue to be available, actually, for the
11 foreseeable future, because the Navy will continue to
12 have their operations in there even after 1 October.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Preferences?

14 MR. ALLMAN: PG&E.

15 MR. VAN WYE: PG&E.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: 2 out of 11.

17 Anybody else?

18 MS. SMITH: It's a done deal.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. 77 Beale, 24th
20 Floor.

1 MR. ALLMAN: Do they have the power on on
2 the weekends?

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's a Tuesday.

4 MS. SMITH: They have the power on.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes, and we have security
6 guards. Okay.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, then, we would be
8 providing the preliminary response to the RAB still on
9 or about the 1st of May, and then there would still be
10 an interim RAB meeting on the 6th of May.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And this first
13 discussion meeting will occur the following Tuesday on
14 the 13th of May.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Which is one of our
17 original proposals.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

19 And I would propose that we start earlier,
20 like 6:30 or 6:00, if we can, and just have pizza and

1 sodas brought in and make it a working session; is
2 that agreeable?

3 MR. ALLMAN: As long as it's not going to be
4 here at 6:00.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

6 MR. HANSEN: That's at the end of Market
7 Street, is that the PG&E building?

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's at Beale and Market.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. And this isn't
10 until the 13th of May. We will put out a flier. I
11 think we did the last time that we had it over at
12 Pat's place with a map.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we will always have a
15 flier advance notice of any of these special meetings.

16 MR. ALLMAN: Are we going to combine two?

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think, once we see the
18 written response, we will know whether we need one
19 meeting or two.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, Sharon?

1 MS. TOBIAS: I think my question for the RAB
2 is, at the interim meeting, do you think at that time
3 you will be able to identify the topics you wish to
4 discuss at these workshops so that we come in knowing
5 which items you want to discuss, rather than coming in
6 and not knowing?

7 MR. ALLMAN: I thought it was the comments.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, the interim meeting,
9 we know we have two addenda that we will have to
10 review. One of them is the new data.

11 MS. TOBIAS: We thought the meetings were to
12 discuss certain issues, okay?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, we wanted to --

14 MS. TOBIAS: We want to know what we are
15 going to be discussing at the meetings.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We understand that. I'm
17 just going over the agenda items for the interim
18 meeting.

19 We need to look at Sites 12 and 17 and the
20 comments to determine if it will be one meeting, and

1 what the topics will be for the meeting on the 13th.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Okay.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, in other words, we
4 will fine tune the meeting topics at the 6th of May
5 interim meeting.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

7 And I was confusing things by indicating 12
8 and 17, because our review of Sites 12 and 17, at
9 least Site 12, are part of our comments that you will
10 be responding to.

11 So there may be new issues that we identify
12 as part of our addenda review that we might also want
13 to discuss in the context of response to the RAB
14 comments that the Navy and PRC may have.

15 Now that I've totally confused the
16 discussion, are there any other items to bring up for
17 the RI comment issues?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Next, action
19 items.

20 I do have one handout, one action item

1 completion handout, and that's a list of the UST AST
2 fuel line documents that we put together.

3 The reason that this has been a separate
4 document is that the CERCLA requirement for
5 information repository, as it relates to the CERCLA IR
6 sites and not the UST sites that have never been
7 CERCLA sites, and that's why there is currently no
8 official information repository for the other
9 documents.

10 What we did is go back through and identify
11 them all, and we do have them all in stock at our
12 information repository Building 1.

13 And so this represents the body of documents
14 associated with the USTs, ASTs and fuel line.

15 MS. SMITH: And they are sorted by date.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. Well, these
17 documents are chronological order.

18 MS. SMITH: But this document is sorted by
19 date of removal?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, date of the issue of

1 the document.

2 MS. SMITH: Okay.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The first document being
4 issued back in 1987, and different documents refer to
5 different USTs.

6 What may be a little more confusing about
7 the UST program is that rather than have one RI report
8 that discusses all of the IR sites, in the case of the
9 UST program, different USTs had been moving on
10 different schedules, so you might have one report that
11 talks about ten USTs, and then another report that
12 talks about six other different USTs.

13 So it's not structured the same way as the
14 CERCLA program, and that's because it doesn't have the
15 public participation structure that was built into the
16 CERCLA program.

17 The UST program mostly focuses on ultimately
18 getting to the Corrective Action Plan at the end of
19 the process, rather than having the intermediate
20 processes, like the remedial investigation.

1 But at least this can be a starting point or
2 one of the starting points for further discussion of
3 the UST program.

4 Other action items that we are dealing with,
5 and I will try to put together a handout to go with
6 the interim meeting notice in a couple of weeks, data
7 management, we thought we were going to award a
8 contract in March. The reason being, we haven't, I
9 haven't finished drafting the scope of work for it.
10 So we are still working towards an approximately April
11 award for data management which would include
12 electronic display of data.

13 And, likewise, we are going to award, we
14 thought we would award one in March for USTs, but it
15 looks like that's going to be more in April.

16 And then the admin record information
17 repository, we provided a draft listing here of the
18 UST AST fuel line documents.

19 We are still working on a draft listing of
20 other BRAC appliance documents which we are planning

1 to have on schedule at the May interim meeting.

2 And then we are ready to meet with
3 interested community members of the Information
4 Repository Subcommittee any time.

5 And budget, we are still basically on track
6 with our cleanup budget this year.

7 We originally were planning to get about 10
8 million 8. That's now down to about 9 million 8, but
9 that was really due to adjustment and cost figures.
10 And then we deferred some above ground storage tank
11 work because we didn't need to do it this year. It
12 will be done in association with the cleanup of those
13 sites, which are already IR sites.

14 So at this point, we basically have the
15 money to do what we need to do in '97. So the program
16 really, at this point, is not being driven by any lack
17 of money.

18 And there is no new information on the BTAG
19 that I'm aware of.

20 And we pared down our RAB membership. We

1 pared down our mailing list.

2 Hugo is working with Dan McDonald to get our
3 advertisements set up for the next round of member
4 solicitations.

5 We have already got a draft ad for Dan to
6 look at, and we expect to place the advertisements
7 probably in May.

8 And that's basically it.

9 I skipped over general updates. We did have
10 a BRAC Cleanup Team RPM meeting earlier this month,
11 which Christine attended. The main focus of
12 discussion of that was the remedial investigation
13 program, and also the additional sampling that we plan
14 to do at Site 12 and 17.

15 MR. GALANG: Site 24.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Pardon?

17 MR. GALANG: Site 24.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: 24. I'm sorry.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Jim, I have a question about
20 that.

1 That additional sampling for Site 12 on the
2 grid?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: Is that happening inside the
5 EBS program or the CERCLA program?

6 MS. SMITH: CERCLA.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right now, it's CERCLA.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: Thank you.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the draft of that
10 will be out sometime towards the end of the month.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: So there is a work plan coming
12 out?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is a draft work
14 plan for additional sampling for Site 12. It's in
15 development.

16 MS. SHIRLEY: Thank you.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Reuse issues. The
18 EIS/EIR is still being drafted and is expected to be
19 released sometime in the July-August time frame.

20 The goal is to have the public meeting for

1 the EIS/EIR in September. We are still tracking for
2 that.

3 I have already been reviewing the draft of
4 the draft.

5 Organizational business. Pat?

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, I think you already
7 covered the RAB membership.

8 Two items under Administration, we are
9 trying a little bit different meeting format to see if
10 we can keep the agenda moving. And we still seem to
11 be about 52 minutes behind schedule, so please bear
12 with us. We do want to keep these meetings moving.

13 I appreciate everybody's cooperation tonight
14 in trying something new and different. It does
15 take -- what do they say -- it takes three weeks to
16 start something new and three days to break an old
17 habit? Or maybe it's the other way around. So maybe
18 in a couple of months, we will get this new format
19 down.

20 Thank you again.

1 The other item matter under RAB
2 administration, I have been a co-chair here for about
3 a year, which is the initial limit under our
4 operational guidelines. So we would like people to
5 consider further discussion how you want your meetings
6 certainly run, and then by whom at the next meeting.
7 A little fuller discussion of that, I think, is going
8 to be pending.

9 And then there were two items that, I think,
10 had been circulated, Jim, that you kind of glossed
11 over. I got them in my package. But we do have
12 additional sampling plans for Sites 24 and 12 that
13 were part of the package that we received tonight.

14 And I think this is, I just want you to know
15 that this is a very positive action that the Navy and
16 PRC are taking.

17 We thank you, certainly, for what we think
18 addresses some of our comments and maybe the agency's
19 comments as well by developing another work plan.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Which part of the packet is

1 this?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That was part of the
3 package that went out, I think, with the finding of
4 suitability, either the finding of suitability or --

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No. I think Ernie
6 handed it out with the addendum document.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Addendum document?

8 MR. GALANG: That's the addendum for Sites
9 12 and 17.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think it got shuffled
11 between my FOSL and my addenda. I don't know which it
12 came out with, but if you received either of those
13 documents, you should have these.

14 MR. GALANG: That's addendum number two that
15 we distributed today.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, if you don't have
17 it, I guess we could get you copies.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: I didn't get it either.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

20 MR. ALLMAN: I got a cover memo and a

1 synopsis.

2 And you're holding up things that have
3 "draft" stamped on them.

4 MR. GALANG: Maybe that's the draft plan for
5 Site 24 and Site 12 that we discussed at the last
6 meeting. We didn't have that yet. We were still
7 producing the meeting minutes for that.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I don't know how I got
9 this copy, but I wanted to thank the Navy and PRC.
10 Jim?

11 MR. ALDRICH: Something more related to the
12 membership and attendance. Can I?

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes, please.

14 MR. ALDRICH: At the last month's meeting, I
15 asked if Larry Florin was briefed on the outcomes of
16 these meetings, and the answer was yes.

17 Now, at this month's meeting, I will ask if
18 nobody from the city is here, are they briefed on the
19 outcome of the meeting?

20 Maybe along with that, I would personally

1 feel strongly that the city should be represented here
2 at each meeting, and I realize that specific
3 individuals can't always come to every meeting, but
4 can somebody come in Martha's place when she can't?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I failed to
6 introduce him, but Bill Lee, I didn't know whether he
7 wanted to just sit in the audience, was here from the
8 city, and he basically came because Martha wasn't able
9 to be here tonight.

10 But in addition, of course, even Martha, of
11 course, gets all the correspondence, and then she
12 attends the weekly meetings that the Navy has with the
13 city and voices a lot of comment concerning the
14 progress of our cleanup program and what we are doing.

15 MR. ALDRICH: I guess does that include
16 comments made by the community members?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In fact, I think some
18 community members met with Martha outside of regular
19 meetings.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: But I think it's still

1 valuable for the city to hear the discussion ongoing
2 in this room and not be disconnected.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That certainly can be
4 reflected in the minutes of this meeting. The voice,
5 a RAB concern that the city remain represented at the
6 regular RAB meetings.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do we know why Martha
8 hasn't been here?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, she's actually not
10 working TI full-time. She's split between several
11 other sites.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So she has other
13 commitments.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It think we are on the
15 back side.

16 Upcoming documents. I attached a document
17 schedule to the agenda when it went out. Documents
18 are starting to come fast and furious now. We will
19 try to maintain flexibility where document review
20 dates are close to regular meetings, so we can make

1 them coincide as much as possible.

2 One date that I didn't have, Ernie, that I
3 didn't have a chance to get was the draft final RI
4 report.

5 Are we locked in on a date for that?

6 MR. GALANG: Not yet. We tried to end up in
7 July, I think, end of July time frame because of this
8 budget constraint we have.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, basically, all of
10 the RI addenda is working towards a July date for the
11 draft final RI.

12 And the reason we are being pressed to meet
13 that date in order to, because of expiring funds, and,
14 consequently, in discussion with the regulators, we
15 anticipate that the amount of time we spend in review
16 of the final, and going from the draft final to the
17 final, will be longer than normal in order to account
18 for the compressed schedule in getting between now and
19 the draft final.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: And in great Navy terminology,

1 we call that accelerated delays.

2 MS. SMITH: That's rude, Chris.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: I thought it was a charming
4 term.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I don't think we
6 have any open questions or discussion. Unless someone
7 has something.

8 MR. ALLMAN: One thing I might clarify.

9 Now, I was making, earlier I was responding
10 to a statement that Jim had made and was cut off and
11 told to put it on the card. That was not a comment
12 but I was making a bit of a response to his comment.

13 So if we are going to have it where we say,
14 "address your comment," and if you have a response --
15 there were several times throughout tonight where
16 people responded to comments made.

17 And so I just wanted to have it clear
18 whether or not we wanted to do that. If we want to
19 say, "make your comment," and if you're on the speaker
20 list, do that, otherwise, don't say anything.

1 To me, that was something I wanted
2 clarification on. If you're considering the building
3 that was built in 1989 and nothing was in existence on
4 that property beforehand, that's one thing.

5 But if you're not sampling the soil because
6 what's there now was built in 1989 after a lead-based
7 paint was removed from the market, then that means
8 that there were probably structures that were
9 demolished from that site that may have contained
10 lead-based paint, which, to me, is more of a reason to
11 sample for lead-based paint.

12 I was just trying to respond to a point that
13 Jim was making. I still want that comment to be made.

14 And because they do all this historical
15 search to see what was here before, but in the case,
16 for example, with the sump, the acetylene generator or
17 the transformers that were stored in a building that
18 are gone, you have to avail yourself of what has ever
19 been on the property, if you're going to do historical
20 research, otherwise, there is really no basis for

1 using historical data for determining what was on the
2 sites.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And I apologize for
4 cutting you off. I was trying to keep the discussion
5 focused on those that had raised their hands.

6 I'm trying to feel my way through this new
7 process as well, so I'm glad you took the time here to
8 clarify your comment.

9 And please be patient with me, as well.

10 MR. ALLMAN: Oh, no, that's fine. It just
11 happens that people make responses to things that are
12 going on all the time. That may be what extends the
13 meetings.

14 But we also need, in order to have a clearer
15 discussion of certain issues, maybe we do need to
16 reduce the number of issues we are talking about,
17 instead of just keeping it on a strict time clock,
18 too.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

20 MR. ALLMAN: I want to leave at 9:30, too.

1 But if we discuss an issue, then we need to
2 discuss it to the point nobody is sort of ready to
3 chew off their chair because they need to say
4 something versus just because we need to get through
5 in a timely manner.

6 Which maybe we do have too much to discuss,
7 or it's too lengthy a meeting, or we just need to have
8 something move to interim meetings to review.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I guess what I would
10 recommend is a procedure, if people are comfortable
11 with it.

12 Those that raise their hands will be
13 identified as their hands are raised.

14 Those people that raise their hands have
15 first priority for the floor.

16 If somebody has a response, to raise their
17 hand.

18 And as time allows, we can ask if it's a
19 comment or a response to something.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Yes, that would be a good idea,

1 so we know.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So that we will know.

3 It's hard to be a moderator. I don't want
4 to cut anybody off, but I do want to keep us to a
5 schedule.

6 MR. ALLMAN: I think it's important to
7 realize whether you're just extending the discussion
8 or trying to close what's already been discussed.

9 We will learn together.

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Thank you.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. For next meeting,
12 we will have the presentation on the remedial
13 investigation revised recommendations and conclusions,
14 which is going to be a pretty significant
15 presentation. That will be the last of the addenda,
16 addenda 4.

17 And then the draft finding of suitability
18 for reuse for Zone 2.

19 And then we will have some concluding
20 discussion on the comments related to the Zone 1 FOSL

1 we just seen tonight.

2 MR. ALLMAN: And are you going to give us a
3 date for the actual, the two dates I was talking about
4 before the next general meeting, or are you going to
5 send us a mailing?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. Any meetings we
7 have, we will send a notice out for.

8 Just jumping ahead, then, the next meeting
9 is the 6th of May. That's the interim meeting.

10 MR. ALLMAN: No, I'm not talking about that,
11 but the two documents that comments are due by May
12 16th and 19th, when the meeting is on the 20th.

13 You had said, well, if it's that's close, we
14 will allow a few more days.

15 But are we going to be given a day that you
16 will want them by?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I'll update.

18 What I need to do is update our document
19 review schedules and get that out to everybody. So I
20 will update that.

1 So the next meeting is the interim meeting
2 on the 6th of May. And that's here in TI, Building 1.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's still going to be at
4 TI, Building 1, unless people have other preferences.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then two days later
6 is the base closure ceremony, Thursday, the 8th of May
7 at 6:30 p.m. in front of Building 1.

8 And then our next regular meeting -- well,
9 then there will be the first of these discussion
10 meetings on the 13th of May.

11 And then the next regular meeting on the
12 20th of May.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: May is Treasure Island
14 month.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And I have listed here,
16 I didn't have a location until today for the 20 May
17 meeting. It will be back in the Nimitz.

18 This may be the last meeting we have in this
19 room. So we will be back to the Nimitz for the
20 regular meeting on the 20th of May. And then that may

1 be our last meeting in the Nimitz and we will move
2 somewhere else.

3 So, if there aren't any other comments, we
4 will close the meeting.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I would like to make a
6 comment.

7 I would like to thank Harlan for keeping
8 time. He has missed two of his favorite television
9 programs. I appreciate it.

10 MR. VAN WYE: When will we get some response
11 from the Navy to the comments that were made about
12 area 27 back in December, have I missed something?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, no, you haven't
14 missed anything. It's being addressed.

15 It's actually a Navy level issue that's
16 being discussed in a conference in the next month, and
17 you're right.

18 MR. VAN WYE: When you say "Navy," do you
19 mean --

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Navy-wide level. It's

1 not just a TI issue.

2 Sediments are a Navy-wide issue as far as
3 base closure cleanups are concerned.

4 The city has sent us a letter, too, and we
5 are working on a response to the city, too.

6 MR. VAN WYE: Does that say that we are
7 going to get some response in a month or two months or
8 who knows?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably a few months.
10 That's the best I can turn around at this point.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We are going to put it on
12 the follow-up action items.

13 MR. VAN WYE: I've learned to be very
14 patient.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you very
16 much.

17 MR. VAN WYE: Thank you, all.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: If there are any other
19 cards, be sure to summarize those comments on the
20 FOSLs and put them in some sort of word processing

1 format and get them to Jim.

2 (The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.)

3 ---o0o---

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

Stephen Balloni