

5090  
Ser 6225/L8031  
27 Oct 1997

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity, West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR  
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Encl: (1) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 19 August 1997  
(2) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 16 September 1997

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are the approved and final Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes and are provided for your file and information
2. Thank you for your guidance and involvement in this project. For further information, please call me at (650) 244-2560.

Original signed by:

ERNESTO M. GALANG  
By direction of  
the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Ms. Mary Rose Cassa)  
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Ms. Francesca D'Onofrio)  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Mr. Dennis Mishek)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. James Ricks, Jr.)  
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency ( Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)  
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Mr. Richard Knapp)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. James Aldrich	Mr. Rick Nedell
Mr. John Allman	Ms. Patricia Nelson (Co-Chair)
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Mr. Richard Hansen	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Paul Hehn (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Mr. Gary Jensen	TI Museum (Ms. Laurie Glass)
Ms. Alice LaPierre	TI Yacht Club (Mr. Harlan Van Wye)
Mr. Clinton Loftman	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Mr. Daniel McDonald	Mr. Brad Wong

5090  
Ser 6225/L8031  
27 Oct 1997

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR  
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Blind copies to:  
622A(JS), 6221(w/o encl) 6225EG. 64  
Information Repository (3 copies)  
Chron, RF  
Writer: E. Galang, 6225EG, X-2560  
File: NS Treasure Island

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 19 August 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 19 August 1997 at 7:20 p.m. at the Building 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) receive a presentation on the Technology Needs Assessment Report by the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team Environmental Technology Partnership (BADCAT ETP), 3) present and comment on the Site 12 Investigation Work Plan, 4) comment on the Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease (FOSL) for Reuse Zone 4 (North TI Housing), 5) receive an update on the Fuel Line Removal Project, 6) receive an FY97 Execution/Draft FY 98 Project Execution Plan, 7) discuss and approve the revised February meeting minutes, 8) provide general program updates, 9) review action items, 10) attend to organizational business, 11) provide an upcoming environmental report review schedule, and 12) review proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

**I. WELCOME REMARKS**

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed meeting attendees. He noted that this was the first meeting to be held in Building 1 and announced that the next RAB meeting will also be held at the Building 1, however it is unsure where future meetings will be located.

**Discussion/Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Sullivan stated that due to the fewer number of base personnel and the increased work associated with the base closure, he was not able to complete his update of the fuel line removal project and review of the February meeting minutes. There were no comments on the meeting agenda.

**Discussion/Approval of Draft 17 June Minutes**

Mr. Sullivan noted the general satisfaction of recent meeting minutes reflecting the additional time put into their review. A vote was taken and the July 22, 1997 meeting minutes were approved.

**II. Public Comment**

Richard Hansen compared the NAS Alameda cleanup with the TI cleanup, stating the NAS Alameda cleanup will be straightforward because of its reuse as a wildlife refuge. He expressed concern over the complexity of the cleanup at TI because of the variety of reuse plans, and the concerns posed by

such reuse as residential, which could include children's playgrounds. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that only a portion of NAS Alameda will be established as a wildlife refuge, and the rest of the property is designated for various types of reuse. Mr. Hansen replied that there has been no solid decision that TI will be reused for residential. Mr. Sullivan noted that TI has a mixed use plan, with some residential and some commercial use; not all will be unrestricted reuse. Martha Walters stated that residential and commercial use will be cleaned up to two different standards. She added that there needs to be a differentiation between interim and long-term reuse.

John Allman distributed a paper, *Combined Effects in Toxicology-A Rapid Systematic Testing Procedure: Cadmium, Mercury, and Lead*, and expressed concern over the lack of consideration of the potential synergistic effects of chemicals that occur together at former military sites. He noted an additional 42 references on synergistic effects resulting from an Internet search. Mr. Allman added the topic needs to be investigated to determine if it is a concern at TI. Mary Rose Cassa, DTSC, noted that she discussed the concern with a toxicologist who cautioned her to consider that chemicals may also have an opposite reaction, canceling out the effects of each other. Mr. Allman stated that the information needs to be built into the calculations to determine if some sites may require a more conservative level of cleanup. He added that it is better to be more conservative from a human health risk standpoint.

Henry Ongerth asked what would need to be done to take a more conservative approach. Mr. Allman responded that the regulatory agencies would have to set limits; the paper he distributed outlines one method. He added that he would propose to the regulators and the Navy to look into all factors to determine the cleanup level, especially at those sites containing mixed waste. Mr. Sullivan stated that perhaps this could be the topic of future special meetings. Tom Huetteman, U.S. EPA, stated that he was aware of the issue of synergistic effects, noting that it is not normally considered because it is a complex issue. He recognized it as an important concern.

### **III. BADCAT ETP Technology Needs Assessment Presentation**

Amber Evans of the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team Environmental Technology Partnership (BADCAT ETP) distributed copies of their draft Technology Needs Assessment Report, and explained BADCAT's role of identifying innovative and emerging technology which can be used to expedite the cleanup of former military sites. Through review of U.S. EPA data and discussion with BRAC Conversion Team members, BADCAT determined that petroleum products and metals posed the greatest level of concern in the Bay Area. Additional concerns included addressing groundwater and sediment contamination. Ms. Evans stated they are presently contacting the Bay Area Restoration Advisory Boards and requesting their feedback on the draft report. Written comments can be received through the end of the month.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the next TI subcommittee meeting is on September 9 and asked if acceptance of report comments could be extended to this time. Ms. Evans agreed to extend the comment period. Karen Mendelow asked if BADCAT conducts cleanups at different sites. Ms.

Evans noted that the two primary cleanup concerns are sites with petroleum contamination and metals contamination.

Paul Hehn asked about the success of BADCAT's two demo projects. Karla Jenkins of the Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center commented on the success of the two demonstrations:

1. Soil washing cleaned soil to the industrial level from all metals, and to the residential level for all metals except lead and antimony; five tons of soil were processed through this small scale pilot project.
2. Field screening for metals using energy dispersive x-ray fluorescence (XRF) optimized the soil washing technology and provided a quick turnaround of results.

John Allman asked if their technology array included phytoremediation. Ms. Jenkins replied not currently but they would consider it if there was a region-wide need. Mr. Allman noted that information on remediation technology can be located on the Web. Ms. Evans added that the Presidio is presently using phytoremediation technology.

## **BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:**

### **IV. Site 12 Investigation Work Plan**

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy is requesting comments on the Site 12 Investigation Work Plan which went out in draft form on August 12. They hope to expedite the process to get into the field by the end of September or early October, but are awaiting funding.

Richard Knapp of Tetra Tech EM Inc. first provided some background on Site 12. He stated that a Remedial Investigation (RI) was conducted at Site 12 to investigate the nature and extent of potential groundwater and soil contamination at known or suspected areas of contamination. Some areas outside the suspected sources were not investigated. Mr. Knapp noted that the RI was originally based on wetland and recreational use of the site, but now that residential reuse is planned, there is a need to confirm that contamination is not present in areas outside suspected source areas.

Mr. Knapp explained that 112 soil and 49 groundwater samples will be collected in areas where analytical data are not available. The sample locations will be based on a 200-foot grid and the grid intersection will be sampled if data is not available within a 100-foot radius. Two soil samples will be taken from each boring- one at near surface and one at near water table. A groundwater sample will also be taken from the water table. The samples will be analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, TPHs and metals by an off-site analytical lab.

The RI data and the data gathered from the additional investigation will help evaluate the potential risks associated with residential use at Site 12. An RI Report Addendum will document the

findings of the investigation. Mr. Knapp added that funding has not yet officially been approved, but is expected soon. Field work should begin in October 1997 for four to six weeks of data collection. The draft RI addendum would then be completed in January 1998.

Mr. Ongerth asked about public exposure to groundwater. Mr. Knapp replied that there are no pathways for exposure to the groundwater and so should not be an issue; ecological effects are more of a concern. Mr. Allman asked if there would be a deed restriction on planting a garden; plantings can provide a pathway for contact with groundwater. Mr. Knapp responded that some restrictions on home grown produce may be necessary, particularly where the groundwater table is shallow.

Ms. Walters asked if there was some confusion over whether this project will receive funding. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy has made a commitment to Mayor Willie Brown to get the investigation funded. Funding was set aside to complete the entire project, but now the cost has increased and so are awaiting access to additional funds. Ernie Galang, EFA West, stated that they expect funding by the end of the year.

Mr. Hehn asked about the depth of the groundwater, and whether it will rise to the surface in wet years. Mr. Knapp stated the groundwater depth to be between three and six feet, with nothing shallower than two and one-half feet over about eight or nine storm events. Mr. Allman asked if the intensity of the off-shore sampling plan is based on what is found on-shore. Mr. Knapp stated that the storm drains were targeted as potential conduits for contaminants and sediment. Mr. Allman asked if additional off-shore sampling be conducted if new hot spots are identified, or a new chemical discovered during the investigation. Ms. Cassa stated it would be likely the regulatory agencies would ask the Navy to conduct further investigation if this scenario occurred. Mr. Sullivan stated that the comment period closes on August 28; a copy of the draft work plan will be forwarded to the Technical Committee.

#### **V. Draft Finding of Suitability to Lease for Reuse Zone 4**

Mr. Sullivan stated that the 30 day comment period for the Draft Resuse Zone 4 FOSL will close on September 13, 1997. He noted the high level of interest by the City of San Francisco on this property, which comprises the north TI housing.

Lynn Srinivasan of Uribe and Associates summarized the approach for the IR Site 12 risk evaluation for lead. She explained that NAVSTA TI-specific lead concentrations were calculated and a lead distribution map developed for concentrations in surface soil. The map would help evaluate potential lead risk to children based on TI-specific lead concentrations. The DTSC Lead Spread model was used to calculate lead in soil concentrations to include both ingesting and not ingesting homegrown produce. Lead concentrations greater than 216 mg/kg were plotted; no clear evidence of a distribution pattern was determined.

Ms. Srinivasan stated that a cumulative frequency graph was prepared to highlight concentrations outside the expected distribution curve. Only four points exceeded 400 mg/kg (EPA Region IX Preliminary Remediation Goal) and 463 mg/kg (TI-specific concentration). She noted that one concentration of 15,478 mg/kg was attributed to a paint chip in the sample; the other three require further evaluation. Ms. Srinivasan stated the conclusions that elevated lead levels occur in isolated areas, children should not play in these isolated areas, and that there should be lease restrictions on home-grown produce.

Mr. Hansen asked about the depth of the samples taken. Ms. Srinivasan stated that samples were taken from the surface. Pat Nelson requested an overlay be created of the sampling locations and suggested further investigation of the three locations with high lead levels. Mr. Hehn asked if the additional Site 12 sampling would change the Reuse Zone 4 FOSL. Ms. Srinivasan stated she was unsure, but would likely not change the FOSL. Mr. Hehn asked about the FOSL schedule. Mr. Sullivan stated that completion of the FOSL is projected for around October 24, 1997.

Mr. Allman recommended that Site 12 be looked at more closely because it contains other contaminants besides lead; the synergistic effects should be considered in addition to individual contaminants. Ms. Srinivasan stated that there has been some discussion on including other contaminants.

Mr. Allman suggested that the site could be made more safe by removing a layer of topsoil or by adding a layer of soil on top of the surface. Mr. Hansen asked about the age of the housing. Mr. Sullivan stated that most of the housing was built in the late 60s to early 70s. Mr. Hansen asked the use of the site around the WWII time period. Mr. Sullivan replied that the site was originally a parking lot for the World's Fair, then was open space until the housing was built.

Mr. Hehn asked if there will be early results of the soil and groundwater samples to provide quick feedback to the City. Mr. Knapp stated it could be accommodated although there was no formal mechanism and it was not in the Work Plan. Mr. Galang noted that this could be specified when field work begins.

Ms. Srinivasan pointed out that a large number of samples were collected, however only one sample detected lead in the tens of thousands range. Based on the total number of samples collected they do not expect another high lead concentration situation such as at the Nimitz House. Mr. Sullivan noted that some of the samples with extreme high values are suspect, as was similarly demonstrated through resampling at the Nimitz House. Mr. Allman asked if it was known whether additional topsoil had been added to the housing area. Mr. Sullivan responded that the site was likely regraded during construction, but it was not known how much. Mr. Allman pointed out there is a higher likelihood that lead contamination could exist below the surface soil of the housing area than at the Nimitz House. Ms. Nelson asked if the work being planned is of interest to the City and if the timing is compatible. Ms. Walters stated that the work is of great interest to the City, particularly for Site 12, noting tremendous pressure to get work underway.

## VI. FY 97 Execution/FY 98 Project Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of the NAVSTA TI FY97 Execution Progress, stating he updated last year's Execution Plan to reflect those projects funded for FY97. He noted that some projects have received partial funding. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the original total funding projected was \$10.9 million, along with some ongoing funded projects. Additional projects were also funded as outgrowths of other work in the amount of \$726,000. The grand total of projects funded in FY97 was \$3.5 million, or about one third of what was planned; approximately \$7.5 million was not funded.

Mr. Ongerth asked for clarification of whether TI had \$11 million available. Mr. Sullivan explained that the \$11 million was a projection of what TI would get out of the Federal budget, noting that funding is provided incrementally throughout the year. He added that more money would have been spent on additional work if they had received it. Mr. Ongerth noted that \$80 million had been projected for total cleanup. Mr. Sullivan stated that the projection figure will become more precise as they complete the investigations and begin awarding the contracts for actual cleanup.

Mr. Allman noted that the City is supposed to receive \$4.2 million from the Navy to cover operating costs of TI for the first year, and asked if this money is separate from the remediation funds. Mr. Sullivan stated that it is all BRAC money, however he was not aware of the potential of shifting money out of the administration funds to use for remediation work. Mr. Huetteman stated that on a national scale the funding looks equally dismal. He noted the Navy's assumption that property transfer would provide income was too optimistic, and they are trying to make better estimates for the coming year.

Mr. Huetteman stated his concern that the closing bases not follow the same procedures as last year. He asked if TI will prioritize projects and request community input for FY98. Mr. Sullivan stated that TI will prioritize projects and seek community input. He noted that the priority would be to fund those projects not funded this year, especially compliance projects that affect leasability and transferability. The prioritization needs to occur before the end of September, although there is some latitude to maneuver after the budget is in place. Mr. Ongerth asked whether the RAB had been provided the opportunity to discuss the priorities. Mr. Sullivan stated that several discussions were held last August at both the interim and regular RAB meetings. Mr. Ongerth stated his interest in reviewing the minutes of those meetings.

Ms. Nelson noted that the FY98 draft final budget is included on the September agenda. Mr. Sullivan stated that some time would be spent at the September 9 interim meeting working on the budget. He noted the schedule allowed for working on the budget from the end of August through September 19. Ms. Nelson asked if the draft budget would be available at the interim meeting. Mr. Sullivan replied that an initial draft would be available, but will include ranges only, not specific numbers. Mr. Sullivan agreed to send a copy of the draft budget with the next meeting agenda.

## **PROGRAM UPDATES:**

### **VII. General Updates**

#### **RPM/BCT Meeting**

Mr. Sullivan stated that an RPM/BCT meeting was held on August 12 which included a conference call with Gina Kathuria to discuss the development of petroleum screening levels. The meeting also included discussions on the Fuel Line Removal and UST programs, FY97 funding, anticipated work for CERCLA sites in FY98, the revised FFSRA schedule, the draft agenda for the RAB meeting, and the decision to add MTBE to the September interim meeting agenda. Mr. Hehn added they also discussed trying to join information on the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) sites with UST issues, perhaps in map form. Mr. Sullivan noted the interest in overlaying information from multiple programs, not necessarily integrating the programs. Mr. Allman noted a document on MTBE that he would send to Mr. Sullivan to aid their interim meeting discussion.

#### **Reuse Issues**

Mr. Sullivan noted a Treasure Island Development Task Force meeting on August 20, 1:00 p.m. at the Ferry Building.

### **VIII. Review of Action Items**

Ms. Nelson reviewed the following action items:

- develop an overlay of Reuse Zone 4 FOSL areas with high lead
- develop and overlay of Site 12 Work Plan sampling points
- distribute John Allman's MTBE document to all RAB members
- distribute to RAB members the August/September 1996 RAB meeting minutes addressing FY97 priorities and RAB comments

Ryan Brooks of EFA West reminded RAB members to please return completed surveys to him by the next meeting.

## **OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **IX. Organizational Business**

Ms. Nelson pointed out that the RAB Technical Committee comments on the RI Addenda were available at the meeting in addition to the letter sent to the regulatory agencies outlining the RAB's concern with removal of DTSC from the RAB. Both will also be included in the next mailing of the meeting minutes.

Ms. Nelson also stated her concern regarding the lack of action by the Navy to proceed with the RAB membership drive during the past year. She stated it is imperative to recruit new members before the release of the Record of Decision. Ms. Nelson requested the Navy respond to the membership drive by printing the recruitment ad in the newspapers, and to not be delayed by affiliating with the Hunters Point RAB. Mr. Sullivan noted that the closure of the base has made it more difficult to contract out for the commercial ad. He has been exploring the option of free advertising through use of press releases, and is working with Ryan Brooks to get out a press release in the next few weeks. The Bay Guardian has a free notice section and may be willing to carry a notice.

Ms. Mendelow recommended contacting the community involvement "pink" section of the Chronicle and the Green City Paper for free advertising. Mr. Sullivan noted the expense of using paid advertising, but may be able to scale down to a more affordable level. Ms. Nelson stated the RAB was looking for a commitment by the Navy to run the ads by a certain date, and suggested this be accomplished by the September 9 interim meeting. She cautioned that the RAB may otherwise have to consider advertising on its own for new members. Mr. Brooks stated that the Hunters Point RAB recently elected a new community Co-Chair and they would be meeting with her to discuss membership recruitment. Ms. Nelson stated that Treasure Island wants to be uncoupled with Hunters Point so as not to further delay the process. Mr. Sullivan agreed to send a mailing out to the City's list of interested individuals as well as to past applicants prior to the September 9 interim meeting. Mr. Allman suggested also running ads in University and college newspapers. Mr. Ongerth stated his support for Ms. Nelson's request to move ahead on the membership drive.

Ms. Nelson announced a letter developed by Paul Hehn and John Allman which expresses concern over funding for base closure studies. Mr. Allman stated that RAB members can simply add their name, address and signature to the letter or can use it to draft their own letter to send out to officials and representatives. The letter can be mailed, faxed, or e-mailed. Copies of the letter were available at the meeting and Mr. Sullivan also agreed to mail copies to the RAB members, along with a cover letter. Mr. Hehn noted that time was of the essence in distributing letters to officials and representatives to get funding for TI. He also thanked Mr. Allman for his effort in getting the information together for the RAB.

#### **X. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule**

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the upcoming Environment Report Schedule as follows:

- Site 12 Investigation Work Plan - out now
- Draft Zone 4 FOSL - out now
- Draft Final RI - not out yet, expected around August 29
- Draft Corrective Action Plan - due mid-to-late October

Ms. Nelson asked about the status of the Site 24 Investigation. Mr. Knapp noted that the Work Plan was funded and the field work has been completed. Ms. Nelson asked if the data would be reflected

in the draft final RI. Mr. Knapp stated it would be contained in a technical memorandum, likely out around September 15; the data will also be incorporated into the final RI.

Ms. Nelson asked when the information for the Site 12 Investigation will be available in the review of the RI cycle. Mr. Knapp responded that the data collection would take place in October with the report being completed by the end of the year. Ms. Nelson asked about the turnaround time from having the draft final RI comments due and the Site 12 data ready for incorporation into the final RI. Mr. Knapp stated there would be a 60 day period from submittal to draft final for regulatory comments and another 60 days for responding to the comments in the final RI. He stated that the timing would be similar for Site 12. Ms. Nelson stressed the importance of having a cohesive final RI document which should incorporate results from the Site 12 and Site 24 Investigations. Mr. Sullivan noted there is more latitude to incorporate information into the final RI document.

## **XI. Proposed Agenda Items**

Mr. Sullivan reviewed next month's RAB meeting agenda as follows:

### **September**

- Draft Final Onshore Remedial Investigation Report
- Draft Final FY98 Project Execution Plan
- Integration of Interim Uses and Cleanup
- GIS Demo for UST Sites

Mr. Sullivan noted that for the October meeting, he may need to adjust CAP presentation, but could instead use the time for further discussion on the draft final RI. He added that the draft Reuse EIS/EIR may not be out until end of year and so would be scheduled for a later meeting.

Ms. Nelson asked for clarification on the date of the next BCT meeting. Mr. Sullivan stated that September 2 was still a tentative date. The next interim meeting has been rescheduled for September 9. A special RI report review meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 30.

Ms. Cassa stated that she agreed with the need to have a complete and cohesive RI report but also recognized there are funding issues the Navy has to deal with, and so must be realistic about the document. Mr. Allman asked about the possibility of leaving blank sections in the report for work not yet completed, that can be inserted later. Mr. Galang noted that a 30 day extension may be requested for the draft final RI.

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

**The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 16 at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference area.**

ATTACHMENT A – MEETING AGENDA  
ATTACHMENT B – ATTENDANCE LIST  
ATTACHMENT C – MEETING HANDOUTS

THESE ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY NAVFAC  
SOUTHWEST RECORDS OFFICE TO LOCATE THE MISSING  
ATTACHMENTS. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A  
PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED SHOULD THE  
MISSING ITEMS BE LOCATED.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

DIANE C. SILVA, COMMAND RECORDS MANAGER, CODE EV33  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, SOUTHWEST  
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY (NBSD BLDG. 3519)  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280  
E-MAIL: [diane.silva@navy.mil](mailto:diane.silva@navy.mil)

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 16 September 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 16 September 1997 at 7:10 p.m. at the Building 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve/discuss the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) receive public comment, 3) receive a reuse briefing by the City of San Francisco on integration of interim reuses and cleanup, 4) provide a presentation on the Draft Final Onshore Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, 5) hold a Draft Final Onshore RI question and answer session, 6) review the Draft FY98 Project Execution Plan, 7) provide general program updates, 8) review action items, 9) attend to organizational business, 10) provide an upcoming environmental report review schedule, and 11) review proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

**I. WELCOME REMARKS**

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed meeting attendees. He noted that Naval Station Treasure Island officially closes in two weeks, and that Engineering Field Activity West will take over administration of the site for the Navy. The October RAB meeting will be held in the same location, however, future meeting locations are still undetermined. Mr. Sullivan also noted that an optional field demonstration of the Site Characterization and Analysis Penetrometer System (SCAPS) was held at 5:00 p.m. prior to the RAB meeting. The SCAPS is used for detection of petroleum products at the fuel line removal sites. He added that the system will be on site for one and one-half more weeks and can be viewed during the work day through arrangement with himself. Mr. Sullivan stated that the community member's interim meeting was rescheduled to 6:00 p.m. tonight due to last week's BART strike.

**Discussion/Approval of Agenda**

Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, recommended adding two additional items to the agenda under the BRAC Cleanup Process: feedback on the Community Relations Plan issued by PRC (Tetra Tech) and discussion of the Zone 4 FOSL, since today is the deadline for comments. Mr. Sullivan requested to defer discussion of the February, March, and April minutes, since he has not yet completed his review of them. **ACTION ITEM:** To complete the February, March, and April minutes markups for discussion at the next RAB meeting.

## II. Public Comment

Chris Shirley stated she had heard talk about the Navy negotiating with San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown on a dirty transfer of Treasure Island, noting that ARC Ecology is opposed to the idea. Mr. Sullivan commented he was unaware of any discussions, noting his efforts have been towards cleanup and transfer of the property. Richard Hansen stated he would be appalled if a dirty transfer comes to pass, adding it would make a mockery of the RAB. Usha Vedagiri commented that a dirty transfer would raise questions on whether the commitment for cleanup would be maintained should funding be limited in the future. Larry Florin, of the Mayor's Office, responded that there has been no discussion of a dirty transfer of Treasure Island, adding that the Treasure Island Development Task Force will be involved in discussions regarding conveyance of the property. Ms. Nelson asked if the Task Force is the appropriate forum to voice concerns regarding dirty transfer. Mr. Florin indicated that it would be the best venue, noting that public comment is on the agenda at every meeting.

Henry Ongerth asked to hear the perspective of the regulatory agencies if this concern goes beyond rumor. Ms. Shirley noted that EPA and DTSC are developing guidelines on handling dirty transfers, but are still in the discussion stage. Mary Rose Cassa, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), agreed to look into the matter. Mr. Hansen asked that copies of the guidelines be distributed to RAB members. Martha Walters of the City of San Francisco stated that EPA and Department of Defense (DoD) are working on guidelines. Stacey Lupton of Tetra Tech stated that DTSC follows EPA's guidelines and offered to distribute public information that is available on dirty transfer. Ms. Shirley noted that there is currently no mechanism in the guidelines to ensure continued funding of the cleanup.

James Ricks of U.S. EPA introduced himself as the replacement for Rachel Simons. He offered to look into this concern and share any information and documents with the RAB.

John Allman informed Mr. Ricks that Tom Huetteman of U.S. EPA had agreed to get feedback from their toxicologist on the synergistic effects of contaminants. Mr. Allman asked if Mr. Ricks could follow up with their toxicologist on this concern. He also asked if Gina Kathuria, of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), was still a participant of the RAB, noting her absence. Ms. Cassa stated that the funding situation of Ms. Kathuria's agency may be such that they are unable to compensate her for attendance at every RAB meeting, noting that she was present at the last RPM meeting.

Ms. Cassa addressed the issue of synergistic effects, noting discussion with a high level DTSC scientist. She stated it is felt the safety factors built into the Risk Assessment adequately cover this nebulous area, and that it cannot be addressed through the regulatory process. Mr. Allman stated that it was his intent that consideration of synergistic effects be introduced at the decision-making level for how much to clean up, more so than that it be put into the risk assessment calculations, since he agreed that it would be virtually impossible to take into account every interaction. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that this is going to be a continuing topic.

## **BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:**

### **III. Reuse Briefing by City of San Francisco**

Mr. Sullivan introduced Mr. Larry Florin from the City of San Francisco Mayor's Office. Mr. Florin stated that on October 1 the partnership between the City and the Navy goes into effect through a cooperative agreement which delegates authority to the City for day to day management of TI. He noted that both Pat Nelson and Martha Walters have kept him informed of the RAB's concerns, and assured members that their voice is heard and consideration given to integrating their thoughts and concerns into the City's reuse plan.

Mr. Florin explained that Mayor Brown has proposed creation of the Treasure Island Development Authority, in the form of State Legislature Bill AB 699. The bill was adopted by the legislature and now awaits signature by the Governor. The Development Authority, comprised of five board members, would function as the local reuse authority, overseeing the reuse and redevelopment of TI.

Mr. Florin stated that transfer of Treasure Island represents a unique opportunity to create a new city. He noted the Mayor's enthusiasm for the project and his focus and involvement in the process. One of the Mayor's prime goals, he noted, is to avoid letting the facility fall into disrepair and become a nuisance for the City. Mr. Florin stated that several projects are proceeding at TI such as the U.S. Department of Labor Job Corps project, leasing of Buildings 2 and 3 for movie production, establishment of a fire training school in Building 600 by the San Francisco Fire Department, plans to relocate the Diamond Heights Police Academy to Building 461, and interest by the Sheriff's Department to operate a women's detention facility on the site. Mr. Florin added that the City will lease Building 1 from the Navy, and that both City and Navy personnel will occupy the building. He noted that Building 1 will undergo renovation, including the former museum space, and stated that the museum collection will be managed by the San Francisco International Airport. The marina will be licensed from the Navy, with eventual lease of the facility, and will be the first permanent transition use. A Request for Proposal has gone out for a marina operator, and eventual expansion of the number of berths has been proposed. In addition, Mr. Florin stated that the Nimitz House of Yerba Buena Island is being leased for special events, that they are also trying to lease Casa de la Vista, and that the City is currently negotiating with a group interested in operating all of the housing not usable by the homeless housing group TIHDI.

Mr. Hansen asked if renovation of Building 1 will be up to seismic standards. Mr. Florin responded that a FEMA 178 assessment for life safety has been conducted, required by the City attorneys prior to lease. Improvements to Building 1 will be consistent with FEMA 178 guidelines. Mr. Ongerth asked where the new Development Authority would get their funding. Mr. Florin stated that funds generated on TI will stay on TI, noting income from the Navy cooperative agreement and movie production. He added that adequate funding will not be available. The Navy decision-makers in Washington DC have chosen to fund operations at only \$4 million — 35 percent of the level of when the base was operable, for a period of two years. Mr. Ongerth asked how the City will keep the property from becoming a nuisance considering the

lack of funding. Mr. Florin responded that there will be some City and County general funds available for operation, noting the City's commitment to the redevelopment and reuse of TI.

Mr. Allman noted that at the last TI Development Task Force meeting, concern was raised about lease of the Zone 4 Site 12 housing until further sampling had been conducted and it could be considered safe for occupancy. He asked if the need for the generation of funds would push leasing decisions despite other concerns. Mr. Florin clarified that the City was not looking at funds generated by housing leases to run the island. He stated that the greater concern is to not allow the 900 units of housing to fall into disrepair. Mr. Florin explained that the housing is subject to the Tidelands Trust, which does not consider housing to be an acceptable use. Housing cannot be replaced once it is lost, and so the City does not want to permanently lose any of the housing. Ms. Nelson asked what would be the appropriate forum to discuss concerns about housing. Mr. Florin stated that Ms. Walters is very involved in decisions regarding leasing issues and brings the concerns of the RAB to the City. He reiterated the importance of not delaying the process so that the City does not lose the opportunity to lease the housing. Ms. Shirley asked if there is a forum to review leases, noting that leases at NAS Alameda did not contain the terms of the FOSL. Mr. Florin noted two forums, the Treasure Island Development Authority which approves leases in open session and the Board of Supervisors.

Dale Smith asked if leasing discussions included YBI housing, and also pointed out a potential similar situation with the marina as with the Site 12 housing, where use may come before full contaminant characterization of the site. Mr. Florin confirmed that leasing discussions also include YBI housing, and that permitting for new marina berths will not happen anytime soon. Mr. Sullivan added that concerns about sediment contamination at the marina have been articulated back to Washington, DC. Harlan Van Wye asked when the City will have subleasing authority for the marina and adjacent structures. Mr. Florin responded that a model lease for the marina provided by the Navy underwent revision; the City and Navy have reached agreement pending review by Navy officials in Washington, DC. Mr. Hehn commented that, in regards to the leasing of housing at Site 12, the RAB is very interested in moving forward quickly and diligently with reuse but also has concerns about environmental issues. The RAB does not want to delay the process but does want to ensure that similar problems do not occur as with the Presidio. Mr. Hehn added that this is why the RAB is working with the legislature and the Navy to get the funding to move the process along as quickly as possible. Mr. Florin asked that the RAB consider the issue of permanent loss of the rare opportunity to lease this affordable housing as part of their efforts. Ms. Nelson thanked Mr. Florin for taking time to speak to the RAB.

#### **IV. Draft Final Onshore Remedial Investigation (RI) Report Presentation**

Mr. Sullivan announced that copies of the draft final Onshore RI Report were available at the meeting. Richard Knapp of Tetra Tech informed members that they would all receive an executive summary of the document by mail.

Mr. Knapp reported that additional studies and data have been generated since the draft RI report was issued in October 1996. The draft final RI report now contains the following information (refer to Attachment C): two additional quarters (June 96 and September 96) of groundwater monitoring data; the contaminant fate and transport modeling from April 1997 now incorporated as Appendix M; additional soil and groundwater data from Sites 12 and 17; ecotoxicological testing for the development of petroleum screening levels incorporated as Appendix N; and a new section, response to regulatory agency comments on the draft RI contained in Appendix O.

Mr. Knapp summarized the following new data included in the draft final RI:

- The fate and transport modeling results modeled those chemicals predicted to reach the shoreline at concentrations greater than ambient water quality criteria. The modeling showed that some metals did show up at four sites (7, 10, 11 and 12), as predicted.
- Additional sampling was conducted at Site 12 to define the extent of hydrocarbon contamination near well 12-MW16, and at Site 17 to define the extent of chlorinated solvent groundwater contamination that may have migrated from Site 5.
- Ecotoxicological testing for the development of petroleum screening levels determined threshold values of 14.3 mg/L TPH in groundwater and 430 mg/kg of TPH in soil, considered protective of marine organisms at the point that groundwater enters the Bay.

Mr. Knapp explained that the sites were recommended to be classified as one of three types, based on this new data as well as on previous studies: no action under CERCLA, perform a feasibility study, or requiring further study. Sites 01, 03, 05, 07, 08, 09 and 17 were recommended to be classified as requiring no action under CERCLA. Feasibility studies were recommended for Sites 10, 11, 21 and 24. Sites 12, 28 and 29 were recommended as requiring further study. Mr. Knapp referred the RAB to the Summary Table in the Executive Summary for further information on how the sites were classified. Mr. Knapp noted that funding is available for additional study of Site 12 which will begin next month. Mr. Knapp added that Sites 28 and 29 require further information to complete the ecological risk assessment. These sites may pose a threat to the peregrine falcon. It is proposed that red-wing blackbirds be trapped and tissue samples collected since blackbirds are a documented food source of the falcons. This additional data collection has been strongly recommended by the regulatory agencies in order to complete the terrestrial risk assessment.

Mr. Van Wye asked what contaminants pose a concern for Sites 28 and 29. Mr. Knapp replied that lead from bridge paint and traffic are a concern at these two sites. Ms. Cassa asked if Tetra Tech was scheduled to talk with the agencies on the ecotoxicological testing, noting it was considered a high priority with the RWQCB. Mr. Knapp indicated that no meetings had yet been scheduled, although it had been considered an action item at the last RPM meeting. He added that the RWQCB is of the opinion that the Navy proposed groundwater concentration (14.3 mg/L TPH) is perhaps an order of magnitude higher than what the RWQCB would like to see. He noted that this also affects the CAP sites. Mr. Hehn asked if there has been extensive rewrite on the RI report due to the additional addenda studies and data. Mr. Knapp noted that there has been a lot

of rewriting based on ecological risk assessment, and that specific comments by RAB members and regulatory agencies were addressed.

Ms. Nelson noted that a summary was made of response to regulatory agency comments, however, there was no summary response to RAB comments. Mr. Allman stated that RAB members had spent much time preparing comments and asked if a response is planned. Mr. Knapp stated that the first goal has been to get the report out and that it has not been the intent to not respond to RAB comments. Mr. Sullivan added that the Navy is open to the response format for addressing RAB comments and suggested it be discussed at the next interim meeting. He noted that CERCLA requires a more formal process to address the comments of regulatory agencies.

Ms. Nelson stated that the RAB had spent much time preparing comments on the document, noting that the Navy and Tetra Tech had eleven months to craft a summary of responses to RAB comments according to a format agreed to earlier in the year. She stated her acute dissatisfaction with how the Navy and Tetra Tech has addressed RAB comments and finds it unacceptable to put it off into the future. Mr. Allman pointed out that the RAB is obligated to bring up these same concerns in the final RI if they are not addressed now. He noted it would be even more time consuming to review the final RI and requested that changes in the document be highlighted to ease review. He added that it will otherwise be hard to justify spending more time on this document, noting his goal to get these issues dealt with now. Mr. Allman stated that the lack of response to RAB comments falls short of the RAB's expectations. Mr. Knapp noted that a response to RAB comments was issued on May 1 by the Navy. Ms. Nelson stated that this response had not been considered adequate, noting deficiencies in the response.

Mr. Ricks asked what had been agreed to between the RAB and the Navy in how RAB comments would be addressed. Ms. Nelson stated that the agreement was to provide either a redline version of the document, or an index with comments keyed to paragraphs in the text. Mr. Van Wye echoed Ms. Nelson's concerns but noted that TI's problems are relatively minor compared to some industrial bases. He expressed his frustration with the slowness of the cleanup process at TI, a relatively clean base. Mr. Allman noted the importance of the review process, stating that the RAB has comments now because of deficiencies found in the initial RI. The review process exists to address deficiencies and ensure that the job is done thoroughly to avoid problems for future residents of the island. Mr. Sullivan added that CERCLA sites tend to be more complex and require more time, however, there is a lot of other cleanup activity on the base that is proceeding in a more timely manner.

Ms. Walters commented that the slow nature of cleanup is inherent in the process, particularly because it is a DoD site, and because the hazardous waste field is still relatively new. She added that there is a lack of financial incentive from Congress and DoD to proceed more quickly, as would likely be the case on a privately-owned site. Mr. Van Wye commented he feels the extensive testing and retesting has been excessive and has served as a jobs bill for environmental experts. Ms. Cassa asked the Navy if it is feasible to generate an index of responsiveness to RAB comments in the next two to four weeks. Ms. Nelson noted it would be in Tetra Tech's best interest to create such an index. Mr. Allman noted

the importance of responding to the contributions of community members in reviewing the documents. Ernie Galang, EFA West, stated he would have to meet with Tetra Tech and review the status of current funding to determine if the Navy has the mechanism and means for this additional effort.

Mr. Hehn suggested that the Navy have a written response document prepared prior to a future Navy meeting with the RAB on the draft final RI report. Ms. Vedagiri expressed concern that the responses be made in writing as well as verbally. Mr. Ongerth commented that it was his opinion the RAB is establishing a higher standard of cleanup than required by regulatory agencies and applied to the population at large. Mr. Hehn expressed disagreement, stating that the RAB is trying to apply the same standards to the Navy bases as normally applied to private property. Ms. Nelson added that a lower standard has been accepted for TI work than would be the case in private industry. Ms. Vedagiri asked if the additional data collected will change the human health risk assessment. Mr. Knapp responded that the additional data collected at Sites 12 and 17 were incorporated into the human health risk assessment. Mr. Allman stated it would probably not take much effort for the Navy or Tetra Tech to review the 24-page RAB comment document to determine if the comments have been addressed. He added that if the comments are not addressed now, they will come up again later, requiring a lot more time and effort.

Ms. Nelson wrapped up the discussion by noting that comments on the draft final RI are due in 60 days. An RI report review meeting for RAB members and regulatory agencies was scheduled for September 30 at the PG&E offices, on Market Street. Ms. Nelson suggested that the RAB not meet with the Navy or Tetra Tech until they have prepared a response index to RAB comments. Mr. Sullivan agreed to respond back to the RAB in one week regarding the availability of funds to develop a response index. Ms. Nelson noted that approval of the August meeting minutes was omitted and will be included in next month's agenda.

## **V. Draft FY98 Project Execution Plan**

Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of the Draft FY98 Project Execution Plan (Attachment C), noting that it was put together later this year than last. He explained that the Navy developed a list of priorities which was reviewed and further prioritized at the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting. Mr. Sullivan made a further adjustment in the ranking of asbestos and lead based paint work.

Mr. Sullivan briefly reviewed the plan, noting that community relations and RAB support received the highest priority ranking followed by program management for IR and UST programs. Mr. Allman recommended cutting back on RAB support funding in favor of more funding in program management for responding to RAB technical comments. Ryan Brooks, EFA West, noted that community relations provides more than RAB support and did not recommend taking funds away from this program. Ms. Walter asked about the bottom line amount of funding the Navy will give to TI. Mr. Sullivan responded that he does not yet know this number, but guesses it will be about \$10 million. Mr. Sullivan also noted that consideration must also be given to the amount of work that can actually be executed during the fiscal year.

Mr. Sullivan stated that priority 3, the IR/UST database management, would provide the funding to get the data into a more viewable fashion. Asbestos design and abatement, as well as lead based paint abatement for housing, were placed as priorities 4 and 5 because of the City's interest in completing this work. Priority 6, the Baseline EBS data update, is not highly definitized but would bring all the data together. Interim IR groundwater monitoring and UST/Fuel Line groundwater monitoring, priorities 7 and 8, are high interest items. The final onshore RI report was funded in FY97 and can be deleted from the list. The final corrective Action Plan (CAP) for nine petroleum IR sites would require funding for completion. Air permits for TI will expire in about a year, and so require funding during FY98. Priority 11, PCB Containing Equipment Abatement, needs to be addressed and effects leasable and transferrable buildings. The same is the case for priority 12, ozone depleting substance abatement. The fuel line RI and additional fuel line removal design requires funding in FY98. RIs and design work are also needed for the miscellaneous USTs. Some sites require no further action and can be completed and moved out of the process. Lead based point abatement for the 36 housing units will be necessary if the design work is funded and completed.

Priorities 16 through 26 include remedial design of nine IR CAP sites; draft onshore RI report; onshore feasibility study and technical support; RAP/ROD for onshore sites; fuel line removal phase II; offshore feasibility study and technical support; EBS FOSLs/FOSTs; and UST Remedial Actions. Undefined interim removal actions were included as priority 27.

Ms. Nelson commented that in reviewing the funding priority list, the administrative processes seem to hold a higher priority than the CERCLA programs. Mr. Sullivan responded that the CERCLA sites are on a certain timeline, and at this point, only the ROD process can be started in FY98. The other sites like the USTs and fuel lines can be taken care of much more quickly and gotten out of the way. Mr. Galang stated he would soon issue a new cleanup schedule. Mr. Sullivan stated that the CERCLA work was proceeding on schedule. Ms. Cassa stated she personally felt the priorities are appropriate and will do a lot towards getting TI to reuse. Mr. Hehn stated that some of the projects more applicable to reuse should be moved further up on the list to ensure their funding, and that required items like groundwater monitoring could be moved down since they would have to be funded anyway. Mr. Sullivan responded that those items further down on the list risk not getting funded, even if required for the cleanup process, because the Navy plans to execute according to priority. Those items that need to be undertaken for either the cleanup process or the City's reuse need high priority status.

Ms. Shirley questioned the deference of the offshore work. Mr. Sullivan stated it was not being deferred but was rather a reflection of the work schedule already in progress. He noted that there is no reason to put money into the work early on if the draft offshore RI document will not be out until later this year. Mr. Sullivan added that the Navy is not slowing down the CERCLA work but instead trying to fit in the other projects. In general, projects requiring funding early in the year were placed at the top of the priority list, whereas those that did not need money until later were placed lower on the list.

## **VI. Zone 4 FOSL Comments**

Mr. Sullivan stated that he could accept written comments on the Zone 4 FOSL through Monday morning, September 22<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Nelson noted that copies of her written comments were available at the meeting, and were also included in a recent mailing to RAB members.

Mr. Allman asked for clarification on Gina Kathuria's participation in the RAB and the BCT, noting a number of action items for the Water Board in the RPM/BCT meeting minutes. Ms. Cassa confirmed that Ms. Kathuria is still a participant of the BCT and the RAB, and was present at the September 2 BCT meeting.

## **VII. MTBE Discussion**

Mr. Allman distributed a Cal EPA document on MTBE, noting he found it to be a good summary of the topic. Mr. Sullivan stated that Ms. Kathuria has been researching the issue, and provided the Navy with some guidance documents for evaluation. Ms. Nelson noted the RAB had expressed concern that MTBE testing was not included in groundwater monitoring. She asked if this was an issue being taken up by the agencies as part of the RI. Ms. Cassa responded that the BCT saw MTBE as a bigger issue, noting that the proper analytical method for MTBE may not have been used in the EBS sampling. She added that one analytical method tends to report the presence of MTBE when it is not there. These sites will be resampled using the correct analytic method, as will future sampling. Ms. Nelson noted for the record that soil testing for Site 12 in October should include MTBE analysis, in particular adjacent to Sites 20 and 6, which are known underground storage tank petroleum sites. Mr. Knapp indicated there are plans to test for MTBE and that the proper method, 8260, will be specified to the lab. Site 12 investigation samples will be the first analyzed and reported on for MTBE. Mr. Galang stated that the quarterly groundwater monitoring report is not yet available.

## **VIII. Membership Drive**

Mr. Sullivan informed the RAB that a press release was issued about two weeks ago to 30 news organizations soliciting new RAB members. In addition, a mailing went out to over 100 people who had previously applied to the RAB as well as to the City's reuse program mailing list. He reported he has already received back one completed application from the head of the Job Corps. Several additional requests have come in for applications. In addition, a request for applications was included in the public notice section of the Sunday Chronicle and Examiner, and will run in the Wednesday, September 17 edition of the Bay Guardian.

Ms. Nelson asked if it is possible to determine which media responded to the press release. Mr. Brooks stated that a list is being developed. Ms. Nelson called for the formation of a subcommittee to address the membership applications. Tom Thompson, Chris Shirley and Clinton

Loftman volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. Mr. Allman asked about the process used previously to rank and select new members, and asked if this information is still available. Ms. Nelson noted she thought it could be made available. Mr. Allman requested the mailing list used to generate the membership recruitment mailing. Mr. Sullivan agreed to provide him with this list.

Ms. Nelson asked about the timeframe in which to receive completed applications. Mr. Sullivan indicated that a deadline for application receipt had been set for October 17. Ms. Shirley noted that she thinks ARC Ecology may have the records from the previous membership application process. Ms. Nelson recommended that the subcommittee choose a principal and report back at an interim meeting on their progress. She added that the subcommittee will review the applications and present a list of proposed applicants to the board. Mr. Brooks stated that the DoD had developed guidance on selecting RAB members and he would provide this information to Ms. Nelson. It was agreed to invite the applicants to the next RAB meeting. Mr. Allman noted that Ms. Shirley sits on both the TI and Hunters Point RABs, and suggested that applicants not selected at TI could potentially be referred to Hunters Point, if they lack interested applicants. Ms. Nelson extended thanks to Jim Sullivan and Ryan Brooks for getting the membership drive underway. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that this was Hugo Berston's last meeting before the closure of the base on September 30 and thanked him publicly for his efforts for the RAB.

Ms. Nelson adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

**The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 21 at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference area.**

ATTACHMENT A – MEETING AGENDA  
ATTACHMENT B – ATTENDANCE LIST  
ATTACHMENT C – MEETING HANDOUTS

THESE ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY NAVFAC  
SOUTHWEST RECORDS OFFICE TO LOCATE THE MISSING  
ATTACHMENTS. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A  
PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED SHOULD THE  
MISSING ITEMS BE LOCATED.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

DIANE C. SILVA, COMMAND RECORDS MANAGER, CODE EV33  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, SOUTHWEST  
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY (NBSD BLDG. 3519)  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280  
E-MAIL: [diane.silva@navy.mil](mailto:diane.silva@navy.mil)