

1 ---o0o---
 2 NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
 3 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
 4 18 AUGUST 1998
 5 7:00 P.M.
 6 CASA DE LA VISTA
 7 TREASURE ISLAND
 8 MEETING NO. 48
 9 ---o0o---
 10
 11
 12
 13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20 REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

1

1 A T T E N D E E S (Continued)
 2 COMMUNITY MEMBERS:
 3 CHRIS SHIRLEY
 4 KAVITHA RAO
 5 NATHAN BRENNAN
 6 PAUL HEHN
 7 ALICE LA PIERRE
 8 CLINTON LOFTMAN
 9 JACK W. SAVAGE
 10 PATRICIA NELSON
 11 PUBLIC/GUESTS:
 12 ROSS TIBBITS
 13 ROBERT MAHONEY

---o0o---

3

1 A T T E N D E E S
 2 U.S. NAVY:
 3 JAMES B. SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
 4 ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
 5 AMELIA DUQUE (EBS)
 6 TETRA TECH EM, INC.:
 7 RICHARD KNAPP
 8 STACEY LUPTON
 9 ROXANNE MC MAHAN
 10 WAYNE MAYER
 11 LYNNE SRINIVASAN (Uribe & Associates)
 12 ANJU WICK
 13 REGULATORY AGENCY:
 14 DAVID RIST (DTSC)
 15 PENNY MC DANIEL (FOR JAMES RICKS, JR. (US EPA)
 16 CLAIRE BEST
 17 GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC. (GPI)
 18 DARLENE ROBBINS
 19 BARRY ROBBINS
 20

2

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, welcome to our
 2 August Restoration Advisory Board meeting.
 3 I was putting together the agenda, and I
 4 happened to notice it's meeting number 48, which
 5 represents four years of RAB meetings.
 6 (Applause.)
 7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we are finally
 8 being able to see the light at the end of the tunnel,
 9 since one of our discussion topics tonight is the site
 10 environmental baseline survey that's leading to the
 11 finding of suitability to transfer.
 12 If you don't have a copy of the agenda,
 13 there are extra copies, should be extra copies on the
 14 back table.
 15 Our first item is discussion and approval of
 16 tonight's agenda. I already have two corrections
 17 myself.
 18 We had one, the 7:45 item, which I had
 19 labeled, "Draft Finding of Suitability To Transfer,"
 20 which we are actually going to talk about tonight.

4

1 The technical subcommittee has already received as the
2 environmental baseline survey that's leading to the
3 finding of suitability to transfer, so we won't
4 actually issue the draft FOST document until we have
5 gotten comment on the environmental baseline survey.

6 So we are doing it in a two-step process.
7 We are not issuing the FOST tonight, and we will be
8 talking about the schedule for that a little bit later
9 in the evening.

10 The second correction is that we also have a
11 brief presentation on the no further action documents
12 for IR Sites 1 and 3. We will be going out with that
13 draft document sometime in the next 30 days. Because
14 it is a no further action document, there is an
15 associated public meeting.

16 So we can discuss, we can put that item
17 after the Zone 4 and right before the discussion of
18 EBS FOST. So that will be one addition to the agenda.

19 Are there any other comments concerning
20 tonight's agenda?

5

1 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a question.
2 If possible, if there is time and people are
3 interested, I did attend a hearing today for the board
4 of supervisors committee on economic development, I
5 think.

6 If you want me to briefly tell you what I
7 said on behalf of the RAB, I would be more than happy
8 to do so. I only had like three minutes to speak, so
9 I guarantee it won't be long.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is there any preference
11 to doing it earlier or later in the meeting? We can
12 either do it in general updates or do it at the
13 beginning as just public comment.

14 I should add that Richard Hansen will
15 probably be delayed. He's currently down in Santa
16 Cruz. I don't know what time he will arrive tonight.
17 He did call and say he would be delayed.

18 Would there be any preference to just go
19 ahead and make that report now before we get too far
20 from the rest of the agenda?

6

1 MS. NELSON: That would be fine.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Chris, you have
3 the floor.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: Michael Yaki (phonetic) called
5 a hearing as an ongoing effort to exercise the Board
6 of Supervisors right to keep tabs on what TIDA is up
7 to.

8 They decided that they are not comfortable
9 with TIDA being completely in the driver's seat and
10 they want oversight.

11 So this committee -- he seems to be meeting
12 every two months or so with updates about various
13 issues, and one of the issues was toxics and how it
14 relates to reuse.

15 So what I told the supervisors committee was
16 that the areas in orange -- this map is from the
17 supplementary baseline survey that we will be
18 reviewing now -- the orange stuff is all the stuff
19 that's not being transferred. It also, as you can
20 see, kind of coincides to the areas that require

7

1 cleanup for remediation.

2 So that's what I pointed out, that the
3 transferred areas are all the clean areas, and if you
4 look at this map with the reuse focus, you find that
5 the revenue generating parcels are the ones that still
6 require cleanup.

7 So that even though there is going to be a
8 bunch of Treasure Island transfer to the city
9 reasonably shortly, that they needed to keep in mind
10 the cleanup issues were still important to follow
11 because of the fact that the revenue generators are in
12 the cleanup areas.

13 So that was basically all I said.

14 And I did offer the RAB services for any
15 questions, if the committee wanted to invite RAB
16 members at the new hearings and what have you. I was
17 sure the RAB would be willing to be involved.

18 And I tried to make it clear to the TIDA
19 people that the RAB wishes to stay involved in the
20 negotiations about cleanup levels.

8

1 So that was about it.
 2 MS. NELSON: Is there a mailing list that we
 3 could be on, or how could we be notified of the
 4 hearing?
 5 MS. SHIRLEY: There is a mailing list. It's
 6 the Economic Development Committee. You have to call
 7 someone. I don't have the agenda.
 8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think I can pass that
 9 on to Martha.
 10 I know it's not that hard to get on the
 11 mailing list.
 12 MS. SHIRLEY: There is one other thing.
 13 I was asked to describe any impediments or
 14 roadblocks to cleanup. I highlighted the TPH issue
 15 dispute and suggested that if the Board of Supervisors
 16 wants to move this process along, stick their noses
 17 into that and help get this resolved. So I don't know
 18 if they will do it, but . . .
 19 MS. NELSON: A word to the wise.
 20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe they can vote on

1 the screening levels.
 2 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, right.
 3 MR. BRENNAN: Set a new level for San
 4 Francisco.
 5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, thank you very
 6 much, Chris.
 7 There are two other, just to mention, there
 8 are a couple of other public related events. We set
 9 aside time to for Chris, later in the meeting for
 10 Chris to talk about the DERTF conference and the RAB
 11 caucus, and also at the end, at the very bottom of the
 12 second page, there is the National Stakeholder's Forum
 13 on Monitored Natural Attenuation. That's in two weeks
 14 on the 31st of August. That's free. You just have to
 15 register for it. I included a copy of the
 16 registration materials in, I think, our mail out for
 17 our interim meeting. But if anyone still needed one,
 18 let us know.
 19 To finish the public comment, are there any
 20 members of the public who wish to comment at the

1 beginning of this meeting?
 2 (No response.)
 3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There being none, we
 4 will move into our next item, the discussion and
 5 approval of the 21 July meeting minutes. There should
 6 be extra copies of the meeting minutes out on the back
 7 table.
 8 So the floor is open to comments or
 9 corrections on the July meeting minutes.
 10 Yes.
 11 MS. RAO: I have a comment on page 10. Item
 12 number 7, I guess, the second paragraph.
 13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.
 14 MS. RAO: It says: "asked for an
 15 explanation of the reasoning in choosing a reference
 16 maximum instead of an average or a 95 percent." That
 17 should continue to say "95 percent confidence limit of
 18 the mean."
 19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: "95 percent confidence
 20 limit of the mean"?

1 MS. RAO: Yes.
 2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.
 3 MS. RAO: And, also, the third sentence of
 4 that paragraph really doesn't make sense at all and
 5 should probably be removed.
 6 That's not what her response was.
 7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. We will recheck
 8 the transcript on that.
 9 MS. RAO: Okay.
 10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's the sentence that
 11 says, "Taking an average will still fall within the
 12 area of contamination, but going above the reference
 13 maximum would be outside the area of contamination."
 14 We will check the transcript.
 15 MS. NELSON: It's really hard to follow that
 16 one.
 17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Try reading the
 18 transcript.
 19 Any other comments? Is there a move to
 20 accept the minutes as amended with those two changes?

1 MR. RIST: I have one.
 2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.
 3 MR. RIST: On page 2 under the "TPH Work
 4 Plan," in the second paragraph, the last sentence
 5 should be "wells," I believe, instead of "walls."
 6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Wait. I'm sorry?
 7 MR. RIST: Page 2.
 8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.
 9 MR. RIST: TPH Work Plan, second paragraph,
 10 last sentence.
 11 MS. NELSON: Monitoring "wells."
 12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh. Yes. Thank you.
 13 Spell check doesn't get those kinds of things.
 14 There being no other comments, is there a
 15 move to accept the minutes with those three
 16 corrections?
 17 MR. HEHN: Move to accept.
 18 MR. BRENNAN: Second.
 19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All in favor?
 20 Okay. The minutes are accepted or adopted

13

1 as amended. Some day I will get the Robert's Rules of
 2 Order down.
 3 The next item we just hold open for City of
 4 San Francisco representatives to comment or to give us
 5 notice of any ongoing city issues.
 6 Martha was unable to join us tonight. We do
 7 have a guest, though. I won't put him on the spot. I
 8 would like to introduce Mr. Bob Mahoney, the city's
 9 new facilities manager -- is that the correct title?
 10 MR. MAHONEY: Yes.
 11 Unfortunately, I'm here one week and I have
 12 absolutely nothing to add. I absolutely know nothing
 13 about this process yet.
 14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But he has already
 15 gotten deep into our asbestos abatement program.
 16 But thank you for being here.
 17 MR. MAHONEY: You're very welcome. I'm
 18 sorry I'm late.
 19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Moving into the BRAC
 20 cleanup process.

14

1 Our first item is the Draft Zone 4/IR Site
 2 12 Site Specific EBS FOSL Revision 1.
 3 As some of you may remember, we had issued a
 4 draft FOSL for Zone 4, which represents most of the
 5 Treasure Island housing, last fall.
 6 However, at the same time, we were
 7 conducting additional field work. So we took comments
 8 on the document. But it was with the proviso that we
 9 would re-review the document with the additional field
 10 data and incorporate the additional field data from
 11 the fall sampling.
 12 We did that. We issued, I guess about a
 13 month and a half or so, or two months ago, an updated
 14 finding of suitability to lease.
 15 But as a result of comments from Restoration
 16 Advisory Board members, we went ahead and updated the
 17 whole site specific environmental baseline survey to
 18 incorporate all of the available data on Site 12 to
 19 date.
 20 And so then we reissued that document, which

15

1 is this (indicating), and opened it for comment. The
 2 comment period will close this Friday, the 21st.
 3 We had a presentation on the document at
 4 last month's meeting. The purpose of having it on the
 5 agenda tonight is to afford an opportunity for
 6 questions, answers and comments, prior to the close of
 7 the comment period this Friday.
 8 So we don't have a prepared presentation,
 9 but we are opening the floor to your comments and
 10 questions.
 11 MS. NELSON: Well, I guess I will get the
 12 ball rolling since I brought it up at the interim
 13 meeting.
 14 I guess there is additional work being
 15 conducted at Site 12. I think if there are some hot
 16 spots that are discovered as a result of, I guess,
 17 this is now a third round of sampling, that that
 18 should be part of the decision making process, and I
 19 think the work was going to start this month; is that
 20 still current?

16

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.
2 The work was starting August, and, in fact,
3 the mobilization for the field work started this week.

4 MR. KNAPP: If I could add a little detail
5 on that. We did, indeed, start Monday, and we
6 collected the dioxin samples yesterday.

7 Unfortunately, today, we've had some
8 mechanical problems with the geoprobe and some
9 problems with the gearing.

10 It looks like we will be delayed maybe where
11 we won't be able to sample the rest of this week, but,
12 certainly, by next Monday, we will resume samplings.

13 We did get started, we got some dioxin
14 samples, and we are making repairs right now.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So based on that
16 schedule, we will be sampling all next week and then
17 probably some into the following week.

18 MR. KNAPP: Correct.

19 MS. NELSON: So there are some results that
20 you would expect back at the end of September with the

17

1 QA/QC to make its way into this document?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The schedule we had put
3 together working with the city was that the -- well,
4 what's on the critical path is the dioxin sampling
5 because of the additional lab time it takes; but we
6 are, as Richard pointed out, we did take those samples
7 first for that reason, and we're also doing expedited
8 lab work.

9 The objective was to have a set of the
10 unvalidated data available by the end of September or
11 earlier to share with the city and the regulators and
12 make a presentation to the RAB. That wouldn't allow
13 us to be able to make any final decisions before the
14 full lease went into effect.

15 MS. NELSON: Which is expected to take
16 place?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is no -- I don't
18 have a specific date, but I do know that the, at least
19 as -- well, the housing lease is not a part of the
20 Development Authority agenda at tomorrow's meeting,

18

1 and, so, consequently, it will probably be brought to
2 the Development Authority in September.

3 So not really wanting to speak for the city,
4 but just kind of based on my own estimate of the
5 situation, if there is a lease in place in the
6 September time frame, and given that the housing
7 operator was planning renovations of housing, I
8 wouldn't think that there would be any residents on
9 site nor anything earlier than October, if even then.

10 So that was the purpose of having even the
11 unvalidated data back in September was to ensure that
12 we had data to look at before any residents were on
13 the site.

14 MS. NELSON: Have any of the units been
15 leased? There were some that didn't seem to be
16 encumbered.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You're correct.
18 We did include approximately 200 units in
19 the Zone 3 FOSL, and that document, that includes the
20 1400 series of housing and a little smattering of some

19

1 of the 11-, 12- and 1300 series, probably a little
2 more than 200, maybe 250 units.

3 That was part of the Zone 3 FOSL, but none
4 of the units have been leased. I would imagine that
5 the city is going to have that all as one lease
6 management package so there are no occupied housing
7 units on Treasure Island.

8 And I think the comment made at an interim
9 meeting also was to discuss the sampling plan in the
10 EBS FOSL.

11 MS. NELSON: Right.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To show how it
13 integrates with the whole package.

14 MS. NELSON: Right.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other comments or
16 questions?

17 MS. NELSON: It seems that the city has been
18 trying to get this management company signed up.

19 Is the fact that that hasn't happened in the
20 last six months going to be an issue, do you think? I

20

1 guess I'm asking for conjecture.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: They said something today at
3 the hearing about getting that done in September.

4 MS. NELSON: Did they come to terms with the
5 John Stewart Company?

6 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, they did. And I think
7 they are planning on doing something in September.

8 That's from my memory, though. I didn't
9 write that down.

10 MS. RAO: Annemarie told TIDA in terms of
11 their housing situation that she's optimistic that
12 that might be able to begin in December around
13 Christmastime.

14 MS. NELSON: It seemed to me that there was
15 some rehabbing that needed to take place.

16 MS. LUPTON: Can I ask people to speak up?
17 We can't hear a thing back here.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But the city and the
19 Navy have been working very closely on this. I guess
20 in terms of our end on it, the environmental, the

21

1 scheduling has worked out fine, because we needed to
2 get this revised document out. So it would have been
3 even more difficult for us if the leasing schedule had
4 been earlier than it is now.

5 So as it is, the schedule, in terms of our
6 process, seems to be working out pretty well.

7 Well, if there aren't any additional
8 comments or questions, the comment period will close
9 this Friday, the 21st.

10 And Lynne or Amelia, could you clarify for
11 us what the sequence and schedule is for the rest of
12 the documents in terms of evaluating the comments,
13 issuing the draft final and then the final?

14 MS. DUQUE: I don't have the dates, exact
15 date, but after we receive comments from the draft,
16 then the next one will be the final SSEBS, and the
17 draft final FOSL, and then we gave like a week or so
18 for the draft final FOSL, and then the next will be
19 the final FOSL.

20 MS. SRINIVASAN: After we receive the

22

1 comments on the 21st, we will have a two-week or so
2 time frame in there to respond, and we will respond to
3 the comments and, hopefully, get everything clarified
4 and make the appropriate changes in the document about
5 two weeks after that.

6 So pretty much from the 21st of August to
7 the 21st of September is when the final SSEBS and
8 draft final FOSL will go out.

9 And then there is that week that Amelia has
10 talked about in there for review of the draft final
11 FOSL.

12 And then we will finalize that FOSL, also,
13 in probably three days, because if history repeats
14 itself, we normally don't get comments at that point.

15 MS. NELSON: Just to clarify, the verbal
16 comments at the meetings are included?

17 MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah, and, hopefully, we
18 will be able to address all of those as well.

19 MS. NELSON: Hopefully?

20 (Laughter.)

23

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm just thinking that
2 in terms of the schedule -- well, I guess the question
3 is, do we expect to receive written comments -- well,
4 no.

5 Do we expect to receive a number of written
6 comments from the community members?

7 MS. NELSON: I didn't intend to write any
8 up.

9 I don't know if anyone else was.

10 MS. RAO: We might have a couple.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Because I was only
12 thinking in terms of the next interim meeting which
13 falls on the 2nd, and if there might be, if there was
14 a necessity or desire to discuss comments, we may want
15 to change that interim meeting into the following
16 Wednesday, because that would give us, because we
17 would probably not have our comments or responses
18 formulated by the time of the next interim meeting on
19 the 2nd of September.

20 But if there was interest on the part of the

24

1 community members to discuss it at an interim meeting,
2 then we might want to change the interim meeting from
3 the 2nd of September to the 9th of September.

4 MS. RAO: I don't see much need to change
5 it.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Then in that
7 case, we would send out comments to the, the responses
8 to comments to the RAB technical subcommittee and any
9 others who requested the document on probably about,
10 approximately two weeks after the 21st.

11 MS. NELSON: 21st of September?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Two weeks after the 21st
13 of this month.

14 MS. NELSON: Okay.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the comment period
16 closes about two weeks after that that we would have
17 the responses to comments.

18 MS. NELSON: Just to understand the other
19 end of the schedule for the final draft, the draft
20 final, September 21st, would we have data back from

25

1 the dioxin testing by then to be incorporated?

2 MR. KNAPP: We have probably three to four
3 weeks before we will have raw data and another couple
4 of weeks to validate that data.

5 So about five to six weeks now, we would
6 have validated data.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, just to clarify:
8 Most of the areas that we are taking the dioxin, the
9 majority of the areas that we are taking the dioxin
10 sampling is in the areas that are not being included
11 with the leased area, but that we are taking some
12 confirmation samples in the area that's being planned
13 for lease.

14 I think what we can do is, we can share the
15 data we have on the areas that are going to be leased
16 when we get the data back from the lab, at least to
17 give an indication whether there is a potential issue
18 or not.

19 The main reason for sampling -- maybe just
20 to clarify for everybody -- the original FOSL

26

1 included, back last fall, included all of the housing,
2 or all of the housing at Site 12.

3 This Revision 1 FOSL excludes 29 buildings,
4 about 174 units, and those are the areas where we were
5 doing additional, we had additional investigation for
6 both TPH and also for dioxin.

7 But there were a few dioxin samples that we
8 have taken in the leased area that's included in here
9 as confirmation, because there was some historical
10 indication that material may have been on site for
11 some period of time.

12 MS. NELSON: Well, I guess that's a fine
13 point.

14 But do those areas that are being excluded
15 from this FOSL, are they going to recreate themselves
16 in a FOSL foray?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

18 MS. NELSON: And is that described in this
19 document?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This strictly represents

27

1 the lease footprint which excludes these 29 buildings
2 In Revision 1.

3 This essentially says, then, we will have to
4 have a Revision 2 that will evaluate these 29
5 buildings that we have excluded from this document.

6 MS. NELSON: Okay. So there will be a Part
7 B.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right, or what we will
9 probably call Revision 2.

10 MS. RAO: Revision 2, it's a continuation of
11 the first document?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We kind of struggled
13 with the name, what names to call these.

14 Whether we call it Revision 2 or not, I
15 guess the answer is that there will be another FOSL
16 that will cover these 29 buildings that we are
17 excluding in this FOSL.

18 And, in fact, it's almost literally the last
19 page, a fold-out map. In the hatched area, it
20 represents the housing that's excluded, which is

28

1 essentially saying it's not part of this FOSL.

2 MR. SAVAGE: Could you just make it an
3 addendum instead of revision?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will call it
5 something.

6 MS. NELSON: I guess my comments are
7 relating to whatever this second revision is going to
8 be, and that the draft final is going to come out at a
9 time when one whole document can be prepared for the
10 entire Zone 4.

11 Would that be of benefit?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a good question.
13 I wonder whether -- yes. I wonder after we evaluated
14 this area of 29 buildings, and written another report,
15 whether it would be worthwhile to reissue the entire
16 Zone 4 FOSL again.

17 That's a good question. I don't have an
18 answer for it.

19 MS. NELSON: So I can't answer but, David --

20 MR. RIST: I guess there is that possibility

29

1 that we're going to take some action for TPH in some
2 fashion.

3 So that's the reason we have excluded it
4 from the lease at this time.

5 And in the future, if we reissue it, it
6 might just be the same thing, that we are still
7 holding the areas.

8 So I think it's wise to go ahead with what
9 we have.

10 MS. NELSON: But we don't know that until
11 the data comes back.

12 MR. RIST: Well, yeah.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I guess maybe the
14 answer might be that when we get additional data back
15 and, again, to repair or prepare this next document
16 for the 29 buildings, that it would be open to comment
17 and consideration whether or not, because the result
18 of the data we have on this 29 building footprint,
19 whether that warrants reissuing the whole document.

20 Now, it will also, regardless of what we do

30

1 with the FOSL, there will still be a finding of
2 suitability to transfer to ultimately cover this whole
3 property.

4 And if we are expediting the cleanup actions
5 on the TPH areas, if remediation is required, then we
6 may be reaching closure on Site 12 at a much earlier
7 date than we had originally envisioned.

8 The original schedule had shown major
9 remediations occurring at most of our IR sites in 2000
10 and 2001, and with then a final property transfer in
11 2002. But based on the expedited approach at Site 12,
12 if we take care of any remedial issues by the date we
13 committed to the city of 1 August '99, then after 1
14 August, we would be in a position to write up a FOST
15 and a closure document on the CERCLA site.

16 So I think at the rate things are going,
17 there will be quite a bit of documentation on Site 12
18 through 1999, and maybe we will be close to coming to
19 the end by the end of '99.

20 So comments close on Friday the 21st. We'll

31

1 take comments by any means -- whether it's by phone
2 call, fax, E-mail -- it doesn't have to be typed,
3 but please write neatly. If I can't read your
4 writing, it's a little difficult.

5 Our next item is this added item to the
6 agenda. This is a brief presentation on IR Sites 1
7 and 3, no further action. We wanted to brief the RAB
8 on this because we are planning the documentation for
9 no further action. We had a pre-draft document and we
10 will be ready to release the draft documents to the
11 technical subcommittee, as well as any other
12 interested community members, probably, maybe as early
13 as sometime in the next 30 days.

14 And once the draft no further action
15 documents are released, the clock starts ticking
16 towards having a public meeting. So we will likely
17 then have a public hearing sometime in the September
18 type frame.

19 But right now, the dates for the document
20 and the public meeting aren't firmed up, but it's

32

1 possible that that will happen before our next regular
2 meeting next month. So we wanted to brief you on that
3 to prepare you for receiving the draft document in the
4 next month or so.

5 So, Richard?

6 MR. KNAPP: I didn't have handouts at the
7 back table there, so I would like to go ahead and get
8 them passed around here before we get started. These
9 will be the overheads that I'm going to go through.

10 Jim, maybe you could help me just briefly
11 point out where the sites are on these maps here.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

13 Site 1, where this big 1 is, is the old
14 medical dental center. Building 257 is located about
15 four blocks north and about two blocks east of where
16 we are right now towards the middle of the base.

17 It was, for a long time, it was the medical
18 and dental building for the base before the new
19 facility was built over here (indicating).

20 There was x-ray type or some medical related

33

1 equipment used in a corner of the building, and at
2 some point, the fluid had leaked from the equipment
3 and through the floor and into the ground. That
4 leakage had been identified during the preliminary
5 assessment of the base back in 1988.

6 Site 3 is located adjacent on the south side
7 of Building 3 or Hangar 3. It's not really a -- it's
8 an area not defined by any particular fence line, but
9 it's an area outside of the main transformer building,
10 which is part of Building 3, main transformer building
11 of the base; and, also, in the preliminary assessment,
12 it was identified as an area, because it was outside
13 of the main substation, where PCB equipment had been
14 stored prior to, or after being taken out of service
15 prior to being removed from the base.

16 So these two sites have been in the program
17 since the beginning and have been evaluated during the
18 remedial investigation.

19 And as a result of that, the Navy is
20 proposing no further action, which is the step to

34

1 formally close out the site.

2 MR. KNAPP: Okay. As Jim kind of led in
3 talking about these two sites, I would like to review
4 briefly why we think there are no actions and so
5 forth.

6 So I'm going to move through them fairly
7 quickly, because we are kind of tight on time tonight,
8 but give you guys basically a heads up that this is
9 coming and give you an overview of what the document
10 is about.

11 So the outline tonight will encompass a
12 little bit of background for these sites, what was
13 done at the sites, what sort of operations associated
14 contaminants, what the site environmental conditions
15 are, and the risks associated with each site.

16 And continuing the overview, we'll look at
17 key findings of the remedial investigation, the risk
18 assessments, and why we feel no action is the
19 appropriate measure for these two sites.

20 Some of this Jim already mentioned, but

35

1 we'll briefly go over it.

2 As you know, the IR program started some
3 time ago, back in the 1980s. And, essentially, we
4 completed the onshore remedial investigation in the
5 fall of last year, '97. And from that remedial
6 investigation, we identified two sites, Sites 1 and 3,
7 which we feel are no action sites. The other 12
8 onshore sites will be going into the feasibility study
9 to be looking at potential cleanup.

10 As Jim mentioned, Site 1 is a small site
11 pretty much in the center of the island. It was the
12 site of the Medical Clinic after World War II,
13 basically, the 1940s until the 1970s.

14 So the situation is, there was possible
15 leakage of developer and fixer solutions. Site 3 is
16 the PCB equipment storage area which was used for
17 storing, maintaining, and refilling transformers. So
18 the situation there is possible PCB leakage.

19 So that's kind of a thumbnail sketch of the
20 two sites.

36

1 To give you a little more detail then,
2 starting with Site 1, former Medical Clinic, as Jim
3 said, way back in the preliminary assessment when the
4 site was looked at and a couple of soil samples were
5 collected, the sampling indicated that silver was a
6 potential problem, again, due to the developer
7 solution and associated x-ray activities in the
8 building.

9 There was a smaller removal action that was
10 taken for soil and the silver contamination, and there
11 is no ground water contamination.

12 So if we take a quick look at the summary of
13 the risk at Site 1, for our risk assessment, we
14 assumed a future unrestricted residential use. The
15 exposure pathways to the silver in the soil were
16 ingestion, dermal and inhalation. And running the
17 risk, with the risk assessment model, the risk from
18 the silver came out to a risk of a hazard index below
19 1.

20 Silver is noncarcinogenic, so rather than

37

1 say something like 10 to the minus 6 type of risk,
2 instead we look at a hazard index. If the hazard
3 index is greater than 1, then there is a potential
4 problem. Here, the hazard index was below 1.

5 Similarly, running through Site 3 again,
6 back in the 1988 preliminary assessment, there were
7 some wipe samples collected from PCBs. These are
8 surface sampling, or actually wipe asphalt or a wall
9 or wherever you're trying to sample.

10 There were low detections of PCBs in two of
11 the wipe samples. There was additional investigation
12 done during phase 1 remedial investigation, and two
13 borings were placed on the site. Samples were
14 collected of the asphalt surface and of the soil
15 beneath the asphalt.

16 There was no PCBs detected in those samples,
17 and there was no groundwater sample at the site
18 because we had no contamination of PCBs in the soil
19 samples.

20 So human health risk assessment was not

38

1 performed for this site.

2 So you might say, well, why no action?

3 Summing this up here, we have limited
4 removal action for Site 1 from the silver in the soil.

5 The risks with our risk assessment
6 subsequent to the removal action showed that we had a
7 hazard index of below 1.

8 We had no PCB detected in the soil for Site
9 3.

10 No groundwater contamination at either site.

11 These sites are basically paved. There is
12 no real habitat. Very little vegetation. There is no
13 terrestrial eco concerns.

14 So the no action will allow for a more rapid
15 transfer and reuse of the property.

16 So the next step is to essentially issue a
17 draft RAP, which has the whole story of both sites.

18 There will also be a fact sheet that goes
19 out and is mailed to interested parties announcing a
20 30-day public comment period that Jim may have spoken

39

1 about.

2 There will be a public meeting about midway
3 through that 30-day comment period.

4 And everyone's comments can be submitted
5 either in writing or verbally at that meeting. As
6 part of the RAP process, those comments are responded
7 to in writing. There is what is called a responsive
8 summary that is put as an appendix to the final RAP.

9 So we are in progress and really kind of
10 looking forward to getting these two sites through the
11 process and finished out.

12 Any questions?

13 MR. HEHN: What's the time frame for that
14 process, the draft RAP final decision?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the schedule for
16 issuing is, we kind of have to work backward from
17 setting the date for the hearing. We haven't set the
18 date yet.

19 We are going to work with the city. It's
20 likely we will have the hearing somewhere in the city.

40

1 We would like to try to hold it at the Ferry Building
2 to ensure that there is plenty of public
3 transportation, and that's where we held the scoping
4 meeting for the environmental impact statement.
5 So we haven't set the date for the hearing.
6 It will probably be sometime in September. Once we
7 set that date, then we will probably -- then we will
8 back up about two weeks because the hearing is
9 typically about midway through the 30-day comment
10 period.

11 So we will set a hearing date in September,
12 back up in two weeks, and then release the draft RAP
13 and the public notice.

14 MR. KNAPP: Something I didn't mention is,
15 we will be placing ads in the newspaper announcing the
16 30-day comment period and the public meeting. So a
17 lot of things kind of happen at once: The fact sheet
18 is distributed; there is a notice in the paper about a
19 30-day comment period; and, of course, there is that
20 meeting date itself.

41

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So this will be our
2 first cleanup document where there is a concurrent
3 community member review and a general public review.

4 MR. HEHN: So you think that will start
5 about the first part of September, then?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Probably earlier to
7 mid -- if we have the public hearing, likely we will
8 have it sometime in September, so that we would
9 probably then release the document early to
10 mid-September.

11 MR. KNAPP: My best guess is, the public
12 meeting in the latter part of September, so the
13 document in the early part of September.

14 MR. HEHN: Does that draft RAP then address
15 the previous issues that were brought up during the
16 phase 2 investigation and things that were brought up
17 by the RAB and things that were brought up by the
18 DTSC, et cetera?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. I guess our
20 draft RAP should be addressing any comments that we

42

1 had received regarding those sites, Sites 1 and 3.

2 And if it's not, then it's certainly a
3 comment that can be made.

4 MS. NELSON: Does the responses to comments
5 look like new text or taped comments from our draft RI
6 and final draft RI comments addressing Sites 1 and 3
7 and putting them in an appendix?

8 MR. KNAPP: There is kind of an odd
9 situation here where we haven't formally responded to
10 RI comments, a few of which are on Sites 1 and 3.

11 MS. NELSON: Right. So this will be another
12 one of our hybrids.

13 MR. KNAPP: What we can do is make sure that
14 we feel we have responded to the comments concerning
15 the sites on the RI as we go forward into the RAP.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm wondering: Maybe
17 what we may want to do is extract the comments for
18 Sites 1 and 3 from the RI document, and maybe it would
19 be better for both community members and the
20 regulators to have a response to comment document

43

1 rather than ask them to try to look for the responses.

2 MS. NELSON: Because it seems to me you have
3 had some of our comments for well over a year and
4 others for almost a year.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think it would be
6 reasonable for us to pull out the comments for Sites 1
7 and 3 and issue those as a response to comment
8 document.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: For the RI.

10 MR. KNAPP: Comments regarding the sites.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

12 MR. KNAPP: Before we release the draft RAP.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Or with the draft.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So that anyone who has
16 made a comment can look at the response to comments
17 and not have to hunt for it in the document.

18 MS. NELSON: That would be very nice.

19 And would you also do the same for the
20 regulatory agency comments and the city comments? I

44

1 would think it would be a global concern.
2 MR. HEHN: Yes, because there were quite a
3 few comments on Site 1 from DTSC.
4 So I think those definitely need to be
5 addressed and how those are going to be included with
6 the draft RAP.
7 MR. KNAPP: Get all those comments out
8 before the release of the draft RAP.
9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.
10 I think it would probably be beneficial for
11 all concerned to see the body of comments and
12 responses.
13 MR. NELSON: Why don't we make that an
14 action item and have a presentation at the next
15 meeting, or have that information circulated before
16 the next meeting?
17 Because, otherwise, if the next meeting is
18 going to be in September, if we don't have that out as
19 a document, then you will have a very messy public
20 hearing.

45

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I guess, then, the
2 question is, do we -- and that's actually kind of
3 what, in going through this RAP, no action RAP
4 process, is really kind of the proving ground for
5 working out this whole process for the other sites,
6 whether or not they require remedial action.
7 So it's good that we are kind of dealing
8 with this on the small sites, and it's inevitable we
9 kind of evolved the process as we go on.
10 So I guess the question is, do we want, is
11 there a need to have the responses out before the
12 draft document or issued with the draft document?
13 MS. NELSON: I would recommend before,
14 unless there is something driving the schedule to have
15 a public meeting in September.
16 MS. SHIRLEY: That's before the draft.
17 I mean, you're saying with the draft, not
18 one released to the public.
19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, that is the draft.
20 MS. SHIRLEY: That is the draft?

46

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What happens is, we hav
2 a draft document.
3 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.
4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we publish a notice
5 saying it's available to the public.
6 At the same time, we actually deliver it to
7 the regulators and the RAB technical committee
8 members.
9 And then any member of the general public,
10 or any other community member who would like to
11 receive the document, we would make it available.
12 MR. HEHN: The one thing about doing it that
13 way is, once you issue that as a draft RAP, the clock
14 starts ticking, right?
15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right.
16 MR. HEHN: So any other discussion at that
17 point is kind of irreversible, so we then have to go
18 to public comment period.
19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No -- well, maybe not.
20 Actually, that's kind of another good question.

47

1 If we are -- and Stacey maybe you need to
2 help me out on this -- if we issue this document to
3 both the RAB as the RAB and also to the public, can we
4 still take community member comments in our normal RAB
5 process?
6 MS. LUPTON: Well, you can extend the public
7 comment period on a request by 15 days, too. That
8 often happens.
9 If during the 30-day public comment period,
10 if someone needs more time, they request it and you
11 just automatically extend it to 45 days.
12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But do we get into any
13 difficulties with taking the comment from our
14 community members at our regular RAB meetings?
15 MS. LUPTON: Oh, no, I don't think so, no.
16 That hasn't really ever -- when this law was
17 set up, RABs were not in place. So there were no
18 legal parameters.
19 The idea is to get public comment.
20 Parameters and time frames were set up because we have

48

1 deadlines and that kind of thing you have to comply
2 with.

3 Are you asking -- let me ask you this -- RAB
4 comments during the public comment period or after the
5 comment period is closed?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we should close
7 both the RAB comment period and the public comment
8 period at the same time.

9 MS. LUPTON: Right.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess the question
11 then, is, how the RAB community member comments are
12 received. If we are issuing the document to the RAB
13 community members, we, based on our normal process, we
14 would get comments throughout the comment period and,
15 also, verbally at our regular RAB meeting in
16 September, or whenever the regular meeting falls
17 within that comment period.

18 MS. LUPTON: Right.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But then we're also
20 having a formal public hearing.

49

1 MS. LUPTON: We just make sure we have
2 copies of the minutes. We record them at these
3 meetings.

4 But during that period of time when comments
5 are being elicited, we just make sure everything is
6 captured and then incorporate them.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, in that case, it seems
8 that we should have the responsiveness summary
9 circulated a couple of weeks ahead of time so that we
10 can, if there is any clarifications, we don't have to
11 encumber the public comment period with all of that
12 conversation.

13 MR. KNAPP: The responsive summary looks at
14 comments after that 30-day period is over.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: I understand that.

16 But I'm talking about just having sort of
17 clarification conversation, and we don't want to have
18 that in the public comment period where it has to be
19 responded to officially.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So you're talking about

50

1 Section 2.

2 There's a response to comments that we've
3 gotten from the RAB community members and the
4 regulators, and then there is also a responsiveness
5 summary that's generated as a result of the public
6 process that occurs afterwards.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

8 If we can resolve or clarify issues in that
9 letter on the RI, then we don't have to do that inside
10 the public comment period, which then requires you to
11 make an official response to the summary.

12 Do you see what I mean?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: So it would be better if we
15 could see that ahead, so if there were any
16 clarifications, we don't have to do it inside that
17 period.

18 And then if something is, if we just
19 disagree, then we can go ahead and say it again during
20 the public comment period and have it be part of the

51

1 response to summary.

2 MS. LUPTON: Are you saying response to
3 comments you want to see ahead of time not the
4 response to summary.

5 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.

6 MS. NELSON: Right.

7 As I understand the document as it's been
8 described, our comments will be responded to in the
9 same document as the draft RAB.

10 But then that doesn't give us an opportunity
11 to discuss with the Navy or their consultant anything
12 that needed to be clarified prior to going to the
13 public process.

14 It would be a cleaner process, otherwise, we
15 have this 30- or 45-day period in which to make all
16 that clear, and that could confuse an otherwise normal
17 public hearing process, because people that are
18 strangers to this process will look to us as the
19 knowledgeable public, and we have already been part of
20 the process. It could be a simple clarification that

52

1 needs to be made that could get knotted up.
2 MS. SHIRLEY: Exactly.
3 MS. NELSON: We want to prevent that getting
4 knotted up.
5 MR. KNAPP: Let me make sure we are all on
6 the same playing field here.
7 Essentially, the Navy would respond to the
8 RAB and regulatory comments in the RI context on Sites
9 1 and 3, and then the RAB or groups of people can take
10 a look at those responses before the start of the
11 30-day comment period.
12 MS. NELSON: Yes, bingo.
13 MR. KNAPP: And if there is still
14 disagreement, you can agree to resubmit those during
15 the 30-day period.
16 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.
17 But, hopefully, we can iron everything out.
18 MR. KNAPP: Hopefully.
19 MS. SHIRLEY: That's exactly it.
20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I agree with that.

53

1 I think we will have to think about how
2 that's going to, Stacey and I will have to think about
3 how that fits into the schedule.
4 Fortunately, our next regular RAB meeting
5 falls early in the month in September on the 15th.
6 So that's what we will do: We will issue
7 the responses to comments. We will figure out the
8 schedule for soliciting your comments and
9 incorporating them into the draft document before you
10 release it.
11 But we will have to, Stacey and I will have
12 to kind of work out a schedule for how that all falls
13 into place.
14 And that leads us into our newest document,
15 which is the beginning of the finding of suitability
16 to transfer process.
17 The RAB technical subcommittee members, and
18 I think maybe a few other interested members, have
19 gotten a copy of the phase 1-A and 1-B supplemental
20 environmental baseline survey. What this is, in the

54

1 past, for findings of suitability to lease, we issued
2 joint documents, the site specific environmental
3 baseline survey slash finding of suitability to lease.
4 Those documents have been issued together.
5 For the FOST process, we are doing it in two
6 steps. We are issuing, what we issued now is the
7 supplemental environmental baseline survey, for which
8 we will take comment.
9 And then based on the revision of this
10 document following the comments, we will issue the
11 draft finding of suitability to transfer.
12 So the supplemental EBS has been out a week
13 or two, and so we wanted to make a presentation of the
14 document at tonight's meeting, try to answer any of
15 your comments or request for clarification, and the
16 comment period for this document closes on Friday the
17 18th of September.
18 MR. MAYER: As Jim said, we just issued the
19 Phase 1 transfer area for the draft supplemental
20 environmental baseline survey.

55

1 We want to give you all an overview and talk
2 about some of what we found, and, basically, give you
3 enough information that you can give us all the
4 questions you want. We can discuss all the individual
5 sites, if anyone has specific comments when I'm done.
6 What I'm going to cover is, first, the
7 supplemental environmental baseline survey.
8 Then we will go into a detailed discussion
9 of each of the parcels in the transfer area.
10 And then, finally, we will spend a little
11 bit of time discussing where do we go from here.
12 What we did in this document was update the
13 six site specific environmental baseline surveys which
14 had been presented to you over the last year and a
15 half, two years.
16 We have included recent site investigation
17 data, and other appropriate information on things like
18 lead-based paint, transformers and asbestos.
19 Based on the data review, we came to some
20 conclusions and made some recommendations for the

56

1 environmental condition of property types for each of
2 the various parcels that were covered.

3 I want to cover a few points. First of all,
4 all of these are Type 1 parcels, which means that
5 there is no indication of contamination on any of
6 them.

7 Second of all, as we get comments back from
8 the regulators and from the community, some parcels
9 that are included in this first draft may not be
10 included in subsequent drafts, if there are particular
11 parcels that people have a particular problem with.

12 The Phase 1 transfer area comprises 48
13 parcels that were proposed or previously confirmed as
14 ECP area Type 1s. They are all on Treasure Island.
15 Six of the parcels are partial transfers, and that's a
16 result of the previous transfer that has occurred in
17 here to the Department of Labor (indicating).

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the original parcel
19 boundaries were developed prior to the two federal
20 transfers that we executed in the last six months with

57

1 the Department of Labor and the Coast Guard.

2 So these federal transfers have split some
3 of the parcels.

4 MS. SRINIVASAN: Actually, the parcel
5 management is developed based on historical
6 information. So sometimes the parcel boundaries, as
7 they are done now, actually split buildings in half.

8 So when we are doing these documents, what
9 we are trying to do is get as much that makes sense
10 into it, so we are not always going along the parcel
11 boundaries that are on the map, because how can you
12 transfer half a building?

13 So that's typically why they sort of don't
14 match the exact lines on the map right now.

15 MR. MAYER: We started by dividing the 48
16 parcels into two different categories. The first one
17 was parcels which had no indication of past releases.

18 The second was parcels that had been
19 categorized as some other classification that we were
20 proposing for reclassification as Type 1.

58

1 For the parcels with no indication of past
2 releases, 11 fell into this category. Of these 11, 7
3 had previously been confirmed by the regulatory
4 agencies in a CERFA letter basically stating that they
5 agree with the classification for these parcels.

6 That leaves us with 37 parcels that we are
7 proposing for reclassification. These fell into a
8 number of general categories:

9 The first category we covered was 15 parcels
10 that were either containing a portion of an IR site --
11 a very corner -- or were adjacent to IR sites and
12 there had been past concerns about migration of
13 contaminants from those IR petroleum sites affecting
14 those parcels.

15 During the IR -- sorry -- RI and the CAP,
16 they did some sampling and came to the conclusions
17 that there was no migration onto the parcels that we
18 are proposing for transfer.

19 The second category was parcels where there
20 was a suspicion of petroleum fuel lines or aboveground

59

1 storage tanks that might have leaked. We took
2 information from the SEBSs, the EBS Sampling Analysis
3 Report, and the letter from Laidlaw Environmental
4 Services, all of which indicated that there weren't
5 environmental concerns on these six parcels.

6 The next set were nine parcels of which, for
7 various reasons, there were concerns about the storm
8 sewer lines. We went out during the EBS sampling
9 analysis report and did some testing on the storm
10 sewers, and came to the conclusion that storm sewers
11 were not of a concern on any of the parcels.

12 Next category, there was three sites at
13 which there was a concern in the past about potential
14 contamination from sanitary sources.

15 Again, the data from the recent
16 investigations suggests that the sanitary sewers on
17 these parcels were not a problem.

18 Finally, there are a number of sites, or,
19 sorry, a number of parcels which didn't fit into an
20 easy categorization:

60

1 At Parcel 29, there was concern over the
2 historical use of the site as an incinerator. There
3 was wipe samples collected for dioxin and furans from
4 the incinerator. Since none of the dioxins and furans
5 were found, it was concluded that the past use had not
6 adversely affected the parcel.

7 At parcels 30 and 62, they were originally
8 classified as ECP Area Type 2, which was a
9 classification originally used for storage of
10 petroleum products.

11 However, the Department of Defense, when
12 they redid the petroleum classifications,
13 recategorized storage only parcels as ECP Area Type 1,
14 mainly because there was no indication of past
15 releases, so there is no reason to think that the
16 storage activities there have affected the parcel.

17 The logic behind parcel 98 is pretty much
18 the same. The only difference being, there was
19 chemical storage as opposed to petroleum storage, so
20 it had originally been ECP Area Type 7, which is used

61

1 for sites where there isn't enough data to put it in
2 one of the other categories.

3 Now we will get into -- well, this is great.
4 We have the document. But where do we go from here?

5 The other steps in the process, there still
6 has to be a finding of suitability for transfer
7 prepared.

8 In addition, there is several other
9 documents that are needed for property transfer.

10 And, finally, at the end, I will give you
11 some schedule idea for how the rest of our work on
12 this will continue.

13 The document that we are presenting now
14 gives you all the foundation that is to needed to
15 prepare a finding of suitability for transfer. The
16 Phase 1 transfer area, SEBS, concludes that all 48
17 parcels are eligible for transfer.

18 After regulatory approval and community
19 comments, we will go ahead and start the process of
20 preparing the FOST. The FOST will go through a draft,

62

1 draft final, and eventually final to give people the
2 opportunity to comment on that, and all the comments
3 will be included to make sure that all concerns are
4 addressed.

5 In addition, a site wide environmental
6 impact statement and environmental impact report will
7 be completed, and a NEPA record of decision will be
8 signed by the regulatory agencies for these parcels.

9 Finally, our sneak preview into what's
10 coming up in the future. As you all know, the draft
11 SEBS was issued on August 12th. The comments are due
12 September 18th. Once we get the comments, the draft
13 FOST as well as the draft final SEBS will be issued
14 for Phase 1A on October 27th.

15 In addition, in the not too distant future,
16 on September 10th, we will go through the same process
17 for Phase 1B, which is the equivalent parcels on Yerba
18 Buena Island.

19 There will be a 30-day comment period with
20 comments being due on October 13th, and then the draft

63

1 final SEBS and the draft FOST for Phase 1B will come
2 out December 3rd.

3 MS. SRINIVASAN: I see a question. I can
4 see it. It's the light bulb coming on.

5 MR. MAYER: That's the end of what I
6 prepared, and I would be happy to entertain questions.

7 MS. NELSON: Great.

8 So when is the EIR/EIS coming out on the
9 draft ROD?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have an approximate
11 date.

12 In fact, I am now reviewing what may be the
13 last internal draft of the joint EIS/EIR. It's not
14 part of our cleanup process, so I have less knowledge
15 of the exact schedule, but it looks like, pending the
16 additional comments that the Navy and the city make on
17 this internal draft, that it will probably be issued
18 sometime in the fall time frame. I really think it
19 will be issued before the end of the year.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: Right at Christmas, right,

64

1 thanksgiving and Christmas?
2 (Laughter.)
3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I really think it will
4 be issued before the first of the year. It could be
5 as early as October, but it may be October, November,
6 December time frame. It kind of depends on the amount
7 of last round comments that we have internally, and
8 then what it takes to incorporate those into the
9 document. But I think I can say it will be released
10 before the end of the year.

11 Just to expand on that and just to kind of
12 clarify why we are doing all of this, one, well, just
13 to clarify, the Phase 1A is Treasure Island. That's
14 the document that's been issued.

15 The Phase 1B is Yerba Buena Island. That's
16 the draft document that will be issued in a couple of
17 weeks.

18 And in order to actually transfer property,
19 there are three things that need to occur: One is a
20 completed finding of suitability to transfer. That's

65

1 our end of the project.

2 Then there is assigned EIS record of
3 decision. And there is also -- that's a Navy, federal
4 government requirement. There is also, there is
5 probably, I would imagine, there is also a similar
6 city requirement for the environmental impact report,
7 and that's why the Navy and the city are doing a joint
8 EIS/EIR. But the federal requirement is to have an
9 EIS.

10 And then thirdly, there needs to be a real
11 estate agreement between the Navy and the city that
12 defines the terms, the legal terms of the transfer.
13 And so the Navy and the city are in discussion on
14 that.

15 So those three things need to occur, given
16 that the draft EIS will probably be out, not be out
17 until sometime in the fall. That would mean that we
18 would probably, that we would have an assigned EIS ROD
19 sometime in the spring or mid-1999.

20 And then assuming that the Navy and the city

66

1 have reached a real estate conveyance agreement, that
2 would be the mid '99, early spring or summer '99 would
3 be the earliest time that this property would be
4 transferred after we complete the FOST.

5 The reason we are doing this, we are not
6 trying to ramrod this through. If there is a need for
7 more time during the FOST process, we will take more
8 time.

9 What we wanted to do was get the process
10 going for the category 1 sites so that we could have
11 our process completed before the EIS ROD and before
12 the real estate agreement between the Navy and the
13 city, because we, on the environmental side, didn't
14 want to be holding up the process.

15 Because once that, for our other sites that
16 may require more cleanup, once the EIS ROD is signed,
17 and once there is a conveyance, a real estate
18 conveyance agreement between the Navy and the city,
19 then for those remaining cleanup sites, then the
20 pressure really is going to be on us to get the

67

1 cleanup done and the finding of suitability to

2 transfer done because then we will be the last straw.

3 But in this case, we wanted to get the
4 documentation going ahead of time so that we could be
5 ready, and also to work out this process with the
6 community members and the regulators.

7 So we won't feel bad about any comments. I
8 won't feel bad if we have to adjust the parcel map for
9 this first FOST. We all want to be comfortable and
10 confident that we resolve the environmental issues on
11 this first set of parcels.

12 So the comment period ends on the 18th of
13 September, and by that time, we would have already
14 gotten the Phase 1B document.

15 MR. HEHN: In looking at the
16 reclassification or the classification of those
17 particular parcels, that takes into account both the
18 CERCLA and the CAP issues?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, because -- well,
20 these sites are essentially saying there are no, there

68

1 are no issues period.
2 We have the category 2 parcels, which are
3 parcels where petroleum products were used or may have
4 been released, will be handled in a subsequent FOST
5 document.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: But some of those parcels were
7 investigated under CERCLA and CAP, were they not? I
8 think there were a few that were actually investigated
9 that were found to be clean.

10 MR. HEHN: Or they were investigated and had
11 some impacts, which I'm not sure what the status of
12 those impacts were at this point.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: That is what we have to
14 review.

15 MR. MAYER: By definition, if there were
16 impact, but it were below the level we were concerned
17 about it, that would be a Category 3 site not a
18 Category 1.

19 Category 1s are the ones that we are saying
20 we don't feel there is any impact at all.

69

1 MS. SRINIVASAN: We had a larger list, and
2 we looked at it pretty closely. We had that exact
3 question. We said we can't do this.

4 We already removed the ones that we knew
5 were really not an actual definition of no release.

6 MR. HEHN: The ones that come to immediate
7 mind are the ones on the west side around this area
8 where there had previously been identified some UST
9 issues, and I'm not sure what the status of those are.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I can touch on
11 this real quickly.

12 We have -- and that's one of the reasons --
13 right around Building 1 there were several USTs, and,
14 in fact, the triangles represent the UST sites.

15 And then, also, next door here at the Fog
16 Watch, Building 227, there is a UST in the rear of
17 that building, which is under active investigation.

18 MR. HEHN: That's one of the ones.

19 MS. NELSON: Well, it seems that T078 and
20 T115 are pretty close to other sites, and I just want

70

1 to note the rationale, why aren't those included
2 rather than excluded from this proposal? Those are
3 hypothetical boundaries, if you will. They could, in
4 fact, expand either westward or northward, if you take
5 272 out, as far as I'm concerned, being conservative.

6 MR. MAYER: Well, part of it is, we want to
7 get reaction from the regulators and the community.

8 We propose that they be included because we
9 don't have any evidence that they don't belong.

10 However, if people feel strongly that they
11 shouldn't be, that's the type of response we're
12 looking to get to this initial document.

13 One of the things that we have changed to
14 make it easier to get that type of response is,
15 originally, the draft FOST was going to be issued at
16 the same time as the draft EBS. We ended up including
17 the draft final FOST, which was not originally
18 envisioned, and lagging -- I'm sorry -- draft final
19 SEBS, which was not originally envisioned, and lagging
20 the FOST by a few months so we get an initial

71

1 reaction, and we can make that sort of adjustment down
2 the road before we get too far along in the process.

3 MS. NELSON: Assuming that this drawing is
4 part of the EBS document.

5 MR. MAYER: Yes. This is Figure 1.

6 MS. SRINIVASAN: But also, Pat, in answer to
7 your question, we did look at the results for those
8 particular wells on this map.

9 We went back and we did look at the data, we
10 looked at groundwater flow direction, we looked at the
11 concentrations in those wells. Although they were
12 proximal to the parcels that we were looking at to
13 transfer, we really didn't expect there to be any kind
14 of contamination going sort of upgradient.

15 And based on the concentrations and
16 everything else we had, that was one of the reasons
17 why we had taken out those other parcels mentioned
18 before.

19 These were some of the ones, the ones you
20 mentioned, were ones in question, but are essentially

72

1 up for grabs as we discussed and are not necessarily
2 that clear-cut.

3 MS. NELSON: The soil data was considered?

4 MS. SRINIVASAN: Uh-huh.

5 MR. HEHN: Could you point out those
6 parcels, please?

7 MS. SRINIVASAN: They are all up around
8 Sites 14 and 22 (indicating).

9 MS. NELSON: Except T102 down there.

10 MR. MAYER: 102 is not included.

11 MS. NELSON: 102 that you found in the
12 corner.

13 MS. SRINIVASAN: Right. That one we
14 specifically have been discussing and discussing and
15 discussing.

16 MS. NELSON: Bingo.

17 MS. SRINIVASAN: Essentially, we have looked
18 at this exact data point right here (indicating).

19 The concentration that you are seeing here,
20 the groundwater that you are seeing here, is a

73

1 concentration of TPH in groundwater less than 1.4
2 micrograms per liter.

3 Scale wise, if you're looking at the map,
4 that's really, really, really, really big.

5 In addition to that, all of the housing that
6 the Navy wants to transfer is way up in this portion
7 of it (indicating).

8 We also discussed one of the possibilities
9 as, rather than eliminating the entire parcel from the
10 transfer area, eliminating that corner, and then
11 keeping in all the housing but just doing it as a
12 portion of a parcel.

13 So that we could then, at least, transfer
14 the housing areas to the city but keep that part
15 that's sort of in Site 12 not transferred.

16 And that's something that, right now, the
17 entire parcel is in the draft document, but it's
18 something we can discuss and it's certainly something
19 we can easily do.

20 MR. MAYER: The other thing that went into

74

1 consideration when we decided to keep that, as we
2 looked at the data from '95 and '96, there was a clear
3 pattern of decrease, in both the number of
4 constituents and the level of constituents found in
5 that well. We don't have any more recent data yet --
6 we will in a little while -- than mid '96.

7 MS. NELSON: And look, also, at the soil
8 data.

9 MR. MAYER: Uh-huh.

10 MS. NELSON: Up in that area (indicating).

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Our next item, at
12 the request of the community members, we set aside
13 time for the community members to present their
14 comments on the draft offshore remedial investigation
15 report, which is, as you know, the comment period on
16 that closed. So now we are in the comment evaluation
17 period.

18 But the comments that we had received at the
19 end of the comment period, there was a request to
20 present those comments to the RAB at large.

75

1 MS. RAO: We had a meeting, an open meeting
2 at the ARC Ecology office at the end of July for RAB
3 members to come and discuss offshore comments. Pat
4 and Nathan and Chris and I went over some of our
5 comments. So these are just a brief overview of some
6 of our major issues that we had with the draft
7 offshore remedial investigation.

8 First, in Section 4, which is outlined,
9 offshore sample collection and analysis, that kind of
10 testifies where they did sampling and did not do
11 sampling. We had some concerns. Different areas on
12 this map shows different areas.

13 Our first concerns were around IR sites 28
14 and 29. I guess sample attempts were made in the area
15 around here (indicating), but the offshore document
16 does not show exactly where the sampling attempts were
17 made. That's something that we would like to see
18 included in the final.

19 Also, we were just concerned because of the
20 contamination issues of 28 and 29, even though this

76

1 area belongs to the Coast Guard. When looking at
2 stormwater outfall data, we saw that a lot of that
3 outfall that started up on the tops of the cliffs that
4 kind of drained out IR Sites 28 and 29 and the Nimitz
5 complex, drained off the coast of the Coast Guard
6 property.

7 So it seems that even though the Navy may
8 not own that shoreline, it seems justifiable that the
9 Navy be responsible for some of the contamination that
10 might be found there. So we just questioned why
11 samples weren't taken in that area as well.

12 And we were also concerned that a lot of
13 that stormwater outfall for this whole tip of Yerba
14 Buena Island are along this side of IR 8, and we were
15 concerned why more samples were not taken closer to
16 the shore here (indicating).

17 We were also concerned why more samples were
18 not taken by IR site 15, which is the pier, pier 1 and
19 the fuel barn. Those are the three main areas that we
20 were concerned with for sampling issues.

77

1 And in Section 5, we were concerned about
2 the reference site for a couple of reasons. First of
3 all, Pat mentioned the figure that was included in the
4 actual document doesn't exactly show where the
5 Paradise Cove reference site was, and it's supposed to
6 be a sample of a clean site in the bay.

7 Pat had mentioned that she had visited some
8 areas in Paradise Cove that were actually old Naval
9 sites.

10 MS. NELSON: What is called a coal station.
11 It's where coal was loaded onto ships for fuel.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

13 MS. NELSON: An old fueling station,
14 essentially, out by the Baylands Institute, and there
15 had been a photographic record of spills and whatnot
16 in that area, including coal.

17 So I didn't know where the reference point
18 was in relation to that, but that was a big military
19 installation which has now been gone onto a public
20 life as the Baylands Institute.

78

1 MS. RAO: And we were also concerned because
2 the way that the screening method used the reference
3 site, they took five samples in the reference site,
4 and then used the reference site maximum, which they
5 screened against.

6 In viewing the data from the five reference
7 sites, it appeared that one or two of the five were
8 frequently more contaminated than the others, and so
9 we were questioning the use of the reference site
10 maximum as the base screening criterion, and why they
11 didn't use an average or a 95 percent confidence limit
12 of the mean or something like that, because if this is
13 supposed to be a reference of a clean site, then there
14 shouldn't really be outliers used as a screening
15 method.

16 In Section 8, which is the bioassay data, we
17 were primarily concerned with the fact that ARC
18 Ecology has reviewed offshore documents at Mare Island
19 and at Hunter's Point. The Hunter's Point document
20 was released back in 1995, and the Mare Island report

79

1 was released earlier this year.

2 There has been consistent failures in the
3 bioassay result. We just questioned why this
4 protocol, why the protocol hasn't really been amended
5 in the way that the bioassays are performed.

6 If sediment grain size is frequently used as
7 the response as to why amphipod survival rates have
8 been so low, we brought up the concern that maybe we
9 should use another species that can endure survival in
10 fine grain sediments, if that's what you're testing,
11 if you're testing for contaminants.

12 Ammonia toxicity has been given as the
13 reason for much of all the sea urchin data to be
14 rejected, and it's said it was due to ammonia toxicity
15 in the lab not in the sediment.

16 And so if that's the case, we were looking
17 into what happened at Hunter's Point and Mare Island,
18 and we found that that was a problem again in those
19 two cases, and, again, the same lab was used for the
20 Treasure Island data, and the lab was all the way out

80

1 in Vermont.
2 We were also questioning why this data
3 needed to be shipped all the way out there, why it was
4 contracted to a lab that was so far away and there are
5 facilities here in the Bay Area that could do the same
6 testing.

7 In Section 9, we were concerned with using
8 ERMs as an indicator for general toxicity. The
9 effects range median seems to be indicative of
10 probability of ecological effect as a result of
11 activities on TI, an offshore document, in our
12 opinion, especially a conservative approach to
13 offshore issues, should be more reflective of
14 possibilities of ecological effect.

15 Section 11, I touched on these last month.
16 An end point assessment, the end point risk assessment
17 should also include the human consumption of fish.

18 The Navy has frequently responded that fish
19 toxicity in human consumption of fish is a bay-wide
20 concern and not site specific concern.

1 But our concern is that especially now that
2 they are doing the tissue sampling right now or
3 probably may have finished it, they might as well go
4 ahead and include the data and evaluate it in such a
5 way that does encompass human consumption of fish now,
6 and then they could compare the PCB and DDT and
7 mercury levels that they find to bay wide, to other
8 levels found elsewhere in the bay, and see if it
9 really is consistent with bay-wide trends, and then
10 that would show if it really is a bay-wide concern and
11 not a site specific concern.

12 We are also concerned that the end point
13 assessment for benthic feeding birds in the document
14 is willets. Willets has a very different feeding
15 pattern than diving ducks. Diving ducks, the way they
16 intake a lot more of the sediment, and it's especially
17 a concern at Clipper Cove.

18 You will see on the handout I gave, there is
19 an attachment which is a copy from a handbook of
20 ecotoxicology, which talks about the ingestion of lead

1 gunshot and how it is a concern to birds more than any
2 other species. So we are concerned this should be
3 included in the end point assessment as well.

4 And, finally, Section 2, we weren't able to
5 really do much review or comment on the eco-risk
6 assessment section, because all of the eco-risk
7 assessment is hinged upon the threshold reference
8 values, the TRVs. The TRVs in the document come from
9 a draft BTAG document, which we just received like a
10 week before the comment period was done. So we
11 haven't really submitted our comments on Section 12
12 completely yet.

13 But just to let you all know, the BTAG
14 document is available. If any of you need to see it,
15 you can request it. We have a copy of it.

16 MS. NELSON: That BTAG document was
17 published last year in May.

18 And I think at the interim meeting, you
19 agreed to bring some to this meeting before we get
20 them out, but I would like to make that an action

1 item.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

3 MS. NELSON: Because I think that's been an
4 issue with the RAB brought up on a regular basis.

5 And it was a surprise to learn that the
6 document, in fact, had been out for over a year, and
7 we hadn't been informed of it.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So do we want to go
9 ahead and send it to the technical subcommittee?

10 MS. NELSON: Yes.

11 And anyone else that may have an interest in
12 it. I know that Dale Smith had an interest in it.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. So she should go
14 it anyway.

15 MR. SAVAGE: I have an acronym. What is
16 BTAG?

17 MS. NELSON: BTAG, I don't remember.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: It's a very funny name. It
19 might be here. Let me see.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Technical advisory

1 group?
 2 MS. NELSON: Yes, it's the Biological . . .
 3 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, there you go.
 4 MS. NELSON: Biological Technical Advisory
 5 Group.
 6 MS. SHIRLEY: Bay Wide.
 7 MS. NELSON: Bay Wide.
 8 MS. SHIRLEY: Biological Technical Advisory
 9 Group.
 10 MS. NELSON: I guess the report was issued
 11 by Ernie.
 12 Ernie, you know that this has been of
 13 interest to us.
 14 Why were we not informed that this issue was
 15 addressed in May '97?
 16 MR. GALANG: I haven't seen the document.
 17 That's being handled now by the technical
 18 support group that's taken over by another section.
 19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what happened
 20 was -- well, it went out under Ernie's contract, so

85

1 that's why his name is on it. But it was not part of
 2 the Treasure Island cleanup program.
 3 The contract was issued, but then it became
 4 part of the bay-wide program. And so neither Ernie
 5 nor I were involved when the document was produced. I
 6 would admit that was an oversight on our part. I
 7 didn't have a copy of the document in our information
 8 repository, because it had never been issued as a
 9 Treasure Island cleanup document.
 10 So we will provide copies of the document to
 11 the technical committee.
 12 Are there any other community members who
 13 would want to have a copy? It's about, it's a little
 14 less, well, about half an inch.
 15 MS. SHIRLEY: (Indicating.)
 16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Not that big as far as
 17 our documents go.
 18 MR. HEHN: Normal size.
 19 MS. NELSON: You know, to the extent that
 20 Usha Vedagiri is available to review it, I think she

86

1 should get a copy, since that was one of her issues.
 2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, she's still
 3 on the mailing list for it.
 4 MS. NELSON: I think she had a baby, and I
 5 think Karen Mendelow.
 6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So the people who are
 7 getting all the technical documents are Pat, Paul,
 8 ARC, Dale, Usha . . .
 9 MR. GALANG: And John Allman.
 10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And John Allman.
 11 MR. GALANG: And then Nathan.
 12 MR. BRENNAN: Yes. I've got quite a few.
 13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, do you want to be
 14 on the list for everything?
 15 MR. BRENNAN: Well, sure, why not?
 16 MR. HEHN: Just as an addition to your
 17 Section 8 comments (laughter), under the question
 18 about the ammonia toxicity, I was gratified to see
 19 that some recent comments came from DTSC also had som
 20 significant issues about that, question about the

87

1 toxicity, and the use of the consideration that
 2 developed because of fine grain sediments, why these
 3 were all dying, and that there should be some other
 4 issues there that should be brought up as to why
 5 everything seemed to have that same kind of problem.
 6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. We are a little
 7 behind schedule, but we will take a short break, 10
 8 minutes or less.
 9 It's six minutes to 9:00, so if we can get
 10 started a little after 9:00, we can still finish by
 11 9:30.
 12 (Short break taken.)
 13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN. Okay. Well, I wanted to
 14 recognize Penny McDaniel here tonight from Region 9.
 15 She's sitting in for James Ricks.
 16 MS. MC DANIEL: Hello.
 17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our next item, Chris had
 18 asked for some time at the meeting to brief the
 19 community members on the Defense Environmental
 20 Restoration Task Force conference last month.

88

1 MS. SHIRLEY: In Chicago.
2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In Chicago.
3 And also that's a joint government community
4 member task force.

5 But then along with that, there was a
6 separate RAB caucus meeting for community members.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: That's right.

8 So it's actually, I had made this mistake:
9 It's Defense Environmental Response Task Force.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: You can read into it what you
12 want, but it's "response," not restoration.

13 Anyway, DERTF is a group, I can't remember
14 if it's seven or nine, as you said, a couple of public
15 members, some from the governors association, and then
16 a bunch of DoD people who advise DoD on environmental
17 cleanup military base, both -- well, actually, I think
18 there are FUDS and BRAC.

19 I do not think they advise on open bases,
20 but some of the issues are the same.

1 So they meet twice a year in June and
2 January. So we went to Chicago in June. They are
3 coming in January, actually early February to San
4 Francisco. So everyone in this room will get to go if
5 they want to.

6 I will talk about that, and then I will talk
7 about the RAB caucus separately. They are actually
8 completely separate. It's just that we like to meet
9 together because there's some synergy that goes on.

10 So at DERTF, there were several dominant
11 themes:

12 The first one was cleanup obligations beyond
13 remedy in place. What that means is, all the DoD
14 accounting procedures stop accounting costs after
15 remedies are in place. So they can't life cycle costs
16 out, the cost of ongoing monitoring or institutional
17 controls. It's not really included in the big picture
18 that they use in their planning. So they had some
19 panels on that.

20 A suggestion was made that the next DERTF in

1 January, DoD come up with a new accounting system that
2 allows them to consider long-term monitoring and
3 maintenance costs associated with partial cleanup and
4 natural attenuation or something like that.

5 Okay. The dominant theme at DERTF was
6 institutional controls. There were two panels and
7 lots of discussion on institutional controls.

8 I won't bore you with all of it because it
9 was very intense, and you will hear more about it.

10 But I did bring a summary of the
11 institutional control discussion that was published in
12 the Defense Environmental Alert. It captured most of
13 the essence of the issues. So I won't belabor that.
14 I won't go into it given the time, but if you're
15 interested, read that.

16 I only brought ten copies because I just
17 didn't know how many people would be here. If you
18 want more, I have more at the office.

19 The second thing was records control. We
20 talked about this here at this RAB. Once the decision

1 has been made, you have this gigantic bunch of
2 documents that supported that decision.

3 The question is, what do you do with this
4 stuff? Where does it go? How do you maintain it?
5 How do you ensure that the information that was used
6 to make the decision is available to people who are
7 using the property later on.

8 There are lots of options which were
9 discussed, everything from microfilming to warehousing
10 it somewhere in Washington.

11 DoD agreed to look into providing the
12 documents, either -- probably on microfilm in the
13 local community. There was quite a lot of concern
14 that these documents would be boxed up and sent to
15 some warehouse somewhere in Washington, D.C. or
16 Alabama or someplace, and you would never get access
17 to them ever again except through a long, arduous
18 process.

19 So DoD will come up with a proposal for
20 keeping at least a subset of the administrative record

1 in the local community.

2 And, then, finally, there was the, of course
3 the lead issue was discussed a little bit.

4 And I have a sort of position paper about
5 lead that was put in the DERTF handout, which is that
6 great big binder. It's a draft document, and I'm
7 sorry, when I copied it, the word "draft" sort of
8 obliterated a lot of the text. But I think it's
9 mostly readable.

10 But that document is actually open for
11 comment. EPA is accepting comments. And so if you
12 want to read it and make comments, it's available.

13 This binder (indicating), which I didn't
14 make copies of for everyone for obvious reasons,
15 contains all of the papers and background material for
16 issues that were discussed at DERTF.

17 Now ARC has three copies of that binder, and
18 I would be happy to loan it to anybody that wants to
19 really get into it. So just let me know and you could
20 take it home with you.

1 Okay. So, now, what else do I have here?

2 Oh. Here's another lead thing if anybody
3 needs it.

4 Two other things: The Department of Defense
5 is putting up a Web site for RAB members. I saw a
6 pilot of it. I made some copies here of the Web site
7 address. There is one for the BCT, the BRAC cleanup
8 team, and there is one for the RAB. Of course, they
9 all have public access.

10 But on that Web site there is an
11 opportunity, there is sort of a chat room feature, so
12 you can, theoretically, post things to it and get
13 responses and begin a certain conversation with other
14 RAB members around the country.

15 Now, we haven't tested it. It is a
16 monitored site. In other words, the DoD will put up,
17 they will look at what's posted before it's posted.

18 They told us at DERTF that they would not
19 edit the messages that are put up there, but that
20 remains to be seen. I can't vouch for whether that

1 will happen or not. But feel free to test it.

2 And, then, finally, I only made five copies
3 of this because you really have to be dedicated to
4 read this.

5 This is the management guidance for defense
6 environmental restoration program. What's in here are
7 the rules that Jim has to follow in making decisions
8 about cleanup at Treasure Island, or anyone has to
9 follow.

10 I found some pretty interesting things in
11 here that might help those that wish to delve into it,
12 understand why some decisions are made the way they
13 are.

14 It also describes what are called, "measures
15 of merit," which are basically how you get gold stars
16 in this process. I found that quite interesting, too.

17 So I have five copies of this. It's quite
18 long. I only copied 45 pages out of a document that's
19 about 60 pages long.

20 It is available on a Web site, which I could

1 read off the address if anybody is interested:

2 It's at HTTP back slash, back slash,
3 Denix -- D-E-N-I-X -- dot C-E-C-E-R, dot Army, dot
4 mill, back slash, D-E-N-I-X. I'm sorry it's so long.
5 Back slash, Public, with a capital P, back slash, E-S
6 dash, programs, E-S, capital E-S dash, Programs, with
7 a capital "P."

8 MS. NELSON: All that is capped.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: IT's E-S -- capital E, capital
10 S -- dash capital P, and then little, P-R-O-G-R-A-M-S,
11 and then back slash Cleanup.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What was that last one?

13 MS. SHIRLEY: There is more. Backslash
14 cleanup.

15 I should just write this down somewhere.
16 It's really long -- Cleanup starts with capital C,
17 little l -- backslash DERTP -- and that is all
18 capitals -- CAP C, little l, back slash, D-E-R-P, and
19 that's all capital.

20 And, then, finally, back slash guide -- all

1 lower case -- dot H-T-M-L.
2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Chris, if you want to
3 write it down for Darlene, we can make sure it gets in
4 the draft minutes.

5 MS. SHIRLEY: That's a good idea.
6 But I do have five copies if anyone is
7 interested.

8 MR. GALANG: Can I give one to Darlene?

9 MS. SHIRLEY: Sure.
10 I didn't copy the whole document. I only
11 copied some of it because I couldn't afford to make so
12 many copies. So I copied the good stuff.

13 So, anyway, there are four more copies if
14 you want to grab one.

15 And, finally, on to the RAB caucus. The RAB
16 caucus is now a national organization, fledgling
17 national organization. ARC Ecology is coordinating
18 it. It's an organization of community people who are
19 RAB members.

20 The RAB caucus does not include regulators

1 or military people. It's a place where community
2 people talk about their issues, concerns, problems,
3 solutions, and just discuss some strategies for
4 dealing with it.

5 I put on the community members places that I
6 knew -- well, I put everyone, all the community
7 members, except I don't think I gave one to you, Jack.
8 Here it is (indicating).

9 It's the minutes from our last RAB caucus
10 meeting which was held in Chicago. We are having in
11 September, or, excuse me, in October, I don't remember
12 the exact dates, October 17th through the 21st. The
13 RAB caucus will be hosting a meeting in Washington,
14 D.C., at which we will be talking with Congressional
15 representatives, national EPA and some other
16 Washington based organizations about how the cleanup
17 is going and where we would like to see policy change
18 and that kind of thing.

19 We will have travel scholarships available
20 for that. I don't know how much money we will have.

1 It's likely that only one representative from every
2 RAB will be paid for, but the travel scholarships pay
3 for everything. So if you get to go, it's a good
4 deal.

5 So I brought some -- we haven't gotten to
6 the point of announcing it, preparing an announcement
7 for this meeting, but what we have done, people who
8 have gone to RAB caucus meetings before, we want to
9 find out from them what they want to see at this
10 meeting in more detail.

11 So what is in here is a questionnaire about
12 what you would like to see at such a meeting. So the
13 community people -- well, actually, anyone can take
14 one of these, but with the knowledge it's for
15 community people.

16 And I want to say, at the DERTF meeting, the
17 RAB caucus took up as a cause a fellow from Texas who
18 lived in a Hispanic community. They had a RAB. They
19 had public meetings and all of that, but they are
20 always in English. 90 percent of the population spoke

1 Spanish. He had been beating his head against the
2 wall to get translations and nothing was happening.

3 So we, the 15 or so of us that were in
4 Chicago, rallied around him and pounded this message
5 into everyone that we could think of. I just heard
6 yesterday that he got his translators, and he got all
7 his documents written in Spanish.

8 So the RAB caucus is effective and it's fun
9 besides. The RAB people from around the country are
10 just clearly fun to be with.

11 So DERTF will be in January here in San
12 Francisco -- or excuse me -- February, first week in
13 February, and there will be another RAB caucus meeting
14 at that time in February, if you can't get to the next
15 one in Washington, D.C.

16 That's all I have. Any questions?

17 MS. NELSON: Thank you.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you, Chris.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Did everyone get one of these
20 lead things? I have an extra one.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there are ever any
2 documents that community members want to bring that
3 you would like us to -- don't feel that you have to
4 necessarily copy things yourself -- but if there are
5 any documents that you would like to bring and have us
6 distribute, please say so and we will make copies.

7 In fact, any document, basically, basically
8 any document that we introduce as part of the meeting,
9 we would, unless it's too huge, we would normally
10 include as part of the mailing packet for the minutes
11 of the meeting; so, consequently, those of you who
12 attend the meetings, you end up getting replicated
13 documents, because any document that's handed out at
14 the meeting is included in the meeting minute package.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: I want to say that's very
16 generous. Not all the RABs do that. So that's great.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have to thank Darlene
18 for that.

19 MR. HEHN: Also, I want to mention that I
20 really appreciate you getting the RAB minutes on

1 E-mail plus the agenda. I really like that option to
2 review that.

3 We could probably even get to the point
4 where we could dispense with serving the mail copy and
5 get an E-mail copy.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, please take the
7 opportunity to update your E-mail addresses or provide
8 us with your E-mail address, if you don't, haven't
9 already done so.

10 So I have been lately going down the list,
11 and anybody on our sign-in sheet that Darlene keeps
12 who will give us their E-mail address, I will send out
13 the agenda and draft minutes in Word, Microsoft Word
14 6, which apparently most people can read in one form
15 or another. If necessary, we could make it in some
16 generic text if somebody had trouble reading it.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: Jim, I have a question.

18 I heard through the grapevine that DoD is
19 developing a Web site for every installation and that
20 TI was a pilot.

1 Do you know anything about that?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I thought I heard
3 something about that.

4 There was, just to be brief, I don't know
5 very much. I heard a few snippets.

6 MS. LUPTON: I do know what happened.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

8 MS. LUPTON: The Office of Economic
9 Adjustment, they have set up, from what I understand,
10 Web sites for all, for national BRAC sites closing
11 bases.

12 We are looking at dovetailing off of that --
13 I know that EFA West was looking at that -- but they
14 don't have the capacity, OEA does not have the
15 capacity to really build on that. So they were hoping
16 to do that.

17 I think you could call Ryan. I know he's
18 done something with the Treasure Island office OEA Web
19 site, but they don't have capacity to really feed into
20 the kind of information that you would want to use.

1 MS. SHIRLEY: I heard that they ran out of
2 money to actually finish the project.

3 MS. LUPTON: I'm not sure that's the case.
4 I think it was more a capacity issue.

5 Call Ryan, he could tell you specifically.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: Okay.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But we would hope to
8 move more and more toward electronic distribution of
9 information. I can't give you a schedule for that. I
10 think we are thinking about being able to issue
11 documents electronically, but I don't know when we
12 will be there yet. We would like to move more and
13 more towards electronic.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: That would be great.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It would certainly save
16 space in my office.

17 The next item, and I will just be super
18 brief, at the community member meeting, there was a
19 request to kind of overview where we were in '98 and
20 going into '99. I started to look at that but don't

1 have anything prepared to hand out.
2 I can just very super quickly go over where
3 we are in '98 and follow it up with the written list.
4 Basically, we are spending about \$8 million
5 this year, which is more than we've ever spent in any
6 single year in the program, so the program is moving
7 along.
8 Next year we hope to spend a little more
9 than that, so we are probably somewhere between 9- and
10 \$10 million.
11 What we have done this year, we have done
12 asbestos abatement, and we will be doing some
13 additional, hopefully finishing the abatement in
14 fiscal year '99 to close out that program.
15 We have been doing all the preparatory work
16 for the lead-based paint abatement, and we will issue
17 the actual abatement contract at the end of September.
18 And then we will perform that work during 1999.
19 We have been proceeding with the Corrective
20 Action Plans for both the major CAP sites, the former

105

1 IR sites, as well as a number of small sites and the
2 fuel line.
3 That process has been slowed a little bit
4 until we reach closure on the TPH screening levels,
5 but we are able to still move along and, in fact,
6 Ernie is going to award the design contract for the
7 corrective action petroleum sites, even though we
8 don't have the screening levels set yet, but we at
9 least get the contract awarded and work out the
10 screening levels later on.
11 And then for the CERCLA sites, we are going
12 to be awarding the RAP ROD for the onshore sites, and
13 continuing with the feasibility study for the
14 offshore.
15 We have already had the onshore CERCLA sites
16 FS awarded. Again, even the CERCLA sites didn't have
17 petroleum constituents. We had to adjust the schedule
18 to allow time to resolve the petroleum screening
19 issue.
20 But I think in terms of awards, we have been

106

1 able to award most of the work we need to do. It's
2 just that some of the execution dates have to be
3 adjusted until we work out some of these remaining
4 issues.
5 So we bought the balance of the
6 investigation. We bought most of the investigation in
7 '98. And in '99, we will be moving more into
8 remediation for the petroleum sites and finishing the
9 asbestos and lead-based paint. In 2000 and 2001, it
10 will be our major CERCLA site remediation, and so I
11 would put that in writing to send out.
12 Are there any more announcements? Again,
13 the National Stakeholders Forum in Millbrae on
14 Monitored Natural Attenuation is the 31st of August.
15 It's free. You just have to register beforehand. I
16 think it's just to fill in the blanks and fax into
17 what was formerly Career Pro. Now it's something
18 else. It's on the form. The Navy is sending some
19 representatives, a representative group from our San
20 Bruno office will be participating.

107

1 We had our last BRAC Cleanup Team meeting on
2 the 3rd of August. We discussed the TPH screening
3 level discussion. It's not just a TI issue. It's a
4 regional issue. Higher level management is now
5 involved. We are working with them, but it ultimately
6 has to be worked out for the entire region.
7 We talked about tank 180C, which is a tank
8 that's currently in our petroleum program that does
9 have some nonpetroleum constituents. We are working
10 with the regional board and seeing if we can keep it
11 in the petroleum program and still address these other
12 constituents.
13 We talked about Zone 4 FOSL, and then, also,
14 an EPA letter on groundwater that was released in the
15 last month directed, I think, at Hunter's Point
16 issues, but it may have some potential impact on what
17 constitutes groundwater resources at other bases, too.
18 So we are working with Region 9 on that.
19 We also discussed risk assessment as it
20 relates to ultimate reuse and transfer. David Rist

108

1 and I met with Martha a couple of weeks ago, and we
2 took a map and, basically, took the reuse plan and
3 kind of translated that into the risk assessment
4 language of residential, recreational and commercial,
5 industrial.

6 The reuse plan started as a myriad of
7 different types of uses -- housing and movie
8 studios -- but we needed to translate that to match
9 the risk assessment scenarios of residential,
10 recreational, commercial slash industrial. So we did
11 that.

12 And we discussed how we would implement the
13 risk assessment to support that and got into questions
14 as to what depths do we assess risk; if it involves
15 construction of foundations and repair construction of
16 utilities; these are all emerging issues at other
17 bases, too, so we wanted to get that discussion going
18 so that we can tailor our data gathering and risk
19 assessing to the ultimate questions we are trying to
20 answer in terms of, is this property ready for

109

1 transfer for a particular use?

2 And then David briefed us on DTSC lead-based
3 paint sampling of nonresidential structures, which
4 DTSC performed a couple of weeks ago, and the lab data
5 will be available in a couple of weeks.

6 MR. RIST: Soon.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Soon.

8 MR. RIST: Within a week, I hope. It's not
9 available yet, but soon.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And DTSC is performing
11 the analysis in their own lab in Berkeley.

12 MS. NELSON: Is that information you can
13 share at the next meeting, David?

14 MR. RIST: If I have the data, yes. I would
15 anticipate. Sure.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then, lastly, we
17 talked a little bit about institutional controls,
18 which is another ongoing issue.

19 The minutes from that meeting should be out
20 in about three weeks or so.

110

1 The next BRAC cleanup team meeting is --
2 normally we have been trying to institutionalize it on
3 the first Monday of the month, but because of the
4 Labor Day holiday, we decided to adjust it to the 31st
5 of August, in two weeks. So that will be our,
6 actually be our September meeting.

7 I don't know if we finalized the location on
8 that or not.

9 MR. RIST: I don't think so.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I don't know if any
11 community members are interested in attending that on
12 the 31st.

13 MS. RAO: Is it going to be at Tetratech?

14 MR. KNAPP: The August 31st meeting is at
15 Tetratech.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh, is it? Okay. Did
17 we finalize that? Okay.

18 That's fine. So it will be the 31st of
19 August at Tetratech at 9:30 a.m.

20 Action items. I don't know whether we got

111

1 them in the last meeting minutes or not. I don't
2 think we did. Is that because we didn't have any
3 identified as outstanding?

4 MS. ROBBINS: I will have to go back and
5 look.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I know there is
7 one that I am working on that will be finished by next
8 month, and that is the issue to contract for the data
9 management to import the data to the geographic
10 information system. So that's been on my desk.

11 We have awarded the contract by the end of
12 September in order to get it through this fiscal
13 year's budget. So that's one thing we will definitely
14 do.

15 MR. HEHN: The ability to look at that data
16 when looking at some of these EBS surveys and results
17 for FOST and FOSLs would be extremely helpful to have
18 that data on the GIS system.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, I know. It's kind
20 of been a long time coming.

112

1 And, actually, I could have used it today.
2 We were looking at some lead issues.
3 But we are going to award the contract.
4 MS. NELSON: Who is that going to?
5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That will be with
6 Tetrattech, because it's basically taking the data that
7 they already have in various electronic formats and
8 putting it into a common format that we can import
9 into the map.
10 MS. NELSON: Is that going to be on GIS?
11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It will be on -- well,
12 it will be, the actual data will be in d-base type
13 format, which actually is also translatable into Excel
14 or almost anything.
15 And then in the ultimate, the front end
16 viewer, would be Art View, which is pretty much
17 industry standard.
18 Our goal was to make it as common as
19 possible so that the most number of people can use it.
20 In fact, there is even some freebie viewers that might

113

1 even work with it.
2 MS. SHIRLEY: I was just going to say that
3 there are.
4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Richard Hansen isn't
5 with us, so I don't know how he wanted to handle the
6 organizational business.
7 I know we had the ongoing membership drive.
8 I think we may have gotten one applicant.
9 MS. NELSON: Maybe two, I thought.
10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: He had one application.
11 Hopefully, the release of the draft EIS will
12 be another recruiting opportunity.
13 Actually, maybe even the public meeting for
14 the Site 1 and 3, no further action document.
15 We will just have to make the meeting
16 announcement as exciting as possible.
17 We will have it in the city to make sure
18 that there is plenty of public transit available.
19 TAPP proposals, it doesn't look like we will
20 have one for FY-98, unless there is something we

114

1 really want to try to award.
2 MS. NELSON: There was one for institutional
3 controls, doing research on institutional controls. I
4 think that might not be awarded in '98, maybe '99.
5 MS. RAO: The draft will be out by the
6 interim meeting and then, hopefully, it can be
7 approved by the next draft. But that's probably too
8 late for this.
9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The fiscal year
10 ends on the 30th of September. If it's something
11 fairly simple and streamlined, in fact, I think most
12 of the other TAPP Grants that have been awarded in the
13 Bay Area have been for review of documents, and so
14 that would have been a simple contract to write and to
15 award.
16 But the TAPP program will still continue on
17 in FY '99.
18 MS. SHIRLEY: Can I put my two cents in?
19 DERTF is quite interested in institutional
20 controls. One is to invite some RAB members to talk

115

1 on some panel about institutional controls.
2 I had hoped that possibly we could have a
3 draft of our little study completed by January.
4 So if we could sort of keep that in mind,
5 because it would be a wonderful -- actually, the first
6 week of February -- wonderful venue to show off that
7 research.
8 MS. NELSON: I guess we just need to get the
9 proposal up and running.
10 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.
11 MS. RAO: It needs to be approved at a full
12 RAB meeting.
13 MS. NELSON: Yes.
14 MS. SHIRLEY: I don't think that's a
15 problem.
16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would recommend, too
17 for any future documents, I would recommend using,
18 making use of the TAPP program for third party review
19 of the documents.
20 That's been a majority of the TAPP grants

116

1 issued.
2 MS. NELSON: Third party review of the
3 documents?
4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.
5 MS. NELSON: Rather than having one of the
6 technical committee review them for the RAB?
7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, no. Simply having
8 an outside organization.
9 Most of the other TAPP Grants, I mean, it's
10 the RAB's choice, but part of the TAPP program was
11 envisioned as allowing, of course, this group has a
12 lot of in-house resources, and others may not have
13 that.
14 But part of the TAPP program as envisioned,
15 was allowing the community members through a contract
16 to bring in a third party to review, outside third
17 party to review documents.
18 That was what the first TAPP Grant that was
19 issued in the Bay Area, up in Alameda, was for review
20 of one of their remedial investigation documents.

117

1 MS. SHIRLEY: I have talked to the TAPP
2 national administrator at DERTF, and she thought -- I
3 can't remember her name -- but she thought that that
4 control was something that would definitely be of
5 interest.
6 MS. NELSON: Since it's national?
7 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.
8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, if you could work
9 on it at the next interim meeting, and then the sooner
10 we could get a hold of a draft of it, we can start our
11 contract people looking at it. At least we could have
12 the paperwork end of it completed and then wait for
13 the new fiscal year '99 funding.
14 All right. Any other organizational issues?
15 Documents. The documents we discussed
16 earlier in the meeting were on the front page, so I
17 didn't replicate that on the back page.
18 Proposed agenda items for next meeting. We
19 will have the fuel line removal report out -- well,
20 should have the fuel line removal report out prior to

118

1 the next meeting, so we could have a presentation on
2 that. That would also be an opportunity to discuss
3 some of these other smaller USTs that are not in the
4 big CAP program.
5 And then we would be able to start looking
6 at a draft of the FY '99 cleanup program in order to
7 prioritize that work.
8 And then the draft Phase 1B SEBS for that
9 FOST will be out, for YBI, will be out and we could
10 have a brief presentation on that.
11 And depending on how much time all this
12 stuff takes up, we were still hoping to have a
13 feasibility study workshop, but that's something that
14 could be discussed at the interim meeting, whether
15 that's something you still want to try to squeeze in
16 September or move it back to October.
17 Right now there doesn't look like there is
18 as much going on in October, although the draft of the
19 first FOST for 1A will be out in October.
20 MS. NELSON: Who knows, the draft EIS might

119

1 be out.
2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the draft EIS might
3 be out.
4 MS. SHIRLEY: Who knows?
5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I did notice in my copy
6 of the internal draft where all the community members
7 were listed on the mailing list. It wasn't entirely
8 clear to me whether that meant that you just get the
9 notices or the document, but I think from what Martha
10 has said, we worked to get the document to any
11 community member who needs it. But you might just get
12 it automatically anyway.
13 You are, by name, on the list in the
14 appendix of the EIS.
15 Our next regular meeting is the 15th of
16 September. And then we will be back here at the Casa.
17 The next interim meeting will be Wednesday,
18 the 2nd, but now the location will be at ARC Ecology,
19 at 833 Market. So Wednesday, the 2nd of September,
20 not at TI, but at ARC Ecology. We will send out the

120

1 usual notice for the interim meeting and that will
2 have the ARC Ecology address on it.
3 And then the next BCT meeting, the 31st of
4 August, at Tetratech.

5 And the next Treasure Island Development
6 Authority meeting is tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. at the
7 Ferry Building.

8 And then, of course, the Monitored Natural
9 Attenuation Forum.

10 Any other announcements?

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Can I just say one thing about
12 TIDA?

13 There is talk about making an advisory group
14 to TIDA. They may talk about this tomorrow. Any RAB
15 member that could go and say that the RAB needs to be
16 on that advisory group would be very helpful.

17 MS. NELSON: We need to resurrect our letter
18 to Annemarie Conroy.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes, and resurrect a letter to
20 Annemarie Conroy that the RAB have a permanent place

121

1 on the agenda to give our impression of how the
2 cleanup is going.

3 MS. NELSON: Because I noticed that was
4 reinstated on the agenda. I can't remember July or
5 June. There was no regular update on environmental
6 cleanup.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

8 The summary is being given by Annemarie.

9 MS. NELSON: The summary is being given by
10 Annemarie?

11 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.

12 MS. NELSON: This is interesting.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it's part of the
14 director's report to the Development Authority. It's
15 a city's report.

16 MS. NELSON: It didn't start out that way,
17 though.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: So I think we need to pass
19 that message along.

20 I can't go.

122

1 Eve Bock (phonetic) from our office will be
2 there. You're welcome to call her tomorrow morning if
3 you have anything you want transmitted.

4 But I think it would be really helpful if
5 somebody from the RAB could go and get those two
6 messages.

7 MR. HEHN: I'm going to see what my schedule
8 is like tomorrow. I might be able to go tomorrow
9 afternoon.

10 MS. SHIRLEY: That would be great.

11 MR. HEHN: One question, Jim. It's kind of
12 a difficult question to answer, I know, but do we have
13 any idea when we might be able to get the Phase 2B
14 report finalized?

15 It seems like a lot of things are stacking
16 up out there that all feeds back into that data.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what it's really
18 hinging on now is resolving the screening levels
19 issue; and, so, yes, we don't have a date for it.

20 MR. HEHN: We have to start talking about

123

1 feasibility studies and transfers and FOSLs and FOSTs
2 and all these things, and they all kind of feed back
3 into that data again.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But I think we are, I
5 think because of all these documents that are starting
6 to build up that are dependent on the TPH screening, I
7 think it's finally, we really brought that issue to
8 the forefront, and now the senior management in both
9 the Navy and the regulators are involved, and I think
10 we will be a lot closer to reaching a resolution on
11 that.

12 MS. NELSON: I would propose that we get an
13 update on this issue, just exactly where the issues
14 are and where the roadblocks are, at a September or
15 October meeting.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, maybe we could
17 make it an agenda item at our BRAC Cleanup Team
18 meeting on the 31st, and kind of put together
19 something, put together a report that we could make to
20 the RAB at the September meeting.

124

1 So then we will add that in as a September
2 regular meeting agenda item. In fact, it may dovetail
3 in with the fuel line removal report, the status of
4 the petroleum issues or something to that effect.

5 MS. NELSON: Whatever. I guess there is
6 nothing preventing the RAB from lobbying the
7 regulators on our own.

8 And before we do that, it would make sense
9 to understand the issues.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So at our 31st August
11 BRAC cleanup team meeting we will work on the
12 presentation we could make to the community members.

13 MS. NELSON: Great.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's a pretty complex
15 issue.

16 MS. NELSON: You could leave the politics at
17 the door.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, okay.

19 Well, with that, we will see you either on
20 the 2nd of September at ARC Ecology, the interim

125

1 meeting, or at the next regular meeting on the 15th of
2 September.

3 Thank you very much.

4 (The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.)

5 ---o0o---

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

126

RAB MEETING NO. 48 - AUGUST 18, 1998

- \$ -	200 19:18 20:2 2000 31:9 107:9 2001 31:10 107:9 2002 31:11 21 11:5 21st 16:2 22:9 23:1,6,7 25:10,11,12,20 31:20 98:12 22 73:8 227 70:16 250 20:2 257 33:14 272 71:5 27th 63:14 28 76:13,20 77:4 29 27:3 28:1,4,16 29:14 30:16,18 61:1 76:14,20 77:4 2B 123:13 2nd 24:13,19 25:3 120:18, 19 125:20	- 8 -	adjacent 34:6 59:11 adjourned 126:4 adjust 68:8 106:17 111:4 adjusted 107:3 adjustment 72:1 103:9 administrative 92:20 administrator 118:2 admit 86:6 adopted 13:20 ads 41:15 adversely 61:6 advise 89:16,19 ADVISORY 1:3 4:2 15:16 84:20 85:4,8 121:13,16 affected 61:6,16 affecting 59:13 afford 16:5 97:11 after 5:17 22:15,20 23:5 25:10,12,16 29:13 31:13 34:14 36:12 49:4 50:14 62:18 67:4 88:10 90:14 afternoon 123:9 afterwards 51:6 again 29:16 30:15 37:6 38:5 51:19 60:15 80:18, 19 92:17 106:16 107:12 124:3 against 79:5 100:1 agencies 59:4 63:8 AGENCY 2:13 44:20 agenda 4:3,12,16 5:18,20 6:20 9:7 16:5 18:20 32:6 102:1,13 118:18 122:1,4 124:17 125:2 ago 15:13 36:3 109:1 110:4 agree 53:14,20 59:5 agreed 83:19 92:11 agreement 66:11 67:1,12, 18 ahead 6:19 15:16 30:8 33:7 50:9 51:15,19 52:3 62:19 68:4 82:4 84:9 Alabama 92:16 Alameda 117:19 Alert 91:12 ALICE 3:7 all 7:18 8:3,13 12:4 13:19 15:18 17:16 20:5 23:18 27:1,2 45:7,11 50:11 52:15 53:5 54:12 56:1,3, 4 57:3,4,7,14 60:4 62:14,16 63:2,3,10 65:12 68:9 69:20 73:7 74:5,11 78:3 80:13,20 81:3 83:6, 13 87:7 88:3 90:13 91:8 93:15 94:9 96:8,17,19,20 98:6 99:19 100:6,16 101:16 103:10 105:15 109:16 118:14 119:11 120:6 123:16 124:2,2,5 Allman 87:9,10 allow 18:12 39:14 106:18 allowing 117:11,15 allows 91:2 almost 28:18 44:4 113:14 along 9:16 58:10 72:2
- ' -	'95 75:2 '96 75:2,6 '97 36:5 85:15 '98 104:19 105:3 107:7 115:4 '99 31:13,19 67:2,2 104:20 105:14 107:7 115:4,17 118:13 119:6	- 9 -	8 77:14 79:16 87:17 833 120:19
- 1 -	1 5:12 15:2 27:3 28:2 31:13,13 32:6 33:13,13 36:6,10 37:2,13,19 38:3, 4,12 39:4,7 43:1,6,10,18 44:6 45:3 53:9 55:19 57:4,12 58:20 61:13 62:16 67:10 69:18 70:13 72:5 77:18 114:14 1-A 54:19 1-B 54:19 1.4 74:1 10 11:11 38:1 88:7 102 73:10,11 10th 63:16 11 20:1 59:2,2 81:15 12 15:2,18 16:15 20:1 27:2 31:6,11,17 36:7 74:15 83:11 12th 63:11 1300 20:1 13th 63:20 14 73:8 1400 19:20 15 48:7 59:9 77:18 100:3 15th 54:5 120:15 126:1 174 27:4 17th 98:12 18 1:4 180C 108:7 18th 55:17 63:12 68:12 1940s 36:13 1970s 36:13 1980s 36:3 1988 34:5 38:6 1995 79:20 1998 1:4 1999 31:18 105:18 1:00 121:6 1A 63:14 65:13 119:19 1B 63:17 64:1 65:15 68:14 119:8 1s 57:14 69:19	- 1 -	- A -
	3 5:12 19:19 20:3 32:7 34:6,7,7,10 36:6,15 38:5 39:9 43:1,6,10,18 44:7 53:9 69:17 114:14 30 5:13 32:13 52:15 61:7 30-day 39:20 40:3 41:9,16, 19 48:9 50:14 53:11,15 63:19 30th 115:10 31st 10:14 107:14 111:4, 12,14,18 121:3 124:18 125:10 37 59:6 3rd 64:2 108:2	- 3 -	a.m 111:19 abatement 14:15 105:12, 13,16,17 ability 112:15 able 4:8 17:11 18:13 21:12 23:18 83:4 104:10 106:5 107:1 119:5 123:8, 13 above 12:12 aboveground 59:20 absolutely 14:12,12 accept 12:20 13:15,17 accepted 13:20 accepting 93:11 access 92:16 94:9 account 68:17 accounting 90:14,14 91:1 acronym 84:15 action 5:11,14 30:1 32:7,9, 14 34:20 35:18 36:7 37:9 39:2,4,6,14 45:14 46:3,6 83:20 105:20 106:7 111:20 114:14 actions 31:4 35:4 active 70:17 activities 37:7 61:16 81:11 actual 70:5 78:4 105:17 113:12 actually 4:20 5:4 38:8 46:2 47:6,20 58:4,7 65:18 69:8 78:8 89:8,17 90:3,7 93:10 99:13 104:2 111:6 113:1,13 114:13 116:5 add 6:14 14:12 17:4 125:1 added 32:5 addendum 29:3 addition 5:18 62:8 63:5,15 74:5 87:16 additional 15:7,9,10 16:14 18:5 22:7 27:5,5 30:14 38:11 64:16 105:13 address 23:18 42:14 94:7 96:1 102:8,12 108:11 121:2 addressed 45:5 63:4 85:15 addresses 102:7 addressing 42:20 43:6
	4 5:17 15:4 29:10,16 76:8 108:13 4/IR 15:1 45 48:11 95:18 45-day 52:15 48 1:8 4:4 57:12 58:15 62:16	- 4 -	
	5 78:1	- 5 -	
	6 38:1 102:14 60 95:19 62 61:7	- 6 -	
	7 11:12 59:2 61:20 7139 1:20 7:00 1:5 7:45 4:18	- 7 -	
- 2 -	2 13:3,7 28:4,9,10,14 42:16 51:1 61:8 69:2 83:4		

77:14 89:5 105:7 106:5
122:19
already 4:16 5:1 14:14
35:20 52:19 68:13 70:4
102:9 106:15 113:7
Although 72:11 119:18
always 58:10 99:20
AMELIA 2:5 22:10 23:9
amended 12:20 14:1 80:4
Ammonia 80:12,14 87:18
amount 65:6
amphipod 80:7
Analysis 60:2,9 76:9
110:11
ANJU 2:12
Annemarie 21:10 121:18,20
122:8,10
announcement 99:6 114:16
announcements 107:12
121:10
announcing 39:19 41:15
99:6
another 26:3 28:15 29:14
43:11 47:20 80:9 85:18
94:2 100:13 102:15
110:18 114:12
answer 28:15 29:18,19
30:14 55:14 72:6 109:20
123:12
answers 16:6
anticipate 110:15
any 5:19 6:10,18 8:14
9:13 10:19 12:19 14:5
18:13 19:8,12,14 20:15
22:7 24:7 25:8 31:12
32:1,11 34:8 40:12 42:20
47:9,10,16 48:12 50:10
51:15 55:14 57:5 60:11
68:7 69:20 71:9 72:13
75:5 83:1,14 86:12
100:16 101:1,5,7,8,13
105:5 107:12 111:10
112:2 116:17 118:14
120:10 121:10,14 123:13
anybody 93:18 94:2 96:1
102:11
anyone 10:17 24:9 44:15
56:5 84:11 95:8 97:6
99:13
anything 19:9 52:11 103:1
105:1 113:14 123:3
anyway 84:14 89:13 97:13
120:12
apparently 102:14
appeared 79:7
appendix 40:8 43:7 120:14
Applause 4:6
applicant 114:8
application 114:10
appreciate 101:20
approach 31:11 81:12
appropriate 23:4 35:19
56:17
approval 4:15 11:5 62:18
approved 115:7 116:11
approximate 64:10
approximately 19:18 25:10

ARC 76:2 79:17 87:8
93:17 97:17 120:18,20
121:2 125:20
arduous 92:17
area 12:12,13 26:11,12
27:8 28:19 29:14 34:8,9,
12 36:16 55:19 56:9
57:12,14 61:8,13,20
62:16 70:7 74:10 75:10
76:14 77:1,11 78:16 81:5
115:13 117:19
areas 7:16,20 8:3,3,12
26:8,9,10,15 27:4,14 30:7
31:5 74:14 76:11,12
77:19 78:8
aren't 22:7 32:20 71:1
Army 96:3
around 21:12 33:8 70:7,13
73:7 76:13,15 94:14
100:4,9
arrive 6:16
Art 113:16
asbestos 14:15 56:18
105:12 107:9
aside 10:9 75:12
ask 21:16 44:1 49:3
asked 9:13 11:14 88:18
asking 21:1 49:3
asphalt 38:8,14,15
assess 109:14
assessing 109:19
assessment 34:5,11 37:3,
13,17 38:6,20 39:5
81:16,16 82:13 83:3,6,7
108:19 109:3,9,13
assessments 35:18
assigned 66:2,18
associated 5:15 35:13,15
37:7 91:3
Associates 2:11
association 89:15
assumed 37:14
assuming 66:20 72:3
attachment 82:19
attempts 76:14,16
attend 6:3 101:12
attending 111:11
Attenuation 10:13 91:4
107:14 121:9
AUGUST 1:4 4:2 10:14
17:2 23:6 31:13,14 63:11
107:14 108:2 111:5,14,19
121:4 125:10
Authority 18:20 19:2
121:6 122:14
automatically 48:11 120:12
available 15:18 18:10 47:5,
11 83:14 86:20 92:6
93:12 95:20 98:19 110:5,
9 114:18
average 11:16 12:11 79:11
award 106:6 107:1 113:3
115:1,15
awarded 106:9,16 112:11
115:4,12
awarding 106:12
awards 106:20

away 81:4

- B -

baby 87:4
back 4:14 11:6 17:20
19:11 21:17 25:20 26:16
27:1 30:11,14 33:7 34:5
36:3 37:3 38:6 41:8,12
57:7 72:9 79:20 96:2,2,
4,5,5,11,18,20 112:4
118:17 119:16 120:16
123:16 124:2
background 35:12 93:15
Backslash 96:13,17
backward 40:16
bad 68:7,8
balance 107:5
BALBONI 1:20
ball 16:12
barn 77:19
BARRY 2:19
base 33:16,18 34:5,11,15
79:10 89:17
based 17:15 19:4 31:11
49:13 55:9 56:19 58:5
72:15 98:16
baseline 4:10 5:2,5 7:17
15:17 54:20 55:3,7,20
56:7,13
bases 89:19 103:11 108:17
109:17
basically 8:13 35:8 36:13
39:11 56:2 59:4 95:15
101:7,7 105:4 109:2
113:6
basis 84:4
bay 78:6 81:5 82:7,8 85:6,
7 115:13 117:19
bay-wide 81:19 82:9,10
86:4
Baylands 78:14,20
BCT 94:7 121:3
beating 100:1
BEC 2:3
became 86:3
before 5:17 6:19 18:13
19:12 26:3 33:1,8,18
44:12 45:8,15 46:11,13,
16 53:10 54:9 64:19
65:4,10 67:11,11 72:2,18
83:10,19 94:17 99:8
125:8
beforehand 107:15
begin 21:12 94:13
beginning 6:13 11:1 34:17
54:15
behalf 6:7
behind 61:17 88:7
belabor 91:13
believe 13:5
belong 71:9
belongs 77:1
below 37:18 38:4 39:7
69:16
beneath 38:15
beneficial 45:10

benefit 29:11
benthic 82:13
Berkeley 110:11
besides 100:9
BEST 2:16 42:11
better 43:19 51:14
between 66:11 67:12,18
105:9
beyond 90:12
big 33:13 74:4 78:18
86:16 90:17 93:6 119:4
binder 93:6,13,17
bingo 53:12 73:16
bioassay 79:16 80:3
bioassays 80:5
Biological 85:2,4,8
birds 82:13 83:1
bit 5:8 31:17 35:12 56:11
93:3 106:3 110:17
blanks 107:16
blocks 33:15,15
BOARD 1:3 4:2 6:3 7:5
9:15 15:16 108:10
Bob 14:8
Bock 123:1
body 45:11
bore 91:8
borings 38:13
both 27:6 39:17 43:19
48:3 49:7 68:17 75:3
89:17 105:20 124:8
bottom 10:11
bought 107:5,6
boundaries 57:19 58:6,11
71:3
boxed 92:14
BRAC 14:19 89:18 94:7
103:10 108:1 111:1
124:17 125:11
break 88:7,12
BRENNAN 3:5 10:3 13:18
87:12,15
brief 5:11 32:6,7 33:2
76:5 88:18 103:4 104:18
119:10
briefed 110:2
briefly 6:6 33:10 35:4
36:1
bring 83:19 91:10 101:2,5
117:16
brought 16:12 19:1 42:15,
16,17 80:8 84:4 88:4
91:16 99:5 124:7
Bruno 107:20
BTAG 83:9,13,16 84:16,17
budget 112:13
Buena 63:18 65:15 77:14
build 103:15 124:6
building 30:18 33:14,18
34:1,7,9,10,10 37:8 41:1
58:12 70:13,16,17 121:7
buildings 27:3 28:1,5,16
29:14 30:16 58:7
built 33:19
bulb 64:4
bunch 8:8 89:16 92:1
business 114:6

- C -

C-E-C-E-R 96:3

call 6:17 9:6 28:9,13,14
29:4 32:2 103:17 104:5
123:2
called 7:4 40:7 78:10
95:14
came 37:18 56:19 59:16
60:10 87:19
can't 21:17 29:19 32:3
70:3 89:13 90:15 94:20
100:14 104:9 118:3
122:4,20
CAP 59:15 68:18 69:7
96:18 105:20 119:4
capacity 103:14,15,19
104:4
capital 96:5,6,7,9,9,10,16,
19
capitals 96:18
capped 96:8
captured 50:6 91:12
care 31:12
Career 107:17
CASA 1:6 120:16
case 25:7 50:7 68:3 80:16
97:1 104:3
cases 80:19
categories 58:16 59:8 62:2
categorization 60:20
categorized 58:19
category 59:2,9,19 60:12
67:10 69:2,17,18,19
caucus 10:11 89:6 90:7
97:15,16,20 98:9,13 99:8,
17 100:8,13
cause 99:17
center 33:14 36:11
cents 115:18
CERCLA 31:15 68:18
69:7 106:11,15,16 107:10
CERFA 59:4
certain 94:13
certainly 17:12 43:2 74:18
104:15
cetera 42:18
change 24:15 25:2,4 98:17
changed 71:13
changes 12:20 23:4
chat 94:11
check 12:14 13:13
chemical 61:19
Chicago 89:1,2 90:2 98:10
100:4
choice 117:10
choosing 11:15
CHRIS 3:3 7:2 10:6,9,10
76:4 88:17 97:2 100:18
Christmas 64:20 65:1
Christmastime 21:13
circulated 45:15 50:9
city 8:8 14:3,5 18:3,11
19:3 20:5,17 21:18 31:13
40:19,20 44:20 64:16
66:6,7,11,13,20 67:13,18

74:14 114:17
city's 14:8 122:15
CLAIRE 2:16
clarification 50:17 52:20
55:15
clarifications 50:10 51:16
clarified 23:3 52:12
clarify 22:10 23:15 26:7,20
51:8 65:12,13
classification 58:19 59:5
61:9 68:16
classifications 61:12
classified 61:8
clean 8:3 69:9 78:6 79:13
cleaner 52:14
cleanup 8:1,6,10,12,20
9:14 14:20 31:4 36:9
42:2 64:14 67:16,19 68:1
86:2,9 89:17 90:12 91:3
94:7 95:8 96:11,14,16
98:16 108:1 111:1 119:6
122:2,6 124:17 125:11
clear 8:18 52:16 75:2
120:8
clear-cut 73:2
clearly 100:10
cliffs 77:3
Clinic 36:12 37:2
CLINTON 3:8
Clipper 82:17
clock 32:15 47:13
close 16:2,6 22:8 31:18,20
35:1 49:6 70:20 105:14
closed 49:5 75:16
closely 21:19 70:2
closer 77:15 124:10
closes 25:16 55:16
closing 103:10
closure 31:6,15 106:4
Co-Chair 2:3 4:1,7 6:10
7:2 9:8,20 10:5 11:3,13,
19 12:2,7,10,17 13:2,6,8,
12,19 14:14,19 17:1,15
18:2,17 19:17 20:12,15
21:18 24:1,11 25:6,12,15
26:7 27:17,20 28:8,12
29:4,12 30:13 33:12
40:15 42:1,6,19 43:16
44:5,13,15 45:9 46:1,19
47:1,4,15,19 48:12 49:6,
10,19 50:20 51:13 53:20
57:18 64:10 65:3 68:19
70:10 75:11 78:12 84:2,
8,13,20 85:19 86:16
87:2,6,10,13 88:6,13,17
89:2,10 96:12 97:2
100:18 101:1,17 102:6
103:2,7 104:7,15 110:7,
10,16 111:10,16 112:6,19
113:5,11 114:4,10 115:9
116:16 117:4,7 118:8
120:2,5 122:13 123:17
124:4,16 125:10,14,18
coal 78:10,11,16
Coast 58:1 77:1,5,5
coincides 7:20
collected 17:6 37:5 38:7,14

61:3
collection 76:9
come 21:4 29:8 64:1 70:6
76:3 83:8 91:1 92:19
comes 30:11
comfortable 7:8 68:9
coming 31:18 35:9 63:10
64:4,8 90:3 112:20
comment 5:5 6:13 10:19,
20 11:11 14:4 16:1,2,7
20:8 22:8 25:15 30:16
39:20 40:3 41:9,16,19
43:3,20 44:7,16 47:18
48:7,9,13,19 49:4,5,7,7,
14,17 50:11,18 51:10,20
53:11 55:8,16 63:2,19
68:12 75:15,16,19 83:5,
10 93:11
comments 5:19 11:8 12:19
13:14 15:7,15 16:6,9
20:15 22:8,12,15 23:1,3,
14,16 24:3,6,14,17 25:7,
8,17 29:6 31:20 32:1
40:4,6 42:20 43:4,5,6,10,
14,17 44:3,6,10,16,20,20
45:3,7,11 48:4 49:4,11,14
50:4,14 51:2 52:3,8 53:8
54:7,8 55:10,15 56:5
57:7 62:19 63:2,11,12,20
64:16 65:7 68:7 75:14,
18,20 76:3,5 83:11
87:17,19 93:11,12
commercial 109:4,10
committed 31:13
committee 6:4 7:11,15
8:15 9:6 47:7 86:11
117:6
common 113:8,18
COMMUNITY 3:2 24:6
25:1 32:12 42:3 43:19
47:10 48:4,14 49:11,13
51:3 57:8 62:18 68:6
71:7 75:12,13 86:12
88:19 89:3,6 92:13 93:1
97:18 98:1,5,6 99:13,15,
18 101:2 104:18 111:11
117:15 120:6,11 125:12
company 20:18 21:5
compare 82:6
complete 67:4
completed 36:4 63:7 65:20
67:11 116:3 118:12
completely 7:9 83:12 90:8
complex 77:5 125:14
comply 49:1
comprises 57:12
concentration 73:19 74:1
concentrations 72:11,15
concern 45:1 60:11,13
61:1 80:8 81:20,20 82:1,
10,11,17 83:1 92:13
concerned 45:11 69:16
71:5 76:19 77:12,15,17,
20 78:1 79:1,17 81:7
82:12 83:2
concerning 5:19 43:14
concerns 39:13 59:12 60:5,

7 63:3 76:11,13 98:2
concluded 61:5
concludes 62:16
conclusion 60:10
conclusions 56:20 59:16
concurrent 42:2
condition 57:1
conditions 35:14
conducted 16:15
conducting 15:7
conference 10:10 88:20
confidence 11:17,19 79:11
confident 68:10
confirmation 26:12 27:9
confirmed 57:13 59:3
confuse 52:16
Congressional 98:14
conjecture 21:1
Conroy 121:18,20
consequently 19:1 101:11
conservative 71:5 81:12
consider 91:2
consideration 30:17 75:1
88:1
considered 73:3
consistent 80:2 82:9
constituents 75:4,4 106:17
108:9,12
constitutes 108:17
construction 109:15,15
consultant 52:11
consumption 81:17,19 82:5
containing 59:10
contains 93:15
contaminants 35:14 59:13
80:11
contaminated 79:8
contamination 12:12,13
37:10,11 38:18 39:10
57:5 60:14 72:14 76:20
77:9
context 53:8
continuation 28:10
continue 11:17 62:12
115:16
Continued 3:1
continuing 35:16 106:13
contract 85:20 86:3 105:17
106:6,9 112:8,11 113:3
115:14 117:15 118:11
contracted 81:4
control 91:11,19 118:4
controls 90:17 91:6,7
110:17 115:3,3,20 116:1
conversation 50:12,17
94:13
conveyance 67:1,17,18
coordinating 97:17
copied 93:7 95:18 97:11,12
copies 4:13,13 11:6 50:2
86:10 91:16 93:14,17
94:6 95:2,17 97:6,12,13
101:6
copy 4:12 10:15 54:19
82:19 83:15 86:7,13 87:1
97:10 101:4 102:4,5
120:5

corner 34:1 59:11 73:12
74:10
correct 14:9 17:18 19:17
correction 5:10
corrections 4:16 11:9
13:16
Corrective 105:19 106:7
cost 90:16
costs 90:14,15 91:3
could 9:3,3 17:4 22:10
29:2 33:10 51:15 52:16,
20 53:1 65:4 67:10 68:4
71:3 73:5 74:13 81:5
82:6 93:19 95:20 100:5
102:3,4,15 103:17 104:5
113:1 116:2,4 118:8,10,
11 119:1,9,14 121:15
123:5 124:16,19 125:12,
16
couldn't 97:11
country 94:14 100:9
couple 10:8 24:10 26:3
37:4 50:9 65:16 78:2
89:14 109:1 110:4,5
course 41:19 93:2 94:8
117:11 121:8
Cove 78:5,8 82:17
cover 28:16 31:2 56:6
57:3
covered 57:2 59:9
criterion 79:10
critical 18:4
Cruz 6:16
CSR 1:20
current 16:20
currently 6:15 108:8
cycle 90:15

- D -

d-base 113:12
D-E-N-I-X 96:3,4
D-E-R-P 96:18
D.C 92:15 98:14 100:15
Dale 84:12 87:8
DANIEL 2:15 88:16
DARLENE 2:18 97:3,8
101:17 102:11
dash 96:6,6,10
data 15:10,10,18 18:10
19:11,12 25:20 26:3,4,6,
15,16 30:11,14,18 56:17,
19 60:15 62:1 72:9 73:3,
18 75:2,5,8 77:2 79:6,16
80:13,20 81:2 82:4
109:18 110:4,14 112:8,9,
15,18 113:6,12 123:16
124:3
date 15:19 18:18 22:15
31:7,12 40:17,18 41:5,7,
11,20 64:11 123:19
dates 22:14 32:19 98:12
107:2
DAVID 2:14 29:19 108:20
110:2,13
day 14:1 111:4
days 5:13 23:13 32:13

48:7,11
DDT 82:6
DE 1:6
deadlines 49:1
deal 99:4
dealing 46:7 98:4
December 21:12 64:2 65:6
decided 7:8 75:1 111:4
decision 16:18 40:14 63:7
66:3 91:20 92:2,6
decisions 18:13 95:7,12
decrease 75:3
dedicated 95:3
deep 14:15
Defense 61:11 88:19 89:9
91:12 94:4 95:5
defined 34:8
defines 66:12
definitely 45:4 112:13
118:4
definition 69:15 70:5
delayed 6:15,17 17:10
deliver 47:6
delve 95:11
Denix 96:3
dental 33:14,18
Department 57:17 58:1
61:11 94:4
dependent 124:6
depending 119:11
depends 65:6
depths 109:14
dermal 37:16
DERTF 10:10 89:13
90:10,20 91:5 93:5,16
94:18 99:16 100:11
115:19 118:2
DERTP 96:17
describe 9:13
described 27:18 52:8
describes 95:14
design 106:6
desire 24:14
desk 112:10
detail 17:4 37:1 99:10
detailed 56:8
detected 38:16 39:8
detections 38:10
developed 57:19 58:5 88:2
developer 36:15 37:6
developing 102:19
development 6:4 9:6 18:20
19:2 121:5 122:14
did 6:3,17 8:14 15:12
17:5,13 18:6 19:18 21:4,
6 56:12 59:16 60:9 72:7,
9 76:10,10 91:10 100:19
109:10 111:16 112:2
120:5
didn't 19:15 21:8 24:7
33:6 41:14 60:19 67:13
72:13 78:17 79:11 86:7
91:17 93:13 97:10
106:16 112:2 118:17
122:16
difference 61:18
different 58:16 76:11,12

82:14 109:7
difficult 22:3 32:4 123:12
difficulties 48:13
dioxin 17:6,13 18:4 26:1,8,
9 27:6,7 61:3
dioxins 61:4
directed 108:15
decided 72:10
director's 122:14
disagree 51:19
disagreement 53:14
discovered 16:16
discuss 5:16 20:9 24:14
25:1 52:11 56:4 74:18
76:3 98:3 119:2
discussed 73:1 74:8 92:9
93:3,16 108:2,19 109:12
118:15 119:14
discussing 56:11 73:14,14,
15
discussion 4:9,15 5:17 11:4
47:16 56:8 66:13 91:7,11
108:3 109:17
dispense 102:4
dispute 9:15
distant 63:15
distribute 101:6
distributed 41:18
distribution 104:8
dividing 58:15
diving 82:15,15
document 5:4,13,14 15:8,9,
20 16:3 18:1 19:19 22:2
23:4 25:9 27:19 28:5,11
29:9 30:15,19 31:15
32:9,19 33:3 35:9 42:2,
9,13 43:18,20 44:8,17
45:19 46:12,12 47:2,11
48:2 49:12 52:7,9 54:9,
14 55:10,14,16 56:12
62:4,13 65:9,14,16 68:14
69:5 71:12 72:4 74:17
76:15 78:4 79:19 81:11
82:13 83:8,9,14,16 84:6
85:16 86:5,7,9,10 93:6,10
95:18 97:10 101:7,8,13
114:14 120:9,10
documentation 31:17 32:8
68:4
documents 5:11 22:12
32:10,15 55:2,4 58:8
62:9 79:18 86:17 87:7
92:2,12,14 100:7 101:2,5,
13 104:11 115:13
116:17,19 117:3,17,20
118:15,15 124:5
DoD 89:16,16 90:13 91:1
92:11,19 94:16 102:18
doesn't 12:4 13:13 32:2
52:10 78:4 114:19
119:17
doing 5:6 6:11 18:7 21:7
27:5 47:12 55:5 58:8
65:12 66:7 67:5 74:11
82:2 105:12,15 115:3
dominant 90:10 91:5
don't 4:12 6:16 9:7,17

16:8 18:17 22:14 23:14
24:9 25:4 29:17 30:10
45:13,18 48:15 50:10,17
51:9,16 58:13 69:20
71:9,9 75:5 84:17 98:7,
11,20 101:3 102:8 103:4,
14,19 104:11,20 106:8
111:7,9,10,20 112:1
114:5 116:14 123:19
done 21:3 35:13 38:12
56:5 58:7 68:1,2 83:10
99:7 102:9 103:18
105:11,11
door 70:15 125:17
dot 96:3,3,3 97:1
dovetail 125:2
dovetailing 103:12
down 6:15 14:2 21:9 72:1
73:9 96:15 97:3 102:10
Draft 4:19 5:4,13 15:1,4
22:13,15,17,18 23:8,10
25:19,19 29:8 32:10,14
33:3 39:17 40:14 41:12
42:14,20 43:5,6 44:12,13
45:6,8 46:12,12,16,17,19,
20 47:2,13 52:9 54:9
55:11,19 57:9 62:20
63:1,10,12,13,20 64:1,9,
13,17 65:16 66:16 71:15,
16,17,18 74:17 75:14
76:6 83:9 93:6,7 97:4
102:13 114:11 115:5,7
116:3 118:10 119:6,8,18,
20 120:2,6
drafts 57:10
drained 77:4,5
drawing 72:3
drive 114:7
driver's 7:9
driving 46:14
DTSC 2:14 42:18 45:3
87:19 110:2,4,10
ducks 82:15,15
due 37:6 63:11,20 80:14
DUQUE 2:5 22:14
during 34:4,17 38:12
42:15 48:9 49:4 50:4
51:19 53:14 59:15 60:8
67:7 105:18
dying 88:3

- E -

E-mail 32:2 102:1,5,7,8,12
E-S 96:5,6,6,9
each 35:15 56:9 57:1
earlier 6:11 18:11 19:9
22:4 31:6 42:6 80:1
118:16
earliest 67:3
early 32:12 42:9,13 54:5
65:5 67:2 90:3
easier 71:14
easily 74:19
east 33:15
easy 60:20
EBS 2:5 5:18 15:2 20:10