

5090
Ser 6225EG/9348-1
14 Dec 1998

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

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

Encl: (1) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes – 20 October 1998

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



ERNESTO M. GALANG
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER
By direction

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Mr. David Rist)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Mr. David Leland)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. James Ricks, Jr.)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)
Geomatrix Consultants (Attn: Ms. Carol Yamane)
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Mr. Richard Knapp)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. James Aldrich	Ms. Alice LaPierre	Mr. Jack Savage
Mr. John Allman (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Clinton Loftman	Ms. Dale Smith
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Mr. Brandon McMillan	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
(Ms. Chris Shirley/Kavitha Rao)	Ms. Karen Mendelow	Mr. Harlan Van Wye
Mr. Nathan Brennan	Mr. Ernest Michelsen	Mr. Humphrey Ho
Mr. Richard Hansen (Co-Chair)	Ms. Patricia Nelson	Mr. John Gregson
Mr. Paul Hehn	Mr. Henry Ongerth	

Blind copies to:

622A, 6225EG, 62B
Information Repository (3 copies)
Chron, RF
Writer: E. Galang, 6225EG, X-2560
File: NS Treasure Island

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

October 20, 1998
Meeting No. 50

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 20 October 1998 at 7:00 p.m. at Fogwatch Club, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to: 1) have discussion/approval of the 15 September 1998 minutes, 2) receive a report from the City of San Francisco, 3) discuss the Site Specific EBS for Transfer Phase Ib for Sites Not Requiring Remedial Action (Yerba Buena Island), 4) have an update on the Fuel Line Removal and UST Program, 5) review IR Sites 1 and 3 RI Response to Comments/ Draft No Further Action RAP 6) conduct a Feasibility Study workshop, 7) discuss general updates, 8) review Action Items and organizational business, 10) review the upcoming environmental report review schedule, 11) hold open questions/discussion, and 12) note proposed agenda items for next meeting.

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

I. Welcome Remarks and Agenda

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the 50th meeting of the TI RAB. He noted the meeting location change to the Fogwatch Club, and commented that future meeting locations may vary depending upon the availability of the Casa de La Vista.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sullivan called for comments on the agenda. There were none, so the agenda remained as provided.

II. Public Comment

There were no members of the general public present.

III. Discussion/Approval of the 15 September 1998 Minutes

Mr. Sullivan stated that he has been e-mailing a copy of the meeting minutes to those who provide their e-mail address, and encouraged members to verify or add their address on the sign-

up sheet. There were no comments on the minutes; the RAB voted to accept the minutes as written.

IV. City of San Francisco

Martha Walters reported that the City of San Francisco is in the final stages negotiations with the John Stewart Management Company about management of the housing on TI. She will inform the RAB when the agreement is finalized.

Ms. Walters also announced that the next Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) meeting will be held Wednesday, 21 October, 1:00 p.m., at the Ferry Building. RAB members are invited to attend.

Richard Hansen, Community Co-Chair, noted that the agenda for the TIDA meeting includes consideration of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC). He pointed out that the RAB had written to TIDA requesting placement of a RAB representative on their CAC. Kavitha Rao distributed copies of TIDA's draft CAC application.

Alice La Pierre asked if you must reside in San Francisco in order to participate on the CAC. Ms. Walters said she was unaware of a residency requirement. Ms. Rao stated her concern that the selection process requires TIDA staff to select appropriate members to serve on the CAC, which are then accepted or rejected by the Authority. Ms. Walters responded that TIDA follows standard procedures and that it is typical for a commission to take staff recommendations. Dale Smith pointed out that a prospective board member for the Berkeley Environmental Commission can also express their interest to the City Council, and that not all appointments are made through staff. Ms. Walters suggested that these concerns be brought up at tomorrow's TIDA meeting.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

V. Discussion of Site Specific EBS for Transfer Phase Ib for Sites not Requiring Remedial Action (Yerba Buena Island)

Mr. Sullivan stated that a presentation on Phase Ib was given at last month's RAB meeting. Phase Ib includes all sites on YBI which don't have outstanding environmental issues. A Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) is being prepared for these sites, however it is being accomplished in two steps. An EBS is first being prepared, and once the draft final EBS is complete, then a draft FOST will be issued.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed that a Phase Ia EBS, which includes all TI sites with no outstanding environmental issues, has been issued and the comment period has closed out. The Navy is currently in the process of preparing a draft response to comments, which should be available in

about the second week of November. The Phase Ib EBS has also been issued, and the comment period ends on 23 October. The Navy's draft response to comments on the Phase Ib will be available about 30 days after close of the comment period.

Mr. Sullivan noted that tonight's meeting provides the opportunity for RAB members to comment on the Phase Ib document before the comment period closes. Both documents will be completed in the March-April time frame if the schedule is followed. The Navy is trying to stay ahead of the process until all of the other transfer documentation is in place. He noted that all of the Technical Subcommittee members received copies of the Phase Ib document.

Ms. Smith recalled that a road on the west side of YBI was lost to erosion in the early 1990's, and noted that the Phase Ib document didn't describe this occurrence. Mr. Sullivan agreed that it would be a good idea to document this occurrence as part of the site geology. He noted that the slippage occurred due to excess moisture in the soil, possibly from rainfall, and not due to failure of physical infrastructure. Harlan Van Wye recalled significant slippage in the same area in the 1970's.

Nathan Brennan suggested that references in the document to electric oil fill switches and transformers should indicate that the oil did not contain PCBs.

Mr. Sullivan stated that additional comments can be taken in any form until the comment period closes. He noted that there will be additional opportunities to review the document as they proceed through the process.

Mr. Sullivan then proposed to move on to the Feasibility Workshop agenda item, to allow enough time for the presentation.

VI. Feasibility Study Workshop

Mr. Sullivan stated that a feasibility study (FS) will be conducted for the IR sites following completion of the remedial investigation (RI). He noted that this evening's presentation is intended to provide an introduction to the process before it gets underway. The FS work has already been contracted for and will begin once the RI is complete. Mr. Sullivan introduced Edward Ho, an engineer with TetraTech, to provide a general overview of the FS process.

Mr. Ho noted that the RI and the FS are part of the same process. The FS is the aspect that systematically develops remedial alternatives to address contaminants identified in the RI. The purpose of the document is to combine data, applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), risk assessment, and knowledge of technologies into comprehensive remedial alternatives for subsequent analysis and comparison.

The FS typically starts with a summary of the findings of the RI and goes into actual

development of the alternatives. The first step is to define the remedial action objectives (RAOs), which are contaminant specific, medium specific, receptor specific, and pathway specific, and incorporate ARARs and risk goals. The next step is to develop general response actions (GRAs), which are general strategies such as removal and disposal, containment, treatment, or no action/institutional controls. GRAs can apply to any of the RAOs for a given site.

Identification of volumes of media for action follows development of the GRAs. This information is based on the RI data and the RAOs. The next phase of the FS involves technology identification and screening. A broad range of technology types and process options are identified and considered. The screening is site-specific and based on effectiveness, technical implementability and qualitative cost. Options that remain after the screening process are assembled as alternatives. Alternatives may combine many technologies to comprehensively address all RAOs at the entire site.

Once the alternatives are developed, these continue to a detailed analysis phase. Nine criteria are used to evaluate each specific alternative: overall protection of human health and the environment; compliance with ARARs; long term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume through treatment; short term effectiveness; implementability; cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance. All alternatives must meet the first two criteria; the remaining seven are used primarily for purposes of comparison. The cost criteria involves an actual cost estimate. The last step of the process is to perform a comparative analysis of the alternatives. The alternatives are compared against the same nine criteria in the previous step to determine which ones are best.

Mr. Hansen asked the origin of the FS protocol. Mr. Ho stated that it was EPA guidance for Superfund sites. Mr. Sullivan noted that every military base and federal facility follows similar protocol for an FS. Mr. Ho added that the intent of the guidance is to leave some leeway because an FS will differ in emphasis on a site-by-site basis.

Ms. Smith asked for an explanation of a home treatment unit noted as a GRA in the handout. Mr. Ho stated that it is a water filter installed under a sink, which serves as a way to treat groundwater. He also pointed out that the community acceptance criteria would be used to examine environmental justice issues.

Ms. Smith stated that she is aware of few documents that have well-defined the extent of contamination for a plume, and asked if the Navy is prepared to carefully delineate the contaminated areas. Mr. Ho responded that this is an RI/FS process, and so the two interact with each other. There is provision to gather additional information during the FS if it is determined to be beneficial. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that for Treasure Island, the RI report is not yet complete, and the Navy anticipates conducting some additional investigations during the FS.

Ms. Rao reminded the RAB that Chris Shirley agrees with the BCT that the RAB should be more

proactive in the FS process. She has encouraged the RAB to look into alternative remedial technologies and provide a list of these to the BCT for consideration. Mr. Ho strongly encouraged input from the RAB, noting that the FS is a collaborative effort, and that there is interest in examining all of the technologies available.

Mr. Hansen asked if unique technologies were being used by Catellus Development Corp. in Mission Bay. Ms. Smith noted that Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) is more appropriate because it is a naval base, not a private development project. Ms. Walters noted that the Mission Bay project is being approached very differently, and agreed that work at HPS is more comparable because it follows the CERCLA process. Mission Bay is not a Superfund site and therefore, cleanup does not follow the CERCLA process. Mr. Sullivan stated that Superfund sites can be public or private; federally owned property cleanup follows the federal Superfund process. If a property doesn't qualify for ranking on the Superfund's National Priorities List, and is therefore not considered a Superfund site, then cleanup would fall under the state program. The state program is parallel to the federal process. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the cleanup process is independent of base closure and its purpose is to protect human health and the environment. Base closure adds a few additional steps, such as the FOST, but otherwise the process remains the same whether or not a base is closing.

Mr. Sullivan stated that additional presentations on the FS process would follow, as necessary. The FS process should begin after the first of the year.

VII. Fuel Line Removal Report and UST Program Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that nine IR sites originally in the CERCLA Program were moved to the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) program due to major petroleum issues. In addition, several other smaller sites are being investigated under other programs. Fuel lines and other USTs not under the IR Program pose impacts to soil and groundwater.

Mr. Sullivan first reviewed fuel line removal efforts. He noted that full lines on TI were used primarily to transport diesel fuel, gasoline and ship fuel. Most of the lines run along the east side of TI; a fuel line for heating oil also runs along YBI.

A geotechnical survey was performed in 1995 to identify the location of inactive lines. It was based on existing maps, and soil and groundwater samples. Plans and specifications for the removal and closure of the lines was prepared based on the geotechnical report. It was decided that most lines could be removed but that some would best be closed in place. The construction contract was awarded to CAL Inc. in 1997; work was performed between June 1997 and March 1998.

About 16,000 lineal feet of pipe was excavated and removed; piping was cleaned and fuel product disposed of; asbestos pipe insulation was removed and disposed of; excavated soil was

stockpiled and tested (clean soil was reused as backfill, otherwise it was removed for off-site treatment and disposal); almost 1700 cubic yards of TPH-impacted soil was removed, along with 19 cubic yards of lead-impacted soil; and the closed in place lines were water cleaned and filled with cement. Most of the lines closed in place were on YBI, however a few short pieces of line were closed on TI. Soils around fuel lines through IR sites were also tested for other contaminants of concern.

The contractor prepared a completion report to document the work and provide the analytical data and hazardous waste manifest. Under separate Navy contract, TTEMI provided oversight and testing of trench walls. The soil was tested at 100 lineal feet intervals, as well as at valves junctions and areas of overexcavation. In addition, groundwater was tested at 200 lineal feet intervals, where present.

TTEMI is currently in the process of preparing a Fuel line summary Report, which will document their oversight and testing work, and recommend areas for further remedial investigation. It will be available around 01 November. This information will feed into a RI report for the fuel lines. The contract for the RI has been awarded and work will begin following comments received on the assessment report.

The Navy also conducted an in-house investigation using a laser induced fluorescence penetrometer to search for hydrocarbons underground. This data, along with that from CAL Inc., and the fuel line summary report will all feed into TetraTech's fuel line remedial investigations.

A small UST (UST 234) was also removed as part of the fuel line removal project. It will still require a separate investigation and closure report.

Other UST sites under investigation include UST 270, near the YBI Coast Guard property. Other than the fuel lines, it is the most significant other petroleum site. The Navy is in the process of delineating a plume at this site. There are also a number of other small tanks that don't appear significant but require closure. There are two suspect tank sites that need further investigation. One is some piping located behind Building 1 on TI, which is not likely a tank, and the other is a vent adjacent to Building 221 and the garage on the top of YBI.

Either quarterly or semi-annual groundwater monitoring is being conducted on this and other UST sites. At the request of the RAB, the Navy is now coordinating the groundwater monitoring at these UST sites with the monitoring for the IR sites.

Mr. Hansen asked if the fuel lines were actively in use during the 1989 earthquake. Mr. Sullivan responded that most were inactive at that time, but that any active lines were taken out of service following the earthquake.

Ms. Smith noted a reference to black oil in the Phase Ib report. Mr. Sullivan stated that the reference should be clarified, but likely refers to home heating oil. Ms. Smith asked if the extent

of testing around the lines includes vertical as well as horizontal investigation. Mr. Sullivan replied that the fuel lines were excavated to include a five foot radius above and below the pipeline and to either side. He also noted that the water used for cleaning the pipelines was captured. Ms. Smith pointed out a phantom fuel line indicated on a YBI map in the FOST report and asked what it referred to. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there was a storage tank near the top of the island, which was enclosed in place, and may be associated with this. He added that the question calls for clarification, and resolution before transfer.

Mr. Sullivan noted that there are no longer any active fuel lines or USTs on TI and YBI. There are a few above ground tanks in service. He added that the Technical Subcommittee and regulatory agencies will receive the fuel line removal report in about three weeks. The Navy will be seeking comments on the document.

VIII. IR Sites 1 and 3 RI Response to Comments/Draft No Further Action RAP

Mr. Sullivan stated that IR Sites 1 and 3 are two CERCLA sites that have been in the program since the beginning. IR Site 1 is the old medical building, where medical equipment chemicals leaked through the floor and into the ground. IR Site 3 is a site where electrical equipment had been stored and there was a potential for PCB contamination.

Upon evaluation of these two sites, the Navy has determined there is no contamination requiring remedial action, and therefore no further action. The sites need to be officially closed out and so the Navy plans to issue a public draft No Further Action Remedial Action Plan (RAP). As part of this process there will be a public comment period, a public meeting, and then finalization of the document.

Mr. Sullivan stated that Pat Nelson had asked that copies of the Navy's response to comments from the regulatory agencies and the RAB be provided to the RAB. A written copy of the response to comments was sent out to RAB members last month. Concerns by the RAB on the Navy's response can then be addressed prior to the draft No Further Action RAP being issued to the public.

Ms. Smith asked if an investigation had been conducted under the slab at Site 1 to determine if contaminants had migrated off or through the slab. Mr. Sullivan noted that silver was the contaminant of concern at the site and that, although penetration through the slab was not determined, a well was placed five to eight feet from the location of the spill to see if silver was detected in the groundwater. There was no detection of silver in the groundwater sampled from the well.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the next step would be for the Navy to issue the draft No Further Action RAP. A public announcement published in the paper would specify the availability of the

document, the length of the comment period, and the time and location of the public hearing. The public hearing may be held at the Ferry Building or some other location in the City.

Mr. Sullivan conveyed Ms. Nelson's concern that the draft No Further Action RAP was not distributed to the RAB. She has expressed interest in reviewing the document before it is released to the public in November. Mr. Sullivan agreed to provide copies to the Technical Subcommittee, and hold discussion on it at the 04 November interim meeting. He noted that the data for the document was extracted from the RI.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the timing of the release of the document is dependent upon the scheduling of the public comment period and public hearing. If the document is released in early November, then the comment period would end in early December.

PROGRAM UPDATES

IX. General Updates

Announcements

Mr. Sullivan noted that the TI Development Authority Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 21 October. He also noted that the CalTrans draft EIS for the bridge replacement is available. The comment period is scheduled to close on either 08 or 09 November, although it may be extended to 23 November. The complete EIS is on the Internet at the CalTrans District 4 website, Public hearings have been held in several Bay area locations.

FY99 Cleanup Program/Prioritization

Mr. Sullivan stated that this item would be deferred to the November RAB meeting, to allow the BCT time to discuss the item first. He noted that some of the funding prioritizations are predetermined because the projects follow a sequential process. Investigations are conducted first, followed by design, then remedial action. There is still some opportunity, however, for community members to express their concerns for particular projects.

Lead in Soil Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that there have been no final developments since last month's meeting. He noted the two areas being addressed - lead in soil in nonresidential areas and lead in soil in residential areas, which the Navy is sampling and abating.

Ms. Rao announced that the comment period for the EPA's proposed national guidelines on lead has been extended to 30 November, due in large part to the requests made by RAB members across the country. She urged the RAB to review and comment on the proposed guidelines because it has ramifications for the Bay area.

05 October 98 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the issues covered in the meeting to include: the additional sampling conducted for dioxins, TPH and lead for Site 12; the No Further Action RAP for Sites 1 and 3; lead sampling being conducted in residential and nonresidential areas; the Navy's preliminary point paper on risk assessment with regards to depths and the methodology for conducting risk scenarios; and validation studies for Sites 11, 28 and 29. A tech memo was issued for the validation studies for Sites 11, 28 and 29; sampling will follow. The Navy is also considering pulling these three sites out from the onshore RI, because they have an outstanding ecological investigation issue, and validation for these sites may affect completion of the RI document.

Ms. Smith asked if the RAB would have an opportunity to comment on the technical memo. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the technical memo would feed into the RI, which the RAB will be able to comment on. He added that he would accept comments on the memo, but that there is no specific request for the RAB to do so.

Mr. Sullivan noted that tonight's RAB meeting was also discussed. Meeting minutes will be mailed out in several weeks. The next BCT meeting is Monday, 02 November, at the DTSC office in Berkeley.

Document Status/Schedule

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy has a rough draft of the document status schedule. It requires move refinement before copies can be sent to the regulators and the community members. He recognized the need for a status schedule because of the large number of documents to be kept track of. He added that he hopes to get the schedule out before the next RAB meeting.

X. Review of Action Items

Ms. Rao asked about the status of the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) proposal. Mr. Sullivan noted that it was reviewed by the Navy's San Bruno staff and forwarded to Washington for comment. He suggested that the RAB complete the application.

The RAB needs to determine the level of effort in work hours, and what this will cost. The RAB may also want to consider approaching it in more manageable pieces if it appears to be a sizable project. He also noted that there is more flexibility in choosing the RAB's own provider when a contract is smaller; the Navy is obligated to seek alternative bids on larger contracts.

Mr. Sullivan agreed to send a TAPP application form to Ms. Rao. Ms. Smith cautioned the RAB not to hamper the process by requesting only a particular provider. Mr. Sullivan encouraged RAB members to consider using TAPP funding to provide third party review of some of the upcoming technical documents. The contracting procedure for this type of service is simple and straightforward. The additional assistance with review of documents might also help compensate for loss of membership. The program funds up to \$25,000 per year. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the RAB think ahead through FY99, to make use of as much of the TAPP funds as possible.

OTHER BUSINESS

XI. Organizational Business

Membership

Mr. Hansen welcomed Clinton Loftman and Henry Ongerth back to the RAB meetings. He then introduced Dr. Chu-Fei Humphrey Ho, noting this as the third RAB he has attended. He is a colleague of Nathan Brennan's.

Mr. Brennan stated that Dr. Ho works with the environmental staff at the treatment plant on TI. He is very technically oriented and will be able to provide technical assistance to the RAB. Dr. Ho has a Ph.D. in sanitary engineering from UC Berkeley. Mr. Hansen welcomed Dr. Ho as a new RAB member.

Mr. Hansen stated that he had received a new RAB membership application from John Michael Gregson, a San Francisco resident. It was agreed that Mr. Gregson be accepted as a RAB member.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the RAB is at a point where another membership drive is needed. He suggested that it could coincide with the release of the EIS, due out around the first of the year. The Navy will start preparing for advertisements to be run after the first of the year.

Mr. Van Wye asked Mr. Sullivan if he knows when the TI RAB will expire. Mr. Sullivan responded that the question has been posed by other RABs to the Department of Defense, and that it is open-ended. The federal regulations do not specify when a RAB is terminated. Does termination come at the time of the record of decision, when the cleanup is actually complete, or at the time of the five year review point, which follows completion of the cleanup to determine if has been successful? It may be that the RAB is self-terminating, based on when the group feels their mission is complete.

Mr. Hansen requested clarification on the five year review following completion of cleanup. Mr. Sullivan explained that the Superfund regulations require the Navy to return in five years to ensure that long-term on-site treatments are operating as expected.

Mr. Van Wye noted that the RAB operates under the auspices of the Navy, and questioned what the role of the RAB would be once the property is turned over to the City. Mr. Sullivan stated that the role of the RAB is unknown at this point, once the City assumes control of the property. The Navy does, however, retain responsibility for any treatment systems that will operate in the future. Mr. Van Wye questioned the authority the RAB would have to monitor the Navy's performance, or whether this responsibility would instead be assumed by the City's Health

Department. Mr. Sullivan noted that the decision point for this question will not arise for another year or two, when they approach the time of property transfer. He added that part of the criteria for establishing a RAB is to have some minimal public interest, and that if interest wanes enough, the RAB may no longer be self-sustaining, or may choose to reduce the frequency of meetings.

XII. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Phase Ib document is the only document currently out for review. Copies of the draft No Further Action RAP will be provided to the Technical Subcommittee for their review prior to the next interim meeting.

XIII. Proposed Agenda Items

November

- Site 12 Data/GIS Review
- Groundwater Monitoring A - Z

Mr. Sullivan stated that the draft EIS would be deferred as an agenda item because the document will not likely be released for several months. Mr. Hansen reminded Mr. Sullivan of discussion during the last interim meeting that the December RAB meeting be canceled if the draft EIS document would not be available for review by that meeting. Mr. Sullivan said that he wanted to throw this option out to the RAB if there were no burning topics to be discussed for the December meeting. He pointed out that the interim meeting would provide an opportunity to discuss pressing business. Mr. Hansen called for RAB input on whether to cancel the December RAB meeting; RAB members indicated their agreement to cancel the meeting. It was added that a meeting would still be held if deemed necessary by the RAB at the November meeting.

XIV. Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the following meeting schedule:

Next Regular Meeting:	7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 17 November 1998
Interim Meeting:	6:30 p.m. Wednesday, 4 November 1998 PG&E, San Francisco
BCT/RPM Meeting	9:30 a.m. Monday, 2 November 1998 DTSC, Berkeley

TI Development Authority Meeting: 1:00 p.m. Wednesday, 21 October
Ferry Building, San Francisco

XV. Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS
10/20/98

N60028_000930
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 20 OCTOBER 1998

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000924