

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

**April 18, 2000
Meeting No. 66**

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 18 April 2000 at 7:16 p.m. at Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were: 1) to provide for discussion/approval of the agenda; 2) provide time for public comment; 3) discuss the RAB meeting format and member interest questionnaire; 4) give an overview on the Offshore Remedial Investigation (RI) status on Installation Restoration (IR) Sites 13 and 27; 5) provide an overview on TI Environmental Program Strategic Planning and Scheduling; 6) discuss organizational business; 7) provide general updates; 8) review the proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings and 9) to discuss other items.

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, called the meeting to order at 7:16 p.m. and welcomed the attendees. Given the time change, he noted that the room is sunnier than usual; he encouraged attendees to give input as to how to rearrange the room to their comfort. He asked the attendees to introduce themselves for the benefit of the new RAB members present. He explained that the RAB is supported by staff from Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI), Alameda. GPI provides the meeting transcript and minutes, room set-up, and other services. Phillip Ramsey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) stated that he has replaced James Ricks; he will attend RAB meetings. Nathan Brennan, Community Co-chair, welcomed the new RAB members. He stated that the community co-chair is selected from the RAB members.

Mr. Sullivan called for comments on the agenda; none were voiced.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Sullivan explained that this public comment period is allocated to allow members of the public to make comments or to give announcements without having to wait until the end of the meeting. Harlan Van Wye stated that Dale Smith is unable to attend the meeting due to illness.

Mr. Sullivan expressed that she will be better by the next meeting.

III. RAB Meeting Format and Member Interest Questionnaire

Mr. Sullivan stated that a questionnaire was distributed at the previous RAB meeting and was also included in the most recent monthly mailing. It is intended to assess the efficacy of the RAB in its responsiveness to community concerns. Stacy Lupton, Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI), requested that there be completed questionnaires sent to Mr. Sullivan by the end of April. Ms. Lupton explained the responses to the questionnaire will be utilized to enhance the RAB and to improve its effectiveness.

Ms. Lupton inquired as to the RAB members' expectations and major goals for the RAB. Mr. Brennan stated that the RAB serves as a community voice to ensure technical quality and completion. Scott Lunt commented that the RAB fosters awareness of the environmental issues at TI. Clinton Loftman added that the RAB and its individual members serve as avenues by which the public can receive information. Peter Kiel stated that the RAB provides an opportunity for the Navy and regulators to bring controversial issues to the public in order to gauge community feedback, and to develop a strategy to correct existing problems. Lou Schalit stated that the RAB is a tool that ensures Navy compliance with applicable state laws.

Mr. Kiel commented that the RAB seems to be an insular group in that he is unsure as to the extent of public outreach. Mr. Van Wye stated that since TI is a relatively "clean" base as compared with heavily industrial military bases, the RAB is a massive waste of time and money. Ms. Lupton inquired as to what can be done to enhance the process. Mr. Van Wye replied that RAB involvement should have ended when the property was transferred in 1997. He added that the RAB should recommend that the entire base be signed off to the City.

Mr. Kiel stated that the RAB may be more strategic if it addressed more pressing issues and served as a first line of defense. He acknowledged that although the information sharing is important, the RAB may be meeting too often. In response to Ted Connelly's inquiry about the term "advisory," Ms. Lupton explained that the RAB guidance was set up with the intent to move forward, although it is unwise to move forward with actions that have such an imminent impact on the surrounding community without public involvement. The idea is to solicit feedback from the public which are considered by the Navy and the regulators. Mr. Connelly asked if the RAB has taken a position in certain issues, and Ms. Lupton replied that the RAB has done so many times. Mr. Brennan noted that the RAB provides an opportunity to express various positions, rather than a consensus. Mr. Van Wye commented that the RAB does not forge policy, however.

Ms. Lupton asked for suggestions on how to improve the structure of the RAB meetings. Mr. Van Wye commented that the meetings have been regular and reasonably well attended; the materials covered are relevant to the process, if one agrees with the process. Mr. Connelly inquired as to why only three community members attended the most recent Open House. Mr.

Brennan replied that it is a matter of priority; also, they may not feel that they know enough about the subject. He commended the new RAB members for setting aside time to attend the RAB meeting. Mr. Lunt stated that he was only informed of the Open House one day in advance. Mr. Sullivan stated that flyers were included in the John Stewart Company newsletter and mailed to other residents. Mr. Lunt suggested that the notices not be included in the John Stewart Company mailings given that many residents dispose of them.

Mr. Sullivan added that other ways to reach the public can be explored. Mr. Schalit and Mr. Ramsey suggested using e-mail. Mr. Sullivan replied that email has been used within the RAB. At present, however, it would be ineffective with regard to announcing the Open House to the community at large given that only some members of the public have e-mail addresses.

Ms. Lupton inquired how the RAB members characterize the communication that takes place at the RAB meetings. Mr. Van Wye commended the level of communication at the RAB, and noted that requested information is provided in a timely manner. Mr. Kiel agreed, adding that the RAB offers an opportunity for different levels of involvement. He said that communication is encouraged and questions are answered very well.

David Rist, DTSC, observed that the RAB was formed as part of the CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act) process, which was established as federal law for private sites. When it became part of the BRAC process to administer DoD facilities, this became the RAB, and the technical committee was set up. Mr. Rist added that a few years ago it seemed that the RAB was very much involved in reviewing documents and submitting detailed comments on work plans, RI reports, and feasibility studies. He noted that in the last year or two, the RAB has become less involved in providing in-depth reviews and specific advice on work plans and become more like a benign information exchange. He questioned if the RAB wanted to continue in this informational exchange capacity or as a more watchful advisory board.

Mr. Van Wye asked Mr. Rist if he thought any significant changes occurred because of the RAB, or if the RAB has done anything that impacted an individual's life. Mr. Rist replied the grid sampling at Site 12 was conducted because of RAB input. He added he was unsure if the RAB can function to protect specific individuals or public health. He emphasized the RAB can, however, help to ensure the process is carried out so people are not put at risk. Mr. Sullivan stated that according to comments from the community and regulators, the feedback that the Navy receives from the RAB process had a cumulative impact with respect to the improvement of documents. One of the purposes of the RAB is to increase community involvement at the early stages so as to tailor the data presented during the formal public comment forums. Mr. Brennan commented that because of the RAB, more information is disseminated by the Navy and its contractors than would otherwise be the case. The extra work and disclosure should prevent potential lawsuits and problems such as the Midway Village scenario.

Mr. Sullivan stated that over the last six years, the Navy has received several hundred pages of

comments which, cumulatively, have improved the process. At times, the Navy disagrees with comments; many times, the Navy agrees with and incorporates the comments. Mr. Kiel opined that the RAB is very much an informational body in that the community members, such as himself, do not contribute the time necessary to give detailed comments. He also noted that only one in three members receive all of the materials, which he does not have the time to review. He focuses on major omissions as well as the answers to his specific questions.

Mr. Kiel stated that he is unable to contribute detailed comments given his limited technical background. Mr. Brennan replied that the purpose for obtaining a Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) grant is to commission a consultant to review documents and to give comments. Mr. Sullivan added that a few years ago, the RAB benefitted from a TAPP grant for an outside consultant who provided technical support. He introduced Marcelo Pascual, TI Environmental Liaison, as the in-house TAPP expert. The Navy will be working with the community to get more TAPP grants awarded.

Ms. Lupton noted that the meeting is behind schedule. She asked for suggestions on the structure of the RAB meetings, with regard to presentations, discussions, and questions and answers. Mr. Van Wye stated that in general, the RAB meetings are well-structured, although a lot of time is wasted. One of the ways is when the presenter reads the slides that are distributed as handouts. He suggested that the information not be read aloud when it is also distributed as handouts.

Mr. Rist stated that in order to make the TI RAB more active and involved in the meeting agenda, the members could have more input in helping to create the agenda. He also suggested instead of meeting monthly, the RAB could meet quarterly, six times a year, or on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Van Wye stated that three years ago, the meetings were larger and there were some really good technical people. A lot of the work has already been done. He added that if this base were more contaminated, there would be more community interest and interested from San Francisco and the Board of However, TI is very clean, and given that there is not much here, some filler is inserted to occupy the time allocated for RAB meetings. He suggested that the RAB should facilitate transfer to the City and to trust the experts to take care of the remaining problems, so that the property becomes an asset to the City.

Mr. Brennan stated that the general meeting can be held every other month, with technical meetings held in between. Mr. Connelly commented that public interest may wane if meetings are held less frequently, or if there is no formal structure. He asked how information can be effectively disseminated to the public. Mr. Van Wye reiterated that there is very little left to do. Mr. Connelly replied that he does not know if this is truly the case, and if it were, he asked how the process has been allowed to continue.

Ms. Lupton stated that at present, the Navy is finishing up the investigation, after which activity will increase. Mr. Sullivan stated that activity will not cease once the investigation is finished.

There are areas that require some form of treatment or monitoring of petroleum in the soil and in the groundwater. Because some are near the Bay, it is a potential concern to the aquatic habitat. Although the base is not highly industrial, there are public works, municipal and light industrial activities which resulted in some areas showing elevated lead or cleaning solvents in soil. Some action may be necessary before transfer can be achieved.

Mr. Schalit suggested designating part of the meeting as a technical review and part of the meeting as a dissemination of community information. Mr. Sullivan noted that it may a matter of geography. A number of the other RABs have subcommittees that meet as part of the general meeting. The subcommittees do work behind the scenes and provide a condensed report to the RAB at large during the regular meetings. The Navy has tried to foster such subcommittees at TI, and there is a technical subcommittee that meets monthly. However, because the original members of the RAB were so geographically spread out in the Bay Area, it was difficult for them to meet, whereas the members of the other RABs live fairly close to the facility.

Mr. Brennan added that it is not so much that the Navy does not want to relinquish the island to the City; he clarified that the City did not want to take the property until documents were issued that certify that the property is ready for transfer. He noted that there is a fair amount of politics involved. Mr. Van Wye replied that if he thought that transfer would adversely affect public health, he would not foster its transfer. Given the information he has reviewed over the last four or five years, this is a self-perpetuating process that is prolonged by federal law. He opined that there is very little public interest at TI, as there is at Hunters Point Shipyard, Mare Island, and other highly industrial bases. He suggested that the remaining cleanup be financed by leasing revenues. Three to four years ago, the problem areas were identified and there was a lot of input. He reiterated that he does not know if anything changed because of the extensive input that was provided. The regulators would have picked up the problems. It's not easy to create a lot of interest about something that is not very interesting.

Ms. Lupton commended the RAB for the informative discussion. She stated that up until the present time, TI has been one of the most active RABs, and that the lull in activity is temporary. She encouraged RAB members to put some thought into the questionnaires and to submit them to Mr. Sullivan by the end of April. The input will be compiled into recommendations that will be used to increase and enhance community involvement in the RAB process.

BRAC CLEAN-UP PROCESS

IV. Offshore Remedial Investigation (RI) Status (IR Sites 13 and 27)

Mr. Sullivan stated that there is value to explaining overheads as well as handouts, as it allows interactive participation. Mr. Van Wye clarified that his earlier comment was not necessarily directed toward Mr. Sullivan; he stated that some presenters do nothing but read the overhead slides verbatim. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged his concern. He explained that for the members who

are unable to attend a meeting, the handouts are included in the monthly mailing as well as the draft minutes.

In an investigation, sites of potential are identified and grouped into installation restoration (IR) sites. The sites were initially numbered from 1 to 29; there are only 25 total sites remaining, as several sites were dropped earlier in the process. Sites 13 and 27 are in the water along the perimeter of TI; these two sites comprise the Offshore RI.

IR Site 13 represents the stormwater outfalls. Both islands have separate storm and sanitary systems. The sanitary sewers direct sewage to a treatment plant and ultimately discharged to the Bay under a permitted process under the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The storm drains, on the other hand, direct rain directly to the Bay without treatment. TI and YBI have about 40 storm drain outfalls. There was a concern that other substances such as the liquid from equipment washing or hazardous materials may have dumped into the storm drains and then flow directly out into the Bay. The focus of the investigation is to sample around each of the stormwater outfalls to determine if the sediments have been impacted.

Mr. Schalit asked about the sediment sampling results.

IR Site 27 is the Clipper Cove Skeet Range located down the street from Casa de la Vista. The skeet clay pigeons were shot out into the Bay and then fired on. The Navy determined there was an arc into the Bay that represented the fall of the clay pigeons and the lead shot from the shotguns. The C.A. RWQCB identified this site during a survey of Bay Area skeet ranges and subsequently ordered the Navy to conduct an investigation. The Navy negotiated for this site to be included in the overall RI rather than conduct a separate investigation on the skeet range alone.

Samples were collected in 1992, 1996, and 1997; the information was used to develop the Draft RI report. After having received comments from both the agencies and the RAB, the Navy issued the Draft Final RI on 19 March 1999. The process entails the production of a draft document, a comment period, a draft final document, a second comment period, and then a final document. The Navy is proposing to the agencies No Further Action (NFA) on this site. This means that although the Navy has detected some chemical constituents, they do not warrant any cleanup action and they want to close the site.

Anju Wicke, TtEMI, stated that TtEMI responded to regulatory comments in October 1999. The agencies have ongoing concerns about the NFA recommendation. Over the last two to three months, TtEMI has been meeting with the regulators to discuss the outstanding technical issues. She hopes that the meetings will result in a resolution within the next month or so with regard to whether the document will proceed to the Final phase, or if additional sampling is necessary.

Mr. Van Wye asked as to what areas are still in dispute in Site 13. Ms. Wicke explained that on Area E, there were slightly elevated lead concentrations in the sediment. TtEMI has responded to

those concerns. The outstanding concern pertains to an area within Site 12, where the regulators feel that there may not be enough sampling. There were no elevated lead concentrations found in the sediment in that area. Mr. Rist added that one area at the north end of TI showed high lead concentrations. Mr. Van Wye asked if Mr. Rist's comments pertained to the cove in general, or to the skeet range in particular. Mr. Rist replied that his comments replied to both; there were questions about the bioassays and the delineation of the vertical extent of the lead contamination in the cove.

Mr. Van Wye recalled that the delineation was between 36 and 18 inches below the sediment. Mr. Rist agreed and added that the sampling may not have gone deep enough to reach the contamination. He said that the City is also concerned about the cost and liability of dredging.

Mr. Van Wye opined that if CalTrans decides to locate the bridge on the southern side, then Area E will be impacted by a pier or two from the new bridge. Mr. Rist agreed that when construction begins on the new bridge, whether northern or southern alignment, there will be significant activity in those areas. He said they will have to create a temporary structure on one side or the other of the new structure so that traffic can continue to move during the construction of the permanent structure.

Mr. Schalit asked if copies of the Offshore Response to Comments are available to RAB members. Mr. Sullivan explained that as the Navy generates a large number of documents, about five RAB members receive all of the documents as the agencies receive them. Any RAB member who wishes to be added to the document mailing list, or who wishes to receive documents on an individual basis, should contact Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Brennan offered to provide his copy of the older documents that may no longer be available. Mr. Schalit asked if the documents are available electronically, and Mr. Sullivan replied that at present, all the documents are on paper. The Navy is required by CERCLA to have an administrative record that is located in the San Diego office; there are two information repositories that contain all of the documents. The repositories are located in Navy offices at Building 1 and at the San Francisco main library.

Mr. Van Wye asked if the offshore study group is using TI Enterprise's development plan for the marina to decide the extent of cleanup necessary. Mr. Rist replied that he has been asking for such a plan, but has not received such. He said that negotiations are ongoing with the developer, and when there is something concrete, he will provide the information to the RAB for their input.

Mr. Van Wye asked if the Navy is cognizant of the developer's plans for the cove. Mr. Sullivan replied that it is still a developing process; there is no draft EIS/EIR yet, and the City is still working with the developers. He noted that even if there is a plan, the question remains whether the Navy should investigate and clean up the offshore areas to current use, or to future use. If current use, then the future reuse is irrelevant as the Navy would evaluate the offshore areas based on their current condition.

Mr. Van Wye commented that there is a fairly well-developed plan for a 403-slip marina which

the City and TI Enterprises are negotiating through the auspices of the TI Redevelopment Authority (TIDA). He opined that this should inform the current discussion about cleanup. Mr. Rist replied that he has been asking for the City and Navy to discuss these issues with the regulators, who are not invited to the table. Mr. Rist concurred that the regulators have been requesting it for some time, but they have not yet been invited to discuss this at the table. Mr. Van Wye stated that he has a copy of the plan, which was presented in a public meeting on Jan. 10 by TI Enterprises. Mr. Rist stated that until the plan is adopted, the regulators cannot get involved.

Mr. Van Wye acknowledged this point, but he added that millions of dollars have been spent in developing and promoting the concept. The plan involves sinking piers down into the Bay mud about 18 to 36 inches down, and in some of the areas covered by the skeet range. However, it seems that they intend to avoid that skeet range and use that as a kind of turning basin. Once it gets done, it would define the extent of dredging needed, because it is a small boat harbor. At present there would probably not be a lot of dredging, although there may be some areas where larger boats will be stored and which would then require some dredging. He would hope that the regulators would be able to review the plan before more effort and money is spent on a plan that is not yet concrete. Mr. Rist acknowledged Mr. Van Wye's concern. He explained that there is some disagreement between the City and the Navy about whether it will be cleaned up to current or future use.

Mr. Van Wye encouraged the Navy to spend dollars in the cove, if, in fact, it intends to spend dollars anywhere. Mr. Sullivan replied that the Navy's objective is to protect the environment whether it is located in or out of the cove. Mr. Van Wye commented that this is the first place where development will occur.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy will have more information in June or July. The community members will decide whether the Navy should give a technical presentation to the RAB and/or to the technical subcommittee.

V. TI Environmental Program Strategic Planning and Scheduling

Mr. Sullivan stated that the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) has been working on the strategic planning and scheduling for the last couple of months. This update is presented in response to concerns put forth from RAB members. The BCT has decided that a more integrated schedule was needed. The Navy has a legal need to fulfill requirements under the Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA), which is a contract between the Navy and the State of California that includes schedules. This two-way mutual contract was executed in 1992; its purpose is to give the State of California the right to provide oversight. Over the years, the Navy has gotten off schedule and it was subsequently revised. The Navy felt that the schedule was no longer viable to meet the requirements of the FFSRA.

The planning and scheduling mainly involves 25 IR sites. It also involves former fuel lines in both islands and smaller underground storage tanks (USTs) that are not otherwise included in the 25 IR sites. The draft schedule based on the current FFSRA projects the cleanup and transfer in 2005 or 2007. The Navy proposed to condense the schedule by reducing the review time and to have more working meetings instead of producing an actual document for review so that by the time a physical document is produced, it should already be satisfactory to most of the contributors. This resulted in a project completion of six years.

After two iterations, the schedule is back in the Navy's court to propose other options to condense the schedule. When the second schedule was produced, the Navy also sent a letter to the agencies to document how the schedule would be condensed; a copy was sent to the RAB members. Mr. Sullivan explained that copies of correspondence between the Navy and the agencies are also sent to the RAB members. The letter gave the inaccurate impression that the Navy, City, and agencies met to change the process; he clarified that the community is included in the process. Mr. Brennan noted that the letter, which was dated 6 February, was actually sent out on 27 March. He noted that many decisions were made without community input.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the Navy issued two drafts to the regulators. The second draft is dated 9 March. He inquired if a copy should be reviewed by the Technical Subcommittee members or the RAB in general, or if they would like to wait until the next version is issued. Mr. Brennan opined that ARC would like to see it along the way and would likely have more people to help review it than does the RAB. Mr. Sullivan proposed that it be provided to the Technical Subcommittee. It also includes the schedule that was referenced in the 6 February letter.

With regard to the CERCLA and petroleum regulations, the objective is to reach a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). The petroleum sites also include the fuel lines.

Mr. Rist opined that the RAB has seen the schedule so often now that there is not the same need to cover it in depth as in the past. He said that although they want to ensure compliance with the CERCLA process, they also want to move quickly. He asked for input from the RAB on how to cut down on the time, and he added that their big goal now is to plan to shorten this process. He advocated holding technical subcommittee meetings instead of perusing documents for 90 days and delaying another 30 days because of insufficient time to return the comments on schedule.

Mr. Connelly recalled that he had made several inquiries about the offshore situation but was told rather strongly that the situation is in hand and that there is nothing more to be said. He noted that most of the evening was spent discussing this issue. He added that if the RAB is to provide input, the information must be clear so that they can determine how to respond to particular questions.

Mr. Brennan encouraged attendees to put the comments into the survey and to forward them to Mr. Sullivan by the end of the month. Mr. Shalit suggested that a contact list be circulated; Mr.

Brennan stated that the sign-in sheet is included in the monthly mailing. Mr. Connelly asked if the minutes can be received one week before the meeting. Mr. Sullivan replied that he has been unable to provide this for the last few months, adding that he receives the draft minutes for review about one to two weeks ahead of the meeting. He stated that the minutes can be provided earlier; he also offered to email the minutes and the agenda.

VI. Organizational Business

RAB Involvement in accelerated cleanup investigation/remediation

Mr. Brennan stated that this item was discussed earlier in the meeting. He noted that RAB participation in the working sessions would more than likely accelerate the process.

Proposal to change Interim Meeting dates from Wednesday nights

Mr. Brennan explained that usually, the interim meetings are held on the first Wednesday of each month at the PG&E office and are hosted by Pat Nelson. Ms. Nelson is taking a class and will be unavailable on Tuesdays and Wednesdays; she proposed the meeting nights be changed to either Monday or Thursday. The RAB members agreed to change the interim meeting to 6:30 p.m. on Monday, 1 May. Mr. Sullivan stated that a flyer and agenda will be issued. He explained that the interim meeting serves as both the planning meeting and the technical subcommittee meeting. Mr. Brennan asked the members to review the documents and bring ideas to the meeting.

Ideas for RAB training, new member indoctrination, and site tours

Mr. Brennan explained that in the past, TtEMI would give an orientation, which includes a tour, to new members on the functions of the RAB and historical information on TI. He stated that this could be made available to both old and new members. Mr. Sullivan stated that most orientations were held on Saturdays and last a couple of hours. He proposed that it be held on 6 or 13 May. He will confirm this date with Navy staff and send a notice accordingly.

VII. General Updates

Announcements

There were no announcements.

11 April 2000 RPM/BCT/Project Team Meeting

Mr. Sullivan explained that at least one monthly general meeting is held between the Navy, regulators and the City. A RAB member is invited to attend. The meetings are now held on the second Tuesday of the month, one week before the regular RAB meeting. Chris Shirley, ARC Ecology, attended the most recent meeting one week before. He listed the following topics discussed during the 11 April meeting: update on the fuel line and active petroleum investigation which will continue for one or two months; ongoing efforts at Site 12 which involve unleased areas, buried debris, and PCB detections in the soil; he explained that Site 12 is a separate site

from the rest of the onshore sites; general administrative items. Minutes are provided to the RAB members.

Document Status

Mr. Sullivan provided document status sheets arranged by date and by document.

VIII. Proposed Agenda Items for Next Meeting and Review of New Action Items

Mr. Sullivan explained that in the absence of specific requests for agenda items, the Navy presents what is topical for that month. He encouraged RAB members to give suggestions via telephone, email, or during the interim meeting on 1 May.

IX. Other Items

Mr. Sullivan called for other items of discussion; none were voiced.

X. Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Next Regular Meeting:	7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 16 May 2000 Casa de la Vista, Treasure Island
	7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 20 June 2000 Casa de la Vista, Treasure Island
Interim Meeting:	6:30 p.m. Wednesday, 1 May 2000 Pacific Gas & Electric, San Francisco
BCT/RPM Meeting:	9:30 a.m. Tuesday, 2 May 2000 TI, Building 1, 2nd Floor Conference Room

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Sullivan will confirm the orientation and site tour date of 13 May.