

April 25, 1992
N60028_000405
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

COPY

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER
TREASURE ISLAND
MEETING NO. 9

REPORTED BY: DEBRA BRANDAU, CSR

405

1 Captain Burns to Captain Handle. So Captain
2 Handle will be with us for all the way until the
3 closure of the base in September, 1997.

4 Did you pass out the agendas?

5 Does everyone have an agenda? I have
6 some extra ones up here.

7 Sharon, do we have minutes from the
8 March meeting? I don't think we do because I
9 haven't received them. I think we are going to
10 have to ask to defer the --

11 MS. TOBIAS: They should have gone
12 out.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Has anyone received
14 the minutes from the March meeting? Well, maybe I
15 just misplaced mine.

16 Are there any corrections for the
17 minutes or can we go ahead and approve the March
18 minutes?

19 What I would like to do, then, is,
20 well, if anyone has any comments on the minutes,
21 we will take them now. If not, we will make sure
22 that everyone has the March minutes and approve
23 those at the May meeting; okay?

24 Moving on to the next item,
25 Organizational Business. And I would like to turn

1 it over to Brad.

2 MR. WONG: Thank you, Jim.

3 Brad Wong, Community Co-Chair.

4 I have a couple of items under
5 Organizational Business here, one of which is I
6 want to, on behalf of the community members, to
7 congratulate and welcome Captain Handle as we look
8 forward to working with you during the process
9 ahead, but also just want to say that Jim and I
10 have talked earlier about one of the issues we had
11 as a board and how we can kind of help the meeting
12 processes go along a little better and more
13 smoothly. And one of the things we are going to
14 try tonight -- and you can see it's reflected in
15 the agenda a little bit -- but to see if the
16 Community Co-Chair here can play a little bit more
17 of a role in facilitating the meeting so they move
18 along and get to the different agenda items and
19 make sure everybody has heard the issues that are
20 raised.

21 But now that we have a stenographer,
22 it's important we really phrase what we want from
23 the Navy, what kind of information, what kind of
24 action items and things like that, and really pose
25 them as questions or action items to be handled,

1 and we will be able to get a better track record
2 of what we have requested and what we need back
3 and things of that sort.

4 Also, I think it will help us get
5 through some heavy agendas and keep the process
6 going. And if we need to set aside some
7 subcommittee work or some additional meetings to
8 get into more technical points, we can set that up
9 and do that. But the idea is to try and make
10 these meetings, anyway, run a little bit more
11 smoothly.

12 With that in mind, I want to mention
13 that one of the things I have done from listening
14 to various groups of people is I took the
15 initiative upon myself to draft some -- and
16 actually some with Don Meyers' help -- to draft
17 some basic administrative-type things that we
18 might want to take a look at to help us over the
19 long-term and again be more effective and
20 efficient.

21 And I would like to say I have a
22 draft of those here for anybody who would like
23 them. And if I could share them with you, if you
24 would give me a call and fax me your comments and
25 things of that sort, it would be a starting point

1 and get on the same page and move forward and keep
2 the flow of information and stuff going at a good
3 clip.

4 And then the last organizational
5 thing I have was I wanted to ask Dan McDonald if
6 he could give us an update on where we are in the
7 process of looking for new members, and if we have
8 anybody that has applied, and then we can take a
9 look at how to get them on board and get them up
10 to speed.

11 Dan?

12 MR. McDONALD: Dan McDonald is the
13 name.

14 I have received applications from
15 three prospective community members. I will pass
16 out the completed applications to everyone. I
17 will take one and pass it along, and there's
18 enough for everybody.

19 The individual names are John Allman,
20 Ruth Ravanus and Daniel Cooper. All three have
21 indicated their interest to Donald Meyers and
22 Donald Pathaculic. (phonetic)

23 I just received the applications in
24 the last couple of days. I believe it would be up
25 to the Chair to decide how to review and improve

1 these and how many applications to take.

2 I have a number of calls out to
3 individuals who applied to be on the RAB last year
4 who did not get chosen, and I expect to have as
5 many as a half-dozen other applications in the
6 coming couple of weeks.

7 Brad, do you have an idea of about
8 how you want to proceed?

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan,
10 Community Co-Chair.

11 What I would like to recommend is,
12 based on the process we went through last year in
13 the original selection, is if we anticipate
14 getting some additional applications, that you
15 decide on a close-out date, and maybe even by the
16 next meeting in May, on the 23rd of May, and then
17 after you have closed out the application process,
18 then form a selection subcommittee among the
19 community members. We had three that thought that
20 would probably be a good minimum and go through
21 those applications and probably, based on prior
22 discussion with Community Co-chairs, decide how
23 many that you want to select.

24 MR. MEYERS: Don Meyers.

25 Do you have any idea how many people

1 we have at this point?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Based on two
3 individuals that have been consistent no-shows, we
4 would probably -- and that's something that I
5 would want to discuss with Community Co-Chairs --
6 if there is a selection of a subcommittee, we
7 probably, I would recommend purging two
8 individuals which would bring the membership list
9 down to 16 from the current 18.

10 MR. HEHN: Paul Hehn.

11 Do you have a feel for how many
12 members we want to get back up here? Do we want
13 to get back up to the full 25 or 20, or how many
14 are we looking for? Do you have a sense of that?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, there's no
16 Navy -- I mean, the Department of Defense has not
17 tried to set a number, you know, preset the number
18 of community members. It's really in looking at
19 the RAB Restoration Advisory Board guidance
20 projection would evolve during the time we were
21 going through the selection process last year.
22 But it's finally been completed. There's a desire
23 to have a diversity of the community and I think
24 if what I shared with Dan was the chart we used to
25 initially categorize the '93 applications we

1 received last year based on about ten categories.

2 In fact, one of our earlier RAB
3 meetings, I went through the ten diversity
4 categories, environmental groups, academics, et
5 cetera, business associations, et cetera. And the
6 intent was to try to fill slots in those groups so
7 that you would have a diverse slice of the
8 community.

9 So I would recommend to the Community
10 Co-Chair and the Selection Subcommittee, if one is
11 formed, to look at that diversity and, as a result
12 of resignations, it appears that we lack members
13 in certain categories, then those are the areas
14 that you might want to fill, although it's not a
15 rigid system.

16 MR. WONG: Brad Wong, Community
17 Co-Chair.

18 If I could get clarification, did you
19 finally receive all the applicants that applied
20 the first time around? I think there was
21 something like 90 of which 20-something were
22 selected?

23 MR. McDONALD: I received them a week
24 ago today.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: What I gave Dan was,

1 we took the '93 applicants, and then I subtracted
2 out the ones that had been selected and I think
3 was a total, actually it was 23 were selected, so
4 it was a total of 70 applications.

5 MR. WONG: What I would like to
6 recommend, then, is if we could appoint a
7 Membership Subcommittee here to work with --

8 Daniel, if you would be willing to
9 work on it --

10 To work with you to screen those
11 members, as well as these three, for our next
12 meeting and to be able to produce a list of
13 members that the board, as a whole, can vote on
14 for community membership.

15 And then we could invite them to join
16 us in the meeting of June, and that would just be
17 the one-year anniversary of the RAB.

18 And it could bring us back up to full
19 strength, whatever we would determine that to be.
20 But I would leave that to the subcommittee.

21 Anyone else have any comments?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I guess that's a
23 thought. Instead of forming a subcommittee, if we
24 just collected the applications between now and
25 the May meeting, and then since there's usually

1 now only about ten or so community members
2 attending, if you just, or, you know, if we were
3 able to mail them out ahead of time, if you wanted
4 to focus as to the total group rather than a
5 subcommittee and make a selection at the May
6 meeting.

7 MR. ONGERTH: Henry Ongerth.

8 We need two things. We need to know
9 what number we are shooting for; we need to know
10 what areas we need to fill in for the desired
11 diversity.

12 MR. WONG: I think, if I understand
13 things correctly, the number we are shooting for
14 is really up to us.

15 MR. ONGERTH: Okay. Somebody has to
16 pick the number. When do we do that?

17 MR. WONG: We can do that right now
18 if we collectively would like to take a number at
19 what the number we are shooting for.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan,
21 Community Co-Chair.

22 Actually, the way we ended up doing
23 it, we kind of backed into it last year and we
24 sort of started out thinking about having 10 to 15
25 members. But when we looked over the

1 applications, there were so many qualified members
2 that we ended up with 23. Rather than force
3 ourselves down to the artificial number, we looked
4 at the candidates and came up with a group of,
5 reduced the 93 down to 23 who we really felt we
6 must have on the Restoration Advisory Board. Then
7 went with that larger number because we didn't
8 want to exclude anyone.

9 Actually, I shouldn't say "we." It
10 was a Selection Subcommittee, which was the two
11 original community members of the Technical Review
12 Committee and the early Restoration Advisory
13 Board, plus one volunteer from the League of Women
14 Voters, and then we as the Navy, and also Cal-EPA
15 acted as facilitators but did not participate in
16 the actual selection.

17 So, anyway, I am suggesting that
18 maybe you might want to look at the number of,
19 look at the applicants who receive, and unless
20 that number is too large, take them all, if it's
21 appropriate.

22 MR. McDONALD: I would like to
23 propose that we shoot to have seven group members.
24 I think that would be an adequate new number to
25 integrate onto the board and that we could have --

1 I am guessing -- between 10 to 15 applicants to
2 review in the next three weeks, including the
3 three that came in just this last couple days.

4 MR. WONG: Does anybody else have
5 some thoughts on a target?

6 MR. MEYERS: I would agree with what
7 Dan said.

8 MR. WONG: All in favor?

9 No discussion?

10 Okay, let's aim for seven.

11 Does the group feel comfortable, and
12 it's open to all members to join, but to appoint a
13 subcommittee to do the initial screening in terms
14 of diversity of people in taking a look at the
15 applications as a whole and coming back with
16 recommendations for us to take a look at and
17 discuss next time, or would you prefer to push it
18 back a month and just bring all of the
19 applications and mail it out as part of the
20 pre-packet next time and then discuss it here at
21 the meeting?

22 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers.

23 I would be happy to work with Daniel
24 on that. I think we should move ahead on that.

25 MR. WONG: Anyone else?

1 MR. BOATMAN: Charles Boatman.

2 I would like to volunteer for the
3 Screening Committee.

4 MR. WONG: Any others?

5 MS. BUFORD: Hi, Brad.

6 Shirley Buford from the Department of
7 Toxic Substances Control.

8 I would like to suggest, if you're
9 going to go back to your original applicants,
10 that's one group that you should choose from, but
11 if you're going to open it up, you really need to
12 do broader outreach. You may want to do a public
13 notice or some other form of making sure that
14 other community members who may not be a part of
15 this process know that there's seats available.

16 So I don't know if you want to have a
17 subcommittee to do that or if Jim himself will
18 take it upon himself to make a public notice. But
19 if you're going to reach outside of that initial
20 group of people who have applied, I think you need
21 to do broader outreach to reach that diversity in
22 the people who may be interested who may not know
23 that there are open seats on the board.

24 MR. LOFTMAN: Clinton Loftman.

25 I think that's a good idea.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

What we are probably going to have to do is, that would probably definitely push us to probably the June meeting because we would have to place an advertisement, if we did what we had before, which was to place advertisements in the Chronicle and Examiner and SF Weekly and the Bay Guardian. Then we would probably need to --

Well, we would first have to set a deadline for applications, which would probably be, might have to be around the middle of -- it would probably have to be at least the end of May because we are probably not going to get advertisements in until the beginning of May, so the application period would probably have to close out maybe the end of May, early June.

And then you would have a couple of weeks during June to evaluate, and then, if you wanted to vote on it at the June meeting.

MR. WONG: How does everybody feel about that? I think what is important is we just get rolling on with it. But I think the public outreach is a good component, and we just need to build that into the time frame.

Does everyone agree with that?

1 I would also like to say I would like
2 to be on the committee as well. So, Jim, you
3 would make arrangements to have it published in
4 the usual local media or should we convene a
5 meeting of this group with Jim and discuss where
6 the appropriate spots are that we should
7 advertise?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

9 I thought we were pretty successful
10 in our advertising last year. We actually
11 received about 250 requests. We mailed out about
12 250 applications at which we received 93 back. I
13 think the advertising in the Chronicle and the
14 Examiner, which appeared both in the daily paper
15 and also the Sunday paper, reached quite a wide
16 audience as well as the Free Weekly, the San
17 Francisco Weekly and the Bay Guardian.

18 MS. BROWNELL: Is there any reason
19 why we can't carry the same ad?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, what I would
21 probably like to do this time is actually combine
22 it and do revised ads to be both a kind of a
23 notification, brief notification of what the RAB
24 is and what we have been doing, and also to
25 solicit community attendance at the RAB.

1 But basically, we would use a similar
2 type ad and just revise the language.

3 MS. BROWNELL: Just in order to try
4 to keep it brief and get it out in a short period
5 of time.

6 MR. WONG: I would like to represent,
7 one, if the people are comfortable, to ask Dan if
8 he would be willing to serve as sort of a Chair of
9 his group to kind of help facilitate some of these
10 things, if you feel comfortable with that. And
11 then that can be something that the final details
12 of how that goes out can be worked out between the
13 committee and the Chair and Jim in terms of when
14 it goes out. But I don't know if we need to get
15 into the details here tonight.

16 Does everyone feel comfortable with
17 that and we could get an update at the next May
18 meeting of what we are looking at having people to
19 vote on for membership at the June meeting?

20 MR. NEDELL: Rick Nedell.

21 I am a little confused about the
22 process here.

23 Is this subcommittee group going to
24 screen and rank the candidates and then present
25 them to us as complete?

1 Are we going to be discussing the
2 relative merits of one versus another in an open
3 meeting with the record, which I don't believe was
4 done the first time when Jim was putting it
5 together?

6 How do you intend to make the
7 selection?

8 How do you intend to evaluate the
9 list of the subgroup if that is indeed what is
10 intended?

11 MR. WONG: My assumption, I guess,
12 was the initial screening would be done by the
13 subgroup in the coordination of the advertising
14 and what not, and they would bring a slate of
15 people for us to review and to vote on at the June
16 meeting. But that was my assumption in trying to
17 put it out to the committee and let them do the
18 ground work and look at the issues, the criteria
19 of the diversity within the community.

20 Reaching a goal, I think we got a
21 consensus on seven or eight new members and, you
22 know, if we could give them a target of how many
23 people we want to look at to vote on seven or
24 eight people, but I thought an initial screening
25 would be done by them, and then we could just

1 discuss the people that were brought to us.

2 MR. NEDELL: I guess I am still not
3 clear on what we are going to discuss.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

5 What I am assuming is that you're
6 going to have a subcommittee doing a pre-screening
7 and end with, say, 15 potential candidates. And
8 then from that slate you would select a lesser
9 number.

10 So rather than have to have all the
11 community members review every application, you
12 would have a subcommittee doing some screening.

13 MR. NEDELL: I am sure you will work
14 out the details, but are we going to do this in an
15 open forum?

16 MR. WONG: On the final candidates,
17 yes, that would be at the June meeting. I thought
18 that's what I suggested.

19 MR. NEDELL: You're going to discuss
20 the relative merits of selecting one individual
21 over another in an open forum and on the record;
22 is that correct? Is that what your intention is?
23 I am asking the question.

24 MR. WONG: Yes.

25 MR. BOATMAN: Charles Boatman.

1 I would like to get back to your
2 earlier discussion that the subcommittee get
3 involved with the advertising. I think if we were
4 successful in using the San Francisco Examiner,
5 Chronicle and the San Francisco Weekly and
6 Berkeley Express or whatever we used, we
7 probably -- the subcommittee probably does not
8 need to get involved in that process directly.

9 MR. ONGERTH: Doesn't need to get in
10 involved in what?

11 MR. BOATMAN: Doesn't need to get
12 involved in that process directly.

13 MR. McDONALD: Dan McDonald.

14 So you're saying let's let Jim revise
15 the advertisements and place them in the same
16 media they were placed in a year ago?

17 MR. BOATMAN: Yes. That's correct.

18 MR. BESSETTE: Michael Bessette of
19 the Water Board.

20 I would think we might want to
21 include the East Bay Express as a newspaper and
22 maybe (unintelligible) of California because I
23 notice there's a lot (unintelligible) and we may
24 want to expand and reach out a little bit more to
25 get some more diversity into the RAB.

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

2 Yeah we could consider that.

3 MR. WONG: Let me see if I can
4 summarize this and maybe we can move on.

5 We have formed a Membership
6 Subcommittee -- Dan McDonald, Don Meyers, Charles
7 Boatman, myself.

8 Did I miss anyone else?

9 And I have asked Dan if he would
10 chair the group organizationally to help kind of
11 facilitate things. We are going to, for the most
12 part, do some outreach and place advertisements in
13 the same publications that they were placed in a
14 year ago, with the addition of the two suggestions
15 Mike made, the committee aiming for a selection on
16 the record at the June meeting.

17 The committee will come up with a
18 pool of, say, 15, 16 applicants for seven or eight
19 positions in a pre-screening that we will then
20 discuss the merits of and vote on at the June
21 meeting and that this should bring us up to the
22 desired members we want.

23 Paul.

24 MR. HEHN: Paul Hehn.

25 We are up to the point in that do we

1 need to discuss this again at a RAB meeting, or
2 will the subcommittee discuss it within themselves
3 and come up with a slate of candidates and discuss
4 relevant merits of members that are possible new
5 members, come up with a slate of candidates and
6 say, "This looks great," and go for it.

7 MR. BOATMAN: I think the difficulty
8 is if we don't approve it, then we are back
9 another month possibly, or more. So I vote we do
10 discuss it at the next meeting.

11 MR. WONG: I got the sense that there
12 were people on the board that wanted to have an
13 open discussion of the members as opposed to
14 delegating that decision out behind closed doors
15 to a committee.

16 MR. MEYERS: Don Meyers.

17 I think maybe the problem that people
18 are seeing is that if the people are there at the
19 meeting and we're discussing, people are in the
20 audience, and that may not be an appropriate way
21 to do it, you know. People may be asking, "Why
22 did you choose that person and not me? Obviously
23 I am qualified."

24 I am not sure how to get around that,
25 but that is, I take it, the problem.

1 MR. NEDELL: I would say that fairly
2 represents my concern. And, frankly, I don't
3 think that there was an open discussion of it
4 before we were selected.

5 We are the members of the committee,
6 and if we trust our subcommittee to look through
7 and screen those candidates and come to us and
8 say, "Here are the people. This is the reason we
9 selected them. This is the slate of individuals
10 we would like to see added to the organization,"
11 they may come back with five, they may come back
12 with ten. Maybe we would have the same problem.

13 MR. WONG: Is that the way the
14 Community board members want to go with this?

15 I am speaking from my past experience
16 in trying to get the by-laws going and all that
17 the board members were unwilling to delegate that
18 type of activity to a small group.

19 MR. ONGARTH: I would support what
20 Rick said for a particular reason, and it is that
21 the group that have stated an interest, and I
22 assume will be involved, is a reasonably
23 broad-based group. It's not two or three people.
24 It's five or six people. And I would be quite
25 willing to accept them as representing me at

1 least, if not the whole group, and I would suggest
2 it would go as Rick has suggested it. And if we
3 have a disagreement on this point, let's vote on
4 it and let the majority rule.

5 MS. NELSON: Pat Nelson.

6 I would agree with that, and I would
7 suggest that those members be Community RAB that
8 are here and are interested and have a stake in
9 the decision to join the subcommittee.

10 MR. ALCEDO: I think one of the
11 critical things that you said back there that it
12 would be broad based because two out of the three
13 that we got here are set by Bate keepers; however,
14 one is an attorney who says he has litigated
15 against the Navy and the DOD and so on.

16 And I think to pick up two or three
17 or so people like that, it is going to put us
18 further behind because, similar to ARC, they come
19 in with an agenda and they don't trust the Navy.
20 They don't trust DOD. They assume we are going to
21 screw the whole thing up, you know, the Navy is.

22 And that's not going to help this
23 process at all. And they come into it up front in
24 saying this, this particular attorney.

25 MR. MEYERS: At least he is honest.

1 MR. WONG: The issue that we have is
2 are we delegating those decisions to a
3 subcommittee and vote on what they present. And I
4 think what I am hearing is that's the way we would
5 like to go. I would just like to wrap this up and
6 encourage, if anybody has those concerns, to join
7 the subcommittee, and that's the place to discuss
8 those.

9 So agreed?

10 We will vote on the slate as
11 presented by the subcommittee at the June meeting
12 without discussing the individual merits.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: We will close out the
14 organizational business section, and let me just
15 say a few brief comments on upcoming environmental
16 reports.

17 We are going to, later on tonight, we
18 are going to close out the commentary on the draft
19 base-wide environmental baseline survey which was
20 provided to about six Community members, and we
21 also had a special workshop on that several weeks
22 ago.

23 The draft scientific finding
24 suitability to lease at Zone B for film
25 production, we expected to have that out last

1 week; however, we won't be able to get that out
2 until sometime the second week in May. So as a
3 result of that, the comment period for the Zone B
4 FOSL, instead of being at our next meeting in May,
5 will be about two weeks after that. So for those
6 people who had asked for copies of the FOSL, and I
7 also have another sign-up sheet in the back and
8 also a copy of the draft FOSL which is not quite
9 ready to go out yet, you can take a look at it and
10 decide again whether you want to look at the
11 document.

12 For those people who asked for it
13 before and plus those who want to ask for it
14 tonight, we will mail it out in the next couple of
15 weeks, we will be able to discuss it at our May
16 meeting.

17 But the comment period will still go
18 on for a couple of weeks after that. So you will
19 have 30 days from the time you get the document.

20 Also, there's another addition which
21 is not written into the agenda.

22 We have the preliminary draft
23 engineering evaluation cost analysis for soil
24 removal, and that will be out in a week or so.

25 And I will let Sharon Tobias say a

1 few words about that.

2 MS. TOBIAS: Thank you.

3 This is for a removal action that we
4 plan on doing at Site 614 and 22. The removal
5 action won't take place until next year, until
6 after we incorporate, until we get the results of
7 a phase 2B remedial investigation.

8 But what this is, this is a
9 preliminary draft just to give you an idea of what
10 we plan on doing with it.

11 The reason it's preliminary, it does
12 not have applicable or relevant and appropriate
13 requirements for clean up levels because we
14 haven't negotiated those yet to the regulatory
15 agencies.

16 And since we don't have the results
17 of the investigation, we don't know the exact
18 limits of contamination. But no matter what we
19 plan on doing removal action to some degree.

20 So this would just give us an idea of
21 what we have planned, and this will have a 60-day
22 comment period when you receive it. So we will
23 put a sign-up sheet so if anyone is interested in
24 receiving it, we will send it out to you.

25 MS. NELSON: Excuse me. When is that

1 going to be released?

2 MS. TOBIAS: This week.

3 MS. GLASS: And, Sharon, you said
4 there would not be a clear delineation of the area
5 for the soil removal?

6 MS. TOBIAS: No, no. Because we
7 don't know the exact limits of contamination at
8 this time. That's why it's preliminary.

9 MS. GLASS: When would that
10 information be forthcoming?

11 MS. TOBIAS: We plan to have perhaps
12 another draft final in October or November of this
13 year, so that would be the one that would have the
14 limits of contamination and the clean-up levels in
15 it.

16 MS. GLASS: Thank you.

17 MR. WONG: Brad Wong, Community
18 Co-Chair.

19 And with regard to the delay in the
20 FOSL coming out, we are going to look at the May
21 meeting to have a presentation on risk assessment
22 and risk evaluation because that is playing into
23 the FOSL as it comes out in the EBS.

24 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

25 That may turn out to be, work out

1 actually better than our original schedule because
2 we can't discuss the risk assessment which is
3 really the elements in the finding suitability to
4 lease. That determines whether or not it's
5 appropriate for a given use; in this case, for
6 film production. So we will be able to have that
7 discussion in our May meeting, then we would still
8 have a couple of weeks to look at the FOSL.

9 MR. MEYERS: Don Meyers.

10 Is that risk assessment or risk
11 evaluation? I mean, what is the actual difference
12 between those two things? What is it actually?
13 What will the FOSL include?

14 MR. SULLIVAN: I would like to ask
15 Anthony Saponara from ERM-West to just clarify
16 that for us, please.

17 MR. SABONARA: For the purposes of
18 this investigation of risk assessment and risk
19 evaluation is unanimous, so it means the same
20 thing.

21 MR. MEYERS: My understanding is a
22 risk evaluation is a tiered approach something
23 like risk-based corrective action, whereas risk
24 assessment is a different process.

25 MR. SAPONARA: Well, basically what

1 we did is we took the existing data and ran,
2 compared it with risk-based action levels and
3 ended up doing a risk-based box model on it.

4 MR. MEYERS: So that's more like a
5 risk-based corrective action approach rather than
6 EBA-style risk assessment; would that be a fair
7 summarization?

8 MR. SAPONARA: Yes, that would be
9 correct.

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

11 So we will move into the updates.

12 Mary Rose Casa, did you want to say a
13 few things about our RAB clean-up team actions
14 during the last month?

15 MS. CASA: Sure thing, Jim.

16 I am Mary Rose Casa, DTSC.

17 I was a strong proponent of this idea
18 some time ago, so I am happy to be one of the
19 first of the rotating teams with recent BCT
20 activities.

21 We met on April 4th with the focus
22 group who studied the EBS and, along with
23 ERM-West, went through a little presentation on
24 how they conducted the environmental baseline
25 survey and entertained questions from the group.

1 On April 17, the BCT met. One of the
2 things we discussed was the provisions of the work
3 plan. PRC pointed out any changes that were made
4 in the draft final work plan as they made it go
5 final to facilitate review and approval by
6 regulators, and the regulators' approval was
7 imminent.

8 We also talked about the plans for
9 field evaluation or sample collection, which is
10 being overseen by the USPTA. It will take place
11 quarterly, as well as sampling will take place the
12 first week in May, and on the 3rd and 4th, the
13 regulators will be present to observe sample
14 collection and make any recommendations, just
15 making sure that the contractors are following the
16 work plan in sampling ground. And the regulators
17 are also going to take plates of the ground water
18 sample for duplicate analysis.

19 Another thing we did at the VCT
20 meeting was planning a presentation on
21 immunoassays. We also discussed the schedule,
22 particularly for the upcoming RI activities. We
23 also talked about delay regarding the further
24 characterization of Site 1 and the title.

25 Both of those delays had to do with

1 the weather, rainy season.

2 And finally, the Water Board gave a
3 brief presentation on non-attainment zones, which
4 is a proposed amendment to the existing basing
5 plan.

6 So that gives you an idea of some of
7 the things we were discussing this month.

8 MR. HEHN: Paul Hehn.

9 What is the --

10 We are going to take a split of all
11 the quarters ground work levels, the wells?

12 MS. CASA: We're taking a split from
13 11 wells to be sampled on one day.

14 MR. HEHN: Running the same analysis?

15 MS. CASA: Yes. We're running
16 exactly the same analysis and the same protocol.

17 MR. HEHN: This should be some
18 quality assurance check or comparison check or
19 what is the purpose?

20 MS. CASA: The main purpose for the
21 split is laboratory projection.

22 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers.

23 Do we have a brief update on
24 non-attainment?

25 MR. BESSETTE: Michael Bessette from

1 the Regional Water Control Board.

2 The non-attainment policy went before
3 the State Board April 16 for discussion of the
4 public comments that it received up to date. At
5 this time, they decided to table --

6 The decision-making process, from
7 what I understand, is either 60 or, at this point,
8 is 60 days from that meeting. And they will be
9 expecting more public comment, and they're going
10 to determine the adoption of the non-attainment
11 policy after that review period. So it still is
12 up for public comment.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

14 Okay, thank you.

15 What I would like to do now is, just
16 for a brief couple of minutes, turn over to Laurie
17 Glass from the Citizens' Reuse Committee to
18 present a brief discussion of what is going on in
19 the last month at the Reuse Committee meeting.

20 MS. GLASS: Laurie Glass.

21 Thank you. I heard "brief" two
22 times, so I will go with that.

23 You will, of course, be receiving
24 copies of minutes for the last meeting with your
25 minutes, I am assuming. I did not get copies of

1 the last minutes for the RAB to include with this
2 packet, but anyway, that's another issue.

3 The last CRC meeting, there was a
4 review of the Outreach Subcommittee action
5 meeting. The Treasure Island display concerning
6 reuse is up. I invite you to go and take a look.
7 There's a little dispenser box with a newsletter
8 which is also printed and a response form for
9 comments on the draft, goals and objectives and
10 anything else you care to comment about.

11 Also, if you haven't received a copy
12 in the mail, let's talk after the meeting, and I
13 can get your name and address if you would like to
14 be on the mailing list to receive a newsletter.
15 There will be a few more issues kind of
16 sporadically public.

17 There was some talk about a media day
18 that the citizens reuse the video equipment have
19 concerning reused planning on Treasure Island for
20 probably sometime toward the end of May or June,
21 possibly as late as August. I don't think so,
22 actually. And to talk about getting together a
23 tour of Treasure Island for the public probably in
24 early June, maybe a little later, depending on how
25 plans work out.

1 The contract of the planning
2 consultant was signed, and the work scope is
3 defined, the schedule. And once again, I brought
4 a copy of it. It's basically a schedule that you
5 probably have seen before pushed forward a month,
6 so everything that was listed in June is now going
7 to happen in July because of the delay in signing
8 the contract.

9 There was kind of some review of the
10 Expo '99 process. That's an event, the
11 feasibility of which is currently being scheduled
12 for 1999. It would be kind of a World Fair kind
13 of thing to be sited on Treasure Island.

14 The feasibility study is due to be
15 given to the Mayor on May 15. There were three
16 parts, so that's concerning the siting and what it
17 would be, transportation issues and economics.

18 The next meeting of the CRC is May
19 1st at 4:00 p.m., with redevelopment issues, which
20 is 770 Golden Gate Avenue. The public is invited.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

23 MS. NELSON: I have a question.

24 Pat Nelson.

25 At the last meeting, you indicated

1 you would approach your group for reciprocal
2 chairs for the RAB. Was that accomplished?

3 MS. GLASS: I did talk again, and
4 again it was pointed out to me that the Mayor is
5 the person that appoints members to the CRC. The
6 CRC can't just sort of add its own people. And
7 once again, as I think as Brad pointed out
8 earlier, the CRC members are people who are
9 selected because of their past involvement in the
10 community in San Francisco in various civic
11 activities, including previous base closure
12 activities. So if there is somebody from the RAB
13 who also has that kind of, those kind of
14 qualifications, perhaps they would like to contact
15 the Mayor's office and see about getting appointed
16 to the CRC because that's the process.

17 So it's a little, obviously a little
18 different from what the RAB's process is.

19 MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell from the
20 San Francisco Health Department.

21 And we could also talk to some
22 people -- if somebody is really interested, we
23 could talk to some of the people at the
24 Redevelopment Agency who also could put in a good
25 word or whatever to the Mayor's office.

1 I know that for the Hunter's
2 (phonetic) Point draft, for instance, a lot of it
3 happened. So if you're unsuccessful with the
4 Mayor's office and you would like to try that
5 other angle, I am suggesting that.

6 MS. NELSON: Thank you.

7 It would seem to me that the Mayor's
8 office was aware of his position on the board to
9 the CRC members that there should be some
10 reciprocity because of the importance of having a
11 liaison on both sides of the group.

12 MS. NELSON: I think a redevelopment
13 would be a strong active position, and I know the
14 importance of the RAB.

15 MS. GLASS: And also I would like to
16 point out once again that my communication is not
17 a one-directional kind of thing. In other words,
18 I am a member of the RAB or represent the CRC on
19 the RAB, I don't just talk to you about what the
20 CRC is doing. I talk to the CRC about what the
21 RAB is doing, although Jim Sullivan, present at
22 our meetings, gives presentation concerning what
23 the claim of activities have been and so on and so
24 forth.

25 And the arrangement is that the

1 minutes will be included in the packet that is
2 sent out to CRC members, so there isn't a lack of
3 communication. That's what I am trying to say.

4 And also, once again, Saul Bloom, who
5 is with Archaeology, is a member of the CRC. So
6 then you know there's lots of linkages as they
7 stand right now for what it's worth.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Laurie.

9 What I would like to do right now is
10 take like a real quick two-minute stretch break
11 and give everybody a break, especially our court
12 reporter.

13 (Brief recess.)

14 MR. SULLIVAN: I would like to
15 introduce Bob Haas from the California EPA
16 Department of Toxic Substances Control, who is
17 going to make a presentation on immunoassays
18 testing. And what I would like to do is for us to
19 hold our questions until the end as much as we
20 can.

21 MR. HAAS: Yes. Bob Haas is my name.
22 I am with the Hazardous Materials Laboratory.

23 Thanks, Jim. Thank you very much for
24 inviting me to speak a few words here.

25 Mary Rose Casa called me a month or

1 so ago and said that there were a number of
2 questions from the RAB on the use of field
3 screening methods here at Treasure Island. And
4 since I am the HML, Hazardous Materials Laboratory
5 resident amino chemist, what I try to convey to
6 you some of our enthusiasm for field screening and
7 its usefulness.

8 About a year ago, Cal-EPA, under a
9 legislation, AB 2060, was mandated to begin a
10 program of environmental technology certification.
11 Within that program, there is a number of
12 different industries that measure in technology,
13 and just one of them is the certification program
14 for hazardous materials. Hazardous waste
15 technologies shown here is a performance-based
16 certification system.

17 And what we basically do is invite
18 manufacturers of commercial products to submit
19 their products for review, either a product that
20 is eminently awaiting commercial development or
21 already on the market. These performance-based
22 methods are, as one might imagine, don't have
23 strict standards associated with them.

24 The idea here is that the product
25 claims have to be substantiated, and we evaluate

1 the certification principles based on those
2 product claims.

3 I am not going to belabor a lot of
4 these principles. There are many more than this,
5 actually, in our literature. And I welcome you --
6 I brought a whole stack of stuff both on the
7 certification program and a couple of the relevant
8 data validation packages or reviews that we have
9 done on the products under discussion in the work
10 plan addendum.

11 But for our purposes tonight, these
12 five are the relevant ones. Every technique that
13 we look at must have a proof of concept that is
14 based on sound scientific principles. And to look
15 at this from the other side, we don't want to look
16 at black box technologies. We encourage novel
17 applications and even novel science, but we're
18 not, as a regulatory agency, we are not prepared
19 to either support or certify methods that haven't
20 been proved to be efficacious.

21 So that's number two, the efficacy
22 must be able to perform a useful service.

23 Thirdly, it has to have a range of
24 applications very well defined. And I think you
25 will find, when you look at the products, the

1 immunoassays, particularly the ones that PRC has
2 proposed to use here at Treasure Island, that this
3 range of applications is very well defined.

4 And we furthermore, in our
5 recommendations and in our reports, try to be as
6 specific as possible as to the range of
7 applications and the limitations.

8 The fourth thing that I have listed
9 here is the reliability and must have indicators
10 of performance over time. We are not unique, and
11 the next person who is going to speak, Dr. Carter
12 from ENSYS, is going to show you an overhead.

13 There are many other agencies that
14 have been involved in field screening methods and
15 immunoassays, in particular, those include the
16 Office of Solid Waste, the Department of Energy
17 and the Natural Laboratories of both Livermore and
18 Oakridge. They have been using, all of these
19 organizations have been using and specifying field
20 screening methods for their personnel, as well as
21 for the contractors.

22 The fifth item here is really the
23 most important and I can't get it up to the top
24 here because of this thing. But I understand
25 validation of these methods is what we in the

1 laboratory stress as the most important criteria
2 for what we are looking at.

3 We want to make sure that not just
4 the data presented by the vendor or manufacturer
5 or developer is the only data that we rely on, so
6 we always encourage that independent contractors,
7 as well as ourselves and other government
8 laboratories, independently validate these tests
9 under a variety of conditions. And this, of
10 course, means that the product claims to be
11 substantiated over those conditions.

12 I want to introduce tonight Dr. Kevin
13 Carter from ENSYS who will talk a little bit about
14 the immunoassay field screening test that his
15 company produces for PCBs, polychlorinated
16 biphenyls, PAHs, polyaromatic hydrocarbons, and
17 total petroleum hydrocarbons. PRC is proposed, as
18 you all know, to use these in the field here at
19 Treasure Island.

20 Following that, Tom Shoon, from
21 D-Tech is here as well. We have, you know, a dog
22 and pony show prepared for you folks. You can
23 walk up, shake tubes, look at colors. They're two
24 real samples, PRC brought tonight and the D-Tech
25 kit, polyethyl benzene toluene, Ethylbenzene,

1 Xylene. This is a diesel-contaminated sample,
2 very heavily contaminated as it turns out. And
3 there's also a clean up.

4 And without further ado, I want them
5 to get their fair share of the time, and I want
6 this to be an interactive session so when they
7 made their presentations, please, please, I
8 brought a lot of literature.

9 If there's any issues you want to
10 discuss, come and talk to me, you know, publicly
11 or at another break or when this part of the
12 meeting has adjourned.

13 Dr. Carter.

14 MR. CARTER: Thanks, Bob.

15 I want to take just a short period of
16 time to talk about immunoassay, but not really in
17 the context of how they work. I'm not going to
18 spend a lot of time on that. I am quite happy to
19 spend time with one individually if you want to
20 know a little more about them. So we will talk
21 about the principle on how they work and also talk
22 about where they have been applied and the
23 validation with the method as it exists today to
24 give us a feel for how broadly this method has
25 been applied in a variety of sites to give you

1 some kind of an idea of what innovative technology
2 has been used.

3 Innovative technology has been around
4 for a while. And I think you will see it's been
5 used at a lot of different sites.

6 A little background of the technology
7 is probably in order.

8 Immunoassays have been around and
9 used in a number of very important applications
10 for over 30 years and that in the metrodiagnostics
11 field where everyday people are evaluating samples
12 that originate from humans for different
13 perimeters of medical significance, some of them
14 relate it to life and death decisions.

15 Those immunoassays are used by people
16 who are trained to use them for that application
17 and to deliver high-quality data that is, in large
18 part, unsupported by other analytical methods and
19 used to make decisions. And there's a contest
20 which immunoassays have been another field. And
21 what we have done is accompany, take the
22 technology that was developed with the medical
23 field, adapted to the environmental application
24 where the matrices are different and the analytes
25 are different to a significant adaptation that has

1 to be done there, and then try to take that
2 application area or these application areas in the
3 environmental field and make them scientifically
4 sound so they deliver the kind of data that is
5 needed to make the kind of decisions that are made
6 in the environmental field.

7 Now as an example of where
8 immunoassays are used in the Department of Defense
9 sites, there's a list of 27 sites, and there are
10 more where immunoassays have been used in the past
11 or are currently being used now as we speak.

12 A whole variety of immunoassays cover
13 the range of analytes from PCB's and talked about
14 PAHs petroleum hydrocarbons, by and large, those
15 three and a few others.

16 Many of you are familiar with some of
17 the sites.

18 There are several contaminant
19 categories for environmental immunoassays that
20 have been developed, and you see these cover some
21 of the things that Bob talked about plus some
22 others that you're familiar with. There's a whole
23 range, and if you stopped to look at all the
24 individual immunoassays within these analyte
25 classes, you see there's about 25 different

1 immunoassays. What I mean is 25 different
2 contaminants or contaminated classes that exist
3 now and that are being used on a daily basis by
4 people doing environmental work.

5 When you talk about the different
6 analytes, I also want to talk about the sample
7 makers because these are clearly the sample
8 makers. These are important here. There are a
9 variety of them. Not only are environmental
10 immunoassays being used for soils now, but are
11 being used for other types of solid waste surfaces
12 sampling for the decontamination of building or
13 buildings surfaces, metal surfaces, liquid waste
14 and primarily non-aqueous liquids, water, ground
15 water, surface water, waste water, and in some
16 cases, biological samples, fish tissue, that sort
17 of thing. So there are a lot of ways in which
18 immunoassays are being used today.

19 So that gives you kind of the scope
20 of their application as it exists today.

21 Let's talk about what an immunoassay
22 is. I think it's good to use an analogy.

23 Immunoassay is really just another
24 analytical method. It's not a black box. It's a
25 method that's based on tried and true chemistry,

1 has been used in the medical diagnostic field.
2 And it gives us a molecule called an antibody as a
3 detector. I think the analogy that's a good one,
4 an antibody is a detector, just like a GC is a
5 detector. The detector is a detector whether it's
6 an FID or ACD, and don't worry about the technical
7 difficulties for technical jargon. It's just
8 another detector that we can detect compounds.

9 We have developed it so that we can
10 take specific compounds and quantify those
11 compounds and environmental samples.

12 One analogy that people often use to
13 explain immunoassays so they can explain very
14 clearly is that an antibody is like a lock and an
15 analytes is like a key. When they fit together,
16 that constitutes the protection with a lock and
17 key. Obviously, when they fit together, you can
18 turn the lock and the key and unlock the situation
19 you're trying to unlock. It's that kind of an
20 interaction that's what generates the specificity
21 that immunoassays have.

22 Let's get specific.

23 One of the methods that is being
24 proposed to be used here at Treasure Island is a
25 method of 4030. That's the method designation for

1 petroleum hydrocarbons test. That test has been
2 used on many sites and has been validated by a
3 whole different group of people who are interested
4 in applying it in their particular applications.
5 So the EPA has used this test on the Navy sites
6 for the site program. Various state agencies such
7 as the Wisconsin DNR, in the State of North
8 Carolina, have used this test in validation trials
9 to look at its performancy that it's applicable
10 for particular applications.

11 Various companies, major oil
12 companies obviously for a product like this, are
13 interested in its application and have tried it in
14 research laboratories and have tried it out in the
15 field in real life circumstances, and some of the
16 DOE's lab, Oakridge National Laboratory, sandia
17 national Laboratory, have also used this test,
18 both under laboratory conditions where they're
19 testing its performance and out in the field on
20 real environmental projects where they have been
21 interested in environmental restoration on their
22 sites. So this is a test that's undergone a lot
23 of scrutiny by a whole variety of people who are
24 interested in its performance and have generated
25 data that has proved its performance out in the

1 field, and some of the data that is generated in
2 some of these exercises were the data that was
3 submitted to DTSC in support of the technology
4 certification program application which Bob was a
5 reviewer of.

6 So that's how this all ties together.

7 Now, there are some field
8 considerations for applications. At least to test
9 every application is different because the
10 matrices are different, and contaminants are
11 different. There are a variety of different
12 considerations.

13 One of the keys to successful
14 application anywhere is making sure that first the
15 application is a correct one by reviewing the kind
16 of analytes that are present at the site the matrix
17 to site specific circumstances. The other key to
18 successful application is training for the people
19 who are using the test.

20 As a company, we are committed to
21 providing training to operators. The training
22 program that we offer has become a real, a major
23 component of the application in the State of
24 California because it's certification of document
25 training is called out as a specific quality

1 assurance-related item. And, in fact, the PRC
2 people who are anticipating using the test here
3 have been trained by us as operators and certified
4 on our system.

5 So, success of the application, as I
6 said, is dependent upon the correctness of the
7 application based on the test characteristics and
8 the site and the training of the folks for the
9 application.

10 So I would like to just stop showing
11 you slides and get on to now a demonstration of
12 how the test works.

13 As Bob said, we analyzed some samples
14 earlier so we can sort of shorten the time frame
15 here. We won't take up a lot of time in the
16 proceedings. And what I will do is I will show
17 you how a test works and give you a feel for the
18 procedure. And if you want to come up and look at
19 this at the appropriate time, you can do that as
20 well.

21 This setup, as I have it here, is as
22 you would see it in the field. We have a number
23 of test tubes and bottles that contain solutions
24 that are necessary to run the tests.

25 And then we have a field instrument

1 work station that includes some battery-powered
2 instruments that are necessary to run the test.
3 It's completely portable and operable in what we
4 call a field situation, which means no power, no
5 water, fluctuating temperatures over the course of
6 the day. It's capable of doing all of those
7 things.

8 And let me just kind of go through
9 the procedure here to give you an idea.

10 If I was actually running a test, I
11 would put on my gloves and other safety equipment,
12 get prepared to run the test, set up a work
13 station which includes --

14 I will tilt this up so you can see it
15 -- a number of components that I have
16 already set up. It's organized in such a fashion
17 that the field operator can proceed sort of from
18 back to front in an organized fashion, run the
19 test with good quality assurance and, of course,
20 there are detailed instructions that the user,
21 even having been trained, still follows as a
22 quality assurance measure throughout the process.

23 What that involves is first taking
24 the sample as it might be presented to you here in
25 these brass sleeves, weighing out ten grams of

1 sample on a scale, battery-powered scale, and then
2 taking that sample and placing it and some
3 extraction solvent, methanol is what we use as an
4 extraction solvent in a small bottle which
5 contains some steel balls to help break up the
6 sample, take that and shake it for a minute, the
7 steel balls agitating the sample to make sure that
8 the extraction solvent contacts all of the soil
9 that is in the sample, removes the contaminants
10 from the surface of the soil, and it puts it in
11 the extraction solvent.

12 Once that extraction process is
13 complete, we try to remove the soil particles from
14 the extract and to do that, we filter it. Simple
15 filtration removes the soil particles so we have a
16 particle-free solution to operate on.

17 At that point, we then mix the
18 reagents that are necessary for the test with some
19 of the sample extract, and to do that we use a
20 battery-powered microprocessor controlled diluting
21 station which allows the user to decide on the
22 concentrations that the test needs to be run at
23 simply by reading the instructions, feeding it a
24 program here. The program microprocessor
25 determines the volumes to allow it so people

1 aren't having to measure out small volumes of
2 liquid themselves.

3 It's measured by an instrument that
4 is more competent in doing that. And one simply
5 takes that sample that one has just filtered,
6 draws it up, dispenses it into one of the
7 reagents, mixes it, takes a standard which is
8 provided with the test and analytical standard
9 which is used as a reference with a new tip on the
10 pipette, and takes the standard, puts it through
11 the same procedure and then transfers the contents
12 of the liquid of this tube into the tube where the
13 reactions is carried out. Times the step for ten
14 minutes and during this time, the reaction between
15 the entire body and the anlytes you're attempting
16 to measure happens.

17 At the end of the ten minutes, you
18 wash this tube out. The anlyte remains bound to
19 the antibody which is bound to the inside of the
20 plastic tube. You dispense one squirt of each of
21 these two reagents in the tube, wait two and a
22 half minutes.

23 During that time, color develops in
24 inverse proportion to the amount of anlyte that
25 was in the original sample. And at the end of

1 that time, you stop the color formation, and what
2 you get are a whole series of tubes. And these
3 are the ones we ran before you all came in that
4 contained different colors that represented
5 different concentrations.

6 Now what we have done is we have
7 tested these two samples, one of which was
8 purported to be clean and one of which was
9 purported to be quite contaminated with diesel
10 fuel.

11 We also analyzed some standards to
12 provide a reference for comparison so that we
13 could accurately determine whether there was
14 contamination or lack of contamination. And we
15 can compare them by eye and clearly see that the
16 contaminated sample --

17 I don't know how easily you can
18 see this, but we will try to provide a
19 background --

20 -- the contaminated sample gave a
21 very light-colored result compared to standard,
22 okay. And a clean sample gives a very
23 dark-colored result compared to that same
24 standard.

25 Now we don't judge these by eye

1 because that would be inaccurate. If you were
2 color blind, you would have a problem. We judge
3 that by using an instrument which measures the
4 color that is in each one of these tubes.

5 But in any case, you could see the
6 principle of contaminated sample gives less color
7 and contaminated sample gives more color. And you
8 can accurately determine whether a sample is
9 contaminated as in the case of diesel contained
10 sample or uncontaminated.

11 Now the level of which contamination
12 is detected is determined by the standard that you
13 use. That's why you run a standard along with
14 each set of samples. That standard is specific to
15 a particular regulatory situation.

16 In this particular case, we did the
17 detection of diesel at 15 ppm threshold and a
18 hundred fifty ppm threshold and found that the
19 sample in the contaminant soil was above a hundred
20 and fifty ppm in the diesel, and the clean soil
21 was below 15 ppm. So that was the result that we
22 got.

23 MR. HAAS: At this point, I want to
24 introduce Tom Shoon from D-Tech. He also came in
25 early and used the D-Tech kit which is,

1 technically, slightly, I mean, principally is the
2 same technically. It's a bit different.

3 And again for your edification, I
4 think he just wants to show you how he carried out
5 the assay for detection using the same
6 fuel-contaminated sample.

7 Tom.

8 MR. SHOON: Thank you, Bob.

9 I am Tom Shoon. I work for EM
10 Science. We make the kits called BTEX field
11 testing kits.

12 Just real briefly, I only have a few
13 minutes to tell you about it. I am going to go
14 over and show you how our kits work. They're
15 based on a different format than the first kits
16 that came out.

17 Theirs are based on a test tube color
18 change. Ours is based on a color change with
19 particles. We are going to filter the particles
20 onto a surface and the color change will occur
21 there.

22 So what we did is we decided to, and
23 we did a lot of research to find out what was
24 really needed out in the field. We found the ease
25 of use was the number one thing that was required

1 and asked from people out in the field. So we
2 have reduced the number of steps down to just six
3 steps for the test and three steps to do the
4 extraction.

5 So I'm going to go through the format
6 with you.

7 What we have done is, just to let you
8 know, I have litechvee back here on the desk, and
9 in our kits we put, well, basically we have two
10 different kits. We have one kit for the soil
11 extraction, and we have one kit for the test. And
12 the reason for that is we have waste water to
13 water samples. Naturally, you use the test kit
14 for it.

15 We have all the instructions in each
16 of the kits, and also we put instructions on the
17 lid. If you're like me, the first thing you do is
18 lose the instructions on anything that you buy.
19 And if you leave your instructions back in the
20 lab, you have it on the lid, so it's very user
21 friendly.

22 And as we ship these, we put the
23 dates on the bottom of the kits so, as you know,
24 these are time and temperature sensitive, so this
25 will let you know how long they're good for.

1 At room temperature, they're stable
2 for nine months. If they're refrigerated, they're
3 good for 12 months.

4 And basically the way it works, we
5 found through our research that people don't like
6 to do weighings -- excuse my back -- don't like to
7 do weighings out in the field. It's much easier
8 to do a measurement biometrically, so we have the
9 syringes which are preset so you just scoop up the
10 soil.

11 What I did was I took a plug out of
12 the sleeve, and I put it into our extraction vile.
13 Our extraction viles have metal beads in them to
14 help with extraction. I mix it for one minute as
15 with this the same extraction, and then it settles
16 out. And it looks something like this.

17 It passes to the soil at the bottom,
18 and you see it's like a clear liquid at the top.
19 And I take a small sample from the top with my
20 little pipette, which is happening now.

21 Everything is premeasured, premarked,
22 so you don't have to do a lot of reading. You
23 don't have to do a lot of verbage to figure out
24 exactly how it works. So it makes it much easier.

25 So you take the extraction vile and

1 you put it into the dilution vile. And what I am
2 doing is I have to extract with the solvent to get
3 the -- in our case, we are methanol to get the
4 anlyte into solution. Then the extract is deluted
5 into an aqueous solution in order to do the
6 antibody reaction and enzymatic reaction. Then I
7 take the sample, this will be my sample that I am
8 going to test my extract. I am testing with my
9 other kit.

10 If I am looking at just a waste water
11 discharge, the water sample, naturally I would
12 start with the water, bottled water. And from
13 that I would take another aliquot, which is half a
14 mil from here or from my bottled water from my
15 waste water discharge, and I put it into a second
16 solution.

17 Now, I want you to notice they're
18 very small. The reason we have everything very
19 small is because we are very concerned about
20 volitility. Naturally, I'm working with D-Tech
21 which is very volatile, and I mix it in here and I
22 do a filtration, too.

23 I have a filtered disk like on an eye
24 dropper which snaps onto here. Then what I do is
25 I run two tests together. I have my antibodies

1 freeze dried in my little test viles, and I have
2 one for my test sample, in this case, BTEX, and
3 one more my reference.

4 We want a reference for standard with
5 every test we do. You can see they're very small.
6 We have the freeze-dried material in the bottom as
7 you add your liquid to it as with freeze-dried
8 food or whatever to regenerate it.

9 As liquid is added, it regenerates
10 our antibodies. We have a couple lines. I don't
11 know if you can see these. They are very small.
12 The meniscus takes about 10 to 12 drops for each
13 one of those, one my test and the second one my
14 reference, was standard. I add the drops. I
15 swirl these around, and I let them sit for five
16 minutes. This is a crucial part of the test.
17 Time reaction, five minutes. We use our watch, or
18 if you have a stopwatch.

19 And after that, you filer the little
20 viles in these principals. You can see they're
21 fairly small. But I have two sides. One side is
22 for the test. One side is for the reference.

23 I am returning my reference with my
24 test in parallel so I can see a comparison of how
25 things work out.

1 I filter these two through the little
2 test crucible, and then I add my first reagent,
3 which is a second molecule, which is color latex
4 molecule, add five drops to that, let it filter
5 through. And then I add five drops of water just
6 to rinse out all the unreacted enzymes or
7 antibodies and reagents, and then it filters
8 through, and the color develops.

9 As the color develops, you can kind
10 of see here how the color looks, a blue color
11 develops. Notice that a reference our standards
12 are very low. We have a color card to match. We
13 don't need pipettors or spectrophotometers or any
14 other kind of meters. You can do your
15 determination with a color card. And as the color
16 develops to the various levels of intensity, that
17 shows you the level of contamination.

18 So when my reference color gets to
19 this intensity, then I know the test is complete.

20 And it shows me two things.

21 One thing it shows is the kit itself
22 is working properly. I said initially that they
23 are time and temperature sensitive, and we want to
24 make sure that the kits are working.

25 And it also checks me in what I am

1 doing is all correct. If I don't do the steps
2 correct or if the kits have been kept in high
3 temperatures or too long a time, this color on the
4 reference will not develop, so that's a real good
5 quick reference for you.

6 Then I turn to the other side of the
7 test, and as you see the color intensity will show
8 which level that I have for contamination
9 according to how dark it is.

10 And with the NC kits, same thing; the
11 darker it is, the cleaner it is and the lighter is
12 the more contaminated. So from this, you can
13 determine your levels with three steps to do the
14 extraction, six steps to do the test, and you have
15 your test done. It only takes about 15 to 20
16 minutes to do.

17 We are happy to be accepted by
18 Cal-EPA. Bob and his group have accepted our PCB
19 and BTEX kits, and some of our other kits will be
20 out soon.

21 I just want to tell you, on the back
22 of the literature it mentions the six different
23 kits on the back here, shows the six different
24 kits we have out and the ranges that we have. And
25 those levels are where we are at. And I have

1 inside the package all the different kits we have.

2 We are happy that PRC chose us to do
3 the BTEX testing of the samples at Treasure
4 Island, and we are looking forward to working with
5 the group.

6 MR. HAAS: Thank you.

7 I just want to summarize from the
8 DTSC perspective that we, in HML, are committed to
9 making sure that the field testing is done in a
10 way consistent with data that is acceptable to me,
11 the data quality objectives of any site that is
12 under our investigation.

13 I have made already here a number of
14 recommendations to PRC in response to some of the
15 RAB comments.

16 Some of these discussions are that
17 there indeed be a pilot study done on a site with
18 a large percentage of laboratory confirmation.

19 I come from an analytical chemistry
20 laboratory where I am inundated day in and day out
21 by chromatographers who have a great distrust of
22 methods such as this. And we always want to make
23 sure that the data that is produced on any side is
24 confirmed by quality laboratory data, so, I
25 believe that PRC is going to be doing a pilot

1 study. And I looked over their project plan for
2 survey sampling and confirmation. There are
3 confirmation of negatives and positive samplings,
4 and it's consistent with our recommendations in
5 the documents that are on the table, the
6 certification studies.

7 This being a remedial action -- and I
8 am just reading very briefly from this -- by
9 qualitative and fully qualitative analyses, and
10 this is exactly the kind of a situation where we
11 feel that field testing is a promising way to go.

12 The other situation is the actual
13 remedial situation where there is field testing
14 while the contractors are digging is an extremely
15 high cost savings measure. So I think that
16 there's also some data presented on the different
17 cost factors here regarding use of an on-site
18 laboratory versus an off-site laboratory versus
19 field screening for the kind of purposes that are
20 presented in this work plan.

21 We feel that this is an excellent
22 opportunity to further validate these methods.

23 I welcome questions and discussions.

24 MR. ALLMAN: My name is John Allman.

25 I am curious with the BTEX system

1 since you're only looking at color changes, is it
2 sensitive enough to tell if a few color cards
3 change in color or is it more of a level of an
4 accepted level that you want to be above or below?

5 MR. HAAS: It's actually both. You
6 were shown the color card situation, and one of
7 the characteristics of these tests --

8 This is Bob Haas again --

9 -- is they generally give you a range
10 rather than absolute number. I don't know the
11 range on this, but it would be something typically
12 like one or two EPM to 8 or 10, and the different
13 gradations of the color.

14 The color card will give you those
15 gradations, and, admittedly, that's very
16 semi-quantitative.

17 D-Tech EM Science provides a
18 hand-held reflectometer that functionally gives
19 you a number similar to what Dr. Carter showed you
20 with his spectrophotometer that by then you have a
21 percent, so if it's 22 of 40, of 40 to 60 or so,
22 that will say it's either two to three or three to
23 five, three to eight, or above eight, and then at
24 the low end, below the detection limit.

25 The nice thing about this is remember

1 that the real purpose of these is to determine the
2 extent of contamination, you could always dilute
3 your samples to get down into the range,
4 particularly if you already got some target levels
5 set.

6 Where there's some anxiety is, of
7 course, at the low end. That's where we recommend
8 that you get confirmation of a fixed percent,
9 well, a fixed but flexible percentage. And,
10 again, if you're work plan, they addressed this as
11 trying to determine the extent of the plume or
12 something that you went by getting this sort of
13 almost instant feedback from field methods you
14 have a much better way of going about this than
15 sending stuff off to the laboratory and waiting
16 two days or two or three weeks before their data
17 package.

18 Remember, the turn around times are
19 only turn around times for analysis. They're
20 generally not turn around times for recording.

21 Furthermore, the issues of false
22 positives and false negatives is always a concern
23 of any analytical method whether it be a field
24 method, an (immuno) chemical method, an
25 instrumental method.

1 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers of Arc
2 Ecology.

3 Let me see if I understand the origin
4 of the antibody technique. My understanding is
5 that here are antibodies produced by animals in
6 response to having a foreign chemical injected
7 into their body; is that correct?

8 In this case, my understanding is
9 then you can get a lot of different antibodies
10 reacting to that, so you might not necessarily get
11 a pure strain of antibody in response to that
12 foreign compound, so you get what are called
13 polyclonal antibodies, and then you have to sift
14 through those to find monoclonal.

15 Is that what was actually done to
16 produce your kit?

17 In that case, there must be a certain
18 amount of cross-reactivity, and nobody has talked
19 about cross-reactivity or to what extent you might
20 accept that in these different kits.

21 MR. CARTER : Well, let me talk about
22 this.

23 There's two ways of making
24 antibodies. There's the polyclonal process and
25 the monoclonal process. The polyclonal process

1 involves immunizing animals and taking the whole
2 serum which contains a whole range of antibodies
3 which you described, a whole bunch of different
4 specificities, different properties, at times.

5 The monoclonal process is one in
6 which you immunize animals in the same fashion,
7 but in the end, you remove cells, individual cells
8 that make antibodies, and culture those cells.
9 Each individual cell makes a chemically unique
10 antibody.

11 So in the monoclonal process, you
12 make a whole bunch of different type antibodies
13 from individual, clone themselves, so you have a
14 chemistry-unique species for each one of these,
15 and you determine which one you want to use based
16 on your goals for the particular tests you're
17 trying to develop.

18 So in the end, if you use the
19 monoclonal process, you have a chemically-distinct
20 antibody with a chemically-defined response.

21 Now, that's the difference between
22 the two processes.

23 We used exclusively the monoclonal
24 process.

25 I am not going to debate the relative

1 merits and demerits of the process because that's
2 not germane here. But the thing that is germane
3 is, regardless of which process you use, you have
4 a range of specificity for compounds for each
5 assay that depends on a whole bunch of things
6 during the process, mostly things you can control.

7 And as an example, for a test like a
8 petroleum hydrocarbons test, you want a broad
9 range of reactions to a whole class of compounds
10 because you're trying to detect class of
11 compounds; okay?

12 For a test like a pentachloropheno
13 test where you're dealing with a single compound,
14 you shoot for a single compound. And once you
15 have done that, you can get very far one way or
16 very far the other way, but it's not perfect in
17 either case.

18 So for petroleum hydrocarbons, you're
19 asking for a range of compounds. We get a range
20 of compounds.

21 In a case of a very specific assay,
22 like in the pentachloropheno test, you can be
23 successful to a large degree, but you still have
24 some, what we refer to as cross-reactivity. What
25 that means is the test has sensitivity for some

1 other chemically-related compounds, okay.

2 Is that a significant issue? It can
3 be or it may not be, depending on the individual
4 circumstances. And that's why we don't recommend
5 that people would use immunoassays as a
6 preliminary chemical characterization tool,
7 meaning that tool that allows you to decide what
8 is present because they're not appropriate for
9 that application.

10 The application they are appropriate
11 for is one in which you already know what is
12 present because you have done some laboratory
13 analysis in which you used methods that are very
14 specific for individual analytes, and you can
15 detect all of those.

16 You know what you have, and once you
17 establish that, you now have the means for
18 establishing the usefulness of the immunoassay
19 because you have the primary characteristic done.

20 When I refer to sort of Step 1 in the
21 proper use of immunoassays, that's what that's all
22 about. And in this particular application, lots
23 of analytic work has been done to establish the
24 contaminants that are present on Treasure Island.

25 And those data were used to make the

1 decision for the actual application of immunoassay
2 to address this issue you brought up.

3 MR. MEYERS: So you actually quantify
4 cross-reactivity with similar compounds as the
5 compounds in your kits?

6 MR. CARTER: Yes. If you look at our
7 test kit technical literature, what it describes
8 are a whole list of things that the test reacts
9 to, some of which are intended and some of which
10 are not intended that we are knowledgeable about
11 based on our experience in the past and
12 applications that we believe the test would be
13 most effective for.

14 MR. NEDELL: This discussion is
15 getting a little bit beyond my capability of
16 understanding, and I am really more interested in
17 knowing the purpose of this test is to do some
18 field screening for it if it passes the threshold
19 or is above it or below it or is it to actually
20 precisely identify and quantify the chemicals to
21 make a decision to clean up, or is that going to
22 be done on a follow-up more precise testing?

23 MS. TOBIAS: The purpose of this test
24 is to, if it's above the threshold, we would keep
25 investigating until we reached the threshold

1 until we find it's clean.

2 MR. NEDELL: So what you're saying is
3 that you're using this test to establish whether
4 you take further action or not take further
5 action?

6 MS. TOBIAS: No. We are using it to
7 determine the limits of contamination.

8 MR. NEDELL: "Limits" meaning the
9 area of extent?

10 MS. TOBIAS: Area of extent.

11 This is Sharon Tobias. Sorry.

12 And then what will happen is based on
13 we are sending 20 percent of all the samples we
14 collect to the laboratory for confirmation of
15 sampling, and the results of the laboratory, the
16 analytic results from the laboratory, will be used
17 in the risk assessment in addition to the original
18 data we collect during the phase one for the
19 medial investigation.

20 And we will determine if there is a
21 risk based on both sets of data. And we also will
22 determine if any of the sites need to be
23 remediated.

24 MR. NEDELL: Can I just for
25 clarification, Don, I guess I am trying to

1 understand your concern is that you will get false
2 data because of whatever chemical reaction that
3 you were describing here a minute ago?

4 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers.

5 No. I was just trying to clarify
6 that point just for my own interest primarily, and
7 also that the RAB realizes this idea of the lock
8 and key as I think is described, is not entirely
9 accurate in that -- well, maybe it is. You can
10 pick locks with keys, so it's possible that a
11 single antibody will react to a number of
12 structurally-related compounds.

13 That was what I wanted to clear up.

14 But carrying on from your point,
15 Rick, if I understand this thing, the ELISA test
16 will in fact be used to determine the extent of
17 clean up. And I wonder how that can be if clean
18 up levels haven't been determined yet. How do we
19 know that they will get to the limit that will be
20 required by whatever you folks negotiate?

21 MS. TOBIAS: This is Sharon Tobias.

22 What would determine is the extent of
23 contamination, and then many of our sites will be
24 needed to be cleaned out. And when the remedial
25 action will actually take place, further sampling

1 will be done to ensure that all contamination is
2 removed.

3 If, for example, these results, the
4 immunoassays show ten parts per million (phonetic)
5 of diesel --

6 I am just throwing out a number, so
7 don't quote me on this --

8 -- if it showed in this particular
9 area that the results were ten parts per million,
10 and when we do our feasibility study, we may
11 extend that out 20 feet or 10 feet, some distance
12 to allow for some more area of contamination.

13 Based on whatever the clean up level
14 is that we negotiate with the regulatory agencies,
15 we will predict an area of contamination, and then
16 when we do the actual remediation, we will do
17 confirmation sampling that will be sent to the
18 laboratory to ensure that all contaminated soils
19 above the clean up level is removed and
20 remediated. So, I mean this is not the last time
21 we ever sample, so

22 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers. Arc
23 Ecology.

24 I understand that. I am just a bit
25 surprised that you could go ahead and do a

1 feasibility study when you really don't know how
2 much material you may have to remediate. That's
3 my basic concern on that issue.

4 It's all very well to guess. You
5 might be right. You might over-estimate, but you
6 might also under-estimate, depending on what level
7 is negotiate. We don't know whether that will be
8 the same as the ELISA test. We don't know at this
9 point, and that could have a great bearing on the
10 amount of material you have to remediate. That's
11 just my opinion.

12 MR. WONG: I would like to, if we
13 could, in keeping with the schedule so that we can
14 take a quick break here and give our stenographer
15 a break, but also we do have to cover some topics
16 here regarding the upcoming FOSL and the EBS, so I
17 would like to recommend we take a quick break.

18 MR. SHOON: Could I say one thing
19 first?

20 I forgot to mention we are having a
21 technical seminar on May 11 in San Francisco at
22 the Hyatt Regency from 8:30 to 12:30. And I would
23 like to invite each one of you to come. I have
24 invitations which I will put out here. All you
25 have to do is fax your name and your company to

1 us, and we will put you on our list. And at this
2 seminar, we are going to be talking about very
3 technical things. Some of you have very specific
4 questions, as some people do tonight. We will go
5 over those there.

6 (Brief recess.)

7 MR. WONG: Are we all set?

8 Before we move on now, we need to
9 still discuss the FOSL and the EBS.

10 Rich had one last question he wanted
11 to ask before the people leave.

12 MR. NEDELL: This is on your test.
13 Is that the BTEX test? You measure your soil
14 sample biometrically with a little device, and I
15 am curious to know what the repeatability to
16 getting the same weight of material is, what the
17 limits are in terms of soil classification of
18 clays versus granular soil.

19 Is there perhaps an opportunity to
20 introduce enough air to take the results and push
21 it from one category of BTEX range to another?

22 MR. SHOON: And that's a really good
23 question, and we have done a study on that because
24 that is a very normal question to ask.

25 With soils, with the density of the

1 soils, various clays or sands, they will weigh
2 differently and also, with different water
3 contents, they naturally are going to weigh
4 differently.

5 As you measure them volumetrically,
6 we have done a study of about 30 different
7 matrices, different soils, different water
8 contents. And we have done the test and done the
9 actual screening test on them and sent the test to
10 the lab and see if the variance was great enough
11 to throw them into different categories of
12 contamination.

13 And we have been able to show that
14 they don't. Even though there is a certain amount
15 for the weight as you do measure volumetrically,
16 but it does not pull them out of range. And we
17 have studied for that. I could show you, if you
18 would like to have those, but we have looked at it
19 quite extensively.

20 MR. NEDELL: My other last part of
21 that question is the technique with which you
22 scoop this material important or is it -- it
23 doesn't make any difference?

24 MR. SHOON: It really doesn't make
25 that much difference.

1 As in sampling, you want to have a
2 homogeneous sample, and you want to have it as
3 granular as possible as if you were collecting
4 samples for a lab.

5 So it's basically the same thing. We
6 like to make sure the syringe is totally full.
7 And in training people now to use the kits, we
8 make it pretty clear to really fill that syringe
9 pretty full.

10 MR. NEDELL: I guess the analogy I
11 would use is these people that scoop ice cream.
12 You can get it the same size ball, but you can get
13 a lot of different quality.

14 MR. SHOON: That's true. We have
15 done a lot of tests and have done a study to show
16 that because that's a big concern as moisture
17 content is for a lot of lab samples. And we have
18 been able to show that it does not take those into
19 different ranges.

20 MR. WONG: If we could entertain one
21 more, and then we are moving into the FOSL.

22 Paul.

23 MR. HEHN: I just have a couple of
24 quick questions, general kinds of questions. And
25 I think my partner, Sharon, would probably address

1 these are which of these two methods are going to
2 be used at Treasure Island? That is not clear to
3 me at this point.

4 The second thing is there was
5 originally going to be a field presentation of the
6 same methodology. Is that scheduled or would that
7 point take place?

8 And third, we talked about a
9 comparison study between the immunoassay and
10 traditional laboratory analysis. Is that planned
11 prior to the full Phase 2B going on or is that
12 going to be going on currently?

13 MS. TOBIAS: Let me start with the
14 second question.

15 Well, we are going to plan a day in
16 the field on a Saturday. Right now we are looking
17 for toward the end of June. We are planning to be
18 out in the field the middle of May, but we will be
19 using the geoprobe at one site. And it won't be
20 on the base for a few weeks until we get the
21 results of the immunoassay back, immunoassay study
22 back.

23 So what we are doing is we are going
24 to do -- I am confusing everybody. So we will do
25 the pilot study at Sites 14 and 22. That's the

1 two weeks. We are scheduling two weeks to do that
2 study or to do the actual field investigation.

3 We will have about three to four
4 weeks to receive all the data, evaluate it, meet
5 with the regulatory agencies and select well
6 locations based on the results. I mean, assuming
7 that the laboratory results compare well with the
8 immunoassays.

9 And at that time, we will move
10 forward with the rest of the Phase 2 of the
11 investigation.

12 And at some time a little further in
13 the future, we will give the RAB presentation of
14 what we found, the comparability study that we
15 have done.

16 Does that answer the second question?

17 MR. HEHN: So the comparison or the
18 field demonstration of that will go on after or
19 well into the Phase 2B; is that correct?

20 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, but we will only be
21 using it -- at this time, we only plan to have a
22 geoprobe on the base for about a two-week period
23 and that would fall right around Memorial Day
24 weekend. And if you want to come out Memorial Day
25 weekend, that would be great. But I don't think

1 people will want to give up a three-day weekend to
2 come out.

3 If we can work it out, maybe the
4 first weekend in June, we can hold on to the
5 geoprobe for a few more days and show you how
6 it -- we wanted to combine the geoprobe
7 presentation with the immunoassay presentation,
8 and so if we don't have the geoprobe on the base,
9 we might have to wait until the end of June.

10 MR. HEHN: Okay.

11 MS. TOBIAS: Because we don't want to
12 be paying every day we are not using the geoprobe.

13 MR. HEHN: And then as to which of
14 the two methods are going to be used?

15 MS. TOBIAS: At this time, we plan on
16 using the Ph methods from ENSYS and the BTEX
17 method you were shown tonight from D-Tech.

18 MS. NELSON: This is Pat Nelson.

19 Excuse me, what were you going to use
20 for PBC?

21 MS. TOBIAS: What was that?

22 MR. WONG: ENSYS.

23 If we could move along to the FOSL, I
24 know that's more questions here, but this is an
25 item that is coming up, and I think that's the

1 30-day comment period.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

3 I would like to introduce Anthony
4 Saponara from ERM-West who is our consultant for
5 the environmental baseline survey and has also
6 prepared the draft finding suitability to lease
7 for two land parcels immediately across the street
8 from us here for use by the City of San Francisco
9 for film productions.

10 So Anthony is going to present a
11 brief overview of this document which will be
12 available to the RAB, Restoration Advisory Board
13 members in the next two weeks.

14 MR. SAPONARA: Yes. My basic goal
15 here tonight is to introduce this document to the
16 RAB, and I have to emphasize, at this point it's
17 in the predraft stage. This is not even
18 considered a draft.

19 And Jim was just delivered copies of
20 it this morning, so even the Navy has not had a
21 chance to review it. But we felt it was important
22 to introduce the documents to the RAB so you feel
23 comfortable with what is inside and so when you
24 see it, you will be able to understand what it is.
25 And because it's a predraft and the Navy has not

1 had a chance to review it, what I am going to do
2 is basically present just real broad based
3 findings. And I would like to defer any questions
4 or, you know, especially any technical questions,
5 to a later date when at least the Navy and those
6 regulars have had a chance to review it. So, but
7 with that --

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

9 And you have a handout?

10 MR. SAPONARA: That's right. There
11 should have been a handout on at least all the RAB
12 members' chairs outlining what we are talking
13 about and an attached site map.

14 This document is basically two
15 things. It's called a Sites specific EBS which is
16 an environmental baseline survey for Parcels 5 and
17 6. And it's also FOSL findings of suitability to
18 the lease. So it's basically two documents in
19 here.

20 And the Sites Specific EBS part of
21 this includes all of the environmental baseline
22 information dealing with Parcels 5 and 6.

23 So that includes all of the title
24 search information, all of the aerial photo review
25 information, all of the interviews, all of the

1 information that was gathered during the site
2 inspections.

3 All that information dealing with
4 Parcels 5 and 6 is in here in this Sites Specific
5 EBS.

6 The second part of the Sites Specific
7 EBS is a risk evaluation, and we talked about it
8 briefly earlier. And what we did was we looked at
9 the worse case levels of soil and ground water,
10 the elevated levels of contaminants in the soil
11 and the ground water and did a risk evaluation to
12 find out whether there are potential risks
13 associated with this and whether the potential
14 risks are relevant given the lease scenario.

15 This figure here which you all have a
16 copy of shows Zone B which is, essentially which
17 is Parcel 5 and 6. And they're located, unless I
18 am turned around, right over here -- where the
19 facility is where we are sitting in right now is
20 somewhere over here (indicating).

21 And the second part of this document
22 is a FOSL, that's the finding, the suitability to
23 the lease. And that includes the items in the
24 EBS, the basic, the findings in the EBS that are
25 relevant in terms of the lease, meaning that it

1 excludes things without properties that wouldn't
2 impact the person leasing or whoever is leasing
3 the building or the tenant inside there.

4 So it only discusses the sites of
5 specific things that occur on this facility that
6 might be encountered by a tenant. And also, the
7 FOSL presents lease restrictions which are
8 proposed lease restrictions that we have
9 recommended that should accompany this lease based
10 on the environmental factors that were identified
11 on these properties.

12 And as far as the proposed usage for
13 those two parcels, I think we talked about this
14 earlier, too. But the proposal is a follow-on
15 lease to the City of San Francisco to be used as a
16 movie production facility.

17 And this site usage is defined as an
18 industrial usage.

19 I am sure most of you are already
20 aware that the buildings are currently used for
21 this now so that the lease really isn't going to
22 change much.

23 I guess the term of lease has not
24 really been real decided at this point.

25 Let's move on to some brief findings.

1 Probably the most important finding
2 is that, based on the investigation data
3 available, the environmental conditions at Parcels
4 5 and 6 did not pose a significant risk to the
5 tenants as long as the proposed risk or the
6 proposed lease restrictions are implemented. And
7 these lease restrictions are presented in your
8 handout there.

9 There's basically three lease
10 restrictions, and these are three very common
11 lease restrictions when there's environmental
12 issues involved.

13 The primary one is that the tenants
14 are going to be refrained from any intrusive
15 activities such as shoveling or trenching or
16 otherwise disturbing the subsurface soil.

17 The second lease restriction is that
18 the ground water is not to be used either as a
19 source of drinking water or used in the tenants'
20 operations, and given the operations that are
21 already used at the facility, ground water won't
22 be used for either of those.

23 And the third lease restriction is
24 that the tenants have to give access to the Navy
25 to finish the work that is being conducted at the

1 site and not, obviously not obstruct them and give
2 them pretty much immediate access to investigative
3 remediation activities, should they occur at the
4 site.

5 I guess we can talk a little bit more
6 about the risk assessment aspect of this project.
7 Let me back up and just summarize some of the
8 environmental concerns that were raised at the
9 site.

10 The major one is that you can see
11 from the shaded areas is a little bit difficult to
12 see here, but there's a shaded area here that
13 occupies this portion of the Parcel 6 that's been
14 designated as IR Site 25, and that IR site was
15 identified because Parcel 6 and the one above it,
16 Parcel 7, in those areas were used as a former
17 seaplane maintenance area, and there has been a
18 certain amount of subsurface investigation.

19 We have done at least two episodes of
20 investigation. The first involved borings and
21 soil sampling, and the second one involved
22 additional borings and ground water sampling. And
23 to date, there have been elevated levels of
24 organic contaminants present in the ground water.

25 The key thing to remember there,

1 though, is that the site is virtually a hundred
2 percent paved. All the building, all the activity
3 is going to be above the ground surface, and so
4 therefore the tenants -- the risk of the tenants
5 is minimal.

6 MR. ONGARTH: Is it safe to assume
7 that's been there for over 55 years?

8 MR. SAPONARA: The contamination or
9 the --

10 MR. ONGARTH: The contamination from
11 the seaplane base.

12 MR. SAPONARA: You know, I don't know
13 offhand what the date of that activity was.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

15 I think basically you're right. The
16 seaplane operation has ended some time just after
17 World War II, so 1945, 1946.

18 MR. ALCEDO: The Pan American
19 operations ended before they took over. There was
20 no more Pan American coming in here. And the
21 Navy, as far as I recall, during the early part of
22 the war, did not use seaplane operations out of
23 there. It did some out of Alameda. It did some
24 out of Moffatt.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: So it's approximately

1 50 years since seaplane operations took place, so
2 there may have been other Navy maintenance
3 operations in the area, so we don't have a final
4 cutoff date.

5 MR. ALLMAN: John Allman.

6 If it's been 50 years since the
7 operations have been performed there and you're
8 still measuring high levels of organics in the
9 soils and ground water, that means either an awful
10 lot of stuff was dumped and there's some pile of
11 stuff being released from the time it was done.

12 What I am wondering is the areas that
13 are paved over now during the lease before
14 transferring the property to the City, is the
15 Navy, does the Navy intend to clean it up before
16 it's signed over to the City or are they just
17 going to tell the City, "Well, just don't ever
18 take away the paved surface"?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Let me clarify.

20 This whole finding of suitability is
21 strictly for lease. We are not transferring
22 property at this point in time.

23 MR. ALLMAN: So the lease then, I
24 would presume, would go up to the point where if
25 they figure it's going to take six months to clean

1 up that area, the lease would end six months prior
2 to the transfer date, and then it would be cleaned
3 up by the Navy before the transfer occurred, with
4 possible delay if it's not cleaned up in time?

5 I mean, doesn't it make more sense to
6 clean it up now?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: Basically, we are
8 trying to make the property available to the City
9 because it asked for it. If, you know, they
10 hadn't asked for it, then we would continue to --
11 we would be continuing in our clean up either way.
12 But we are trying to make the property available
13 to the City community as early as possible.

14 And if we can make the property
15 available while we are still continuing the
16 investigation and the clean up, then it's a
17 winning situation for both us in the community
18 rather than for us to say, "Wait until we are done
19 with the clean up," which would be five or six
20 years from now.

21 And the whole reason for doing this
22 finding of suitability is to determine whether or
23 not it's safe in terms of risk assessment to allow
24 this community use of the property before the
25 clean up is complete.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. WONG: Okay.

Again, I think this was just supposed to be a brief introduction, and we will be receiving, in the next couple of weeks, the actual copy of the FOSL, if I am not mistaken.

MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

Those RAB members, and I think I recall having a sign-up sheet at the last meeting, and then I am also putting out a copy of the document at the end of the meeting so you can at least see what it looks like and read through it a bit if you want.

And I put an additional sign-up sheet so you don't think you signed up for it last month and want to sign up for it now, go ahead.

So I anticipate that maybe, as it's typical, maybe six or seven of the members will ask to have a copy of this. But we weren't going to mail it out to everyone.

MR. WONG: So what should happen is those that want a copy of this will receive it at the next meeting. We will have a presentation discussion on risk assessment and risk evaluation, some of what went into developing the FOSL. And then we still didn't have a discussion on the

1 FOSL. Then when people have had a chance to read
2 it, then we would still have a couple weeks even
3 after that meeting if people want to make comments
4 and what not.

5 So if it's okay with everybody, I
6 would like to maybe close that conversation so
7 that we can touch on EBS itself and then wrap up
8 the meeting.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

10 What I would like to do now is then
11 to solicit any comments that you may still have on
12 this document, the environmental draft, basewide
13 survey, which is what we had the workshop on
14 several weeks ago because we are closing out the
15 comment period on this now so that we can proceed
16 to finalize the document by the end of May.

17 MS. NELSON: This is Pat Nelson.

18 Were the comments that were discussed
19 with the group at the workshop going to be
20 commented at the next RAB? Do we need to keep
21 them here?

22 We have specific comments.

23 MR. SULLIVAN: I am just asking this
24 question of everyone. Was there going to be any
25 written comments coming from anyone from Arc

1 Ecology?

2 MS. NELSON: No, we were counting on
3 comments, and we discussed with the BCT being
4 reflected in the next draft. That was my
5 perception, maybe.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: The comments I
7 found -- and maybe Anthony can echo that, too -- I
8 thought were somewhat broad. Some of the comments
9 were broad, and I am not sure. I think I have to
10 state that I don't anticipate that we would be
11 able to incorporate the comments in total.

12 MS. NELSON: I guess what was
13 interesting to me and the other people that
14 attended the subcommittee meeting elaborated, we
15 have a lot of IR sites. We have different site
16 designations that need to be translated into these
17 areas that are being considered for lease.

18 And, I believe there were
19 recommendations that a matrix and drawings be
20 prepared so members of the community RAB can pick
21 up the EBS and translate it into a lot of
22 technical documentation and will be receiving as a
23 result of the underground storage tank studies and
24 the IR site studies.

25 MS. CASA: Mary Rose Casa.

1 It was my understanding at the
2 workshop that those particular items, the matrix
3 and certain clarifications regarding the maps,
4 would be delivered as a separate deliverable, that
5 they would no be specifically incorporated into
6 the division of the environmental baseline survey,
7 so if that's not the case, I think that has to be
8 stated.

9 MS. NELSON: Well, I guess the
10 purpose of my bringing it up is so that the
11 comment is recorded so the matrix and the drawings
12 can be prepared either as part of the revision or
13 as a separate document.

14 I need to understand, are they being
15 accepted as such.

16 MR. NEDELL: I do recall that past
17 comments we went into a long discussion about the
18 fact, and I think that this map is illustrative of
19 the problem that has got three different
20 designations for the same area, Zone B, Parcel 6,
21 IR Site 25.

22 And my understanding was that that
23 information and that comment was being taken back
24 and was going to be acted upon as part of the
25 comments for the environmental baseline survey.

1 I further understood that there was
2 going to be some sort of executive summary that
3 was going to be presented to give us a feeling of
4 what the document really entails here.

5 As I recall here, there was a
6 presentation of information in a binder that was
7 five inches thick. But my comment was, is that,
8 you know, I am not prepared to sort through the
9 details of that, and I am looking for some
10 distillation of that information in a digestible
11 form that is understandable to me.

12 And thirdly, I recall we discussed
13 whether or not we were going to review some
14 additional area of photographs that perhaps were
15 available through sources other than what we
16 investigated initially. So to that extent, I
17 guess they're not on the written record, and they
18 should become part of the comments that become
19 part of the response to that document.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. The way I would
21 like to address that is say that I think in as far
22 as our ability to do an additional analysis at
23 this point, we need to finalize. We need to at
24 least get the basewide survey final, at least as
25 far as this point in time. And I cannot say at

1 this point in time whether or not we will be doing
2 additional photographic analysis. But at least
3 for the purposes of our contract with ERM-West, we
4 need to close out this document. But this
5 document will continue to be updated in the
6 future, and we may, if we need to do additional
7 photographic analysis, what we will do in terms of
8 readability, we will take your comments, as far as
9 the matrices and drawings, and make some
10 modifications to the documents for readability and
11 for ease of use.

12 And to and including looking at how
13 we did our summaries up front and, if necessary,
14 having a one- or two-page executive summary which
15 just explains the document.

16 MS. CASA: I am Mary Rose Casa.

17 I have a question.

18 Is this type of summary that was
19 presented for the FOSL useful? Is it getting
20 close to what that committee was asking for and
21 maybe just take that as -- and you don't
22 necessarily have to answer now -- but if it's
23 close, let us know. And if you want to say,
24 "Well, it's almost there but maybe take this idea
25 and modify it a bit," I think that the Navy and

1 ERM would find that helpful.

2 MR. NEDELL: Rick Nedell.

3 I will respond because I was probably
4 the strongest proponent of that type of summary.
5 And I think this comes close to being a fact sheet
6 that I find that presents the salient information
7 so I can seek out other information if I need it,
8 but distills the important information in a form
9 that is readily digestible.

10 But typically, the third sheet of
11 this which has the depiction of the site with all
12 the different designations on it to me that needs
13 to be done basewide.

14 MR. WONG: If I could interject here.
15 I was going to save this for closing remarks, but
16 since it's come up, I might as well address it
17 now, is I remember very much what Rick and Pat had
18 said about what was going to be done, my
19 recollection was the same as theirs. And what
20 happens, though, is it gets lost in the
21 conversation because I think there were people
22 from ERM who were agreeing and saying they would
23 incorporate it and saying it would be easier and
24 all of that. But the big issue is it's getting
25 lost in what are specific requests and what are

1 comments, and what seems to be happening
2 repeatedly is what we are viewing as requests are
3 being viewed by the Navy and the regulator as
4 comments. And so nothing goes anywhere.

5 So what I would like to do is, as I
6 mentioned in the beginning, there's a draft of
7 some administrative items that just need some
8 clarification. What are requests? What are
9 comments? When do we get our packets? What do we
10 want in the executive summaries? Things that just
11 make our lives easier. And we keep dancing
12 around. So I would like to, once again, see if we
13 can't have that discussion outside of this meeting
14 and just sit down and take a look and be able to
15 say in a concise way, "Here is what we need. What
16 can you give us?" And come to some resolution and
17 then just present it at the next meeting in May.

18 And then we just move on from there
19 because we are not gaining any ground and I think
20 the frustration level goes up. There are things
21 like getting executive summaries and the agenda a
22 week beforehand so people can read things and just
23 move through.

24 The BCT meetings that I received have
25 a very good system in the minutes of action items,

1 action items completed, and things like that. And
2 we just need to have a discussion and spend some
3 time on let's choose this model and make things
4 easier, and so if people are amenable to that, I
5 would again like to recommend who would like to be
6 on that subcommittee or group to see if we can't
7 have a meeting with Jim and whoever else he thinks
8 is appropriate so we can just put these to rest
9 and come up with that administrative game plan.

10 And once again, I will jump in and
11 volunteer.

12 MS. NELSON: Pat Nelson.

13 I will volunteer.

14 MR. WONG: Anybody?

15 MR. LOFTMAN: Clinton James.

16 MR. NEDELL: This is Rick Nedell.

17 And my sense is that virtually
18 everybody has an input here that they want to get,
19 but perhaps we need to just have a conversation
20 either after this meeting or at some other regular
21 scheduled opportunity and express our interest to
22 Jim and you and where we would like to see some of
23 this administrative stuff go.

24 We discussed it at some extent at
25 that last meeting --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. WONG: Right.

MR. NEDELL: -- the EPS meeting, and I think we got a lot of information across to Jim, but perhaps it needs to be refined.

MR. HEHN: I just wanted to suggest that some of the things you're talking about about having these action items are maybe one of the things we need to do as the RAB and have special subcommittee meetings or meetings with various agencies or contractors, whatever.

When we get done with this, we can summarize where our action items are, make it very specific, make it very clear here is what we are looking for. And then if we have minutes or summaries of that meeting, that these are spelled out so there isn't any confusion. And I think we had that all worked out, now it's on the waste side. And now we need to make sure it's specified.

MR. WONG: So we seem to have a consensus here how do we want to do this? Do you want to stay after the meeting or set another time and whoever wants to attend come to that meeting? If that's good with you, Jim, if we could just stick around afterwards?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, with that, we
2 are ready to close out the meeting. We did have
3 some proposed agenda items for May. In today's
4 agenda, we were going to present an overview of
5 our compliance program which is something that you
6 have expressed an interest in wanting to talk
7 about and wanted us to explain more.

8 As, suggested, I am going to insert
9 an item on risk assessment, and then we will have
10 the results of the Phase 2A ground water study.
11 And then, under RAB business, we talked about
12 finalizing our RAB operating procedures, so that
13 would be four, four major agenda items for May.

14 And then we also have some proposed
15 agenda items for June or July, June and July,
16 excuse me.

17 Are there any comments or any
18 proposed additional especially for next month's
19 agenda? So that would be, for next month it would
20 be compliance programs, risk assessment, Phase 2A
21 ground water study results and RAB operating
22 procedures.

23 MR. HEHN: Was there going to be some
24 also updated discussion during the May meeting of
25 the additional membership?

1 MR. WONG: And we need to have more
2 discussion on the FOSL as well.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

4 MR. WONG: Laurie.

5 MS. GLASS: Laurie Glass.

6 At some point in here, some of the
7 listing condition studies for planning process are
8 going to become available. Did you want to have
9 that now to summarize or something?

10 MR. SULLIVAN: What you mean is --
11 Jim Sullivan.

12 -- the City, as part of its reuse
13 planning, prepares a condition summary of Treasure
14 Island. Now, that environmental is actually just
15 one part of it, which includes like the roads and
16 utility and buildings. And you're suggesting that
17 they may want a presentation on that?

18 MS. GLASS: No. I am just looking at
19 this realizing there will be some overlap.

20 Yeah, I mean it really lies outside
21 the purpose of this committee. On the other hand,
22 you know, there is some -- I am thinking
23 specifically of the June technical information
24 which really concerns seismic earthquakes.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: I would like to

1 suggest that's probably outside the RAB. It's
2 really getting into the issues related to Reeves
3 (phonetic). In the actual environmental portion
4 of the City's condition report is just miniscule.
5 It's on the far more general level than what we
6 discuss at these meetings.

7 MS. GLASS: I am not sure it will be
8 miniscule, but anyway, there's another avenue, as
9 I think about it, is the CRC meetings will have a
10 fair summary of the results, so that will be
11 available.

12 MR. WONG: And has everybody here
13 received those, everybody on the RAB received
14 those?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Jim Sullivan.

16 Our procedure is then to try to, for
17 us to get a copy from Laurie and mail them out,
18 and I am not sure that --

19 MS. GLASS: It just went out.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: We will just be
21 getting ours so we will be mailing them to you.

22 MS. CASA: Mary Rose Casa.

23 I would like to comment as for
24 another baseline I am working on, there was a
25 special meeting on the reuse to present the

1 pre-existing conditions. I attended that, and I
2 found it very interesting, and I would just
3 recommend that people from the RAB who are
4 interested attend that session, the appropriate
5 session for the CRC.

6 MS. GLASS: That would be another
7 avenue. Thank you.

8 MR. WONG: Okay. Anything else?

9 MR. NEDELL: Yeah. I have a comment
10 on the proposed agenda for next month.

11 It seems like we are biting off an
12 awful large amount of tasks to accomplish, the
13 compliance program, Phase 2A ground water result
14 and risk assessment presentation, membership
15 discussion and administrative procedures, any one
16 of which could take two hours.

17 I think we need to make some sort of
18 ranking of what it is we really want to accomplish
19 next month and decide how we are going to address
20 those issues.

21 MR. MEYERS: Donald Meyers.

22 I think I can help you there.

23 I think at the last RAB meeting and I
24 think also at EBS workshop, we requested a listing
25 of all the programs, all the contractors and the

1 status of those programs for this base because
2 people were confused about the programs they
3 hadn't heard of and the compliances, so perhaps
4 rather than having a presentation on compliance
5 program that matrix were produced and the RAB were
6 to read it a week beforehand and maybe the number
7 of questions that people had would be very much
8 produced. And so only a small amount of time
9 would be needed to cover that issue.

10 MR. SULLIVAN: I took a stab at
11 putting one together for this. This is still in
12 kind of a draft form. I apologize. I was just
13 learning how to use windows so the spreadsheet
14 didn't come out that well.

15 But basically, I have listed the
16 major programs, the consultants, the contractor,
17 if there's actually any clean up going on and the
18 reports. But this is still kind of in a draft
19 stage.

20 What I would like to suggest is that
21 since the membership, the finding of suitability
22 to lease, the RAB operating procedures and the
23 risk assessment are, I think, important issues
24 that we may be better off to move the compliance
25 programs from May to June, and maybe that would

1 dovetail better with the availability of the
2 underground storage tanks report which is actually
3 compliance, and maybe that would make for a more
4 manageable schedule so we are not racing to go get
5 through things.

6 So unless there's anything, any other
7 comments, I will move compliance, and I will
8 incorporate that into the June program.

9 And so, for May, we will have the
10 membership, finding the suitability to leave, the
11 RAB operating procedures, the risk assessment and
12 the ground water study results.

13 MR. WONG: Any comments?

14 Everybody is comfortable with that?

15 MR. MEYERS: One further question,
16 and this is just a rumor I heard.

17 I heard a rumor that Brad Conklin
18 (phonetic) was going to be contingent on having a
19 reused plan. Do you have that?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I have that. But
21 the budget, the federal budget process is -- we
22 are in the middle of the federal budget process.
23 We are, as of a few months ago, the President
24 submitted his budget to Congress. Congress is now
25 working on the budget for the next fiscal year,

1 and that won't be voted on until probably
2 September or so. But there has been some
3 questions of whether there will be enough BRACK
4 funding to fund all of the clean up activities.

5 And one of the methodologies being
6 looked at is there has to be some distribution of
7 limited funds is to whether or not there is a
8 reuse plan in place. The idea being that if
9 there's a community, for example, Vallejo which
10 has completed a reuse plan for Mare Island
11 Shipyard, they're ready to proceed with reuse,
12 then maybe if there are limited clean up funds,
13 that the clean up funds should be used there where
14 somebody is going to be ready to use the property
15 when it's cleaned up versus another location where
16 there may not be a reuse plan where the Navy or
17 other DOD agencies expended money to clean it up.
18 The property might sit there waiting for the
19 community to produce a reuse plan.

20 MR. MEYERS: Thanks.

21 MR. WONG: Okay. Anything else?

22 I have just one last closing comment
23 that is there are some requests going back to the
24 membership issue here is, as all the applications
25 for membership come in, that all applications are

1 shared with all Community members of the RAB so
2 they can review them, and everybody knows who's on
3 the committee, and the people can call in their
4 thoughts on the people who have applied for the
5 positions to the committee to help with that
6 process.

7 So I would like to make a request
8 that we do receive all the applications of all the
9 Community members who receive copies of the
10 applications and then call in any of your comments
11 to members of the committee.

12 MS. NELSON: Pat Nelson.

13 I think that's a good idea, but I
14 don't want to see any of the applications myself,
15 so please make note of that.

16 MR. WONG: You won't default.

17 Otherwise then, the meeting is
18 adjourned, and those that want to stay and discuss
19 some administrative items, you're welcome to.

20 (Proceedings concluded.)

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, the undersigned, a duly authorized Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that the within proceedings were taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction and supervision, and that this transcript is a true record of the said proceedings.

Neela Brundau