

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

COPY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

23 MAY 1995

7:00 P.M.

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 10

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR #1268

407

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

A T T E N D E E S

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

- James Aldrich
- Laurie Glass
- Paul Hehn
- Martha Kohler
- Clinton Loftman
- Daniel McDonald
- David Moser
- Donald Myers
- Rick Nedell
- Patricia Nelson
- Henry Ongerth
- Patsy Reese
- Dale Smith
- Brad Wong, Community Co-Chair

REGULATORY AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES

- Amy Brownell
- Mary Rose Cassa
- Rachel Simons

U.S. NAVY REPRESENTATIVES

- Lt. Nannette Roberts
- Jim Sullivan, Navy Co-Chair

1 (The meeting was called to order at  
2 7:10 p.m.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome,  
4 everyone, to our May Restoration Advisory Board  
5 meeting.

6 For those of you who are members,  
7 there are places here at the table; and your name  
8 placards are in the back.

9 For those of you who are guests, who  
10 are responding to our advertisings over the last  
11 couple of weeks, we want to welcome you to  
12 Treasure Island. We have a sign-up sheet in the  
13 back. We would like to get your name down there,  
14 so we can keep you on our mailing list.

15 We also have some refreshments in the  
16 back, as well as displays on either side of the  
17 room, which you are welcome to look at during and  
18 after the meeting.

19 I have some extra copies, but all of  
20 the members should have received a copy of the  
21 agenda in the mail. I do have some extra copies  
22 if anyone at the table needs one.

23 For our guests, there are also copies  
24 of the agenda on the back table. It is a single  
25 sheet of paper on both sides.

1                   Are there any comments regarding  
2                   tonight's agenda?

3                   We have a slightly shortened agenda,  
4                   from 7:00 to 9:00, rather than 9:30.

5                   With that, we will approve the agenda  
6                   for tonight.

7                   The next item is a discussion of the  
8                   meeting minutes. I went ahead and mailed out a  
9                   copy of the March meeting minutes, because it  
10                  appeared that some people had not received them in  
11                  the mail last month. So you should have received  
12                  both a copy of the March and the April minutes.

13                  The April minutes are the first  
14                  minutes that we produced using the stenographic  
15                  service, so tonight is the second meeting in which  
16                  we have used the court reporter services.

17                  Any comments regarding with the March  
18                  or the April minutes?

19                  MR. MYERS: I have an addition on the  
20                  April minutes, I guess it is, yes, page 5, the  
21                  third paragraph.

22                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Why don't we try to  
23                  tick off the March first.

24                  Are there any changes, edits or  
25                  comments that need to be added to the March 28th

1 minutes?

2 Does anybody want to make a motion to  
3 accept them?

4 (It was moved, seconded and carried  
5 that the March minutes be approved.)

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: Now, the April 25th  
7 minutes; and, Don, you have page 5?

8 MR. MYERS: Page 5, paragraph 3. I  
9 asked how the extent of contamination can be  
10 defined if cleanup levels have yet to be  
11 established, and there was another part to the  
12 question, which was how the feasibility study  
13 would be performed without a full data set.

14 So that was really a two-part  
15 question.

16 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay, so the minutes  
17 need to reflect the second part of the question  
18 that Don just mentioned.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have the  
20 verbatim transcript. We will go back to that.

21 CO-CHAIR WONG: Are there any other  
22 comments or questions concerning that?

23 I would like to entertain a motion to  
24 accept the April 25th minutes, edited according to  
25 Don's comments.

1 MS. SMITH: Brad, excuse me for a  
2 minute; but Andy's name is misspelled here  
3 somewhere. I can't find it, unfortunately.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will go ahead  
5 and look for that separately.

6 MS. SMITH: Page 3, actually.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

8 Okay, with that, is there a move to  
9 accept the minutes from the April meeting?

10 MS. SMITH: As corrected.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As corrected.

12 (It was moved, seconded and carried  
13 that the April 25th minutes, as corrected, be  
14 accepted.)

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What we would  
16 like to do now is, we are just starting the circle  
17 of review of past action items and solicitation of  
18 new action items; and we have the board here to  
19 write them on.

20 What we would like to do, at least so  
21 we get started for this meeting, is for anyone to  
22 identify any specific action items of concern from  
23 the past; and we will add them to the board now;  
24 and as we go through the meeting, we will add new  
25 action items.

1                   And at the close of the meeting, we  
2 will review all the action items to ensure that  
3 we're all in sync as to what the Navy is going to  
4 do, what action the Navy is going to take, between  
5 now and the next meeting. So we really have to  
6 jump into this cycle.

7                   At this time, if there are any action  
8 items of particular concern to the community  
9 members that you would like us to identify now?

10                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Those action items,  
11 as identified today and in the future, will be  
12 appended to the minutes.

13                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

14                  MR. MYERS: I recall asking for a  
15 matrix of things ongoing and the current status of  
16 contractors, I believe.

17                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's correct.  
18 That is an uncompleted item, matrix of programs  
19 and contractors.

20                  We took a stab at it last month; but  
21 we need to expand on that; and if we approve the  
22 agenda for the June meeting, we will be discussing  
23 those programs in more detail.

24                  MR. HEHN: Also talking about getting  
25 the compiled maps of all the areas' programs that

1 are ongoing in the IR and UST on the one base.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have Sharon  
3 Tobias from PRC; we have a mini-draft of that,  
4 which they have been working on, and you are  
5 welcome to look at during the break and after the  
6 meeting; so we certainly would like to get your  
7 comments on that, the base map with plastic  
8 overlays.

9 We hope to be able to have a  
10 full-sized version of that map for our next  
11 meeting and for subsequent meetings.

12 MR. HEHN: Some of the other action  
13 items that were on my original list were items  
14 that we were going to be covering tonight, new  
15 members.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is on the  
17 agenda.

18 MR. HEHN: And there was a request  
19 for update on the status reports of Phase IIA, as  
20 we put in the PRC prospective; and that is  
21 something that is going to be moved off until next  
22 month still?

23 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have a handout  
24 on the base groundwater results. We're going to  
25 discuss it very briefly, but we do have a handout

1 for that.

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: So one action item is  
3 to discuss the Phase IIA groundwater assessment --

4 MR. HEHN: Results, yes.

5 CO-CHAIR WONG: And the new  
6 membership is taken care of.

7 MS. NELSON: I recall two items:

8 One was master matrix, would be a  
9 master schedule of all the environmental work  
10 that's going on on Treasure Island, whether it is  
11 IR, UST.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will change  
13 the first one to the matrix and schedule.

14 MS. NELSON: Also, I recall we were  
15 going to have a demonstration of the immuno  
16 assays.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, as a matter  
18 of fact, we're going to discuss tonight what days  
19 in the next month or two that you wish to have  
20 that arranged. Right now we are prepared to do  
21 that on a date that you choose.

22 CO-CHAIR WONG: I'm not sure when the  
23 appropriate time is if we do throw it down for the  
24 record, the schedule of the testing of the immuno  
25 assays, as well as the sampling, immuno assay and

1 core sampling technique.

2 MS. NELSON: It would be the  
3 traditional sampling which you might want to  
4 expound on.

5 CO-CHAIRMAN WONG: Any other  
6 outstanding action items from previous meetings  
7 that you wanted to bring up?

8 We can add all during the meeting and  
9 get it up on the board.

10 MR. HEHN: One of the outstanding  
11 action items was the discussion that, way back  
12 whenever, of the asbestos issue. Do we have a  
13 resolution of that, do you feel, at this point?

14 That has been out there for a long  
15 time.

16 CO-CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We have been  
17 working towards including it in our agenda, and we  
18 had it on the proposed June agenda. Maybe just to  
19 make sure that I'm being clear, when we talk about  
20 compliance programs, we are, in effect, referring  
21 to everything other than the circle program; so  
22 even the UST program is really in the compliance  
23 area.

24 If you will look in the cleanup plan,  
25 it generally divides everything into IR and other;

1 and the other is the compliance program. So we  
2 planned to do a presentation on these other  
3 programs, at the June meeting.

4 MR. HEHN: That would be another  
5 action item.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: Is that covered under  
7 the matrix schedule of all the applicable?

8 MR. HEHN: It would be a matrix,  
9 whether or not it is covered to the degree that  
10 Brad has agreed to look at slides that have been  
11 out here for a long time. We want to discuss  
12 that.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can leave it  
14 under a separate item, the presentation on the  
15 compliance program.

16 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any other  
17 outstanding? And again, we can always add to that  
18 as we go along. This is just to get us started so  
19 we know where we need to go.

20 Then, under "Organizational  
21 Business," there are three items that we wanted to  
22 discuss for this evening, to keep getting us  
23 organized, I guess; and those include the  
24 recruitment of new members; the acceptance of the  
25 RAB Operating Procedures, which we had done a

1 couple of edits last fall, but we never formally  
2 signed off on. And then the last point was, there  
3 was a feeling among a number of the community  
4 members that it would be helpful to establish a  
5 set time for an additional meeting for community  
6 RAB members to get together between the major RAB  
7 meetings, as a way to discuss any outstanding  
8 issues, review documents, and kind of help us  
9 decipher some of the information and figure out  
10 where we're going.

11 So we wanted to see if we can set up  
12 a timetable on the schedule for that, that  
13 everybody could come to or not, as they felt  
14 appropriate, and then as we needed to maybe draw  
15 in some of the regulators, or the Navy, or some  
16 experts to help us go through documents or  
17 whatever, so we could do that.

18 Those were the three items identified  
19 as organizational issues; but before we swing into  
20 the recruitment and new members' update, as you  
21 recall last time, we asked Dan to chair the New  
22 Members Subcommittee, to chair that effort.

23 I have asked him to give us an update  
24 this evening. Jim wanted to say a few words for  
25 potential new members in the crowd, to give them a

1 quick overview of what the RAB process is.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I just wanted to  
3 say a few words as kind of a lead-in to Dan.

4 For those of you who already received  
5 applications in the mail or faxed, we have  
6 included like a two-page question and answer  
7 sheet, with typical questions about the  
8 Restoration Advisory Board. There are also  
9 additional copies of that on the back table.

10 Basically, the purpose of the  
11 Restoration Advisory Board is to involve the  
12 public in our environmental cleanup program, the  
13 idea that we involve the public at an early stage,  
14 that there will be acceptance of our final cleanup  
15 plan two years down the road, as well as the  
16 ongoing cleanup activities we have now.

17 There is also a parallel effort going  
18 on within the City of San Francisco, planning the  
19 reuse of Treasure Island; and the Restoration  
20 Advisory Board is not part of that.

21 The Restoration Advisory Board is  
22 working with the Navy and the Navy's  
23 responsibility for the cleanup of Treasure Island.  
24 And the City of San Francisco has its own Reuse  
25 Committee, which is working with the City on the

1 plans for the redevelopment of the Island.

2 So the Navy's goal is to turn over  
3 the property in a clean condition, ready for  
4 reuse. The goal of this Advisory Board is to  
5 assist the Navy in the speedy and effective  
6 cleanup of the Island.

7 And with that, I would like to ask  
8 Dan to say a few words about our recruiting  
9 efforts.

10 MR. MC DONALD: In response to our  
11 previous meeting, I worked with Jim to develop an  
12 ad to go out to the community. Donald Myers  
13 assisted in the editing of that at one point. It  
14 went out over the last two weeks in four different  
15 newspapers, both East Bay and San Francisco  
16 editions of The Examiner and The Chronicle; the  
17 East Bay editions of The Guardian and The Weekly.

18 Since the advertisements were placed,  
19 there have been 97 requests for applications,  
20 which have been sent out. And there have been 14  
21 applications received already.

22 So it would seem to me that we have a  
23 pretty good response in the works. I would guess  
24 we would probably have another 15 or 20  
25 applications to review before we are done.

1                   It would be my hope that by the  
2                   deadline for applications, which is June 2nd, we  
3                   will then have a stack of applications to review,  
4                   plus the ones that were submitted last year.

5                   We will convene our subcommittee; we  
6                   will all get a set of those; we will read them;  
7                   and we will probably meet twice before the next  
8                   meeting to come up with a slate of candidates to  
9                   submit.

10                  So that will happen probably the week  
11                  of June 5th and June 12th for those committee  
12                  members, and I will be in contact with all of you.

13                  MR. NEDELL: Just a point of  
14                  clarification:

15                  When you say "all will get a copy,"  
16                  do you mean everybody in the group or just the  
17                  subcommittee?

18                  MR. MC DONALD: I believe we decided  
19                  just the subcommittee members.

20                  MR. NEDELL: Everybody that's  
21                  currently seated in the RAB should receive a copy  
22                  so they have an opportunity to comment.

23                  MR. MC DONALD: That's fine. I  
24                  didn't know that is what everybody wanted.

25                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Could we add that as

1 an action item, that all community members, at a  
2 minimum, receive all applications for new members  
3 to the RAB; and then Dan will be convening the  
4 subcommittee to produce a slate; and the slate, as  
5 a whole, will be voted on at the next meeting; is  
6 that right?

7 MR. MC DONALD: I believe, by prior  
8 agreement, we will need seven new members; and I  
9 believe that the proposal was that we would come  
10 up with a slate of at least seven to vote on out  
11 of that group of new applications and old  
12 applicants who still remain interested.

13 MR. MYERS: You might like to make  
14 that eight, because I will be leaving the country  
15 for an extended period of time. I resigned my  
16 position from ARC-Ecology and will be resigning  
17 from RAB.

18 MS. NELSON: Will the ARC be  
19 resigning?

20 MR. MYERS: ARC will hold its  
21 position as long as they can. How long that will  
22 take for a replacement, you will have to be  
23 patient about. If they can't find a replacement,  
24 they will have to relinquish their position,  
25 according to the charter.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Will this be your  
2 last meeting?

3 MR. MYERS: Probably one more. I'll  
4 be here in June or July, but I'm not sure of my  
5 schedule.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Although the Navy  
7 won't be officially a part of this, I would like  
8 to make a recommendation -- a comment and a  
9 recommendation:

10 One comment is that we are ready to  
11 provide you with whatever assistance you need in  
12 terms of meeting space or reproduction or whatever  
13 support the Selection Committee, the subcommittee,  
14 needs.

15 That is the role we played last year.  
16 Neither the Navy nor the other government members  
17 were actually involved in the selection, but we  
18 acted as the facilitators to the three community  
19 members that did provide the selection, so we are  
20 prepared to provide you whatever assistance is  
21 needed.

22 And then the recommendation will  
23 be -- you might want to consider maybe, in  
24 addition to the seven or eight or nine, to have a  
25 couple of alternates or standbys. If we're going

1 through the process of reviewing applications and  
2 presenting a slate, you might want to have at  
3 least a larger pool, so that should there be a  
4 need to bring additional members in, you have at  
5 least a ready group.

6 MS. KOHLER: I would recommend that  
7 the subcommittee put at least seven or eight,  
8 now, alternates, just in case, so the process can  
9 move forward, in case there are some commentary  
10 that the original people are not the ones that  
11 want to be selected.

12 I think if you have to go back again  
13 and review all these resumes, it is going to be a  
14 real burden on you.

15 MR. MC DONALD: I think that makes  
16 sense.

17 MS. SMITH: Are you contacting the  
18 people who applied a year ago or so to inform them  
19 that their applications are now live again?

20 MR. MC DONALD: We will be doing  
21 that, yes.

22 MR. ONGERTH: The ninety figure you  
23 have cited, does that include the earlier  
24 applications?

25 MR. MC DONALD: No, these are all new

1 interests.

2 MR. ONGERTH: Thank you.

3 MS. NELSON: How many applications  
4 have gone out?

5 MR. MC DONALD: Ninety-seven requests  
6 for applications were sent out. There have been  
7 14 applications received back, and I believe that  
8 Jim said that one of those is one of the prior.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: At least one of  
10 them that came in the mail today, who is a  
11 previous applicant, who is very interested. In  
12 fact, he is an associate, a co-worker of Nathan  
13 Brennan. He had been in the previous meeting and  
14 inquired about taking Nathan's place.

15 Also, Henry brought up a point to me  
16 in that we do have, of the 18 community members on  
17 the roster right now, two have been consistent  
18 no-shows; and we have kind of been holding off  
19 removing them from the roster of the 25 original  
20 members, community members.

21 The only ones that we have actually  
22 removed from the roster are those who have told us  
23 that they were resigning or leaving the area.

24 So of the 18 now, there are two who  
25 have never been to a meeting before.

1 MS. CASSA: Are they going to be  
2 asked during this round, or are they going to be  
3 replaced?

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think that actually  
5 leads into the next topic, if there is not  
6 anything else you want to add, Dan, or any other  
7 comments about that.

8 We have done some revisions to the  
9 Operating Procedures, and there is actually a  
10 process in there, on page 3, "Meeting Attendance,"  
11 that addresses that issue; and it is again  
12 something we have not paid too much attention to  
13 at this point.

14 After two consecutive missed meetings  
15 for which there is no explanation given, there is  
16 supposed to be a contact by the Navy Co-Chair to  
17 see if they're still interestd or not. And after  
18 three missed meetings, with no explanation given,  
19 there will be written notification.

20 MR. NEDELL: This is still considered  
21 a draft, and I think, before we take actions that  
22 are proscribed by this particular document,  
23 perhaps we ought to decide whether this is indeed  
24 going to be the procedure.

25 CO-CHAIR WONG: You read my mind. We

1 need to approve this, and then we can probably  
2 enact what it is that is written here, as amended.

3 So I would like to move on to this  
4 and see if people have any comments, edits or  
5 changes to the operating procedures, as presented,  
6 sent to you.

7 They do represent the changes that  
8 were made at the last meeting of 30 November. I  
9 have a copy here with the strikeouts and all the  
10 changes that were suggested at that meeting.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically what I  
12 did for this copy is just take out all of the  
13 changed markings to create a smooth copy, but it  
14 is the same document.

15 MS. SMITH: Comment, under RAB  
16 Procedures, we have, I believe --

17 CO-CHAIR WONG: Which page is that?

18 MS. SMITH: Page 4, "Meeting  
19 Attendance." It's page 3.

20 We have a way of booting people out,  
21 but we have no way of kicking people into the RAB.  
22 We have left out half of the procedure here. We  
23 have no formal process.

24 Obviously, Dan is doing this; and  
25 this is fine; but I think it should be written in

1           there.  If it is, tell me where I can find that  
2           part about adding people to our RAB.

3                         CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  It does not  
4           appear to be in there.

5                         MS. SMITH:  We're just going to  
6           eliminate people over time.

7                         CO-CHAIR WONG:  Would you like to  
8           make a suggestion as an added empowerment for Dan  
9           to do what he is doing?

10                        MS. SMITH:  I don't know, I wasn't  
11           here last time; but whatever process you set up  
12           for setting him up to move forward, I suggest be  
13           incorporated into the language.

14                        CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  It sounds like,  
15           to me, we need to say something under paragraph E;  
16           and I would recommend keeping it ultra simple,  
17           'saying something like: "The community members, at  
18           their discretion, may appoint a subcommittee to  
19           solicit and recommend a slate of additional  
20           community members."

21                        MS. SMITH:  Something of that sort.

22                        CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  If that sounds  
23           non-controversial enough, we can write it in.

24                        MR. MC DONALD:  That fits Section  
25           D.5. on page 5, which talks about the

1 establishment of ad hoc committees; so I think  
2 your wording would be appropriate.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe Brad and I  
4 could spend a brief period of time over the next  
5 couple of weeks and come up with a very simple,  
6 one or two-sentence statement.

7 MS. NELSON: I have a suggestion.

8 If we added to Section 4, maybe we  
9 can entitle that "RAB Community Membership  
10 Requirements."

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Change the title  
12 of paragraph 4 from "Meeting Attendance" to?

13 MS. NELSON: "RAB Community  
14 Membership Expectations or Requirements."

15 MR. LOFTMAN: You just have a  
16 separate Section.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's a  
18 good idea. It dovetails well with the whole  
19 discussion of membership.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: So we're changing  
21 Section 4 under "Community RAB Membership," and we  
22 will add a Section E that empowers the community  
23 members to create a subcommittee, a membership  
24 subcommittee, to develop a slate of essentially  
25 what Jim says.

1                   So we will pull that out of the  
2                   "Members." We're not going to be able to approve  
3                   these as they are.

4                   MR. NEDELL: Why don't we approve  
5                   these tonight and amend them next month, so we can  
6                   move ahead with dealing with the people that have  
7                   been selected that have not participated, and  
8                   there's nothing that says that once you approve  
9                   these as our operating procedure, we can't amend  
10                  them.

11                  So if we accept this this evening,  
12                  then we can move ahead on the next item, which  
13                  entails communicating with and contacting these  
14                  people that have not been participating; and then  
15                  next month we can amend Section 4, change the  
16                  title, add paragraph E, and continue with our  
17                  process.

18                  MS. NELSON: I second that. That's a  
19                  good idea.

20                  MS. SMITH: I have another item I  
21                  wanted to bring up. I brought it up in November.

22                  We really don't have a way for the  
23                  public to speak before us. It is not really an  
24                  issue; but as we get into this further, we don't  
25                  have any kind of forum for the public to attend

1 and comment to us their feelings.

2 MR. NEDELL: I believe that's dealt  
3 with on the agenda under "Open  
4 Questions/Discussion."

5 It seems to me our operating  
6 guidelines deal with our activities, not  
7 necessarily those.

8 MS. KOHLER: You could deal with that  
9 by every agenda. Typically the second item is  
10 comments from the public on non-agenda items.

11 MS. SMITH: That is kind of what I  
12 asked for before.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: I notice you're  
14 saying the second agenda item, or do we need to  
15 provide a space within the agenda?

16 MS. SMITH: The second agenda item.

17 MS. KOHLER: You can put it anywhere  
18 you like. Some public groups like this put it at  
19 the end, because there's a lot of contentious  
20 issues that tend to sort of melt away the whole  
21 meeting time.

22 Other groups put it at the beginning,  
23 just to get it out of the way and allow people to  
24 leave if they want to.

25 MR. NEDELL: As long as it is not

1 agenda items.

2 MS. SMITH: Even if it is, the public  
3 is allowed a certain amount of time to comment;  
4 and after that comment period, the Commission goes  
5 back to its discussion.

6 MR. NEDELL: Are you proposing that  
7 this be added to our operating procedures?

8 MS. SMITH: Well, I think it needs to  
9 be put somewhere. I don't feel comfortable  
10 omitting the public.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We need to say  
12 somewhere, an item in the operating procedures,  
13 that says we iterate that all meetings are open to  
14 the public and the co-chairs shall provide time  
15 for public comment.

16 MS. NELSON: I think that could be  
17 concluded under Roman numeral V, "Participation,"  
18 where it talks about comments to be voiced under  
19 appropriate Section or comments unrelated to the  
20 discussion at the appropriate time.

21 Maybe just a simple clarification.

22 CO-CHAIR WONG: I thought that is  
23 what A. and B. was put in there for.

24 MS. NELSON: That was my  
25 recollection, too; but maybe we need to deal with

1 it more clearly.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It sounds like we  
3 want to clarify between the community RAB members  
4 and the public at large.

5 MR. NEDELL: I think that it is  
6 inclusive. It lets anybody make a comment, so  
7 it's not restricted to RAB members.

8 My interpretation is that is an  
9 avenue for the public at large to make comments  
10 and leaving it sort of imprecise.

11 MS. SMITH: But people don't  
12 understand "Comments will be voiced during the  
13 appropriate Section." I don't think the public  
14 knows they can just walk up to the mike and  
15 comment.

16 MR. NEDELL: It says:

17 "General comments, or comments unrelated to  
18 discussion at hand, will be held until an  
19 appropriate time, generally at the end of  
20 the meeting, reserved for such comments."

21 So if they want to make comments, it  
22 is dealt with there. If they want to comment on  
23 an agenda item, it is still under A.

24 MR. MC DONALD: I would like to  
25 suggest that we let the community co-chairs take

1 all these comments to heart, make some suggested  
2 changes, bring it back to us, and we get on to the  
3 substantive part of the agenda tonight.

4 MS. NELSON: My understanding is that  
5 we have adopted these, and modifications or  
6 amendments will be proposed or articulated at the  
7 June meeting for adoption at that time.

8 And that would include the  
9 clarification of Section V.A. and Section IV.

10 Is that everybody else's  
11 understanding?

12 CO-CHAIR WONG: Yes, Sections IV. and  
13 V.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We can operate  
15 with these, and then we will amend them.

16 MR. LOFTMAN: One more comment on  
17 'II.B., serving a minimum of one year. Will that  
18 accommodate what we are using in terms of Brad and  
19 Paul?

20 MS. SMITH: Actually, we changed  
21 that. We wanted people to have flexibility. I  
22 think Brad even said something about three months.

23 CO-CHAIR WONG: We can strike this  
24 and be flexible.

25 MS. CASSA: You can say something

1           like a year is desirable.

2                   CO-CHAIR WONG: To serve for a period  
3 of time as decided by the community members.

4                   We talked about three months for  
5 Paul; three months for me; and see where we go  
6 from there.

7                   MR. HEHN: Jim got the best idea on  
8 that. Leave it out altogether. I don't think we  
9 need to put a time in there. I know the original  
10 idea was that.

11                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would recommend  
12 to keep guidelines as flexible as possible and  
13 adjust them as needed.

14                   Okay, we can take those comments to  
15 heart. We have approved the non-amended  
16 guidelines, and we will work with them starting  
17 tonight, and then Brad and I will present  
18 amendments next month.

19                   MS. NELSON: Would you consider that  
20 an action item for inclusion on the list?

21                   CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. Amendments  
22 to operating guidelines.

23                   MR. LOFTMAN: I should add one more  
24 comment:

25                   I would advocate for putting a public

1 comment period on the agenda itself, since most of  
2 the public won't see the operating procedures and  
3 assuming they won't get to every meeting.

4 MR. HEHN: In the timeframe, adding a  
5 slash, "questions/discussion/public comments."

6 MS. SMITH: I would prefer toward the  
7 front rather than towards the end of the meeting  
8 for three minutes' worth of comments.

9 MR. ONGERTH: There is some logic to  
10 do it at the end, so they have an opportunity to  
11 comment on something they heard at the meeting.

12 MS. SMITH: Theoretically that is  
13 already in here.

14 MR. ONGERTH: My point is still  
15 valid.

16 CO-CHAIR WONG: What if we were to  
17 give five minutes up front for public comments;  
18 and when it runs over, we just table it for  
19 anybody who wants to stay and comment back to the  
20 open discussion at the end?

21 MS. SMITH: At a time period at the  
22 beginning, and if that time period runs --

23 CO-CHAIR WONG: Everything gets cut  
24 off and tabled to the open discussion period.

25 Does that work for everyone?

1                   Public comment we will do right after  
2                   the welcoming remarks, and you will get cut off  
3                   after five minutes and tabled to the open public  
4                   comments period.

5                   MR. NEDELL: Point of information:  
6                   Did we agree and vote on accepting  
7                   these tonight?

8                   CO-CHAIR WONG: I thought we accepted  
9                   these as is tonight.

10                  MR. NEDELL: The statement is kind of  
11                  a fiat.

12                  CO-CHAIR WONG: And then vote on the  
13                  amended version the next time, so we can get on  
14                  with it.

15                  MR. NEDELL: It seems to me, if we're  
16                  going to take an action, we take an action as a  
17                  group, vote on it, separate it, and move on with  
18                  it.

19                  I just suggested it, but I don't know  
20                  that you said anything, just sort of a fait  
21                  accompli.

22                  CO-CHAIR WONG: I'm sorry, I thought  
23                  I'd asked that we make a motion to accept.

24                  MR. NEDELL: It was proposed and  
25                  seconded, but no action was taken.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: All those in favor  
2 say aye; all those opposed, no.

3 (The motion carried.)

4 CO-CHAIRMAN WONG: The last is the  
5 next operational item, which is the establishment  
6 of an additional RAB meeting for community  
7 members, in order to help digest a lot of the  
8 information we get and to be able to discuss some  
9 of the ideas and other things we might have that  
10 would actually help facilitate these monthly RAB  
11 meetings.

12 And, Paul, you brought this up as an  
13 issue that was of concern.

14 MR. HEHN: Yes. In some helpful  
15 conversations over the last few weeks, we talked  
16 about the necessity or the value of having an  
17 interim sort of ad hoc meeting between the regular  
18 RAB meetings for particular issues that might be  
19 of interest, and they can be of anything that we  
20 need to bring up and talk about further or could  
21 be a presentation by one of the regulatory  
22 agencies or by some subcontractors, like we had  
23 previously, on some technical issues -- just  
24 something to focus the attention when there is  
25 more discussion that is needed than time allows at

1 the RAB meetings.

2 I would like to propose that we  
3 schedule that on a regular basis sometime between  
4 the other meetings so that everybody knows that  
5 there will be a meeting at a particular time and  
6 that we have further issues that we want to talk  
7 about.

8 We can do that, or we can bring up a  
9 variety of issues, and we can always stay in  
10 contact if somebody wants to know when the issues  
11 will be discussed at a particular meeting -- it  
12 could be Brad or myself or anybody else -- to give  
13 somebody input as to what we're going to be  
14 discussing at a particular meeting.

15 I don't think we have settled on a  
16 time or place necessarily. We have several  
17 options.

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: It had been raised to  
19 maybe schedule these two weeks after or two weeks  
20 before the monthly RAB meetings, to try and break  
21 up to even it out; but in terms of the actual  
22 place and all that, it is yet to be determined.  
23 It might change depending upon whose office is  
24 available, or something of that sort.

25 So I would like to see if people have

1 thoughts about the necessity to do this; and if  
2 you thought it was a good idea, to just institute  
3 a standing time that people know there's going to  
4 be a meeting and be flexible in terms of getting  
5 the word out to everybody what time, and where  
6 that meeting would be, and what the agenda is.

7 MR. HEHN: One thing occurred to me.  
8 This might be a place where the Navy could be of  
9 help to us, once we establish this, to find a  
10 place. Maybe Jim can mail that out to various  
11 members.

12 Would that be possible?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You mean an  
14 additional mailing? Once we have established it,  
15 we can just build it into the agenda; but we can  
16 certainly provide whatever announcement, support  
17 or meeting location support that you need.

18 MR. HEHN: Okay, great.

19 MS. KOHLER: Are there some candidate  
20 times and locations?

21 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to  
22 recommend that it is the second Tuesday after a  
23 RAB meeting, and you can just build it into your  
24 schedules that way, but it is really up to the  
25 community members what you all think.

1 MS. KOHLER: Is this center available  
2 for those meetings?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It could be. Let  
4 me make sure I understand this correctly.

5 This is basically a proposal to have  
6 more of a working level meeting.

7 We also had several, half a dozen or  
8 so, working-type meetings in our Naval Station  
9 Headquarters, the first building inside the gate.  
10 We will provide space for it. I would sort of  
11 anticipate it being a little smaller group.

12 Also, you anticipate this of being  
13 more of an optional meeting?

14 MR. HEHN: Right.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If we have it in  
16 our conference room in Building 1, that is  
17 probably adequate.

18 MR. HEHN: If that would be a good  
19 central location, or we could find locations in  
20 the city, also, or East Bay. We could rotate  
21 them.

22 MS. NELSON: Certainly the conference  
23 room that has been available at PG&E can be made  
24 available in the future on a regular basis, and  
25 that's near a BART line.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: The conference room  
2 at my office, which is right at the Montgomery  
3 Street BART station in the city, can be available,  
4 too. I don't know if anybody wants to volunteer  
5 on the East Bay and spread it out, but I think the  
6 important thing is to have an action on whether we  
7 want to establish this second Tuesday after the  
8 RAB meetings as the appropriate time.

9 MR. NEDELL: Just a comment on the  
10 second Tuesday after the RAB meetings:

11 It could be the first or second  
12 Tuesday of the month, depending on whether you  
13 have a five-week month or four-week month. You  
14 might want to say the second Tuesday of the month,  
15 because we meet the fourth Tuesday of the month,  
16 and that way it is much easier to fix that  
17 particular day, as opposed to shifting from month  
18 to month.

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: Do we have a motion  
20 for the second Tuesday of the month, establishing  
21 this informal ad hoc committee?

22 MR. NEDELL: So moved.

23 MS. NELSON: Second the motion.

24 (The motion carried.)

25 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay, I think what we

1 need to do, then, the next one would be June 12th,  
2 if I'm not mistaken; and, Pat, would you be  
3 willing to donate your space for that?

4 MS. NELSON: Absolutely.

5 MR. NEDELL: That's the 13th, I  
6 believe.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: It will be June 13 at  
8 the PG&E Building.

9 MS. NELSON: Twenty-fourth floor,  
10 Room 2452.

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: And what time?

12 MS. NELSON: I would prefer six  
13 o'clock or thereabouts; then we can leave at  
14 eight.

15 MS. CASSA: Where is the PG&E  
16 Building located?

17 MS. NELSON: 77 Beale Street.

18 MR. MC DONALD: Beale and Mission or  
19 Beale and Market.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: Could I entertain a  
21 motion to accept the time and place of the  
22 meeting?

23 MR. LOFTMAN: So moved.

24 MR. HEHN: Second the motion.

25 (The motion carried.)

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To finally  
2 clarify, is this a meeting to which the Navy and  
3 the community would jointly work up an agenda and  
4 at which we, the Navy, would be making  
5 presentations; or is this a community member  
6 meeting?

7 MS. NELSON: It is a community member  
8 meeting, but depending on what the topic is, we  
9 would like clarification from various consultants.  
10 We might want them in attendance.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, this is a  
12 working meeting of the community members at which  
13 the Navy may be asked to participate?

14 MS. NELSON: Right, the Navy or any  
15 other regulatory agency.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's the close  
17 of the organizational business, and we're about 45  
18 minutes over schedule, so we will try to get back  
19 on the schedule.

20 I want to say a few words about our  
21 upcoming environmental reports.

22 There are two reports out now. One  
23 is the Draft Site-Specific EBS/Finding of  
24 Suitability to Lease EBS of Zone B for Film  
25 Production. This is what it looks like:

1 About 10 people have requested it,  
2 and have received it (indicating). If anyone has  
3 not received it and would like it, they can see me  
4 or Hugo Berston after the meeting, and we can make  
5 a copy available to you.

6 The comments for this document are  
7 due between this meeting and the next, on the 12th  
8 of June; and the reason for that schedule is to  
9 allow us to finalize the changes by the end of  
10 June so that that can be included with the Draft  
11 Lease for this site, which will be going to the  
12 City of San Francisco in about the early July  
13 timeframe, because the leases will take effect on  
14 or about the 1st of August, and it takes a couple  
15 of weeks to work its way through the City and the  
16 Navy.

17 The second document is the  
18 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for Removal  
19 Action, and I think that went out while I was in  
20 Chicago.

21 Have people received this document?  
22 It was fairly slim.

23 MR. MYERS: Yes.

24 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There was a  
25 sign-up sheet at the last meeting, and it was

1 mailed out, I think, directly from our Engineering  
2 Field Division at San Bruno.

3 If there's anyone who has not  
4 received this document that would like it, again,  
5 see me sometime before we leave; and we can make a  
6 copy available.

7 It is a slimmer document than the  
8 Finding of Suitability to Lease, and the comments  
9 on that are not due until actually the next  
10 meeting, so there is a little more time.

11 Next, Program Updates.

12 Rachel Simons from USEPA is prepared  
13 to say a few words about the action of the BRAC  
14 Cleanup Team over the last month.

15 MS. SIMONS: May 1st, we had a  
16 meeting on the environmental baseline survey; and  
17 essentially there was a scoping meeting to begin  
18 preparation of the sampling plan to specify which  
19 parcel could potentially need to be looked at.

20 EPA also performed, on May 3rd and  
21 4th, an evaluation of the Navy Quarterly  
22 Groundwater Sampling; and we also took a split  
23 sample.

24 PRC started the base work on May 16,  
25 and they started like 14 and 22; and also this

1 month the agency submitted their review comments  
2 on the draft for --

3 MR. HEHN: Do you have any results  
4 back from the splits?

5 MS. SIMONS: No, I really don't know.  
6 It will be at least 30 days.

7 MR. HEHN: Same constituents as the  
8 PRC?

9 MS. SIMONS: Yes, it is the same  
10 analysis.

11 MS. NELSON: What is the relationship  
12 between the sampling plans for the EBS and the  
13 sampling that PRC is doing for the IR sites?

14 MS. SIMONS: What this is, this is  
15 separate from the IR sites, where the  
16 environmental baseline survey identified data gaps  
17 that just have never -- they were like the first  
18 identification of some area, that potentially  
19 could be contaminated, that is not included in the  
20 IR Program, and so those parcels were Category 7;  
21 and so there may be some parcels where we will  
22 need to actually do some sampling to see if there  
23 was a release.

24 MS. NELSON: And if those areas would  
25 need to be made into IR sites?

1 MS. SIMONS: If they found  
2 contamination, it would be turned over to the IR  
3 Program, like a PASI frame.

4 MS. NELSON: Preliminary assessment;  
5 so there are potentially more IR sites?

6 MS. CASSA: Right.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is a  
8 potential. One of our challenges will be to see  
9 what alternatives to bring in additional sites  
10 into the circle program. I think there are some  
11 benefits to looking at alternatives to the circle  
12 program in order to speed the cleanup.

13 Laurie Glass -- that is not really  
14 Laurie Glass there, it is Laurie Scott from the  
15 City of San Francisco's Planning Department,  
16 sitting in for Laurie. Laurie may be here later.  
17 If she does come in, she will present a brief  
18 couple of minutes' update on the actions of the  
19 Citizens' Committee, the Citizens' Reuse  
20 Committee.

21 So with that, our next agenda item  
22 was Risk Assessment, and maybe we will take the  
23 opportunity of a brief five-minute stretch break.  
24 There is coffee in the back, and we will resume  
25 with the presentation of risk assessment.

1 (Short recess taken.)

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have a  
3 presentation on risk assessment, and handouts are  
4 being passed out. The purpose of this  
5 presentation is to start an initial discussion on  
6 risk assessment, which we intend to build over  
7 subsequent meetings.

8 Also, although it is a general  
9 presentation on risk assessment, it does relate to  
10 the finding of suitability to lease for Zone B,  
11 which does include a risk element.

12 So although this risk assessment  
13 presentation is not going to discuss that document  
14 in particular, it will serve as a baseline from  
15 which to build.

16 CHRISTINA KABITZKE: I work with PRC.  
17 I have worked on the project for the last three  
18 years. I have not been to any of the recent RAB  
19 meetings, but just to let you know I have been  
20 involved and I'm going to be more involved, as we  
21 start taking more of these substantive measures.

22 Your handout mimics the overhead  
23 exactly, so you can follow along with me.

24 The intent of this talk is to kind of  
25 put the risk evaluation that was done for the

PAGE 44

THIS PAGE IS NOT AVAILABLE.

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

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

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

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280

E-MAIL: [diane.silva@navy.mil](mailto:diane.silva@navy.mil)

1 derive risk for people who are working out on the  
2 site or potential future workers of the site, and  
3 the goal is to determine, if the property is left  
4 unremediated, what would the hazards be or what  
5 would the risks be.

6 It helps you decide whether it would  
7 turn up at the other sites.

8 The screening level risk assessment  
9 that is done for the FOSL is different from the  
10 baseline in that it does not involve any  
11 calculations. What it involved was using existing  
12 data, comparing them to bench mark values, which  
13 are provided by the EPA, and concluding from that  
14 whether or not anything had exceeded these bench  
15 mark values or not.

16 It's not as comprehensive as the  
17 baseline in human health risk assessment, and the  
18 goal is actually entirely different. It is just  
19 to figure out if this space, if the property to be  
20 used in its intended use that is coming along with  
21 like deed restrictions or limitations on the  
22 lease, which I will get into on the next slide.

23 There was a risk evaluation conducted  
24 at Buildings 2 and 180. The goal was to determine  
25 whether it was safe for the movie industry to

1 lease these buildings, and the activities that  
2 were conducted included review of the site history  
3 and operations, and then the screening procedure I  
4 just spoke about.

5 Soil data were compared to USEPA  
6 preliminary remediation goals. Those are levels  
7 that are considered safe levels.

8 The groundwater concentrations were  
9 compared to USEPA Region IX preliminary remedial  
10 goals and also to maximum contaminant levels.

11 And then, finally, there was a model  
12 done to determine the benzene in groundwater, to  
13 determine if that imposes a risk if it comes into  
14 the building and people breathe benzene in the  
15 air, coming from the groundwater.

16 The results of those activities I  
17 just spoke about were that all of the soil  
18 concentrations that had been found during previous  
19 investigations, all of those concentrations were  
20 less than Region IX PRG's.

21 Groundwater concentrations were also  
22 less than minimum PRG's, but the benzene  
23 groundwater concentration exceeded the maximum  
24 contaminant level.

25 And, finally, the modeling that was

1 done for the volatile organic compounds, for the  
2 benzene in the groundwater, were found to pose an  
3 acceptable risk for people who would be leasing  
4 these buildings.

5 The results of the risk evaluation  
6 were used in the FOSL, and the findings in the  
7 FOSL concludes that, although it is potentially  
8 not a problem to be in contact with the soils  
9 there, the lessee is going to be prohibited from  
10 disturbing the soil and from installing any  
11 monitoring wells being contacted by any of the  
12 groundwater.

13 I should clarify what I just said,  
14 that the PRG comparison by itself does not imply  
15 that something is safe or not. You have to do the  
16 baseline risk assessment like I was talking to  
17 before.

18 So screening does not necessarily  
19 imply the absence of risk; therefore, we're  
20 talking about the lessee not being in contact with  
21 soil or digging or trenching and that sort of  
22 activity, and also not being in contact with the  
23 groundwater.

24 Does anyone have any questions about  
25 this?

1 MR. NEDELL: On the previous slide,  
2 which reported the results, your second bullet  
3 item indicates, in the second clause, that it  
4 exceeded some maximum contaminant levels on  
5 benzene.

6 MS. KABITZKE: Okay.

7 MR. NEDELL: Perhaps there are more  
8 criteria than just one that it exceeded. I don't  
9 understand; it says "Some maximum contaminant  
10 levels." Of what?

11 MS. KABITZKE: I'm sorry, maybe it is  
12 unclear the way I wrote it.

13 Benzene was the only contaminant that  
14 exceeded the maximum contaminant level.

15 MR. NEDELL: Are there multiple  
16 levels that benzene can exceed?

17 MS. KABITZKE: No, there is one  
18 contaminant level; and benzene in groundwater at  
19 this site did exceed that level.

20 MR. NEDELL: So correctly, this  
21 states that only benzene exceeded the maximum  
22 contaminants?

23 MS. KABITZKE: That's correct.

24 MR. NEDELL: All other measures were  
25 within the guidelines?

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

MS. KABITZKE: Yes.

MR. NEDELL: On the third bullet, you said "were found to pose acceptable risks."

These volatile organic compounds, what does that mean?

MS. KABITZKE: That means that the EPA or the DTSC acceptable is traditionally a term that is more of a risk management tool, and the EPA and the DTSC have set acceptable risk levels.

MS. NELSON: Can you tell us what they are?

MS. KABITZKE: Sure.

MS. NELSON: Are we at Prop 65 standards or one in a million standards?

MS. KABITZKE: Well, I can tell you what they did with their study.

MS. CASSA: Why don't you say it?

MS. KABITZKE: For this modeling, for cancer, the acceptable risk level they looked at was an incidence of cancer of one into one million, one of one million people has the probability of getting cancer from exposure to benzene and the air in the building, and excess cancer means cancer greater than or over and beyond any other source of cancer you may have in

1 your life, like cigarettes or the kind of job you  
2 do.

3 "Excess" means purely related to  
4 exposure, so it is one in a million.

5 And this modeling that was done  
6 supported that it meant that level.

7 MS. NELSON: Were there air samples  
8 taken inside of these buildings to validate the  
9 model?

10 MS. KABITZKE: No, there were not.

11 MS. NELSON: Why not? Why wouldn't  
12 the Navy do that to confirm one way or the other,  
13 or why wouldn't the lessees want that done?

14 MS. CASSA: DTSC recommended that be  
15 done, and that is the comment.

16 MS. NELSON: Do we have those  
17 comments?

18 MS. CASSA: It has not gone out yet.

19 MS. NELSON: I would think that the  
20 occupational exposure standards should be  
21 addressed in the risk assessments for the interior  
22 space of the building, and any areas within the  
23 building that had previously stored what would be  
24 considered toxic or hazardous materials would be  
25 sampled, and the air would be sampled for the

1 contaminants known on that site, and any  
2 particulate matter that could be in the air, such  
3 as asbestos or some other form of uses.

4 MS. GLASS: There is a point about  
5 the soils having been looked at. There are a  
6 number of underground tanks in the vicinity, and  
7 cleanup is proceeding on some of the underground  
8 tanks.

9 Although the lessee is not going to  
10 disturb the soil, how is the cleanup process of  
11 the underground tanks related? Would it disturb  
12 any of the soil that is in this FOSL area?

13 MS. KABITZKE: Yes, it might. Part  
14 of the FOSL talks about if any work is done at the  
15 site, and that includes any kind of remedial work  
16 done at these sites that appropriate health and  
17 safety measures would be adhered to, and that is  
18 not only for the people doing the remedial work,  
19 but dust control measures would be placed if there  
20 were people who were leasing the building who  
21 would possibly be exposed to these.

22 MR. ONGERTH: Are there a range of  
23 exposure values depending upon the length of time  
24 of exposure?

25 MS. KABITZKE: Definitely.

1 MR. ONGERTH: Could you elaborate on  
2 that, please?

3 MS. KABITZKE: Sure.

4 MR. ONGERTH: One in a million is for  
5 a lifetime exposure. What are some of the figures  
6 for lesser time of exposure?

7 MS. KABITZKE: I'm summarizing the  
8 results the ER had done on this, had done the  
9 modeling.

10 I'm summarizing what was presented in  
11 the FOSL -- they probably looked at standard  
12 assumptions for risk assessment, which, for a  
13 worker, would mean a 25-year exposure duration;  
14 and that would be averaged over a lifetime of  
15 exposure for cancer.

16 If the workers were exposed for less  
17 than 25 years, the resulting cancer risk would be  
18 less.

19 I may be incorrect in saying that --  
20 actually I probably should not speak. I don't  
21 know what exposure duration they used in this.  
22 I'm not sure if Sharon has a copy of the FOSL back  
23 there, but I can let you know.

24 MR. ONGERTH: If it was based on 25  
25 years, then the smaller exposure or fewer amounts

1 of years would result in that modeling.

2 MS. KABITZKE: I can talk to you  
3 about that.

4 MR. ONGERTH: I think it is important  
5 for the rest of the group to understand that as  
6 well, not just me.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: Could I recommend  
8 that we put that as an action item we need to keep  
9 track of?

10 Specifically, Henry, what is it you  
11 want to know?

12 MR. ONGERTH: I'm interested in  
13 finding out what the exposure time is with  
14 relation to various levels of risk.

15 For a lifetime exposure, using a  
16 concentration that has not been given, and I have  
17 no idea what it is, that would result from, you  
18 would have one cancer out of a million people  
19 exposed for a lifetime. That's a number. There  
20 will be a concentration.

21 There will be a larger concentration  
22 number for shorter term exposure, but just citing  
23 something that may be not anywhere near reality,  
24 maybe the concentration is one microgram per liter  
25 for a 10-year exposure; and for a 70-year

1 exposure, it would be a smaller number.

2 MS. KABITZKE: I don't think that is  
3 correct, because exposure, the more exposed you  
4 are to something, the more likelihood there is of  
5 a risk. So the mean factor in the 70-year or the  
6 25-year exposure duration, the one in a million  
7 number that is factored in, if you only worked at  
8 this for 5 years, it's not that the risk  
9 increases, your exposure is less because you have  
10 only been there for 5 years, so the risk would  
11 decrease.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think maybe the  
13 action item is that we need to provide more  
14 information and clarify what the exposure scenario  
15 is for the risk assessment.

16 MS. NELSON: For the duration of the  
17 lease and the constituents that have been found on  
18 the site that identify the acceptable and  
19 unacceptable occupational exposures compared to  
20 lifetime risk.

21 MS. KABITZKE: I don't think that  
22 this leasing is going to go out for 70 years, so a  
23 lifetime risk is irrelevant.

24 Sharon brought me the calculation  
25 number that I quoted you. One in a million is

1 based on a 5-year lease, so it is a 5-year  
2 exposure.

3 MR. ONGERTH: Not a lifetime.

4 MS. KABITZKE: Not a lifetime. If it  
5 was a lifetime, or 10 years, or 25 years for  
6 working somewhere, then the risk would go up.

7 MS. NELSON: Those were the  
8 contaminants that have been found in soil and  
9 groundwater; and if I understand it, the interior  
10 air survey of the buildings has not been  
11 conducted. So as far as any of us know, there  
12 might be other contaminants that would be  
13 identified in that process that would have to be  
14 addressed in the rest of the evaluation.

15 MS. SMITH: Because this site is  
16 characterized as industrial, is there a difference  
17 in the risk threshold from what there would be --

18 MS. KABITZKE: In residential?

19 MS. SMITH: Not so much residential,  
20 but office use, because the film industry is not  
21 an industrial product.

22 MS. KABITZKE: Right. The kind of  
23 risk assessment that we have been doing, the term  
24 is "industrial and commercial," is what it kind of  
25 has been; but it kind of meant the same thing.

1                   There is a difference between  
2                   "industrial" and "commercial." The commercial  
3                   might be more of an office setting, but we assume  
4                   that is the setting of an industrial situation,  
5                   also.

6                   Industrial might involve more contact  
7                   with the soil than commercial or an office-type  
8                   setting would be.

9                   This particular risk assessment for  
10                  the modeling assumes that someone was inside in an  
11                  enclosed space, because that's the only way the  
12                  benzene could have a chance to accumulate. So it  
13                  did assume it was an enclosed space, which may or  
14                  may not be the case for that kind of operation.

15                  They may have open hangars, or  
16                  whatever.

17                  MR. MC DONALD: Does this risk  
18                  assessment assume some kind of mean level of  
19                  ventilation?

20                  MS. KABITZKE: Yes. The risk  
21                  assessment uses something called a box model. I  
22                  did not do the risk assessment, so I'm not  
23                  prepared to speak on it on those levels. If  
24                  people are interested, we can have a more in-depth  
25                  discussion at a future meeting.

1                   But the box model normally assumes a  
2                   certain amount of ventilation, and I'm not aware  
3                   exactly what that transfer rate is, what they use  
4                   in the model.

5                   MS. NELSON: Is that explained  
6                   anywhere?

7                   MS. KABITZKE: I think it is  
8                   explained in the appendix, the box model is  
9                   explained in the appendix, Appendix C.

10                  MR. NEDELL: I have a question,  
11                  because I'm trying to synthesize what you told me  
12                  here tonight.

13                  MS. KABITZKE: Okay.

14                  MR. NEDELL: Where do the volatile  
15                  organic compounds come from?

16                  MS. KABITZKE: The groundwater table.

17                  MR. NEDELL: No.

18                  MS. KABITZKE: Where do they  
19                  originally come from?

20                  MR. NEDELL: No, what are the VOC?  
21                  Are they coming from the benzene? Are they coming  
22                  from something else?

23                  MS. KABITZKE: It is only from the  
24                  benzene. That is all there is in the groundwater  
25                  there.

1 MR. NEDELL: Okay. Somehow you think  
2 that this benzene is going to migrate up into the  
3 building. What is the transport mechanisms that  
4 gets it up into the building?

5 MS. KABITZKE: Because benzene is  
6 such a volatile inflammable, like acetone,  
7 anything like dry wood (unintelligible). It may  
8 volatilize from the groundwater table through the  
9 soil, because soil has pores -- you know, it is  
10 like a sponge -- and seep in through any kind of a  
11 concrete foundation and get into the building.

12 There are a number of steps involved,  
13 so there is a lot of uncertainty with the model;  
14 and the suggestion to do indoor air modeling is  
15 probably a good one.

16 I should point out that the  
17 assumptions that were used in the model were  
18 health protective, so that each time you calculate  
19 the transfer from media from the groundwater to  
20 the soil, and then through the soil, through the  
21 concrete foundation into the air, there are some  
22 protection factors involved. So it's probably a  
23 protective number.

24 MR. ONGERTH: Is there a hypothesis  
25 where it came from in the first place?

1 MS. KABITZKE: I am not aware of  
2 that.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The benzene?

4 MS. KABITZKE: Yes.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The benzene is  
6 the result of the underground storage tanks that  
7 were located, about half a dozen former tanks,  
8 located in and around Building 2, because it was  
9 used as a seaplane hangar for the China Clipper.

10 MR. ONGERTH: How many years ago?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Some of the tanks  
12 may have been actually heating tanks associated  
13 with the building construction in 1938, and other  
14 tanks were related to maintenance operations, fuel  
15 line or maintenance operations, and were all  
16 probably installed in the 1940's era.

17 We are in the process of removing  
18 them now. In fact, we removed a number of them.

19 MR. ONGERTH: The volatilities that  
20 are there have been there for 50 years or emitting  
21 for 50 years?

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. The tanks  
23 that we have pulled, some of them still contained  
24 fuel in them; so even the abandoned tanks were not  
25 dry.

1 MS. TOBIAS: I just want to say that  
2 benzene that has been found in the groundwater is  
3 about 125 feet away from the building and closer  
4 to the Bay, so it is not adjacent to the building,  
5 it is pretty far away.

6 That might be something to keep in  
7 mind. It is not right there.

8 MS. NELSON: I just want to say, for  
9 the record, that what is in the soil and  
10 groundwater 125 feet away may not be germane to  
11 the risk assessment. And in the leasing of the  
12 interior space, an inventory should be done on the  
13 interior spaces, including air model or air  
14 monitoring and sampling; and that is more relevant  
15 than what has been produced here.

16 MR. HEHN: I totally support that  
17 idea, not only of the modeling of that and looking  
18 at the basic scenario that the model was done on,  
19 but also the air monitoring and the air sampling,  
20 because there are two things to keep in mind here:

21 One is that because groundwater is  
22 very shallow, down two or three feet, you don't  
23 have to volatilize very much to get into the base  
24 and the building.

25 And secondly, one of the things that

1 came out of the most recent groundwater sampling  
2 report we just got was the only well that I saw  
3 that had volatile constituents detected in the  
4 head space, up near the top of the well, were from  
5 the wells that were in site 25, which is one of  
6 the sites being leased, so there is volatilization  
7 up fairly high in that particular soil column, at  
8 least in those wells.

9 MS. GLASS: I think I know the answer  
10 to the question, but I want to ask, would the air  
11 sampling include testing for things like asbestos?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It could well.

13 MS. NELSON: Anything that is  
14 airborne.

15 MS. GLASS: So it would be sort of a  
16 broad spectrum search?

17 MS. NELSON: It could be.

18 MS. GLASS: Would that be a  
19 reasonable thing to do?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Possibly,  
21 although we have done an asbestos inventory of the  
22 building. The report won't be available for  
23 another two months or so, but we have done  
24 asbestos monitoring elsewhere on the Base in times  
25 in the past, and we have generally found where

1           there is not a problem, where there is not any  
2           real problem with damaged, friable material, that  
3           generally the air modeling does not show  
4           significant levels of asbestos in the air.

5                     If you had an interior building space  
6           where the pipe lagging was all damaged and  
7           asbestos debris was laying about, that's where you  
8           would tend to find higher levels; but where the  
9           building has been well maintained and there isn't  
10          any asbestos damage, we found, from mass  
11          monitoring, the levels are acceptable.

12                    We have actually kind of rolled into  
13          the next agenda item.

14                    MS. BROWNELL: I just want to make  
15          one comment about underground storage tanks and  
16          protecting if they're pulling tanks in  
17          remediation.

18                    All of the prophets state that if you  
19          determine that, because of remediation, you have  
20          to move out of the way, if you have to temporarily  
21          tell them not to be in there so you can do  
22          remediation.

23                    CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is a  
24          statement in the FOSL that relates to that the  
25          Navy will need to have access to the site for

1 cleanup and investigation.

2 And then there is also an item in the  
3 actual real estate leasing document, which will  
4 say something similar.

5 MR. NEDELL: I just have another  
6 question:

7 When you were estimating these  
8 concentrations of benzene and you referred us to  
9 Appendix C, you have this equation estimate of  
10 emission rate. Is that the estimated emission  
11 rate as it diffuses through concrete?

12 MS. NELSON: What is the source  
13 document for that?

14 MS. KABITZKE: The EPA '93 document.

15 MS. NELSON: Yes.

16 CO-CHAIR WONG: I know we have been  
17 running late all night, but one of the things  
18 we're supposed to do is discuss and answer  
19 questions about the FOSL.

20 And we're also rolling into the open  
21 questions and discussion time, and I just want to  
22 check with everybody, is this line of questioning  
23 holding all right? It seems like we're addressing  
24 some of the issues that we would be talking about  
25 under the FOSL and open question time.

1                   Is that all right with everyone if we  
2                   just let this roll?

3                   (There was general agreement.)

4                   MR. NEDELL:   Do you want me to  
5                   restate the question?

6                   MS. KABITZKE:   The methodology was  
7                   derived from the USEPA Guidelines, and your  
8                   question was, does this emission rate account for  
9                   the amount that comes through the concrete slab or  
10                  not?

11                  MR. NEDELL:   I guess what I'm asking  
12                  here, is this equation, which predicts an emission  
13                  rate of benzene in milligrams per second, is this  
14                  what I would expect to find when standing on dirt  
15                  substrate?  Is this what I would expect to find  
16                  coming on the asphalt, or is this what I would  
17                  expect to find coming through the concrete that is  
18                  in this building?

19                  MS. KABITZKE:   I'm not sure; I'm not  
20                  sure.

21                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:   That is something  
22                  we will have to clarify.

23                  MS. CASSA:   We have a special  
24                  toxicologist for DTSC, Calvin Willhite, who  
25                  reviewed this.

1 MR. WILLHITE: My name is Calvin  
2 Willhite; I'm a toxicologist who reviewed this  
3 book for you.

4 It is pretty simple, really. It is  
5 kind of like proof of the pudding, so to speak.

6 To answer your question, dirt, that's  
7 the answer to your question.

8 There are really sophisticated  
9 models, and Mary Rose has some references, and she  
10 will provide these for you. They are poroustic\*  
11 models, which come from the east, where they had  
12 radon going into houses and basements, all that  
13 kind of stuff. That is where they generate those  
14 kinds of things, and you can correct for that.

15 And that is doable, but in a lot of  
16 cases you want to ask, "is it worth it?" because  
17 you need to collect so much data, like depth of  
18 groundwater is simple, but it depends on the kind  
19 of soil you have, and this, that, and the other.

20 The real question you want to know,  
21 like for a little project like this, which it is,  
22 is what is the concentration I have inside the  
23 structure?

24 And then I want to know what numbers  
25 should I compare that value to?

1                   And you want to use actual area  
2                   sampling, and Mary Rose has the references for  
3                   that.

4                   You want to compare a couple or three  
5                   different kinds of numbers. One number you want  
6                   to look at in making your judgment is the  
7                   granddaddy of them all, it comes from the United  
8                   States Supreme Court, known as the Benzene  
9                   Decision; and that is the permissible exposure for  
10                  Cal OSHA, as well as Federal OSHA, one part per  
11                  million value.

12                  The next value in an environmental  
13                  context, take a look like at Proposition 65, no  
14                  significant risk value; and you can back-calculate  
15                  and you come up with another number, which is  
16                  substantially less, because they are different.  
17                  One is made by the Supreme Court, and one is made  
18                  by the risk assessment stuff, and that's the 10 to  
19                  -5, so you can ask yourself a question and the  
20                  details of this, but that is like the most direct  
21                  way. And you folks have answered the direct  
22                  questions to that document.

23                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Did I understand  
24                  everything right, that there was no air monitoring  
25                  done inside of the buildings despite us saying

1 this is a simple, straightforward thing? This  
2 FOSL was developed without ever doing the simple  
3 thing?

4 MR. WILLHITE: You don't have  
5 confirmatory data to validate the results of your  
6 model calculations.

7 MR. NEDELL: I guess my question gets  
8 more at, you started with a premise that this  
9 material is evaporating or may have gone up  
10 through dirt. And then you extrapolated that,  
11 putting it inside a building?

12 MR. WILLHITE: Actually, more  
13 interesting, there are a couple of references that  
14 Mary Rose had. This is about the way of what is  
15 real and what is imagined, and the real thing is  
16 if tank removals happen, there are published data  
17 it is a one part per million, which is the federal  
18 PEL. You can up to 9 in office buildings next  
19 door to where the tank pull is happening, because  
20 in the tank pull itself, you can raise to 30 parts  
21 per million.

22 So you can get pretty high doing a  
23 gasoline tank pull, and mainly to be reflected in  
24 concentrations in an adjacent structure. You  
25 don't want that to happen at the same time and

1 the -- under the Prop 65 warning and all that kind  
2 of stuff, so it is a matter of risk management  
3 that these folks do.

4 MR. NEDELL: That's interesting, but  
5 it still, I don't think, answers my fundamental  
6 question; and that is you made a statement about  
7 the apparent risk level for this usage, based on  
8 some data that you estimated.

9 And it seems like, fundamentally, you  
10 have omitted two things:

11 One is, you did not go into the  
12 simple part, which was, what is the real air in  
13 the building? You created a model, based on, to  
14 me, an erroneous assumption that whatever is  
15 coming out of the soil is also coming through the  
16 concrete, which does not -- and I'm not an expert  
17 at this -- but does not make sense to me,  
18 logically.

19 So maybe Paul can help me understand  
20 this or others in this group who are smarter about  
21 this than me.

22 MS. NELSON: The simple thing would  
23 have been an interior inventory or what is in the  
24 building, and the modeling is almost irrelevant.

25 MS. KABITZKE: I think one of the

1 things that was in the ER was published, they had  
2 these groundwater data available, and the indoor  
3 air monitoring occurred. When you do that, you  
4 try to figure out what are the risks associated  
5 with the contaminants with the groundwater on the  
6 ground.

7 When you do indoor sampling, you get  
8 a lot of things that are detected by sampling that  
9 may be related to materials in the building, to  
10 carpeting in the building, printing machines,  
11 which may not be the case if the building is  
12 unoccupied and everything; but you attribute  
13 something that was detected in the air by taking  
14 indoor air samples versus being attributed from  
15 the soil in the groundwater, which might be a  
16 little more tricky.

17 MS. NELSON: As far as I can see,  
18 what is in the interior of the building in terms  
19 of hazardous substances or releases is more  
20 germane to the FOSL than anything to the exterior.

21 And it's nice to know what's in the  
22 soil and groundwater might come up through a  
23 concrete foundation; but if I'm leasing a  
24 building, I want to know what's in there and if  
25 there was a spill in what was used as a hangar.

1 That's more important to me, finding that in the  
2 concrete, and finding out if it is still  
3 volatilizing and creating an exposure risk, than  
4 something that is in the subsurface of the  
5 groundwater.

6 And I am surprised that was not  
7 addressed in this document. In fact, I am  
8 appalled.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we based  
10 this assessment on what we thought, what we  
11 thought were the significant risks. And being  
12 that this facility, although it was built as as  
13 hangar in 1938, has been used for the past 40  
14 years or so as a Naval Reserve Center, and even  
15 though it is a hangar-type structure, its actual  
16 usage has been as a classroom and office facility.

17 When the reserve center vacated the  
18 facility, we did inspect the building for  
19 hazardous materials; and the only materials that  
20 had been present in the building in the past were  
21 typical materials that you would find in an  
22 office-type setting -- paints and cleaning fluids.  
23 There were no sumps or areas of industrial-type  
24 operation in the building.

25 And I think, based on that, it was

1 not deemed that we needed to do additional  
2 investigataive work inside the building.

3 What you will find, we may, in the  
4 next year or so, be doing a FOSL on Building 3, a  
5 companion building to the east of Building 2.  
6 That building does have an industrial usage,  
7 including up to now; so we expect that the FOSL  
8 for that facility will take a different approach  
9 than the FOSL for Building 2.

10 As a consequence of the discussions  
11 here and the comments that we just received or  
12 have been receiving from Cal EPA, we will probably  
13 be doing some confirmatory air sampling in the  
14 building; and that may at least help when we do  
15 FOSL's on other type or non-industrial type  
16 buildings. It may provide us a basis for not  
17 having to go into air sampling in every office  
18 space that we lease or transfer.

19 So the points have been well taken  
20 from both Cal EPA and the community members that  
21 some confirmatory air sampling should be done to  
22 confirm what we already feel that there is not  
23 additional threats inside the building.

24 MR. ALDRICH: Are you aware of  
25 whether the air has ever been sampled there during

1 the time it has been used?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We don't have any  
3 specific air data on the building.

4 MR. HEHN: Back to Rick's original  
5 question about that concrete.

6 What we found in industrial  
7 facilities, where you have benzene in groundwater  
8 below a concrete slab, oftentimes you have an air  
9 space immediately below the slab on, whatever  
10 grade material that slab is placed on, that tends  
11 to travel on benzene vapors; and we have in the  
12 past, when we were doing remediation under such  
13 buildings, had to go through and seal all the  
14 cracks and spaces where pipes go through, to  
15 prevent the vapor from going up into the building.

16 It's fairly easy to detect on the  
17 thickness of the slab, take an air sample, or  
18 literally just take a sample where there is a  
19 crack or something in the concrete, which probably  
20 there is in the buildings, considering their age  
21 and the number of earthquakes.

22 So there are avenues for that vapor  
23 to enter the building, even though there is a  
24 concrete slab.

25 So there are places that you have to

1 really address. Sometimes you have a concern  
2 about that, and we're talking about cases where  
3 the groundwater levels might have been down 20 or  
4 30 feet below that slab. And here we've got a  
5 very permeable soil. It tends to be more of a  
6 potential for vapors rising through the slab.

7 MR. NEDELL: Even though the sites  
8 are 125 feet away from the building?

9 MR. HEHN: Oftentimes, depending on  
10 what the history of those areas are, you will  
11 find, especially when you have a very flat ground,  
12 like you do out here, generally those things can  
13 be found out as far as six or eight hundred feet;  
14 but it is not unusual to have them several hundred  
15 feet away from the source, especially in the flood  
16 areas out here, plus tidal influence surging it  
17 back and forth, and moving it around in the  
18 subsurface.

19 MR. MYERS: There are float lines in  
20 the concrete as well, Ned. They corrode.

21 MR. NEDELL: It seems fundamental to  
22 me, if you have a space that is surrounding the  
23 building that's unsealed, there's no asphalt on  
24 it, just growing grass, that the potential for  
25 evaporation of the benzene from those areas would

1 be so much higher; and hence the gradient of  
2 concentration would be from the higher areas to  
3 those areas; -and it wouldn't go into the building,  
4 because the amount of material that would actually  
5 physically be moving through the buildings would  
6 be so small that my sense tells me you got a  
7 non-problem in these buildings.

8 That's what my sense tells me.

9 MR. HEHN: It is a very simple  
10 process to do the air model and find out; and if  
11 it comes up with no problem, then you got a clean  
12 shot at it.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We have rolled  
14 into that discussion of the FOSL.

15 Even though the review period for  
16 this document is still open, are there any  
17 additional comments related to the FOSL anyone  
18 would like to make?

19 MR. NEDELL: Yes, there is a comment.

20 This gets back to my request earlier  
21 of some sort of chart that unifies the designation  
22 system. This is for partial T 005 and T 006.

23 The explanation that was just given  
24 was given for Buildings 2 and 180, which are parts  
25 of T 005 and T 006, which are different IR sites

1           again.

2                           I didn't even know at the time she  
3           was presenting that we were actually talking about  
4           buildings in this area until I opened the map up  
5           and checked to see which buildings you're talking  
6           about.

7                           MS. NELSON: You mentioned that it is  
8           not part of the CBS; and getting all the  
9           information together to make a decision would be  
10          helpful; and identification of those would be  
11          necessary for the FOSL to be recommended.

12                          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In the particular  
13          case of the asbestos survey, the actual physical  
14          survey has been done; but the report has not been  
15          written.

16                          The building is currently under  
17          license, which basically is a short-term lease.

18                          MR. MYERS: How is it that that  
19          report is only being put together now, and yet the  
20          building has been used for some time?

21                          CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It was based on  
22          the desires of the City of San Francisco about a  
23          year ago to get into the building fairly rapidly.

24                          We did an initial in-house screening  
25          of the buildings in question, Building 180 and

1 Building 2; and we felt that, based upon our  
2 current use of the building and what their  
3 proposed use was, we felt that we could allow them  
4 to come in there on a short-term basis, with the  
5 specific understanding from the regulators that we  
6 would be doing a more detailed study.

7 MS. NELSON: Are the asbestos results  
8 available so that the RAB members can consider  
9 them when they review the FOSL the next week?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have to check  
11 on that. The survey really consists of an  
12 identification of all the asbestos-containing  
13 material in the building and whether or not it is  
14 damaged.

15 And I have a general feeling that the  
16 answer is probably, no, that it is a base-wide  
17 asbestos survey. The draft report is probably  
18 still a month or two away.

19 MS. NELSON: Could the lab sample  
20 idea for the surveys taken in these buildings,  
21 would you be able to request them of your  
22 contractor that performed the survey and make it  
23 available to the RAB members?

24 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It's possible.

25 MS. CASSA: This was a visual survey

1 of asbestos?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, the asbestos  
3 survey, which is in accordance with EPA-sanctioned  
4 asbestos survey guidelines, consisted of both a  
5 visual, complete visual, examination as well as  
6 sampling.

7 MS. NELSON: Sampling where there has  
8 been damage?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the same  
10 thing, to confirm whether the material is asbestos  
11 containing or not, whether it is damaged or not,  
12 plus a survey of the condition of the  
13 asbestos-containing material.

14 MS. NELSON: It would be helpful to  
15 have that information if it is at all available.

16 MS. GLASS: You said earlier air  
17 samples, too?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, no air  
19 samples are taken. The asbestos survey is the  
20 survey of material, and the air monitoring will be  
21 in addition to that. So no air monitoring has  
22 been done.

23 MS. NELSON: On the interior space?

24 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: On the interior  
25 space, for asbestos or any other air contaminant.

1 MR. MYERS: Is the recommended lease,  
2 the restricted part that says the lessee or  
3 sub-lessee shall not dispose any hazardous  
4 materials or waste at the leased premises, does  
5 that mean the activity is not going to involve any  
6 hazardous materials?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, that was  
8 something not picked up in the commentary.

9 I think the draftee took a rather  
10 ultra conservative approach. We certainly expect  
11 that the movie industry, as we have already seen,  
12 is going to have hazardous materials in the  
13 building.

14 What it will say in the final is  
15 something to the effect that hazardous materials  
16 and waste shall be properly stored and disposed of  
17 in the building.

18 We do expect that we will be bringing  
19 in, more likely they will be bringing hazardous  
20 materials in, more than have been in the building  
21 in its current usage.

22 MR. NEDELL: What procedures are you  
23 taking to assure yourselves, when they leave the  
24 building, that the Navy is not going to get stuck  
25 with a cleanup bill?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's a good  
2 question.

3 As part of the checkin and checkout  
4 procedures, we have done a walk-through inspection  
5 when the City took over; and then as the  
6 individual movie companies, who are sub-licensees  
7 or sub-lessees to the City, as they left, we have  
8 done an outgoing inspection.

9 In addition to that, because they are  
10 commercial enterprises, they are subject to  
11 inspection by Cal EPA. In fact, Cal EPA did go  
12 into Building 2 and inspect the movie operations  
13 there.

14 MR. NEDELL: It seemed to me, as an  
15 ordinary course of business precaution, that  
16 whatever testing you have proposed for the future  
17 of the building for your remediation plans ought  
18 to be done before the movie company moves in, so  
19 you have a baseline to compare those data with  
20 data when the movie company moves out.

21 MS. NELSON: There probably should be  
22 an indemnification clause.

23 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That will be the  
24 ideal. However, in working with the City to make  
25 spaces available and since our remedial

1 investigation won't be completed until the fall of  
2 '96, there will be at least some leasing that's  
3 ongoing before our investigations are complete.

4 But you are correct; that would be  
5 the best case.

6 MR. NEDELL: So the City is  
7 indemnifying the Navy for any increases in the  
8 cleanup?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The lease  
10 documents do hold the lessee, in this case the  
11 City of San Francisco, responsible for any  
12 actions.

13 MR. NEDELL: How are you going to  
14 prove it?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the system  
16 isn't perfect. The facilities, the leased  
17 facilities receive regular inspections by Naval  
18 Station personnel. They receive, at the very  
19 least, a monthly inspection by our fire  
20 department, our Treasure Island Fire Department,  
21 which also inspects for hazardous materials  
22 storage.

23 And as a result of these and other  
24 inspections, we will be evaluating their use of  
25 the building, the same as any other landlord would

1 evaluate what their lessees would be doing.

2 MR. NEDELL: I understand that point.  
3 I can understand a visual to see if they chip the  
4 paint off the walls; but what I'm a little more  
5 concerned about is, we are testing and detecting  
6 very low levels of contaminants in this building,  
7 something I don't suspect you can do by a visual  
8 inspection.

9 And it seems to me -- I don't know  
10 what the movie industry does or what kind of  
11 chemicals or compounds they use -- but what if  
12 they brought in a drum of benzene and spilled it  
13 around and they leave this building, is the Navy  
14 going to get stuck, i.e., the taxpayers, with the  
15 cleanup of their carelessness?

16 Because you suspect, because of this  
17 document, that you got some sort of benzene  
18 problem; and now you detect levels of benzene; and  
19 you have to go and do a bunch more remediation,  
20 which should not be our problem; it should be the  
21 problem of the persons that caused it.

22 I'm trying to understand, as you move  
23 through this FOSL what procedures or protections  
24 there are to make sure the government does not get  
25 stuck with something in addition to what they are

1 already doing.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that is a  
3 good comment, to clarify what action the Navy, as  
4 the leaser of the facility, is taking to prevent  
5 any contamination by debris. And that is  
6 something that we can elaborate more on.

7 But in answer, what it is going to  
8 say is that the Navy will exercise due diligence  
9 to ensure that the lessee of the facility does not  
10 contribute further to the problem. But it is  
11 going to be based on normal, typical,  
12 landlord-lessee relationship.

13 We will never be able, to a hundred  
14 percent, police the City or the individual  
15 lessees; but we will exercise due diligence to  
16 have a reasonable assumption that they are not  
17 contributing to the problem.

18 The alternative would be that we  
19 would not lease any of the facilities until we had  
20 completely completed the cleanup, but it has been  
21 the desire of the City and the business community  
22 to be able to move in and start reusing the  
23 facility prior to our leaving or prior to the  
24 cleanup, which won't even be completed until  
25 several years after the Naval Station closes.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think there are  
2 some related issues, but I think the bottom issue  
3 here is that -- and I think it was suggested that  
4 is going to be addressed in the FOSL -- that there  
5 was no inside air monitoring done either for  
6 benzene or other volatile hydrocarbons or  
7 asbestos; and I thought I heard that was going to  
8 be incorporated into this to be done before this  
9 is leased to verify the modeling that was done and  
10 derive the results.

11 So it actually addresses both of  
12 these issues:

13 One, are we leasing something that  
14 contains some sort of a hazard to human use?

15 And the other is, it establishes the  
16 baseline.

17 MS. NELSON: For the protection of  
18 the Navy.

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think that was  
20 something that Cal EPA suggested in their  
21 comments, and I thought I heard tonight it is  
22 going to be done.

23 MR. MYERS: It is going to be  
24 considered.

25 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is a

1 recommendation by Cal EPA as well as by the  
2 community members, and it is something that we are  
3 very likely to do. I can pretty much say we will  
4 go ahead and do air monitoring.

5 MS. NELSON: It seems to me, in the  
6 absence of performing these tests, the Navy and  
7 the City are leaving their respective selves open  
8 to all sorts of potential complaints.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we started  
10 out with an assumption that, based on the existing  
11 use of the building and the nature of the  
12 contaminants surrounding the building, that the  
13 screening levels used in the risk assessment are  
14 adequate.

15 But now it appears it may be prudent  
16 to do some confirmatory air sampling. Whether or  
17 not we continue to do that air sampling for every  
18 space that we lease throughout the base is  
19 something we will have to consider, the same as a  
20 commercial landlord may not necessarily conduct  
21 air sampling every time a new commercial tenant  
22 enters the space.

23 But at least it will provide us with  
24 initial data, which we feel is going to identify  
25 the problem.

1 MS. NELSON: Another thing that would  
2 be helpful is if the lessee would be required to  
3 provide a list of the hazardous and toxic  
4 substances that they plan to use inside the  
5 building spaces or store along the perimeter.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, lessees, as  
7 part of our fire protection program, are required  
8 to have MSDS, material safety data sheets, on all  
9 the materials they use. That's supposed to  
10 provide information to the fire department in case  
11 of fire, and our fire department also is our  
12 hazardous material response unit.

13 So for those two reasons, they have,  
14 over the lessee or any of our existing Navy  
15 activities, overall responsibility for all of the  
16 material safety data sheets on hand for the  
17 materials being used on site.

18 MS. NELSON: If you had the inventory  
19 in advance, then you can set for the baseline, for  
20 the interior air monitoring, so you know what the  
21 baseline is and whatever the constituents are, so  
22 that when the lessee leaves, you know whether  
23 something increased or has been added.

24 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is certainly  
25 a consideration.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to take  
2 another question from Dan, and then see if there  
3 are any other questions not having to do with the  
4 FOSL, and see if we can't go into the agenda items  
5 for next month.

6 MR. MC DONALD: Isn't it true that  
7 the buildings being reviewed for the FOSL have  
8 been occupied by movie production studios  
9 intermittently or continuously for the last two  
10 years?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the  
12 licenses for Buildings 180 and 2 took effect on  
13 the 1st of August of last year.

14 MR. MC DONALD: There has been  
15 production facilities?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There has been  
17 production intermittently but not continuously  
18 since that time.

19 I would say it seems to be averaging  
20 about half the time.

21 MR. MC DONALD: These baseline air  
22 quality samples have to take into account the  
23 current activities that are going on in there,  
24 unless the movie production facility moves out and  
25 you have an empty building; otherwise, you will be

1 taking a sample of air that, in effect, is  
2 contaminated by the ongoing activity, such as  
3 painting, and lacquering, and other kinds of uses  
4 that typically go on on a movie studio set, where  
5 you have all kinds of organic compounds.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Of course,  
7 whether or not the building is occupied or not, if  
8 there is a potentially hazardous level of  
9 contaminants in the air, that's something we want  
10 to know either way.

11 But you are right; if the building is  
12 occupied, then the results of that might lead us  
13 to looking at what the current lessee is using,  
14 rather than what might be a source coming from the  
15 building or the ground itself.

16 Right now both of the buildings -- at  
17 this point in time, both of the buildings are  
18 vacant or both of the leased portions of the  
19 buildings are vacant.

20 Just to clarify real quickly, we did  
21 the finding of suitability to lease for the entire  
22 land parcel, which includes the largest buildings,  
23 which are 180 and Building 2, but also includes  
24 all of the ground areas, as well as some smaller  
25 structures in that footprint.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to see  
2 if there are any other questions that need to be  
3 raised, either by the community members or members  
4 of the audience.

5 MR. MYERS: Action about ad hoc  
6 subcommittee meeting, that letter that we sent to  
7 you. I brought copies of that with me for people  
8 to review, if they so desire.

9 CO-CHAIR WONG: Would you like to lay  
10 a little background?

11 MR. MYERS: The Technical  
12 Subcommittee got together in the middle of last  
13 month to discuss the methodology to be used in the  
14 Phase II IR and the Navy responses to our original  
15 recommendations.

16 And we felt that our  
17 recommendations -- at first we felt our  
18 recommendations had been taken to heart; and on  
19 reviewing what was actually happening as to what  
20 was proposed to happen there, we felt that, in  
21 fact, our recommendations had not been met.

22 So we put together a letter which we  
23 sent to Jim and which we want to submit to the  
24 administrative record. And that letter also asks  
25 the Navy to respond on the record to this letter,

1 as well.

2 A number of the people at that  
3 meeting signed on to the document, and I believe  
4 Rick has also agreed to sign onto that, and other  
5 folks can read the letter at their leisure and  
6 decide if they want to add their names to it.

7 I brought a copy of it, and I can  
8 pass it around, and people can read it and decide  
9 what they would like to do about it.

10 We discussed it at length at several  
11 meetings. I don't think there is any need to go  
12 into deeper discussion just for people to decide  
13 whether they want to sign on or not.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: Is there a specific  
15 request?

16 MR. MYERS: This should be entered  
17 into the minutes of this meeting and appended to  
18 the end of the minutes of this meeting; and if the  
19 Navy decides to respond, we would like their  
20 response to be in the minutes.

21 MR. NEDELL: I think this is an  
22 action item, because we're asking something from  
23 the Navy. To me, this is an action item.

24 CO-CHAIR WONG: Can somebody state  
25 what the action is?

1 MR. NEDELL: It is to append the memo  
2 from the Technical Subcommittee to the minutes and  
3 to the administrative record.

4 MR. MYERS: It requests a specific  
5 response from the Navy to the letter, and that  
6 response should also be appended to the minutes.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay.

8 Any other issues or questions?

9 Rick?

10 MR. NEDELL: Another issue, we have  
11 accepted our operating guidelines this evening. I  
12 am going to suggest that the Community Co-Chair  
13 notify those people that are members of the RAB,  
14 who have failed to meet the minimum requirements  
15 set forth in Part IV, "Meeting Attendance," of the  
16 action that's going to be taken if they choose not  
17 to continue to participate.

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay, except that the  
19 way it is written, it's the Navy Co-Chair.

20 MR. NEDELL: The Navy Co-Chair or  
21 whatever.

22 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay. That action  
23 item is for the Co-Chairs to contact members of  
24 the RAB, who have not shown up, to see if they're  
25 still interested in being members; am I right,

1 Rick?

2 MR. NEDELL: Right.

3 MS. NELSON: And to notify them that  
4 they have been eliminated as set forth in the  
5 operating procedures, because they missed three  
6 consecutive meetings.

7 MR. NEDELL: This is a two-step  
8 process, actually, now that it has just been  
9 adopted.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: We want to initiate  
11 the process of contacting them.

12 MR. ONGERTH: If we ask them if  
13 they're still interested, and they say "yes," and  
14 we keep them on the list, even though they don't  
15 come, then what do you propose?

16 MR. NEDELL: I think it states if  
17 they continue to miss three consecutive meetings,  
18 for which there is no explanation, they will be  
19 sent a notice that they need to start attending or  
20 else they will be informed that the Navy assumes  
21 they are no longer interested in participating.

22 MR. ONGERTH: I am not satisfied with  
23 that. You are ignoring the past year of  
24 non-performance. Is that the case?

25 MS. NELSON: The question is when the

1 operating procedures really take effect. Do we  
2 count the consecutive meetings from the meeting  
3 when they are adopted or the consecutive meetings  
4 missed between the first meeting of the RAB and  
5 currently?

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would propose,  
7 given the situation that we are in now, that we  
8 grandfather these people in terms of the  
9 procedures, because we as community members have  
10 to necessarily get ourselves organized in a timely  
11 fashion; and as of tonight, we accepted these  
12 minutes; and now we're going to amend them; so I  
13 think we should start counting from now but keep  
14 an eye on all people and follow procedures as laid  
15 out here.

16 But I don't think we can  
17 retroactively go back and say, "Okay, you are  
18 off," because we really did not pay attention to  
19 ourselves, so I would like to propose that.

20 MR. NEDELL: I'll accept that.

21 MS. GLASS: I just want to make it  
22 clear that in working with the CRC, I found this  
23 is a non-issue, that people who don't show up, in  
24 general are not interested in continuing.  
25 Sometimes they say "I want to quit," and sometimes

1 I think you will find they don't, but in general  
2 it is not a problem for people that have not shown  
3 up. There may be some exceptions.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think it is worth  
5 our going through the procedures as outlined here.

6 MR. NEDELL: Perhaps even now you can  
7 put them on notice, send them a copy of this, and  
8 say "You really have not been participating. Are  
9 you going to start participating? Do you want us  
10 to drop you now, or do you want to wait until  
11 three meetings pass?"

12 Because what it does, we have people  
13 in sort of a limbo here. It means we can't  
14 replace them when Dan brings in his list of  
15 candidates. We have got to continue to carry  
16 these individuals, so we drag out this process of  
17 finding replacements for an extended time.

18 MR. ONGERTH: I don't think we have  
19 any obligation at all to these people. I don't  
20 see why we can't drop them right now.

21 CO-CHAIR WONG: Why don't we do this:  
22 After this meeting, we will be in this process and  
23 contact them and find out their interest, and I  
24 can give you an update at the next meeting.

25 But I think we should start adhering

1 to our own rules now that we approved them, and I  
2 don't believe we really have an upper limit on the  
3 number of people, so, in fact, if we decide to  
4 bring in eight, and it is nine people that are now  
5 thrown out, that is not a problem.

6 How does that sound for everybody?

7 Okay.

8 Any other questions from the audience  
9 or anyone else?

10 MR. HEHN: I want to mention you also  
11 have invited Laurie Glass to give a CRC  
12 presentation.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: Sure.

14 MS. GLASS: I thank you.

15 Well, let me start.

16 . Recently there was a decision to have  
17 special dates that you may be interested in. On  
18 August 19, here on Treasure Island, there will be  
19 a workshop in the afternoon -- I'm not quite sure  
20 where yet -- and in the morning there will be a  
21 tour that is kind of linked to presenting the  
22 existing conditions report, the information which  
23 will be available by then, publicly available.

24 But at any rate, the August 19  
25 workshop is to begin to develop some options for

1 reuse of Treasure Island.

2 And then, this is not a participatory  
3 thing particularly, but on July 12th, we plan to  
4 have a Press Day here, invite members of the  
5 press, provide them with information about  
6 Treasure Island, etc, etc., etc. and try to lay  
7 the ground work for future press coverage.

8 And the third issue is the Newsletter  
9 will be out in the beginning of July, so you will  
10 get copies.

11 That is the gist of what has been  
12 happening.

13 Thank you.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to move  
15 on, then, for proposed agenda items for the next  
16 meeting. There is the one that's the review and  
17 approval of the draft slate of new members; is  
18 that the matrix?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, actually,  
20 what those items are, it may be a more than full  
21 agenda, which is the discussion of the compliance  
22 programs, which would be basically the matrix and  
23 then, specifically, which is one of the compliance  
24 programs, the discussion of the underground  
25 storage tank report, which will be coming up

1 during that period.

2 And, then, lastly, a summary of the  
3 cleanup programs to date, although maybe the last  
4 item is a little too much to add, to include on  
5 the June agenda.

6 So I would, maybe as a result of  
7 this, propose to delete the summary of the cleanup  
8 program, which includes a summary of all the  
9 circle work, and limit the agenda to the  
10 discussion of new or selection of new RAB  
11 community members; the compliance program/matrix;  
12 and the underground storage tank report -- I think  
13 that would be sufficient for an agenda -- and move  
14 the summary of the cleanup to the July meeting, to  
15 include as kind of our one-year wrapup, because  
16 the July meeting will be the one-year anniversary  
17 of the expanded Restoration Advisory Board.

18 MS. NELSON: What happened to the  
19 Phase II-A work? When are we going to get a  
20 briefing on that? Is that going to be in the June  
21 meeting?

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There was a  
23 question, Sharon. We had a handout on the Phase  
24 II-A. That may be something that you may want to  
25 have at one of your intermediate meetings.

1                   It is a question whether, for the  
2                   entire Board, you want to have a significant  
3                   discussion on the Phase II-A. I'm throwing that  
4                   out.

5                   MS. NELSON: I looked at the  
6                   quarterly monitoring report. I might be the only  
7                   one that has an interest in that, but I have some  
8                   comments on that report that I would like to have  
9                   reflected in the subsequent monitoring report.

10                  MR. HEHN: I will also submit some  
11                  very detailed recommendations and suggestions for  
12                  making that document more user friendly.

13                  And so whether or not that needs to  
14                  be addressed at the next RAB meeting is something  
15                  that can be discussed, whether that would be  
16                  appropriate there.

17                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess it's a  
18                  question of whether we want to take the Phase II-A  
19                  comments from you as individuals or whether you  
20                  want that discussed in an open forum and possibly  
21                  include some sort of presentation. It depends on  
22                  what you want to include with the RAB at large.

23                  MS. NELSON: I think Paul and I will  
24                  probably prepare some comments, which I think the  
25                  rest of the Board would be interested in hearing.

1           Certainly we would like the opportunity for the  
2           CRC and the regulatory agencies to respond to  
3           those at a meeting.

4                       MR. HEHN:  I might suggest, if I can  
5           get mine down by the 13th meeting for our ad hoc  
6           committee, we can present those and discuss those  
7           a little bit at that time and maybe decide what  
8           kind of discussion might be appropriate for the  
9           RAB meeting, whether it be a response, or some  
10          provisions, or some kind of brief review on  
11          results.

12                      I am sort of interested in getting  
13          PRC's procedures' perspective on that, based on  
14          their a-lot-more-detailed information on the site.

15                      CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN:  We can pencil in  
16          for the June meeting a short discussion of Phase  
17          II-A, which would discuss our recommendations to  
18          the RAB at large.

19                      I think we can include that as a  
20          short agenda item, so I will add Phase II-A to  
21          June.  So that would leave us, for June, with the  
22          new community members; compliance programs/matrix;  
23          UST report; and Phase II-A.

24                      I think that's a pretty full agenda.

25                      MS. NELSON:  As I recall from the

1 last meeting, somewhere between now and the next  
2 meeting, there is going to be the field  
3 demonstration; and I would like to know when  
4 that's going to be scheduled, assuming it will be  
5 scheduled at the end of this month or sometime in  
6 June.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That was another  
8 action item that we want to take care of tonight.

9 We are available, beginning,  
10 basically, for the month of June. We would  
11 propose, for the month of June or July, we be  
12 available on Saturdays; or if there is any other  
13 convenient time.

14 But if you wanted to do a Saturday in  
15 June, we would be available.

16 MS. NELSON: While the field work is  
17 being conducted would be the most logical time to  
18 have such a field demonstration.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If we were doing  
20 it on a Saturday, we would be conducting field  
21 work.

22 MS. NELSON: Right, but at the last  
23 meeting it was only going to be available for two  
24 weeks in May and not necessarily available in  
25 June, so we would like to get that in.

1 MS. TOBIAS: Actually, if we do a  
2 demonstration, the demonstration will be on,  
3 because of liability, because it is a  
4 requirement --

5 MS. NELSON: What is the requirement?

6 MS. TOBIAS: OSHA training.

7 MS. NELSON: I have got OSHA  
8 training.

9 MS. TOBIAS: The demonstration will  
10 occur on a clean parcel, not on a dirty parcel.

11 MS. NELSON: This, I don't think, is  
12 acceptable.

13 MS. TOBIAS: It is a demonstration  
14 how we take a water sample. It should not matter  
15 whether the soil around that is clean or dirty.

16 MS. NELSON: My understanding is the  
17 event was going to be a demonstration of the  
18 immuno assay on the dirty sample. We talked about  
19 this in a previous meeting. I think we  
20 recommended the site 6, and it was 12 and 21 that  
21 had been identified as the site on which this  
22 parallel sampling would occur.

23 And I find it surprising, if not  
24 distressing, that the Health and Safety training  
25 requirements for those participating in the field

1 demonstration or interested in attending the field  
2 demonstration is brought up almost three months  
3 after the Technical Ad Hoc Committee had even  
4 identified the desire to have such samples, which  
5 is not to say that some of us don't have the  
6 required training to be out in the field.

7 MS. CASSA: I think we need to get an  
8 idea who is interested in the field sampling. If  
9 the only people who are interested in a field  
10 sampling perhaps have the required training, it  
11 might be open for consideration. But if anybody  
12 in the RAB wants to observe this field sampling,  
13 it is supposed to be open to the entire RAB, then  
14 the Health and Safety training requirements cannot  
15 be met by those people; and it has to be carried  
16 out on a clean site.

17 MR. MYERS: I think and suggest that  
18 we only send out qualified members. I would be  
19 more than happy to have Paul and Pat go to that.

20 MR. HEHN: Wouldn't there be a  
21 possibility, if you're going to establish an  
22 exclusion zone around the particular site, to have  
23 the other RAB members outside of the exclusion  
24 zone, which would comply with the Health and  
25 Safety Regulations, which they can observe there

1 without having to necessarily get their nose down  
2 in the soil?

3 MR. MYERS: There is two options  
4 there.

5 MR. ALDRICH: We already have a  
6 technical ad hoc group; and of that group, two of  
7 the members are already trained. We certainly  
8 could consider that a delegation to participate in  
9 the sample.

10 MR. HEHN: I think one of the  
11 important things to consider is that this is  
12 supposed to be a demonstration of the actual field  
13 conditions, techniques, methodologies of the  
14 sampling analysis under field conditions, not on a  
15 clean site to sample whatever, just to look at the  
16 analysis we did that is already out here.

17 It does not give us that information  
18 that we're looking for for this type of  
19 methodology comparison. A clean site is not going  
20 to do it, so we need to address this as an actual  
21 field condition, as it is being conducted, so we  
22 need to be aware of what we're looking for for  
23 this particular comparison.

24 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to  
25 state that field conditions can also be construed

1 to be in the field, working with actual soil and  
2 actual groundwater, whether or not that soil or  
3 groundwater is actually contaminated or not.

4 Unfortunately, I have to apologize  
5 for not being as prepared to address this issue,  
6 but it is possible, I certainly agree with Pat,  
7 that the Health and Safety training may be  
8 adequate to allow you to be present at one of our  
9 actual investigative sites.

10 But one thing I'll admit I do need to  
11 check on is whether or not there may be some  
12 potential liability issues. So even though you  
13 are fully qualified to be on the site, whether or  
14 not there may be potential liability issues to be  
15 on a Navy cleanup site, that I have to ascertain.  
16 But if not, the Navy would entertain having  
17 safety-qualified RAB members on our sites.

18 I apologize for not being able to  
19 answer that.

20 MS. NELSON: I am really frustrated,  
21 because that issue has been brought up at least at  
22 three consecutive meetings; and it is my  
23 observation that either the Navy or the regulatory  
24 agencies or PRC has not wanted to perform this as  
25 recommended by the RAB Technical Subcommittee.

1 And there really has not been a justifiable reason  
2 for PRC not to undertake this parallel sampling.

3 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to make  
4 a recommendation as an action item by picking a  
5 random date: By June 1st the Navy gives its  
6 response to the Technical Subcommittee on whether  
7 or not two certified members of that subcommittee  
8 can attend. If the liability is covered, they can  
9 attend an actual field test.

10 And part of this whole issue will be  
11 addressed in response to the memo that was  
12 submitted as well.

13 So I would like to throw a June 1  
14 date to get back to you whether or not that can  
15 happen. And if it does not, we can take it from  
16 there.

17 MS. NELSON: I would like to know  
18 before I leave tonight what Saturday this field  
19 demonstration would occur and at which site, so  
20 that I can make my own plans for Saturdays in  
21 June.

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Did you have a  
23 date in mind, Sharon?

24 MS. TOBIAS: No, it was up to you all  
25 what you prefer.

1 MS. NELSON: Which Saturday?

2 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

3 MR. MC DONALD: How large is this  
4 exclusion zone that excludes you for safety  
5 reasons? Are we talking about yards or feet?

6 MS. NELSON: Generally, for soil  
7 borings, it is within 5 feet.

8 MR. MC DONALD: So if I am 5 feet  
9 away, I can still observe the process?

10 MR. MYERS: Bring your binoculars.

11 MR. HEHN: I would be happy to supply  
12 the Navy with my 40-hour certification and  
13 anything else, and I have safety equipment, too.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Let's pick a date  
15 and a site, pending Navy determination whether  
16 there is any liability issues involved.

17 MS. NELSON: I recommend one of the  
18 first two Saturdays in June.

19 MR. HEHN: How about Saturday, before  
20 the subcommittee meeting?

21 MR. MYERS: That would be the 10th.

22 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, Saturday,  
23 the 10th of June. What time? Ten o'clock? Nine  
24 o'clock?

25 MS. NELSON: Ten o'clock.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is that  
2 acceptable, 10:00 a.m.?

3 MS. NELSON: And what site?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The proposed  
5 site, pending clearances.

6 MR. ONGERTH: What testing methods  
7 are to be demonstrated?

8 MR. NEDELL: Geo probe, immuno assay,  
9 field conditions, and field methodology for doing  
10 immuno assay.

11 MR. HEHN: I am assuming, Rick, you  
12 have to be like at the 16-22 site. We will be  
13 doing full methodologies; is that correct, using  
14 both benzene and the pH?

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: Did we select a site?

16 MS. NELSON: No, we didn't. It would  
17 be nice to have a plan of the site, and what has  
18 been done to date, and what is pending in the next  
19 couple of weeks, so we can select a site.

20 MS. SMITH: PRC selected 14 and 22 in  
21 February.

22 MS. NELSON: 14 or 22.

23 MR. HEHN: That, if that is in the  
24 schedule, Sharon?

25 MS. TOBIAS: That can be arranged, if

1 that is what you would like, and we get the  
2 concurrence from Navy counsel.

3 I would like to apologize on PRC's  
4 behalf, because when we received regarding what  
5 you would like and what your recommendations were,  
6 we never understood or never interpreted that. We  
7 knew you wanted a demonstration; we knew you  
8 wanted a comparison study done; but we never  
9 knew -- it was never clear -- that you really  
10 wanted a demonstration at a particular site.

11 So when we talked about doing a  
12 comparison study, it was going to be at 14 and 22;  
13 but we never intended -- it was never our  
14 intention to mislead you, and maybe that is where  
15 the demonstration will be done.

16 I'm really sorry for all the  
17 confusion.

18 MS. NELSON: If there were questions  
19 or comments, they could have been addressed to me  
20 or any other members of the Technical  
21 Subcommittee.

22 If our comments were clear, we did  
23 have two meetings with PRC and the agencies.

24 CO-CHAIR WONG: I appreciate what  
25 you're saying, Sharon; but that's water over the

1 bridge. What is important now is, I think, we  
2 clarified things and submitted it for the record.

3 We selected a date for natural field  
4 trial; and pending the liability issues, all we  
5 need to do now is, as far as we know, we go with  
6 14 and 22, or what site; and I think this issue is  
7 all set; and we're on the right track.

8 MR. HEHN: I might want to mention  
9 one more thing here.

10 I want to make sure that you  
11 understand that we are really looking for an  
12 investigation going on. We are not looking for a  
13 dog and pony show, where we give demonstrations of  
14 just the methodology. We would like to actually  
15 see this as an actual ongoing field demonstration,  
16 collecting actual samples, actual data being  
17 logged, and done as it is going to be done in the  
18 field throughout the rest of the Base.

19 So if that requires doing all day to  
20 get a good representation of that data, I am  
21 prepared to give up my Saturday for as much time  
22 as necessary to do that, because I think this is  
23 very important. This is something we have been  
24 trying to get to for six months, so we want to  
25 make sure that you understand this is not going to

1 be just a walk-by. We plan on being there -- I  
2 plan on being there all day.

3 MS. TOBIAS: I'm glad you told us  
4 that.

5 MR. HEHN: That's why I want to set  
6 it straight, because it is not just a walk-by and  
7 "here is what we are doing." We want to see  
8 samples collected and analyses done by the  
9 personnel that are going to do the sampling all  
10 the time, the geo probe work, how it is going to  
11 be done, so we have a full understanding of what  
12 that analysis and what that assessment work is  
13 going to entail.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: We need a site.

15 MS. NELSON: I would prefer site 6.  
16 Let's do site 6.

17 MS. TOBIAS: First of all, site 14  
18 and 22, we would be done with the investigation of  
19 that site by then. We also need to talk with the  
20 Navy more about --

21 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For the purposes  
22 of discussion, if we were to at least discuss what  
23 the potential site might be.

24 MS. TOBIAS: For the purposes of the  
25 discussion, if the Navy is going to allow RAB

1 members on the site, site 6 is a really nifty  
2 site.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, then we  
4 will say site 6 is the site that is being  
5 discussed, and the Navy will respond to Pat and  
6 Paul by the 1st of June.

7 MS. NELSON: If we could be notified  
8 if we need to bring our own tieback, hard hats,  
9 gloves, duck tape, whatever we need to bring,  
10 respirator.

11 MR. HEHN: Steel toes.

12 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think we have a  
13 date and time, Sharon?

14 MS. TOBIAS: We will get back to you.

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: Laurie has to say one  
16 more thing about CRC. Then I would like to just  
17 go quickly to the action items, make sure they are  
18 right, because they're going to end up in the  
19 minutes; and then adjourn the meeting.

20 MS. GLASS: You may recall, not once,  
21 but twice, you asked me to ask CRC about some sort  
22 of reciprocal thing.

23 Well, apparently I was asking the  
24 wrong people; and recently there was another  
25 discussion on that; and staff of the Planning

1 Department and staff of the Redevelopment Agency  
2 indicated a willingness to facilitate bringing  
3 applications from people who would be interested  
4 to the right people so they could be on the  
5 committee.

6 I thought I would like to let you  
7 know that.

8 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to  
9 propose, given that new information, that we put  
10 that as an agenda item for the June 13th meeting,  
11 because the community members need to come up with  
12 a representative.

13 MR. ALDRICH: Is there anything we  
14 can do before that? If anybody has a particular  
15 interest in being that representative?

16 MR. NEDELL: Is that limited to San  
17 Francisco citizens?

18 MS. GLASS: No, what I want to do,  
19 this is what I know -- and what I was being told  
20 was not apparently the deal before -- so I can  
21 tell you what I think I know, which is, it is  
22 typically a person who has an involvement in San  
23 Francisco community affairs.

24 I think there are a few people on the  
25 RAB who don't actually reside in San Francisco,

1 but the work they have done involves community  
2 affairs in San Francisco, so that is the key  
3 thing, involvement in community affairs in San  
4 Francisco.

5 MR. NEDELL: Is participation in the  
6 RAB considered community affairs in San Francisco?

7 MS. GLASS: I think so.

8 MR. NEDELL: So by extrapolation,  
9 then, anybody that is currently sitting on the RAB  
10 could be a candidate for the CRC without  
11 necessarily being a resident of San Francisco?

12 MS. GLASS: That seems logical to me.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to  
14 add, I would recommend that those RAB members who  
15 may potentially be interested try to attend the  
16 next CRC meeting to see what it is all about and  
17 maybe get a feel for the type of people on the  
18 committee.

19 MS. GLASS: The next meeting is June  
20 5th, 4:00 p.m., that's on Monday, at the San  
21 Francisco Redevelopment Agency's Commission Board  
22 Room on the third floor.

23 MS. SMITH: Just for a point of  
24 reference, in that document we got from CRC  
25 sometime ago, our previous co-chair was on that,

1 on CRC, at the same time he was our co-chair, so  
2 there is a precedent to be on that.

3 MS. GLASS: Right.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay, if we can go  
5 through the action items for this evening.  
6 Everybody just verify these.

7 First is the matrix and schedule of  
8 programs and contractors.

9 Compilation of the Base map, which  
10 means --

11 MS. NELSON: The Rosetta Stone.

12 CO-CHAIR WONG: Phase II-A,  
13 groundwater results.

14 Schedule of the immuno assay and  
15 sampling, which I think we just did.

16 Presentation on compliance programs.

17 All community RAB members will  
18 receive RAB applications.

19 Co-Chairs will present amendments to  
20 procedures to the operating procedures.

21 Second Tuesday of the month, we  
22 established informal meetings for community  
23 Co-Chairs.

24 Provide more information for risk  
25 assessment, particularly with regard to --

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

MS. NELSON: Occupational and  
lifetime exposures.

CO-CHAIR WONG: Occupational and  
lifetime exposures.

The Navy will check on the  
availability of the asbestos survey for the  
consideration for the sites in the current FOS.

Navy will clarify the lease  
provisions regarding Navy's liability as  
leaseholder.

MS. NELSON: Lessor.

CO-CHAIR WONG: And Navy will  
consider the air monitoring for confirming the  
modeling sample.

MS. NELSON: Of interior spaces.

MR. NEDELL: Is that considering or  
will act on them?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have to say  
that we are strongly considering and highly likely  
to act on them.

CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to have  
all community RAB members receive the minutes of  
the BCT meeting and all community RAB members  
receive the minutes of the CRC meeting.

MR. NEDELL: Those are action items?

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

CO-CHAIR WONG: Right.

MS. NELSON: I presume we're sharing the RAB minutes with the CRC right now?

MS. GLASS: This has gone round. I did not receive the minutes for the last previous, for March; so they didn't go out; but the previous time they did; so it is supposed to happen.

If I get the RAB minutes in time, then I send them out; and I have the ones for the last meeting.

CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay, any other items?

MS. NELSON: I think I had requested a copy of the agency comments on the FOSL.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

MS. NELSON: To be shared with the rest of the committee.

MS. CASSA: I would like to make a comment:

Will the agency comments be part of the draft final?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, they will; but Pat's point is to look at the agency comments before any final comments that you may make.

MS. NELSON: That's right on the

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

FOSL.

CO-CHAIR WONG: Unless there are any other comments or issues, I propose we adjourn the meeting.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to thank again our guests, who have come as a result of our advertisement. All of these meetings are public meetings, regardless of whether somebody is a community RAB member or not. All members of the public are welcome to attend all of our meetings and to speak, as appropriate.

So thank you again to everybody.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE

I, PAUL SCHILLER, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing transcript constitutes a true, full, and correct transcript of my shorthand notes taken as such reporter of the proceedings herein and reduced to typewriting under my supervision and control to the best of my ability.

*Paul Schiller*

MAY 3 01995

(Signature)

(Date)