

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

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

SEPTEMBER 26, 1995

7:00 P.M.

COPY

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER

TREASURE ISLAND

MEETING NO. 14

REPORTED BY: VIRGINIA K. CORRIEA, CSR NO. 6447

444

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

I N D E X

PAGE

1 Welcome Remarks/Discussion ..... 3  
2 Public Comment ..... 6  
3 BayKeepr/ARC Ecology Presentation ..... 7  
4 Review of Action Items ..... 18  
5 Organizational Business ..... 27  
6 Environmental Report Review Schedule ... 54  
7 Program Updates ..... 57  
8 Status Report - Phase II B Remedial  
Investigation ..... 78  
9 FY96 TI Budget/Projects ..... 88  
10 Open Questions/Discussion ..... 92  
11 Closing Remarks ..... 121

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

7:06 P.M.

WELCOME REMARKS/DISCUSSION

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Good evening and welcome to our Restoration Advisory Board meeting for September. We'll go ahead and everyone should have a copy of the agenda. If there aren't -- there's some additional copies on the back table. And so, first thing we would like to do is approve the agenda for tonight's meeting.

Are there any comments regarding the agenda for tonight?

Yes, Dale.

MS. SMITH: The interim meeting for Tuesday, October 14, would be on a Saturday, so would we like to adjust the meeting, either to Saturday or --

MR. SULLIVAN: I goofed the dates. It was meant to be the second Tuesday in October. And so the second Tuesday in October is the 10th; okay. So I stand corrected. The next meeting

1 will be at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday the 10th of  
2 October.

3 Any other comments?

4 MS. SMITH: I have an announcement to  
5 make.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: In the public comment  
7 or -- okay -- any other comments regarding the  
8 agenda? If not, we'll approve the agenda as  
9 amended and proceed.

10 The first item is the approval of the  
11 meeting minutes from both the 25th of July and  
12 the 22nd of August. Due to some members having  
13 not received the 25 July minutes, we deferred  
14 finalizing those minutes until this meeting. And  
15 then, everyone should have also received a copy  
16 of the 22 August meeting minutes. If not, we  
17 have additional copies of the August meeting  
18 minutes here.

19 So, are there any comments regarding  
20 either the July -- well, first the July meeting

1 minutes?

2 Okay. So then, go ahead and approve  
3 the July meeting minutes.

4 MR. WONG: Make a motion to approve  
5 the July minutes.

6 MS. SMITH: Second.

7 MR. WONG: All in favor? Opposed?  
8 Okay.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Regarding the 22 August  
10 minutes, are there any comments concerning the  
11 August meeting minutes?

12 MS. SMITH: It's only a picky one. We  
13 don't have to take this whole thing all over  
14 again. I don't work for the City of Berkeley, I  
15 serve on a commission for the city of Berkeley.

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. We will correct  
17 that in any future minutes. Thank you for  
18 pointing that out.

19 So, if there aren't any other comments  
20 regarding the August minutes, we can go ahead and

1 approve those.

2 MR. WONG: If I can get a motion.

3 MS. SMITH: So moved.

4 MR. WONG: Second?

5 A PARTICIPANT: Second.

6 MR. WONG: Okay.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT

8 MR. SULLIVAN: So the July and August  
9 minutes have been approved.

10 Next is our public comment period, and  
11 we've set this up as a period for any member of  
12 the public to make a statement. We put these at  
13 both the beginning and the end of the meeting.  
14 We put it at the beginning of the meeting to  
15 allow anyone who would like to make a comment and  
16 not necessarily stay throughout the meeting.

17 So, Amy has indicated she wanted to  
18 make an announcement.

19 MS. BROWNELL: We're going to be  
20 hiring someone for the San Francisco Department

1 of Public Health to do this. As you may well  
2 have noticed, I haven't been able to be here all  
3 the time, so I've been begging my bosses to be  
4 able to hire somebody to do that. And I've  
5 finally got agreement. I don't have an  
6 announcement because not all the details have  
7 been finalized yet, but if anybody is interested,  
8 they can definitely give me their business card.  
9 I'll bring an announcement, a formal  
10 announcement, probably to the next meeting. It's  
11 a temporary, part-time position to represent the  
12 City at this RAB, and also for the Presidio and  
13 whatever that involves, and do reading and  
14 reports and things like that. If you want to  
15 call me confidentially, my phone number is  
16 415-554-2778.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you.

18 Are there any other general public  
19 comments?

20 BAYKEEPER/ARC ECOLOGY PRESENTATION

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. We've -- at the  
2 request of a representative from BayKeeper, we've  
3 also allotted time at the beginning of this  
4 meeting for them to provide an update on the  
5 status of their concerns regarding clean water  
6 issues at Treasure Island.

7 MR. LOSTAU: Thank you, Jim.

8 My name is Mike Lostau with San  
9 Francisco BayKeeper. I just wanted to -- we  
10 wanted some time to update you, I've talked to  
11 the RAB before, about a notice of intent to sue  
12 that we had sent and I wanted to let you know  
13 about an action that has resulted since then. We  
14 entered into negotiations, Jim Sullivan is part  
15 of that process representing the Navy, and we  
16 have gone forward in a, I guess a controlled  
17 manner.

18 We have filed a lawsuit just on the  
19 sewage plant issues that we've encountered. We  
20 refrained, and I wanted to emphasize that we are

1 not filing anything at this time and we are  
2 continuing our discussions with the Navy, on the  
3 storm water issues, our San Francisco BayKeeper  
4 as well as ARC Ecology. So I won't go into the  
5 storm water issues. We are engaged in what are  
6 confidential settlement discussions and those are  
7 proceeding and there's no -- at this time there  
8 is no litigation on that front.

9 On the sewage plant issues, it was  
10 pretty much the same violations that we alleged  
11 in our subject of the complaint. Basically, it  
12 comes down to chlorine residual problems at the  
13 plant, as well as oil and grease problems and PH  
14 problems.

15 The PH problems, the concern is  
16 somewhat historical in terms of last year where  
17 there was a period of time where the facility was  
18 reporting total compliance with the PH limits,  
19 when, in fact, every night there were violations.  
20 And a regional board staff, not JANA, but a

1 regional board staff went out to do some field  
2 work, they found bioassay failures in the  
3 evening; and this was based on a variety of  
4 reasons, low-flow at night and some problems with  
5 the chlorine treatment process which led to high  
6 P -- or low PH readings.

7 A PARTICIPANT: We're in the process  
8 of the sewage plant?

9 MR. LOSTAU: Right. This is just  
10 sewage plant. And we're still, I think, tracking  
11 system complaints on the PH issue, but the main  
12 ones are the chlorine residuals, which is related  
13 to PH, and oil and grease and a few more sporadic  
14 violations.

15 We also have some monitoring and  
16 reporting violations included in the complaint  
17 which involve, from the types of sampling that  
18 were being done, to whether any of the reports  
19 were being signed, to incidents such as the PH  
20 problem where we had monitoring reports being

1 signed off as being accurate and true, but in  
2 fact when someone came to the site it was  
3 apparent that there were violations that weren't  
4 being recorded. Not to say that any of that was  
5 intentional or anything like that. However,  
6 somebody needs to be paying more attention to how  
7 the plant is being run and understand what their  
8 data says and what they need to do to come into  
9 compliance with the permit.

10 So, if anybody has any questions, I do  
11 have one copy of the complaint, which we can  
12 arrange to make more copies of, or I can send  
13 copies to people as they prefer.

14 A PARTICIPANT: I'd like a copy, if I  
15 may.

16 MR. LOSTAU: If I can get a card or  
17 your name.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: Mike, this is the suit,  
19 the suit against the treatment plant?

20 MR. LOSTAU: Just the -- there's two

1 pieces.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: The original notice of  
3 intent complaint.

4 MR. LOSTAU: Both storm water and  
5 sewage plant violations as we alleged them and  
6 had counted them.

7 The Navy may dispute all of this, but  
8 as to the sewage plant issues we did have initial  
9 negotiations; I can't tell you what was said.  
10 However, we decided that we needed to go forward  
11 on the sewage plant violations. However, we have  
12 not gone forward, based on our discussions, as  
13 well as whatever other things we're thinking  
14 about. I suppose we've not gone forward on the  
15 storm water violations that we've alleged in the  
16 notice. And Jim is actually the lead person on  
17 the suggestions with us about what's being done,  
18 what's contemplated, and that is a process that's  
19 ongoing.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, because we have

1 copies of the original notice of intent. In  
2 fact, we have additional copies here, so if  
3 that's what you had or -- though I haven't seen  
4 copies because it's mostly the Public Works  
5 Department or Public Works Center, I haven't seen  
6 copies of the actual suit for the sewage  
7 treatment plant.

8 So that we could also provide.

9 MR. LOSTAU: If I could provide you  
10 with a copy and you can just disperse it however  
11 you normally do that would be best.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. That would be  
13 great.

14 MR. LOSTAU: As a newcomer, BayKeeper  
15 is nonprofit. We conduct patrols of the Bay. We  
16 have a boat that patrols the Bay on a regular  
17 basis. We also have investigators. We do file  
18 research as well as field investigations.

19 A PARTICIPANT: Now, you similarly  
20 monitor the other military facilities, such as

1 Mare Island and Presidio and Alameda?

2 MR. LOSTAU: We have ongoing  
3 litigation against the Navy at Hunter's Point  
4 regarding Drydock 4, that which is the large  
5 Drydock. We have ongoing, or in discussions with  
6 them, on their storm water use at Hunter's Point.  
7 We have been involved in investigations in  
8 Alameda that are ongoing and have been in touch  
9 with some of the decision makers there.

10 A PARTICIPANT: You're mostly looking  
11 at the military facilities or communities, also  
12 Berkeley?

13 MR. LOSTAU: Well, we look at  
14 everything in the Bay as BayKeeper, but the  
15 project we have with ARC Ecology is to go from  
16 base to base.

17 A PARTICIPANT: Next question.

18 Is it within the scope of the Treasure  
19 Island cleanup, if it's found that the sewer  
20 treatment plant is in some way technologically

1           deficient, does the Navy have an obligation to  
2           upgrade it?

3                   MR. SULLIVAN:  There's really two  
4           issues here.  And let me sort of address the  
5           first one, it's a good question, to how far or  
6           how much does the RAB get involved with  
7           compliance issues as opposed to cleanup issues.

8                   The RABs were originally envisioned to  
9           involve the community in the cleanup.  Whether or  
10          not we, you know, we also include all of the  
11          other, you know, related compliance issues, it's  
12          kind of an open question.

13                   MR. LOSTAU:  And I don't know if we're  
14          asking the RAB to do anything.  It's just to make  
15          sure you understand what we're doing so we're not  
16          viewed as being unusually disruptive or anything  
17          like that, that we have a tempered approach.  
18          We're trying to think about these things  
19          logically, I hope that's the impression that the  
20          Navy gets, and there's a reason behind our own

1 strategies.

2 So, I just wanted to try and be clear  
3 with the RAB here.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: But just to answer sort  
5 of the second question. You know, regardless of  
6 the cleanup program, if changes need to be made  
7 to the sewage treatment plant, that would be an  
8 issue regardless of whether the naval station --  
9 regardless of the status of the cleanup program.

10 MR. LOSTAU: And it's BayKeeper's  
11 understanding, probably ARC Ecology, our  
12 understanding is the plant is a fine plant. It  
13 just needed to be run better. So we're hoping  
14 that it will come into compliance in short order.

15 These are not difficult issues  
16 compared to, say, the storm water issues. I'd  
17 say this is a very straight-ahead situation. So,  
18 that's our understanding, that these are things  
19 that can be fixed. They just haven't been done.

20 A PARTICIPANT: The operators of the

1 plant are employed by the Navy?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, the treatment  
3 plant is owned and operated by the Navy. It's a  
4 Navy owned treatment plant, as opposed to a, you  
5 know, a publicly owned treatment plant like East  
6 Bay MUD.

7 A PARTICIPANT: Do they meet the same  
8 requirements of the state requirement, the  
9 operators?

10 MR. SULLIVAN: I couldn't answer that  
11 specifically. I would -- because I'm not  
12 directly involved in the treatment plant  
13 operation -- I would imagine that we would be  
14 sure that our operators would have the same type  
15 of certification or similar type of certification  
16 that publicly owned treatment plant operators  
17 have.

18 MR. LOSTAU: When we participated in  
19 the permits process in that plant, we didn't  
20 change the permit. The permit looks like other

1 POTW permits.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: The Navy is required to  
3 require the same discharge permit as any other  
4 treatment plant.

5 MR. LOSTAU: So if there are no other  
6 questions, that's what's happening. I'll get a  
7 copy to you, Jim.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you very  
9 much. And you're certainly welcome to come back  
10 and update us.

11 MR. LOSTAU: Thanks for the  
12 opportunity.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Any time.

14 REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. The next phase  
16 of our meeting is the review of action items.  
17 And what we'd like to do is, rather than go  
18 through each and every one, I'd like to update  
19 you on the items that have been taken care of,  
20 and then anything else is deferred to the next

1 meeting, or at least -- or to the next interim  
2 meeting.

3 The first one that's been completed,  
4 and I'm reading from page four of the August 22nd  
5 meeting minutes: The Navy will provide copies of  
6 the asbestos survey used for the FOSL for Zone B,  
7 that is Buildings 2 and 180, to those RAB members  
8 who received a copy of the draft FOSL as well as  
9 any other additional members.

10 Tonight we have copies of the FOSL,  
11 and have included with that package a copy of the  
12 asbestos survey, the completed asbestos survey  
13 for Buildings 2 and 180. We also have excerpts  
14 from the general asbestos survey on the back  
15 table for anyone interested, as well as the  
16 actual five volume set of the asbestos survey so  
17 that you could take a look at that, also.

18 So, at the time we started this  
19 discussion regarding the Building 2 and 180  
20 asbestos surveys they were not actually complete.

1 But they have been completed now. So copies of  
2 the FOSL are available, copies of the asbestos  
3 survey are available. The FOSL has not yet been  
4 signed but it's essentially complete.

5 The Navy will distribute copies of the  
6 BCT cleanup team comments on the FOSL. That  
7 should also be included in the package. So the  
8 package with the FOSL should include copies of  
9 the BRAC cleanup team member comments.

10 The Navy will provide the EPA aerial  
11 photograph study of NAVSTA TI for review at the  
12 next meeting.

13 At the back table we have both copies  
14 of individual photographs, as well as the  
15 completed book, which also includes commentary on  
16 the photographs. So that's available tonight for  
17 your review, as well as we can make arrangements  
18 to have it available at other times for your  
19 convenience here at the Naval Station.

20 The Navy will provide an updated RAB

1 membership list. I believe that's something that  
2 the community members already undertook.

3 MR. WONG: Did everybody receive an  
4 updated? So, I think we're set here.

5 MS. KATHURIA: There's an action item  
6 related to the Water Board.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: There's an action item  
8 related to the Water Board.

9 MS. KATHURIA: Michael did come to my  
10 desk before he left, and I guess there was  
11 someone who wants a copy of the report, that's  
12 The Presidio report, and right now it's being  
13 reviewed by Rich Hyde, as relieving all the  
14 assumptions made to the model, the program, the  
15 groundwater modeling program. So, those  
16 assumptions haven't been concurred between the  
17 Water Board and the Army yet, so that could  
18 change the output of the report. So once we are  
19 satisfied with the assumptions, we can give a  
20 copy.

1                   MISS SMITH: The reason why I  
2                   requested it, the Navy is proposing to use that  
3                   here; are you saying that the Navy has nothing to  
4                   work with at this moment because the Army has not  
5                   finalized with the Regional Water Quality Control  
6                   Board how that thing is set up?

7                   MS. KATHURIA: I don't know what  
8                   context --

9                   MS. SMITH: The BCT meeting was  
10                  discussed utilizing The Presidio's fuel  
11                  production level determination report, and so if  
12                  we're going to use it, which one are they using?

13                  MS. KATHURIA: There's a groundwater  
14                  model, and in that model you input site specific  
15                  parameters. So they're working out the site  
16                  specific parameters for that site, and then once  
17                  they've worked that out, then that report will  
18                  become final.

19                  MS. SMITH: So what have you given to  
20                  the Navy on this?

1 MS. KATHURIA: I have not given them  
2 anything.

3 MS. SIMONS: I think this came up on  
4 the contention that we have just started talking  
5 about how we're going to set up cleanup levels.  
6 And Michael mentioned it as something that we  
7 might want to run and we actually haven't  
8 received it. I haven't seen it.

9 MS. KATHURIA: We haven't sort of  
10 stamped this process. We're waiting to see how  
11 it works on The Presidio before we use it at  
12 other sites.

13 MR. WONG: Would it be appropriate to  
14 leave it here. When the Regional Water Quality  
15 Control Board turns over what they're working on  
16 from The Presidio, BCT here, that you receive a  
17 copy of that as well.

18 MS. SMITH: That would be fine. So it  
19 surely will show up in the end-of-month minutes  
20 that you're starting to talk about it, and then I

1 will know that you've gotten the report.

2 MR. WONG: Okay. Great. Why don't we  
3 leave that one on.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. The Navy will  
5 prepare copies of the composite base map that  
6 includes the IR sites and underground storage  
7 tank sites. We're still waiting to get final  
8 community member comments on the map so that we  
9 can reproduce it. Maybe we should make it a goal  
10 to finalize that by the interim meeting.

11 MR. WONG: Okay. We'll make a goal to  
12 have the final comments.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Final comments.

14 MR. WONG: Right.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Sharon, if we have  
16 final comments at the interim meeting, how  
17 long -- well, depending on everything, it will  
18 depend on the nature of the comments, but how  
19 long would it take them to reproduce, make the  
20 changes and reproduce the maps?

1 MS. TOBIAS: A couple of weeks. It  
2 might be available at the next RAB meeting, the  
3 October RAB meeting. It would depend on what the  
4 comments were and how significant the changes  
5 were.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So if we receive  
7 comments by the interim -- next interim RAB  
8 meeting on the 10th of October, we may have maps  
9 by the October meeting or certainly by the next  
10 interim meeting in early November.

11 Future RAB meeting agendas will  
12 include the upcoming RAB meetings. We've already  
13 incorporated that, and we can also incorporate  
14 any other meetings, subcommittee meetings. So,  
15 as long as that information is provided to Brad  
16 and I, we can include that in our handouts to get  
17 the widest dissemination.

18 I'm now at the bottom of page five.

19 Mr. Wong will distribute copies of the  
20 RAB caucus letters and related documents. And

1 everyone should have received a copy of those in  
2 the mail within the last two weeks.

3 Mr. Sullivan will provide a copy of  
4 NAVSTA TI's storm water report to those who have  
5 requested it. And we have copies of that at this  
6 meeting.

7 Okay. Are there any other comments or  
8 any other action items at this time before we  
9 close this segment?

10 MS. SMITH: Wait a minute.

11 What about the next section, the newly  
12 identified items?

13 MR. WONG: Okay. Which section?

14 MS. SMITH: Well, it starts on the  
15 bottom of page five.

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, I just went through  
17 that, and the two items that had been completed  
18 were the RAB caucus letters and the lab completed  
19 the copies of the annual storm water reports. So  
20 anything else is deferred.

1 MS. SMITH: Okay.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. With that, we'll  
3 proceed into organizational business, and I'll  
4 turn it over to Brad.

5 ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS

6 MR. WONG: Okay. On the  
7 organizational business here, hopefully we can  
8 cover this fairly quickly, there was a request  
9 last time, Mr. Hehn, I believe, had made it,  
10 since many members can't -- community members  
11 can't make the interim meetings, that we give a  
12 brief update on what the agenda items are and  
13 what were discussed during those meetings. So I  
14 wanted to just give a quick overview there.  
15 There were four items that were discussed.

16 The first, and I'd like to bring it up  
17 here, is to check in with the new members to see,  
18 now that they had the BRAC cleanup handbook, to  
19 see what kind of training needs remained for the  
20 new members to help bring them up to speed. I

1 wanted to check in on that, and, unfortunately, I  
2 think there were only one or two new members  
3 present there.

4 By way of saying that, I wanted to be  
5 sure to call it to everybody's attention that  
6 this Saturday is a site tour and an overview of  
7 Treasure Island, especially for the new members,  
8 but everybody is welcome to attend, too. You can  
9 see the sites we're talking about and get a  
10 better feel for Treasure Island. And that begins  
11 at 10:00 a.m. But Jim has added an extra hour's  
12 tour, for anybody that would like to attend that,  
13 to do an overall tour at Yerba Buena and Treasure  
14 Island so you get feel for everything on the  
15 island and not just the cleanup sites.

16 So that was the first agenda item at  
17 the interim meeting.

18 And, let me just check in, are there  
19 any specific issues with regard to training that  
20 we could start listing here so we could be sure

1 to provide that over the course of the next  
2 couple of weeks or meetings?

3 A PARTICIPANT: The certification that  
4 would be required, I remember, right when the new  
5 members came on board, remediation. And at the  
6 time it was stated in this that those that had a  
7 certain certification would be able to get in the  
8 area that needed remediation.

9 MR. WONG: You had asked now to go  
10 through that training.

11 A PARTICIPANT: How to go through that  
12 training.

13 MR. WONG: Jim, I think you wanted to  
14 address that.

15 A PARTICIPANT: That might be the OSHA  
16 site.

17 MR. WONG: It is, but let's knock it  
18 off now.

19 MR. SULLIVAN: The question is, as we  
20 find we have this site or this site investigative

1 site tour a month ago, we'll likely have similar  
2 tours in the future. And we have a site safety  
3 plan which identifies training requirements that  
4 are required to be at the actual sampling points,  
5 and that follows OSHA's 29 CFR 1910.120. And,  
6 which basically says that you're required, as a  
7 minimum, to have a 40-hour health and safety  
8 course, and also that certification has to be  
9 maintained with an annual eight-hour refresher.

10 Several of our community members,  
11 because of their daytime jobs, already have this  
12 certification, and, therefore, they were able to  
13 be up close and personal with the sampling  
14 equipment. However, the actual safety zone,  
15 although it would vary from site to site, was  
16 really only, I think, on the neighborhood of  
17 about eight to 10 feet from the sampling points,  
18 and so even those members who had absolutely no  
19 safety training were still able to observe the  
20 sampling.

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

We're not able to provide that training to community members who don't have it, but we'd be happy to provide information on where you could go or how you could obtain it. And I would imagine at any given time we'll always have at least several community members who have the training, so there will be at least some representatives of the RAB who can get as close as we, you know, they may feel that they want to to the sampling. But again, the safety zone is really not that large.

A PARTICIPANT: Well, the impression I got was an area a couple of hundred yards in.

MR. SULLIVAN: No, it was about 10 feet.

MR. WONG: It was plenty close.

A PARTICIPANT: But that won't come into play at all on this tour that we're going on?

MR. SULLIVAN: No, because we won't

1 be -- there won't be any sampling. I don't think  
2 we'll have any field actions going on at that  
3 time, so we'll be able to tour all of the sites.

4 MR. WONG: Okay. If there are no  
5 other comments or questions regarding training,  
6 we'll just assume that as things aren't clear to  
7 you members, if they would bring them up to the  
8 Navy regulators or at the interim meeting, bring  
9 them up there and we can help clarify issue as  
10 they come up.

11 A PARTICIPANT: Training for, like,  
12 for each particular compound and what the options  
13 for remediation are, is that something we could  
14 do in training or that's in the area you haven't  
15 gotten to?

16 MR. WONG: No, I'm sorry. We're  
17 talking more about what the BRAC cleanup process  
18 is, what the role of RAB is, an overview of  
19 Treasure Island and what the different sites are  
20 and things of that sort. As opposed to

1 compound-specific training on what they are or  
2 things of that sort.

3 So it's more what this process is and  
4 what we're trying to accomplish and where it's  
5 going. A bigger overview issue.

6 A PARTICIPANT: State of California,  
7 in conjunction with the military, has issued a  
8 thin book, "Receipt of Remediation Technologies,"  
9 and I have a couple of copies in my office, I  
10 could make a note to bring it to a future meeting  
11 if you're interested in approaches to remediation  
12 technology. We could look at that and see if  
13 there's interest in having multiple copies.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Maybe we can make that  
15 an action item to make a copy available at the  
16 next meeting so members can take a look at it and  
17 decide if we need to make additional copies.

18 A PARTICIPANT: That's an expense I  
19 think it would be appropriate for all to get  
20 copies of it.

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the approach  
2 we've taken so far, and I think it's proved  
3 satisfactory, is to identify items for  
4 availability and then those community members who  
5 would like to see them can sign up for them. You  
6 know, rather than provide everybody with every  
7 document, because it gets pretty voluminous. So  
8 our goal has been to make available whatever  
9 documents whatever community members would like  
10 to have, but, in general, everyone doesn't ask  
11 for every document.

12 A PARTICIPANT: We have a sign-up list  
13 tonight for that one. Sounds like pretty basic.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Maybe you'd like to see  
15 it at the next meeting.

16 MR. WONG: And have a sign-up sheet  
17 once you see it.

18 MR. HEHN: One of the other things, as  
19 far as compound-specific remediation, one of the  
20 things we're talking about for a future RAB

1 meeting is a site, or a specific discussion that  
2 focuses on specific remediation activities for  
3 the particular components that we're dealing with  
4 at Treasure Island. So that may be in the next  
5 couple of months, also. So that will be  
6 specifically on those type of remediation.

7 MR. WONG: Okay. The next thing we  
8 talked about at the interim meeting was  
9 discussion regarding the RAB caucus letter to  
10 DTSC, which I think you all received. We agreed  
11 to send you back documents on all of that from  
12 the initial letters to the ones that actually  
13 went to and some of the other RABs in the Bay  
14 Area had sent in response to that. And we just  
15 simply had a handout there, that packet, and  
16 discussed that we would be drafting a letter that  
17 people can sign onto or note as members of the  
18 Treasure Island RAB. It wouldn't be a letter  
19 that represents a consensus of the RAB, as much  
20 as whoever signs it they agree to the content of

1 the letter.

2 And there I just want to apologize,  
3 that I planned to have a draft of the letter for  
4 everybody to see this evening, and I just got  
5 back up and wasn't able to do one, but I'll have  
6 one by the next interim meeting for everybody to  
7 review. And we'll get copies out of that.

8 MS. SMITH: What's on the back of the  
9 thing we got, it says "Dear:".

10 MR. HEHN: I think that's the draft  
11 version.

12 MR. WONG: That wasn't supposed to be  
13 attached, but if it was, so be it. That is not  
14 the draft.

15 MS. SMITH: But in the last paragraph,  
16 second to the last sign, acquaintance is spelled  
17 with a C.

18 MR. WONG: Okay. Thank you.

19 A PARTICIPANT: Brad, further on that,  
20 you say there will be a copy available to be

1 discussed or signed or what at the next interim  
2 meeting?

3 MR. WONG: Discussed. I think we  
4 should bring it, discuss it, so that we can make  
5 the changes. And I think we should bring the  
6 draft final, if you will, to this meeting,  
7 because there's much better attendance here, for  
8 people to be able to read and sign on.

9 A PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

10 MR. WONG: The next thing we had  
11 discussed is we passed out copies at the last RAB  
12 meeting, Dale Smith had given me a copy of lists  
13 of outstanding issues and concerns she had  
14 regarding review of the BCT minutes and some of  
15 the other activities going on here. So we simply  
16 passed out a copy of that to everyone there. And  
17 as a follow-up to that, we agreed that we would  
18 submit it to the BCT for their next meeting for  
19 response. And that was done. And BCT had  
20 decided that the Navy would respond to each one

1 of those items, and I believe they're in the  
2 process of responding to that. And we'll be  
3 getting that back to Gale, which then will be  
4 available for everybody to review. So that's  
5 well on its way and I do have extra copies of  
6 that, that original memo.

7 And then, finally, the last thing we  
8 talked about, we spent the majority of our time  
9 on, and is directly relevant to, I think, this  
10 evening's meeting, and everybody should have  
11 gotten a copy of the proposed discussion topics  
12 in their packets.

13 What we've been trying to do, in  
14 addition to just be more efficient and making the  
15 meetings more meaningful and having everybody get  
16 a sense of accomplishment that we're really  
17 contributing to the product, is we're trying to  
18 cut down on the organizational administrative  
19 aspects of these public meetings and really guide  
20 the discussion and allow time for people to

1 really explore some of the environmental issues  
2 related to Treasure Island so we get a better  
3 understanding of what's going on, and thereby  
4 make more informed and better comments into the  
5 cleanup process.

6 So what we did was, we drafted up some  
7 suggested topics that we could spend time on at  
8 these meetings, and instead of just getting a  
9 cursory interview, we could really engage in a  
10 prolonged discussion and question and answer both  
11 with the Navy and regulators and among ourselves.  
12 And it was felt that that would be a way that the  
13 whole meeting and process would be more  
14 meaningful.

15 So what you received was a draft of  
16 the discussion from the interim meeting of what  
17 we thought the main topics that we should devote  
18 the next two or three or four meetings to with  
19 regard to the cleanup process should be. And  
20 then we tried to give the BCT a feel for the type

1 of questions and issues under each one that we  
2 thought might be relevant and should be  
3 addressed.

4 It's by no means complete, and by no  
5 means does that mean there won't be questions  
6 once we bring up certain topics here.

7 What I'd like to do here is see if  
8 there is any discussion or thoughts on these  
9 topics with regards to the value of the topics,  
10 the timing of when we would bring them up, and to  
11 get a consensus from the community members if  
12 this seems to be a worthwhile way to go and if  
13 these are the proper topics.

14 And I want to just quickly say that  
15 even though these would take up a good 45 minutes  
16 to an hour discussion time so we can really  
17 explore the Phase II B work plan, if there are  
18 FOSLs that are due or some other issues, that  
19 doesn't mean we wouldn't talk about those either.  
20 But this is a way to structure the meetings to

1 make it more meaningful.

2 Does anybody have some comments or  
3 suggestions regarding the proposed discussion  
4 topics?

5 Does that mean everybody pretty much  
6 agrees with what came out of the interim meeting?

7 Yes?

8 A PARTICIPANT: I just want to  
9 comment, I think it's a good idea. I think the  
10 overall agenda makes a lot of sense.

11 MR. WONG: Right. Okay. Great.

12 Then, what I'd like to do is see if we  
13 can get a motion and a second and pass that we'd  
14 accept -- Oh, I'm sorry, the Navy. Jim?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: I'd like to make some  
16 comments and propose that rather than accept  
17 these agenda items as verbatim, that we, you  
18 know, get an indication, sort of in concept, and  
19 then Brad and I and also the members who attend  
20 the interim RAB meetings can flush these out a

1 little more. And so let me make these comments  
2 and then there's also an opportunity to anyone  
3 else from the government side to comment also.

4 The proposal for the October meeting  
5 on petroleum hydrocarbon program, I would  
6 recommend I think it's a pretty -- it's a very  
7 narrow topic and a topic that that issue of  
8 moving the petroleum hydrocarbon programs from  
9 the CERCLA program into a U.S.T. underground  
10 storage tank related program is really a topic  
11 that's still under discussion, or it's still --  
12 that we're still flushing out on the Navy's side.  
13 And what I would recommend is that we devote that  
14 meeting to really bringing you up to date on the  
15 petroleum related investigations. Up until now  
16 we've been spending more time on the CERCLA sites  
17 and the IR sites, but we also have underground  
18 storage tank and fuel line investigations going  
19 on, and, in fact, more acreage is affected by  
20 those sites than the IR sites. In October we'll

1           be releasing a draft copy of the underground  
2           storage tank report, so I would recommend that  
3           for the October meeting we discuss the overall  
4           issue of petroleum sites at Treasure Island, and  
5           I think that's an introduction that we do need,  
6           and that we can go on from there.

7                       MS. KATHURIA: Can I make a quick  
8           comment.

9                       I talked to the petroleum guy, he's  
10          actually going to be on vacation during October  
11          24th, and he's actually new himself, so, he's  
12          just new to the product himself, so I don't know  
13          if you'd find October 24 a good way to bring him  
14          up to speed, because I haven't had a chance to  
15          meet with him either to get things addressed that  
16          I would like. So, I don't know.

17                      MR. SULLIVAN: So, we may need to --  
18          we may want to defer that. In fact, maybe to  
19          rephrase myself again, maybe I would recommend  
20          that we come to some general agreement of these

1 topics in general and we may not necessarily  
2 tackle them in the same order that has been  
3 proposed here.

4 MR. HEHN: Maybe we might look at  
5 switching the November and October meeting  
6 issues, and give a little more time for the  
7 carbon issue and also to get the board up to  
8 speed on that as well, and a little bit of time  
9 to prepare. If that's possible to get our people  
10 associated with the geotechnical report at  
11 Treasure Island available for the October  
12 meeting.

13 MS. SMITH: One thing I guess I would  
14 like to comment, would be we might not want to  
15 have these dates carved in stone. These were  
16 just suggestions. And I realize in hearing you  
17 that, yeah, we might not be doing it in the  
18 correct order, and we didn't mean to force this  
19 pattern on any of us, we didn't know, we thought  
20 this was a great order to do things in.

1 MR. WONG: Could we say conceptually  
2 we're in the right direction here and devoting  
3 larger amounts of time in this meeting for  
4 in-depth discussions on these various topics and  
5 we can certainly add to them. And through the  
6 course of the interim meetings and throughout the  
7 course of the month, we'll, in collusion with the  
8 Navy, determine what is an appropriate topic to  
9 discuss at that meeting.

10 A PARTICIPANT: Well, it seems to me  
11 that we have to shift this all down a month  
12 anyway, because we're not going to have an  
13 in-depth discussion of the status report today.

14 MR. WONG: In fact, we are. That's  
15 scheduled for today.

16 A PARTICIPANT: Oh, we are. Okay.

17 MR. WONG: Okay. Jim, anything else?

18 MR. SULLIVAN: And then just a general  
19 comment on the geotechnical issues. I think this  
20 is one area where we may need to be a little

1 cautious to how far we get into this as a  
2 Restoration Advisory Board, and when it's also  
3 being discussed with the citizens as part of the  
4 citizen's review committee process. So while I  
5 think there's been some concern by the  
6 Restoration Advisory Board members that some of  
7 the proposals the city has for possible  
8 geotechnical improvements to the island could  
9 have a significant impact on how we proceed with  
10 our cleanup, and that's a valid concern, but at  
11 this time no firm -- no discussions have really  
12 yet been made.

13 The city and their planners and the  
14 Citizen's Reuse Committee is still evaluating the  
15 entire range of options, so we really don't know  
16 at this time what geotechnical improvements that  
17 they may propose, what may eventually be  
18 implemented. And when we have a firmer idea of  
19 that, we'll know whether or not it may impact our  
20 ultimate cleanup decisions.

1                   But in the interim, you know, we're  
2                   still proceeding with our investigations. And I  
3                   think we may have a better idea of the  
4                   geotechnical issues over the next six months in  
5                   the city's planning process.

6                   MR. ONGERTH: Jim, someone here knows  
7                   more about that, a lot more about that field,  
8                   than I do. My fragmentary knowledge of  
9                   geotechnical would seem to divide into two parts;  
10                  the part having to do with what happens to plumes  
11                  in the movement of liquids that we're concerned  
12                  with; and the part that has to do with stability  
13                  of structures and stability of the island itself.

14                  Is that a reasonable kind of view of  
15                  the matter and, if so, the one part is directly  
16                  relevant to what we're doing and the other part  
17                  is, it seems, quite remote.

18                  MR. SULLIVAN: No, that's a very good  
19                  point. I think that we could be involved in  
20                  really two ways. And I think I would propose

1           that this agenda issue of geotechnical may be  
2           revamped into a discussion and brief on the  
3           geotechnical or the geology of Treasure Island  
4           and Yerba Buena Island and that may serve, as you  
5           suggested, to provide a better understanding of  
6           how contaminants may move on Treasure Island and  
7           Yerba Buena Island.

8                         So I think that's needed regardless, I  
9           agree with you, I think that's needed regardless  
10          of the issue of building and land stability.

11                        But the second area that we could  
12          conceivably be involved, and we don't know yet,  
13          is if the city proposed or some other entity  
14          proposed to make some major geotechnical  
15          improvements to the island, it could conceivably  
16          affect our cleanup proposal.  If, for example,  
17          some cover was going to be placed over an area.  
18          But I think that I would propose, as a possible  
19          agenda item, a discussion of the geology of  
20          Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

1 MR. WONG: I'd like to be mindful of  
2 the clock to see if we can't just move on and see  
3 if we can't get agreement on how we'll refine  
4 that, but in general we're moving in the right  
5 direction. If that's agreeable with everyone.

6 And I would like to just say that I  
7 don't think -- I think it's a matter of how you  
8 look at the geotechnical reports here in terms of  
9 what type of remediation actions it would take to  
10 shore up the islands and things isn't so much  
11 what I think the origin of what this was, but  
12 certainly if there are geotechnical issues in  
13 terms of ultimate reuse of the island, it  
14 directly impacts what this board has to look at  
15 in terms of what's going to Washington, what kind  
16 of funding, who gets funding. And if we need to  
17 save, save money, and be able to come up with  
18 innovative types of remediation action, we need  
19 to know the baseline of what's going on in terms  
20 of geotechnical issues here so we can make

1 informed choices and decisions in regards to  
2 those kinds of things if this is going to push  
3 land use planning back for six years. The way  
4 that it's spelled right now is we would get no  
5 funding from Congress because there is no reuse  
6 plan in place.

7 So it's in that context that I wanted  
8 to at least get a layman's knowledge of the  
9 geotechnical issues and see how that impacts on  
10 our overall issues.

11 A PARTICIPANT: I guess I'm concerned  
12 that we don't do anything or we do whatever we  
13 can to make sure that the costs are minimized.  
14 It seems to me, from the things I've been reading  
15 in the public press and the materials I've been  
16 provided, that there is substantial geological  
17 remediation that's going to be needed to make  
18 Treasure Island useful in whatever level it's  
19 going to be useful. And there are also issues  
20 around pollution control. And if it would cost,

1 say, a hundred million dollars to make the place  
2 geotechnically stable so that things could be  
3 built on it for whatever planning is done, and a  
4 hundred million dollars to clean up the  
5 pollution, that if those two things could be  
6 articulated, and the cost to the community, by  
7 clearly or smartly articulating those, would only  
8 be a total of a hundred fifty million dollars,  
9 then you've got a savings.

10 That's, obviously, just an example.

11 What I want to do is, hopefully, the  
12 perspective of this board could be enlightened by  
13 the perspectives of the people that are thinking  
14 about reuse and thinking about the geological  
15 remediation so that we don't go off on some  
16 tangents that aren't terribly useful and waste  
17 our time.

18 MS. SMITH: We have been talking in  
19 our research group, we've got varying opinions on  
20 reuse, the geotechnic report says all underground

1 utilities must be removed. So right there is a  
2 geotechnical impact on our focus. And I don't  
3 think just studying the geology of Yerba Buena  
4 Island and Treasure Island is going to help us  
5 with the fact that right there is an issue, that  
6 we're just going to bury those pipes and  
7 everybody says fine, and that another report  
8 says, oh, no, you're not.

9 MR. WONG: Can we get a consensus,  
10 then, that we will pursue these topics but  
11 through the interim meeting process, and in the  
12 intervening time refine how the discussions  
13 develop, so that we can move off this and finish  
14 up. Can I get a motion on that?

15 A PARTICIPANT: Can we turn this into  
16 an action item that has you and Jim sort of  
17 deciding how to move forward with discussion  
18 topics that emerge from the interim meetings?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Maybe I could propose  
20 as an action item that between now and the next

1 interim meeting on the 10th of October, Brad and  
2 I, and any other interested parties, come up with  
3 a new draft to have available at the -- or draft  
4 for specific months to have available at the 10th  
5 of October meeting. And then those community  
6 members who attend that meeting can help us  
7 further refine that, and that in turn will set  
8 our October, probably, or October, November and  
9 December agendas.

10 MR. WONG: So we will have a refined  
11 document at the interim meetings in collusion  
12 with the Navy; is that correct? And work out  
13 those.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: So we'll still have an  
15 opportunity on the 10th of October to tweak it a  
16 little more.

17 A PARTICIPANT: So what meeting is  
18 that?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: The interim meeting.

20 A PARTICIPANT: The 14th?

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

MR. SULLIVAN: That was my error.

It's typically the second Tuesday of the month, which places it midway between the regular monthly meetings.

MR. WONG: And that's it for the organizational business.

Jim?

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT REVIEW SCHEDULE

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. I will now quickly speed through the environmental report review schedule.

Draft, draft finding of suitability to continue the lease for the Treasure Island Elementary School. And I'm reading just off of the items on the agenda. That document is available. Some people have already signed up for it and we have copies for them, as well as some additional copies, at the back of the room. And comments are due on that at our next regular meeting on the 24th of October.

1                   The draft environmental baseline  
2                   survey sampling plan. That's also available and  
3                   comments are again due on the 24th of October.

4                   A PARTICIPANT: Excuse me. Is that  
5                   the same as the sampling work plan draft?

6                   MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, so that -- yes.

7                   We have an up-coming report of, as I  
8                   had previously mentioned, the former underground  
9                   storage tank sites. That will be available  
10                  sometime in October. The Navy is still  
11                  finalizing it, so the regulators have not yet  
12                  received it. So at the time we release it to the  
13                  regulators, we'll release it to the community  
14                  meetings.

15                  MS. KATHURIA: That's a draft?

16                  MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. That should  
17                  show draft underground former storage tank. So  
18                  it is not a final report. And the regulators  
19                  will be seeing it for the first time in October.  
20                  So that will be probably right around the time of

1           our October meeting.

2                       The base wide asbestos survey report.  
3           That is available. And then comments are again  
4           due on the 24th of October. That should also say  
5           draft report, because that's not finalized,  
6           though it's primarily a document of data.

7                       And then lastly, the draft final  
8           Phase II Ecological Phase plan. We have a change  
9           here as a result of recent discussions with the  
10          regulators. We were going to be making that  
11          draft available, but because of some -- because  
12          of a similar document that's undergoing review at  
13          Mare Island, we may be deferring our draft for  
14          maybe a few more months. And we don't have  
15          funding to conduct this work, so it is not going  
16          to affect our schedule. So the draft ecological  
17          work plan will probably be available sometime  
18          before Christmas and we will give you a further  
19          update on that at our next meeting.

20                      Are there any comments or questions?

1 MR. HEHN: Is the draft available now  
2 for the elementary school?

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, the draft FOSL for  
4 the elementary school is available and I have  
5 copies here.

6 With that, we'll move into program  
7 updates.

8 PROGRAM UPDATES

9 I would first like to introduce  
10 Allison Kendal. This is Allison's first  
11 appearance at our meeting and she's here to give  
12 an update on the city's plan process, which also  
13 involves their Citizen's Reuse Committee.

14 MS. KENDAL: Thank you.

15 Most of you have met my co-manager  
16 Lois Scott. She has been attending your meetings  
17 fairly regularly and trying to keep you apprised  
18 of our progress on the reuse planning side.

19 But in light of all of the issues that  
20 you've been hearing about, both from the press

1 and the geological issues that have been  
2 discussed today, I want to tell you where the  
3 reuse process is and talk with you how best to  
4 coordinate our efforts.

5 There is a need to make sure that the  
6 information is flowing back and forth and that we  
7 are considering the remediation issues in our  
8 planning, and, likewise, you are considering the  
9 emerging planning discussions in your work.

10 As many of you are aware, because I  
11 know that at least a few of you were able to  
12 attend, we had a large public workshop on  
13 August 19th out here at Treasure Island. And at  
14 that workshop we presented the information that  
15 are consultants have gathered over the past few  
16 months in the form of an issues and opportunities  
17 report, which again, I believe you received  
18 copies of. That is reported by two volumes of  
19 technical reports that go into a lot more detail  
20 about all of the many different planning factors

1 that we're considering; including a summary of  
2 environmental remediation issues; including  
3 historical resources, for example; and, of  
4 course, the geotechnical issues and structure  
5 condition and so on.

6 We are now proceeding with that  
7 information to generate some planning  
8 alternatives. And we've got a number of meetings  
9 scheduled in the near future with the Citizen's  
10 Reuse Committee. One of them is actually  
11 Thursday this week from 12:00 to 2:00. That  
12 meeting will be, again, at the Redevelopment  
13 Agency meeting room, which we use, on Golden Gate  
14 Avenue.

15 We'll be considering use activities  
16 and services as in homeless services. All of  
17 those primary land use questions basically about  
18 the island.

19 We have got a meeting just a few days  
20 later on Monday, October 2nd, at which we will be

1           considering implementation strategies, including  
2           the geotechnical issue, the infrastructure reuse  
3           or rehabilitation issues, building reuse or new  
4           construction, and all of the various  
5           implementation questions that kind of follow  
6           from, and in many ways constrain, the use  
7           possibilities of Treasure Island.

8                         We appreciate your interest in the  
9           geotechnical issues. We certainly are very  
10          interested in working with you to identify  
11          potential cost savings and coordination between  
12          the process of seismic remediation or  
13          reinforcement that we hope to at least begin soon  
14          and to plan for in a comprehensive way over the  
15          longer term. And we do think that there is some  
16          potential, we hope, for coordinating other  
17          efforts. We have already benefited in large part  
18          from the information generated for that process,  
19          which has been very helpful in the planning  
20          effort; thanks, in many ways, to Jim providing

1           that access to that.

2                         There is certainly some implications,  
3           also, from your investigations into asbestos  
4           within the existing building, into lead-based  
5           paint, and so on, when we consider reuse. And  
6           depending on the geotechnical and remediation  
7           techniques, there will be a greater or lesser  
8           degree of either one of those approaches.

9                         So, there's very complicated questions  
10          and financial questions to be addressed in the  
11          next phase of our planning.

12                         We're looking at a wide range of  
13          approaches here. An ideal situation might be to  
14          make a massive investment and to try to do some  
15          really comprehensive re-format of the island to  
16          minimize the risk, but that may well be  
17          unfeasible.

18                         Many of those are really affected by  
19          both the scheduling of your cleanup efforts and  
20          the technician that you employ. So we're very

1 interested in exploring those issues with you.

2 I think in terms of our schedule, we  
3 will be starting to articulate that range of  
4 alternatives in November. And it will probably  
5 be good for us to come back to you in that time  
6 frame to talk about what the various options are  
7 that we're considering and what the implications  
8 might be in terms of remediation efforts.

9 We hope in early '96 to be  
10 identifying, through a whole host of public  
11 hearings, a preferred alternative. So that would  
12 be another time which it would be interesting to  
13 have some input from this group. And then as we  
14 get closer in planning the detailed  
15 implementation strategy, there's another level  
16 for more detailed discussion, obviously.

17 So, we're looking forward to meeting  
18 with you. I'd be happy to answer any questions  
19 that I can at this point.

20 MR. VAN WYE: Harlan Van Wye, Treasure

1 Island Yacht Club.

2 Have there been any uses, and I  
3 appreciate the fact that probably the ultimate  
4 decision is probably going to belong to the San  
5 Francisco Board of Supervisors as the appeal body  
6 to the Planning Commission, but have there been  
7 any uses that the planning staff has essentially  
8 locked into place for various portions of the  
9 island, or any structures that currently exist on  
10 the island that it's clear are going to remain?  
11 Can you enlighten us on any, just where are we  
12 and how much set in concrete are we on various  
13 components of the island?

14 MS. KENDAL: We have looked in some  
15 detail at historic buildings on the island, and I  
16 think there's a consensus that Building 1 has  
17 great historic value and definitely reuse  
18 potential, and the rehabilitation issues can be  
19 addressed for that building. So, I think there's  
20 a feeling that one will definitely be one of the

1 ones that will be explored.

2 There is also some interest in  
3 Buildings 2 and 3, because they also date from  
4 the period of the Exposition and have some  
5 substantial reuse potential. In other words,  
6 there is a marketable reuse, for example, film  
7 production that's gone on there quite recently.

8 There are other buildings, there are a  
9 few other buildings, that appear, in light of  
10 both the geotechnical information and the issues  
11 of compliance in terms of local and state codes,  
12 to be able to be rehabilitated fairly cost  
13 effectively. So there are a few more that appear  
14 with that iteration.

15 And then after that it becomes less  
16 clear. It really depends on whether you're  
17 taking an incremental approach or not.

18 There are substantial cost savings for  
19 the seismic improvements if you take a more  
20 comprehensive approach and actually demolish

1 buildings and then can work with soil improvement  
2 and ground strengthening on a larger basis.

3 So it really becomes more of a  
4 question, in this, what way do you anticipate  
5 proceeding. Do you have a large kind of  
6 development that you want to accommodate or what.

7 MR. VAN WYE: A follow-up question.

8 Does the staff, at least at this  
9 level, have a general leading concept as to what  
10 the theme of this island is going to wind up  
11 being: Park, industrial center, housing?

12 MS. KENDAL: That's really precisely  
13 the point we're at in the discussion with this  
14 reuse committee.

15 Our consultants have looked into the  
16 marketability and suitability of the island for  
17 various uses and have strongly recommended that  
18 the most potential seems to exist for kind of  
19 unique visitor-oriented uses, such as theme parks  
20 or recreational destinations, resorts, various

1 kinds of uses like that that are somewhat unique  
2 and take advantage of a very special setting and  
3 don't view the transportation difficulties as a  
4 real obstacle to development, but somehow that  
5 could be made part of the experience.

6 Film production is also another area  
7 that has potential.

8 So we are, assuming that those might  
9 well be elements of the interim plan, there seems  
10 to be some potential for housing, but not as a  
11 primary use, more in concert with only other  
12 uses.

13 So that's what we've got from the  
14 market point of view in terms of suitabilities.

15 A PARTICIPANT: Allison, this Monday  
16 afternoon meeting you mentioned you said would be  
17 an implementation meeting, and you followed that  
18 immediately after some discussion about making  
19 space available for homeless. Do those things go  
20 together? Are you saying they're implementing

1 the plans for homeless people?

2 MS. KENDAL: One of the requirements,  
3 as you probably know, of the Base Closure Law is  
4 to contemplate homeless services and include them  
5 in the re-planning process and to try to  
6 accommodate those kind of uses within the  
7 planning process, whether or not literally on the  
8 site or off-site.

9 A PARTICIPANT: It's an agenda item  
10 for that month?

11 MS. KENDAL: That's actually going to  
12 be discussed more in concert with the discussion  
13 of uses; uses, activities and services.

14 A PARTICIPANT: The reason I asked  
15 that is I sense that the new Navy housing over  
16 yonder happens to be in the portion of the island  
17 which is seismically most unsafe. And at the  
18 meeting that we had with those folks, I left with  
19 the sense that, my goodness, the causeway has to  
20 be improved to make a safe island, and that's a

1 modest cost, \$18 million or whatever it was. Is  
2 the city really prepared to provide low-cost  
3 housing in an area which is seismically unsafe,  
4 which has a quite vulnerable causeway leading to  
5 it, and the view is terrific in the park, but can  
6 the city really do that?

7 MS. KENDAL: I think that's a very big  
8 issue, substantial policy issues that have to be  
9 addressed.

10 A PARTICIPANT: But the city could not  
11 provide housing for anybody unless it met the  
12 plumbing code, the electrical code, fire code?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: These are all issues  
14 that the, you know, that the city staff and the  
15 Citizen's Reuse Committee are addressing. And  
16 our link to them on a regular basis is through  
17 both having Lois Scott from the Planning  
18 Department, as well as Laurie Glass from the  
19 Citizen's Reuse Committee, and Dan McDonald who  
20 is a member of both the RAB and the CRC. And I

1 think we'll continue to have that flow of  
2 information back and forth, though we will be  
3 unable to, you know, totally immerse ourselves  
4 into the planning process, we really have to  
5 leave that to the city and the Citizen's reuse  
6 Committee.

7 Now their meetings are open to the  
8 public and they normally meet on the first Monday  
9 of every month, but this month they're having a  
10 special meeting this Thursday at 12:00 o'clock,  
11 and then they'll have their regular meeting next  
12 Monday at 4:00 p.m.

13 MS. KENDAL: I'd certainly like to  
14 invite any of you that are interested to attend  
15 the discussion.

16 MS. CASSA: To follow up. Would it be  
17 appropriate to telephone you or Lois?

18 MS. KENDAL: Lois and I are  
19 co-planning managers. You can telephone either  
20 one of us. I can give you my card. 558-6290,

1 that's my number at the Planning Department.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. HEHN: One of the questions I  
4 have; in our attempts to try to understand how  
5 the geotechnical report ties in with the  
6 remediation efforts that we're looking at, I  
7 understand there are two different consultants  
8 looking at two different approaches to the  
9 geotechnical work for the island; is that  
10 correct?

11 MS. KENDAL: Are you referring to the  
12 Bechtel work?

13 MR. HEHN: And the Treasure Island  
14 work. Are they sort of two different versions of  
15 how they're looking at the remediation, not the  
16 remediation, but the geotechnical?

17 MS. KENDAL: Yeah, the Bechtel study  
18 was really done at a whole different level of  
19 detail, with the specific purpose of addressing  
20 feasibility of the exposition, and not at the

1 same level of depth as the Rollo study.

2 I don't think they're fundamentally  
3 different. There is a difference in that the  
4 exposition is really looking at a short-term use,  
5 at a much more minimal level of improvement that  
6 would just be needed to support what is  
7 basically, you know, at most a two-year time  
8 frame. So it's a very different set of  
9 priorities that they have.

10 We are looking at their approach,  
11 because, indeed, we may need to look at something  
12 that's more incremental and less of a  
13 comprehensive approach, just because of funding  
14 constraints. So we are getting Bechtel and Rollo  
15 and ROMA together to talk about different  
16 strategies implied by the different land uses.  
17 And so not a substantial difference, though.

18 MR. HEHN: Unfortunately, I was not  
19 able to attend the meeting on Saturday where all  
20 of those were discussed. And I was just

1           wondering, in our evaluation of how we're going  
2           to at least understand the geotechnical portion  
3           and how that affects the land use remediation at  
4           Treasure Island, how long were those  
5           presentations that were done at that Saturday  
6           planning meeting on the geotechnical part only,  
7           and if that was -- if we were looking at sort of  
8           a similar type of presentation to the RAB, how  
9           would that, you know, what kind of time would  
10          that require?

11                   MS. KENDAL: My guess is a minimum  
12           half hour time frame. And, one, given that I  
13           think there would be a lot of questions, then  
14           another half hour to respond.

15                   MR. HEHN: Hour to go through that  
16           process, something similar to that, same type of  
17           presentation?

18                   MS. KENDAL: Right.

19                   A PARTICIPANT: I just want to remind  
20           Brad, that page two of the August 22nd meeting

1 notes, that's precisely what I requested, because  
2 I thought that presentation on that Saturday was  
3 absolutely superb. They were mind boggling, but  
4 they were superb.

5 MR. WONG: Again, we're going to be  
6 here until midnight. I think, without a doubt,  
7 just by the level of interest here, you cannot  
8 artificially separate the reuse and the  
9 geotechnical reports from what we're doing here.  
10 There is a lot of information that we need to  
11 know, and to draw a division that's artificial,  
12 and it's a chicken and an egg argument. So what  
13 I'd like to do is go back to the proposal that  
14 was on the table. Between now and the next  
15 interim meeting, that we work with the Navy and  
16 the regulators to refine these topics in terms of  
17 when they come up and exactly what their contact  
18 is for our review at the interim meeting.

19 But also, I'd like to extend an  
20 invitation to the CRC, to the geotechnical

1 engineers or whoever is appropriate, but look at  
2 having you come join us at an interim meeting  
3 where we can really get into a Q & A. And maybe  
4 this may not be the proper forum to get  
5 everybody's time involved, so I would like to  
6 suggest we move in that way for one of the  
7 interim meetings for geotechnical as well as  
8 reuse discussion. Because you can't separate  
9 them and we're going to continue to come back to  
10 the same issue and maybe get off the beam here.  
11 But I think, again, we make more informed  
12 choices, decisions and comments if we have a  
13 better understanding.

14 So, if that meets with everybody's  
15 approval, we can just move on.

16 Thank you, Alison.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Mary Rose is going to  
18 provide a brief update on the action of the BRAC  
19 cleanup team over the last month.

20 MS. CASSA: We met on September 5th

1 for a data review meeting. This was basically  
2 the project managers from the regulatory agencies  
3 and Navy.

4 We looked at new required data at this  
5 preliminary level in Site 6, Site 9, 11, 16, 25,  
6 28 and 29.

7 Risk assessors from U.S. EPA, DTSC and  
8 PRC met on September 14th to talk about general  
9 approaches to the human health risk assessment,  
10 particularly with respect to incorporating data  
11 from their ongoing Phase II B investigation. And  
12 my understanding is that the result of that  
13 meeting would be recommendations to the BCT as to  
14 how to proceed.

15 On September 18th we had our monthly  
16 meeting. It included an update on the  
17 underground storage tank program and fuel line.  
18 We met the new Navy project manager for that  
19 aspect. His name is John Pfister, P-f-i-s-t-e-r.

20 We talked about the Navy proposed

1 execution for fiscal year '96 budget. And I  
2 think you may hear a little bit more about that  
3 from Jim later this evening.

4 We had some further discussion about  
5 how to handle petroleum contaminated sites, which  
6 we alluded to earlier with respect to using --  
7 we're looking at several ideas as models,  
8 including The Presidio, including things that  
9 were done at Fort Ord, and just a matter of, you  
10 know, getting ideas as to what might be the best  
11 way to proceed here at Treasure Island.

12 We discussed the memorandum that Dale  
13 Smith had sent in, which I think will be  
14 addressed point by point later on, and in general  
15 prepared for tonight's meeting. And also took a  
16 tour on Saturday.

17 And then today we had another data  
18 review meeting where we looked at recently  
19 acquired data from Sites 11, 12, 16, and 20. And  
20 we also welcomed Gina Kathuria back to Treasure

1           Island. She's replacing Michael Bessette as the  
2           project manager from the San Francisco Bay  
3           Regional Water Control Board.

4                        So I guess now it's time for break.

5                        MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. We'll now  
6           proceed to a break, and we've expanded the break  
7           from 10 minutes to 15 minutes. And the reason  
8           we've done that is to create an opportunity, not  
9           to just take a break, but to have more  
10          opportunity for some informal discussion, both  
11          between the community members, as well as the  
12          community members, and the regulators, because we  
13          don't often. This is really our only forum to  
14          meet face-to-face on a regular basis.

15                        So, well, maybe we will limit it to 10  
16          minutes, and we'll get back on schedule following  
17          the 10-minute break. In 10 minutes.

18                        (Break taken from 8:30 to 8:45 p.m.)

19                        MR. WONG: Before we jump into the  
20          next agenda item, I'd like to just say that I

1 found, among my many possessions having to do  
2 with the RAB, a videotape that was done called  
3 "Getting On Board." It was a workshop at the  
4 very beginning of the RAB process as a whole, and  
5 it's a number of speakers and lecturers talking  
6 about this whole process and the role of the  
7 regulators and the RABs and all.

8 There's only one copy, but I wanted to  
9 let you all know that it exists and I'm happy to  
10 let people borrow it. If you want to pass it  
11 around, so at the end of the night if somebody  
12 wants it, feel free to come up and take it.

13 STATUS REPORT - PHASE II B REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. We're now moving  
15 onto the back page of the agenda and to the  
16 status report on our Phase II B Remedial  
17 Investigation. And Sharon Tobias is here to give  
18 us a brief update on that.

19 MS. TOBIAS: My name is Sharon Tobias.  
20 I'm the project manager for the remedial

1 investigation and feasibility study that's  
2 currently ongoing at Treasure Island.

3 What I would like to do is explain the  
4 purpose of the remedial investigation that's  
5 currently ongoing and describe the progress that  
6 we have had to date and tell you what we'll be  
7 doing in the future.

8 The goal of the Phase II B Remedial  
9 Investigation is to delineate the extent of  
10 contamination at 21 installation restoration  
11 sites. 19 of the sites were investigated during  
12 the Phase I Remedial Investigation that occurred  
13 in 1992. Since during that investigation we  
14 identified several data gaps, and so the purpose  
15 of this investigation is to fill those data gaps.  
16 And then two additional sites were also  
17 identified after that investigation. And those  
18 are the bridge sites, the on- and off-ramps on  
19 the Bay Bridge.

20 The purpose of the remedial

1 investigation is to identify the potential  
2 sources and determine the types of contamination  
3 and how far the contamination has moved away from  
4 their sources.

5 A site is characterized by installing  
6 soil borings to collect soil and groundwater  
7 samples and installing monitoring wells to  
8 monitor the migration of contaminants in the  
9 groundwater.

10 You have another handout. I'd just  
11 like to explain what you have. You have a table.  
12 This is from the work plan that is our final  
13 Phase II B Remedial Work Plan Addendum, which was  
14 finalized in April. My months are off right now.  
15 And the intent of this was for all the new  
16 members that don't know what we're doing, and  
17 remind the old RAB, or existing community  
18 members, not the old, all the RAB members who  
19 have been around for a while with us, what we're  
20 trying to achieve at each site.

1                   So it identifies the site, the name,  
2                   the data gap, the various sources that we  
3                   encountered, and what our investigation plan was.  
4                   And then also the analyses that we would be  
5                   running.

6                   And I didn't intend on going through  
7                   this with you. This is just more for your  
8                   information when I talk about the sites. I'm  
9                   just going to give the number of sites for you to  
10                  look back at these sites and ask any questions.

11                  We had 21 sites to be investigated.  
12                  At this time we completed the sampling, including  
13                  the selection of monitoring well locations, at 12  
14                  sites. And those are 4, 19, 6, 7, 10, 8, 9, 11,  
15                  14, 22, 16. And 20 is an error. It's really 29.  
16                  So 20 is not correct.

17                  When you look at the next slide you'll  
18                  see 20 again.

19                  We have nine sites remaining to be  
20                  completed. And sites 5, 12, 15 and 20 will be

1 completed by the end of September, which is the  
2 end of this week. We will be completed sampling  
3 at sites 15 and 20, I believe, and we're waiting  
4 on the results of those. And we went back to  
5 Site 12, which was a rather large site. I'm just  
6 going to go back to that site.

7 Where you see red is installation  
8 restoration sites, and those are the sites that  
9 we're investigating. And Site 12 is this huge  
10 site right here. So, identified, for example, an  
11 additional 26 locations to go back and install  
12 soil borings and collect water samples, just so  
13 you can get an idea of where we're investigating  
14 along the base. Investigations at other sites  
15 will be completed by the second week in October.

16 For the sites that have yet to be  
17 completed, what we're waiting for is laboratory  
18 data, such as for sites 21 and 24, which are  
19 contaminated with trichloroethylene and  
20 tetrachlorethylene. And as some of you know,

1 we're running amino acid test kits, which are the  
2 screening kits, and we're not getting  
3 trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene. So we  
4 have to wait for laboratory data. And we do ask  
5 the lab for a quick turnaround time, and sometime  
6 it's successful and sometimes not. We're also  
7 awaiting screen results.

8 And then we also will be looking at  
9 all this data to determine the need for  
10 monitoring wells. At that time we will sit down  
11 and meet with the regulatory agencies and we  
12 propose our approaches for where to install  
13 monitoring wells and they make their suggestions.  
14 Sometimes they agree and sometimes they don't.  
15 And they always have really good suggestions on  
16 what we should be doing. So it's been working  
17 really well.

18 Our future work for the Phase II IR  
19 will be installing wells in mid October. So by  
20 the end of October all the wells should be

1 installed. And in November we'll start sampling  
2 all of the new monitoring wells and all of the  
3 existing monitoring wells that were installed  
4 during the Phase I Remedial Investigation, or by  
5 other contractors under different investigations.

6 In July we started our investigation.  
7 In May of this year, the end of May to July, we  
8 started receiving laboratory data. And that data  
9 is currently being validated. And we'll be  
10 receiving validating data for February '96,  
11 because the November data, we won't receive it  
12 until January and it won't get validated until  
13 February.

14 And then we begin on report  
15 preparation as soon as the field work ends.  
16 It'll begin November 1995 through August '96.  
17 This includes the remedial investigation, the  
18 baseline human health risk assessment, and the  
19 onshore ecological risk assessment. All of those  
20 reports are scheduled to be submitted in August

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

1996.

When we received your proposed discussion topics, you had a number of items that you wanted information on, and we were hoping that this would provide the information that you wanted to know.

We are currently about four weeks behind schedule and that's due to some sites having more contamination than we originally suspected; which is 12, 5, 11, and I think there's a couple of others but they're not coming to mind at this time. And just getting some administrative details, gaining access to sites, and having other programs complete their work before we can start our work. That has delayed some things. However, the reports, originally our intention was to submit the reports in August 1996, and we don't foresee that the delay in the field work will affect the schedule in August of next year.

1                   So, is there -- are there any  
2                   questions? I moved through all this very  
3                   quickly.

4                   MR. WONG: May I make a suggestion,  
5                   and I think this is a way we can get on track.

6                   Since this was pretty quick, I'd like  
7                   to see, since it's related, if Jim could talk  
8                   about the environmental restoration budget and  
9                   projects, because that was part and parcel with  
10                  the Phase II B work plan discussion. And then at  
11                  that point we're pretty close to 9:00 o'clock, we  
12                  could hop it up to a good 15, 20 minute  
13                  discussion combination, both topics.

14                  Does that seem to agree with you if we  
15                  move it along in that line?

16                  MS. TOBIAS: Can I just say one more  
17                  thing real quick. I'm sorry.

18                  We brought this for you to take a look  
19                  at. We'll pass this around because you can't see  
20                  it. Paul can see it. And what we wanted to show

1 you is how we look at the data and how we decided  
2 if a site had been correctly characterized.

3 So what we have on the bottom is  
4 results from the soil on Site 6. Site 6 is the  
5 fire training school. That's the site that we  
6 conducted the day for RAB on July 15th. And so  
7 on the bottom we have soil results and on the top  
8 we have groundwater results. And when you get  
9 it, this is where you have to look at green, and  
10 that means that area is green, and so you've  
11 identified your contaminant plume in your  
12 groundwater.

13 Also, on this site we have some blue  
14 dots, and what they are are proposed well  
15 locations for that site.

16 So, I can explain it later, but I  
17 thought we could pass it around for everyone to  
18 take a look at. It doesn't lend itself to  
19 overhead. So, I'll start on this side.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Sharon.

1 FY96 TI BUDGET/PROJECTS

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Now I'll talk for a few  
3 minutes, I'll kind of trim down my comments on  
4 the restoration budget/projects. As Brad has  
5 pointed out, that really is interrelated with the  
6 work that Sharon and others are doing.

7 Basically, in a nutshell, and I  
8 briefed this at the last couple of meetings, our  
9 funding is somewhat limited. In part it's due to  
10 the fact that the availability of environmental  
11 cleanup funding government-wide is limited. And  
12 then there's some distribution of that limited  
13 funding based on the status of the land transfer  
14 and leasing of the property.

15 So in those locations where closing  
16 military bases are closer to either major leasing  
17 or actual transfer of the property, that's where  
18 more of the money is going. Locations where the  
19 planning process is still in progress, there's  
20 lesser money being made available, with the

1 assumption that if a property is ready to be  
2 leased or transferred, then more money will be  
3 available to make that happen. But if property  
4 is not ready to be leased or transferred, then  
5 spending expediting the cleanup will not have an  
6 effect on that land being made available to the  
7 community if plans aren't available for reuse  
8 yet.

9 So, consequently, since the City of  
10 San Francisco is still in its land use planning  
11 process, whereas, for example, the City of  
12 Vallejo had completed its land use plan for the  
13 Mare Island Shipyard, and the City of Alameda, I  
14 think, is fairly close to its completing its  
15 reuse plan for the Naval Air Station at Alameda,  
16 we're getting less funding than those two  
17 locations.

18 Our funding is fairly slim. We expect  
19 to receive about \$1.5 million for fiscal year  
20 '96, which begins this Saturday -- begins this

1 weekend, first of October, and runs through the  
2 third of September next year. Most of that money  
3 is going to continue the remedial investigation  
4 program that we just had the brief on, to carry  
5 us to that August '96 remedial investigation  
6 report.

7 What remaining funding is left is  
8 primarily going to our baseline surveys of sites  
9 other than the cleanup sites. And then also to  
10 do a finding of suitability to lease for the area  
11 around Building 3 because of potential city  
12 interest in its use as a movie studio, an  
13 additional movie study, in addition to the FOSLs  
14 that we completed on Buildings 2 and 180. And  
15 then also the Department of Labor has identified  
16 about 35 acres of the island, mostly in our  
17 bachelor quarters or barrack areas, for use as a  
18 job corps center. And we're required to prepare  
19 a finding on suitability to transfer that  
20 property from the Department of Defense to the

1 Department of Labor.

2 So those work items will use up our  
3 available \$1.5 million for FY, fiscal year, 1996.

4 What remains unfunded, and there's a  
5 second category of unfunded but highly desired on  
6 our part to get funded should additional money  
7 become available in 1996, and that is to do the  
8 offshore sediment sampling around Treasure  
9 Island. And then, also, to do a removal of fuel  
10 lines and abandonment cleaning and place of fuel  
11 lines in Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.  
12 So we hope to get funding for those, but at  
13 present it's not programmed.

14 And then what's totally unfunded and  
15 which, unless there's some major changes in  
16 availability of funding, will probably not be  
17 done during 1996, is many of the other cleanup  
18 programs other than the installation restoration  
19 sites. And that would include asbestos  
20 abatement, lead-based paint, underground storage

1 tanks, virtually everything other than the  
2 colored sites on the map. And we hope that this  
3 funding situation will improve in 1997, but at  
4 present, primarily due to the fact that land is  
5 not close to being transferred at Treasure  
6 Island, we're not being funded for those sites.

7 So that, in brief, is the funding  
8 picture, and I will try to put that into more of  
9 a slide or handout that we can send you in the  
10 interim.

11 Are there any questions?

12 OPEN QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

13 A PARTICIPANT: Is the lead-based  
14 paint assessment, is that money that would be  
15 needed to do the actual assessment or do the  
16 remediation?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Both. First we have to  
18 do -- first we have to do an assessment and then  
19 we would have, depending on the results of that  
20 assessment, we would have to do abatement.

1                   Now, there is an assessment going on  
2                   in some of our buildings, but we're not going to  
3                   be able to complete even the assessment program  
4                   in 1996.

5                   A PARTICIPANT:   And does that program  
6                   include also sampling the sediments around  
7                   buildings where the exteriors are painted with  
8                   lead-base paint?

9                   MR. SULLIVAN:   If appropriate.

10                  A PARTICIPANT:   Are all of the  
11                  contracts in place to account for the money, or  
12                  are there, you know, is there a possibility of  
13                  contracting out for things?

14                  MR. SULLIVAN:   Well, we have more --  
15                  we have more contracts available than we have  
16                  money to fund them.

17                  Like, for example, the offshore  
18                  sediment, if money becomes available, we will be  
19                  able to fund that immediately.

20                  The removal and closure of the

1 underground fuel lines, we have the plans and  
2 specs all completed, ready to go to bid, but  
3 we're waiting funding.

4 So on those two projects, we're really  
5 hoping that additional money will become  
6 available during 1996 so we could start those  
7 projects.

8 A PARTICIPANT: Roughly, what kind of  
9 money is available for those, I mean, what kind  
10 of money would they cost? I'm sorry.

11 MR. SULLIVAN: The offshore sampling  
12 is somewhere in excess of, somewhere probably  
13 between a half million -- in excess of a half  
14 million dollars, 500,000, and the fuel line  
15 project is probably in the general neighborhood  
16 of three-quarters of a million.

17 MR. WONG: I think Fred was before  
18 you.

19 A PARTICIPANT: I was just going to  
20 ask: Has any offshore sediment sampling been

1 done in the area of the pipeline pier that's  
2 being -- that's scheduled to be dismantled,  
3 offshore sediment sampling at all on the island  
4 so far?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: We've already done some  
6 offshore sampling at various locations all around  
7 Treasure Island, and then this additional  
8 sampling would complete that process. And I  
9 think the pier you're referring to is our former  
10 fuel pier, Pier 21, which is currently in the  
11 process of being demolished right now and  
12 probably be complete in a couple of months.

13 A PARTICIPANT: How is it determined  
14 how the money is to be spent for fiscal year  
15 1996?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: It was a cyclical  
17 process. The Navy originally put together a list  
18 of projects, or I should say we, as the Naval  
19 Station Treasure Island team, put together a list  
20 of projects, and then we also had to integrate

1 that project list with the project lists for the  
2 other bases in the Bay Area. And then the  
3 regulators, Kelly PC and U.S. PCA were also  
4 brought in to provide comment before the list was  
5 finalized.

6 A PARTICIPANT: So the list is set, it  
7 can't change?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: For 1996, yes. And  
9 given that our funding is so slim, about a  
10 million and a half dollars, most of that is  
11 really locked up in completing the most important  
12 program which is the completion of the IR site  
13 investigation.

14 MR. WONG: Pat.

15 MS. NELSON: Two questions. I have  
16 one for Sharon and one for Jim.

17 Once upon a time we had heard the  
18 possibility of the data being entered into a GIS  
19 program, I think for Phase II B. And the  
20 question I have is whether or not the data from

1 the Phase II B program will be entered into a GIS  
2 program and made available to the technical  
3 subcommittee of the RAB for review prior to  
4 release of the summary documents?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: The Engineering Field  
6 Activity West is still looking at various options  
7 for the geographic information systems. So I  
8 think we're not as far along as we thought we  
9 might be at this point. I think that probably in  
10 the next, probably in the next one to three  
11 months there will be some decisions made on what  
12 direction to proceed in. And that might allow us  
13 to be able to put Phase II data -- well, all of  
14 the Phase I and Phase II data into that kind of a  
15 database.

16 MS. NELSON: I would ask that the RAB  
17 be kept informed as to the progress on that. And  
18 any possibility that the technical committee  
19 would review the data prior to the release of the  
20 reports, because it's going to be a monumental

1 amount of information for the technical committee  
2 to plow through.

3 MR. WONG: Can you rephrase that in a  
4 quick action item.

5 MS. NELSON: I guess there are two:  
6 For the RAB to be kept informed of the progress  
7 obtained in a GIS, geographic information system,  
8 for the Phase I and Phase II work.

9 And two, to make available to the  
10 subcommittee of RAB the technical data as it is  
11 being compiled, so that the technical committee  
12 will have a leg up before the document summary is  
13 ready to review.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Let me just clarify.  
15 Is the request, then, whether or not we have a  
16 GIS or some sort of electronic system  
17 implemented, you're still asking regardless of  
18 that?

19 MS. NELSON: Yes.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: To have earlier access

1 to the data?

2 MS. NELSON: Yes.

3 MR. HEHN: Even if that is in a draft  
4 format and it's not necessarily fully validated,  
5 I think that would still be valuable to have some  
6 idea on direction of where some of those samples  
7 are heading.

8 MS. NELSON: Particularly, the sites  
9 that Sharon has identified as being more  
10 contaminated than originally expected.

11 Now my question for you, Jim; maybe  
12 Sharon can answer it, I'm not sure.

13 Has the Navy considered, for those  
14 buildings it will be leasing out for which funds  
15 are not available to abate any asbestos or  
16 lead-based paints or any of the contaminants that  
17 might be available, consider that as a lease, or  
18 let's abate those contaminants as an option to  
19 investigating them?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: That's a good question.

1 I would have to get back to you on that.

2 MS. NELSON: Okay.

3 MR. WONG: In the absence of  
4 questions, while everybody is thinking about one,  
5 I have a question, Jim.

6 You had a handout on the back table  
7 that shows a one, two, three, four, five, six, a  
8 six-year spreadsheet of proposed budgets, and it  
9 has down 2.6 million for this year, 13 million  
10 for compliance programs. So I'm wondering, has  
11 there been a million dollar cut due to the budget  
12 discussions in Washington right now, and can you  
13 explain the compliance programs a little bit. Is  
14 that ongoing activity or is that -- my  
15 understanding and assessment and all of that.

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I can explain.

17 And, Ernie, you put that out.

18 Okay. What this is, and it's an  
19 addendum to the BRAC cleanup plans. The BRAC  
20 cleanup plans that were issued back in March did

1 not include this table because it was not yet  
2 available. What this represents is the  
3 requirements on an annual basis if full funding  
4 were available. So it represents the scope of  
5 work in terms of dollars.

6 Now, what we're actually getting is  
7 something less than that. And as Brad pointed  
8 out, for example, in FY '96, the total, total  
9 amount of work effort is \$16 million. But we're  
10 receiving about 10 percent of that, \$1.5 million.  
11 And the majority of that is going to the  
12 installation restoration program, with a lesser  
13 amount to compliance programs.

14 And the question for compliance is,  
15 does that represent ongoing compliance like our  
16 operation of the sewage treatment plant or  
17 disposal of hazardous wastes as a result of our  
18 operations. And the answer is no. That's an  
19 ongoing Navy operations cost.

20 This line item for compliance refers

1 to those programs necessary to put the property  
2 in a condition to be leased or transferred. And  
3 that would include the asbestos, lead-based  
4 paint, underground storage tanks; basically,  
5 compliance programs is a catchall for everything  
6 that's not an IR site but it relates to what we  
7 have to do to get it ready for leasing or  
8 transfer, as opposed to what we do on a daily  
9 basis to be it compliance with the law.

10 MR. WONG: So, if I can just have a  
11 follow-up question to that: If I understand  
12 this, then, what you're saying is, basically, you  
13 asked for 16 million and you got essentially a  
14 \$15 million budget slice. Because don't those  
15 compliance programs that you just mentioned that  
16 you asked for \$13 million for, that's some of the  
17 topics that we've been looking at here, for  
18 instance, hauling some of the U.S.T. programs out  
19 of CERCLA, and things of that sort. Essentially,  
20 you're saying this is \$1.5 million to spend on IR

1 and compliance programs to get these sites  
2 available to transfer to the city or whomever,  
3 and that's down from 16 million that you asked  
4 for.

5 MR. SULLIVAN: Basically --

6 MR. WONG: Am I understanding this  
7 correctly?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Basically, we  
9 identified a total of \$16 million worth of work  
10 that could be done in 1996, but we're only  
11 receiving about 10 percent of that. So that just  
12 means that the program is just going to be  
13 deferred until 1997 or beyond that. And that's  
14 being driven primarily by the fact that the  
15 reuse -- it's being driven by limited  
16 availability of federal funds, and also the fact  
17 that we're on a lower priority than bases like  
18 Mare Island and Naval Air Station Alameda,  
19 because we're further -- the city is further away  
20 from a reuse plan.

1                   When the reuse plan for the -- when  
2                   the City's reuse plan is completed, we would  
3                   expect to be a -- or when there's firm proposals  
4                   for leasing -- we would expect to have a higher  
5                   priority for funding. But even if we have a  
6                   higher priority, it's still going to depend on  
7                   the overall amount of federal cleanup money  
8                   available. Which at this point, even if every  
9                   base had its cleanup plan all ready to go and the  
10                  plan was where the community wanted to take it,  
11                  there's not enough cleanup money.

12                  A PARTICIPANT: When you say cleanup  
13                  money, do you mean only IRP money, or do you also  
14                  mean alternative sources of funding like  
15                  Superfund money and other programs from which --

16                  MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the federal  
17                  government, and more specifically the Department  
18                  of Defense, is self-funding for cleanup.

19                  So, for example, the Superfund  
20                  program, which the EPA administers and cleans up

1 sites and then recoups the money later, that's  
2 not -- that's not available to us. The  
3 Department of Defense pays for its own cleanup.

4 So that's our only source; the money  
5 appropriated by Congress for the Department of  
6 Defense is the only source of funding for  
7 cleanup.

8 MR. HEHN: A couple of questions.

9 One, is the sampling of the new and  
10 existing groundwater monitoring wells, is that  
11 going to be delayed, quarterly sampling event?

12 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, that's correct. The  
13 intent was to have the two events coincide.

14 MR. HEHN: So, actually, when that  
15 groundwater monitoring report is released, it  
16 will include the wells, so we'll actually have  
17 that data a little bit earlier than the August  
18 '96 time frame.

19 MS. TOBIAS: I'm not quite sure about  
20 that, if we're going to include the new wells

1 with that. We possibly will. That fourth  
2 quarter monitoring is the annual report for the  
3 four quarters. We might provide other data in  
4 the addendum or as an attachment to it, so you  
5 can look at everything.

6 MR. HEHN: That would be beneficial.

7 Is that also a time frame when you're  
8 looking at making the revisions to the format of  
9 the quarterly sampling report?

10 MS. TOBIAS: Yes, that's correct.

11 MR. HEHN: Also, there was a table or  
12 summary of preliminary data that was back there,  
13 I assume that's from Phase II B?

14 MS. TOBIAS: Right.

15 MR. HEHN: Can you tell us a little  
16 bit about this particular table, is this just  
17 sort of an example of how it's going to be  
18 presented or just data for some site?

19 MS. TOBIAS: That is Site 6, I  
20 believe, from the data the RABs got in the

1 needle. Those are the samples that were  
2 collected that day.

3 MR. HEHN: Okay. Can you explain, I  
4 don't understand the second table of soil and  
5 groundwater analysis for volatiles. Have the --

6 MS. TOBIAS: Which table?

7 MR. HEHN: Let's say page two, or  
8 second -- page one which is inside.

9 MS. TOBIAS: All undetected,  
10 non-detect.

11 MR. HEHN: In the results table, is  
12 that the detection limit?

13 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.

14 MR. HEHN: Okay.

15 MS. TOBIAS: It looks like this. I  
16 know you can't see from way back. Sorry.

17 Right; those are the detection limits.

18 MR. HEHN: So this is all detect, not  
19 really resolved, and these are the actual values?

20 MS. TOBIAS: No, they're all the

1 detection limits because we didn't detect  
2 anything.

3 MR. HEHN: That's where I was  
4 confused.

5 MS. TOBIAS: No, it's a non-detect.

6 MS. NELSON: Are you referring to  
7 the --

8 MS. TOBIAS: No, he's referring to the  
9 table, it was on the back table, for the data in  
10 the field.

11 A PARTICIPANT: Are the detection  
12 limits low in that where they can be prepared to  
13 cleanup standards; do we know that?

14 MS. TOBIAS: We don't have cleanup  
15 standards yet.

16 A PARTICIPANT: So, hypothetical:  
17 What if the detection limit wasn't low enough  
18 where it could be determined whether or not it  
19 did meet cleanup standards or not, does that mean  
20 re-sampling would have to be done?

1 MS. TOBIAS: Well, you could do  
2 re-sampling when you actually went out to do your  
3 remediation. When you do your remediation, you  
4 are going to insure that you remove all the soil  
5 that is below your cleanup standard. However,  
6 the samples that we sent to the lab have very low  
7 detection limits, so they're standard contract  
8 laboratory procedure methods, so, they're very  
9 low, so --

10 A PARTICIPANT: And I guess, in what  
11 phase are the standard cleanup -- when will the  
12 standard cleanup levels be determined; is that  
13 like a year from now, an ecological assessment?

14 MS. TOBIAS: They will be discussed.  
15 Now, we're starting to discuss the approach with  
16 the agencies and proposing approaches and we'll  
17 be determining -- we'll start proposing more  
18 cleanup levels in the next year as part of the  
19 remedial investigation and feasibility study to  
20 determine what sites need to be cleaned up. And

1           you don't clean up a site unless there's a human  
2           health or ecological problem.

3                   MR. WONG:   Or money.

4                   MS. TOBIAS:   Excuse me?

5                   MR. WONG:   Or money.

6                   MS. KATHURIA:   Are you talking about  
7           EPA cleanup values?   We do have PRGs, that we see  
8           if they're above or below that.

9                   A PARTICIPANT:   And so we know what  
10          those are, I guess, the amino assays meet the PRC  
11          values.   Can you meet those, because amino assays  
12          are only done for petroleum hydrocarbons here.  
13          These are all volatiles.

14                   MS. TOBIAS:   These are actually the  
15          laboratory results.

16                   A PARTICIPANT:   But I guess that's a  
17          good point, is the amino assays.

18                   MS. TOBIAS:   And there are no PRGs.

19                   MS. KATHURIA:   Sometimes we use that  
20          for guidelines, which is about 10 pp or a hundred

1 ppm. It's like a cleanup. It's just sort of  
2 alerting, trying to alert us that there may be a  
3 problem, but not that there is one.

4 MS. TOBIAS: So the PRC that we have,  
5 the detection limit we have for the CPH is 15  
6 amino assay. If it's above 15 parts per million,  
7 then we'll see it within a range of 15 to a  
8 hundred.

9 A PARTICIPANT: So there's a pretty  
10 big standard deviation here?

11 MS. TOBIAS: If the contamination is  
12 between 15 and a hundred, we will see that.  
13 There's two different -- three standards that you  
14 measure against. The below 15 parts per million,  
15 between 15 and a hundred, and greater than 100.  
16 And for the investigative phase, if it's higher,  
17 if the levels are higher than a hundred, if the  
18 results show contamination is higher than a  
19 hundred, we will do additional sampling. If it's  
20 between 15 and 100 level, that's within a

1 reasonable range, not necessarily for  
2 contamination, but at that point contamination is  
3 going to taper off.

4 A PARTICIPANT: So it's kind of a  
5 gamble that you're saying that over time they're  
6 going to be reduced?

7 MS. TOBIAS: Also, if your source is  
8 here and over there it's in the mid range, by the  
9 time you get on the other side of the building  
10 you'll be at non-detect. So that's kind of --  
11 you use an extrapolation when you do your  
12 cleanup. You actually do the sampling to be sure  
13 you remove all the soil above that level. You  
14 have to do that anyway, so you either pay now or  
15 you pay later.

16 MR. WONG: The hour is going by once  
17 again. I'd like to try to keep us on track here  
18 a bit.

19 An issue that we all need to keep in  
20 mind, and I may be off in my view on this, but

1 essentially what we're talking about when we  
2 entered this process a year ago, in coming into  
3 Fiscal '96, is there was a \$16 million cleanup  
4 program; that we were supposed to help, provide  
5 input, and maybe come up with innovative ways and  
6 things of that sort. We now have \$1.5 million  
7 for the fiscal year, which I think I heard  
8 tonight means essentially the Phase II B Remedial  
9 Investigation is going to continue to produce the  
10 documents in August of '96.

11 What I think we in addition ask, we  
12 need to take a look at what the focus of the RAB  
13 is going to be in light of the reality that  
14 there's \$1.5 million to spend. To me, what it  
15 says is the discussion that we just had here,  
16 which I think is very valuable and good, is it  
17 gets down to a technical discussion: What is the  
18 detect limits; what is your methodology, is it  
19 correct; and things like that.

20 The broader issue is, setting site

1 priorities, you know, et cetera, et cetera, et  
2 cetera, don't exist for us because there's no  
3 money in the program. It's not moving ahead  
4 until the CRC gets out front.

5 It's something to think about. What  
6 I'd like to propose is that we have been asked to  
7 suggest topics that are global in nature, adding  
8 the bigger picture for environmental cleanup for  
9 Treasure Island, that, and to suggest innovative  
10 ways and comment and creativity, et cetera, on  
11 the cleanup process as it moves ahead to  
12 transfer.

13 Essentially, what I'm hearing tonight  
14 is that doesn't exist. There is, like, no money  
15 for that. And so there is -- and that may have  
16 been behind some of the concerns here -- there  
17 are concerns about the topics we picked.

18 So I would like to, as an action item,  
19 be put on that we need guidance from the Navy and  
20 the regulators on exactly how we can be the most

1 helpful, given the \$1.5 million available, to  
2 expedite the cleanup process, look at innovative  
3 strategies and, in general, keep this process  
4 moving on. Otherwise, it's for nought.

5 And I'd like to see if -- and this  
6 dovetails to what was brought up before, that Jim  
7 and myself, that we work together to come up with  
8 essentially their suggestions, a counter-proposal  
9 to ours, as to what agenda items should be that  
10 we discuss in depth that's relevant to the  
11 process as it now exists in a way that we can  
12 feel like we're contributing in the process  
13 benefits.

14 Again, I may be off and no one else is  
15 thinking that way. I'm happy to entertain it,  
16 but I'd like to throw that out, at least, as an  
17 agenda meeting to look at, at least, in the next  
18 meeting to develop. What I'm hearing is we're  
19 here and we're just going to be taking a look at  
20 the methodologies for detection for the next 12

1 months, and seems to me there's got to be more  
2 that we can do.

3 Henry?

4 MR. ONGERTH: What you have said is  
5 important and makes very good sense. I think it  
6 would -- part of this would be what the position  
7 is of the regulatory agencies. What are their  
8 requirements, demands, to be in the context of  
9 reality of what can be accomplished. Where are  
10 they in their positions. It seems to me that's  
11 part of the background that would be helpful to  
12 us along the lines that you have mentioned.

13 MR. HEHN: I think the other thing is  
14 that things that we can also be involved in and  
15 assist and make recommendations on are those  
16 issues that as we get the results from the  
17 Phase II B, and as the cleanup standards are --  
18 and try to set the cleanup goals and some of the  
19 risk assessments that can be done at the current  
20 funding levels. I think we can still be very

1           beneficial in looking at those goals and work on  
2           remediation options, so that those particular  
3           pieces of information are put together and  
4           available by year-end so that they are ready for  
5           funding as that becomes available. So that these  
6           are moving from that assessment issue into the  
7           remediation issue, which the way that we're  
8           getting the ideas back from federal funding is  
9           they don't want to be paying for assessment, they  
10          want to be paying for remediation. So let's move  
11          to the point where we're looking at the  
12          remediation and have a plan for doing that kind  
13          of work.

14                    So I think, I think there's something  
15                    that can be done out of that with very little,  
16                    you know, cost.

17                    A PARTICIPANT: Brad, I think we  
18                    definitely need to be involved or seek the advice  
19                    of the San Francisco planning authorities to  
20                    understand, and this falls back on something I

1           said earlier and I know that, but in terms of the  
2           reality here, we're talking a year ago  
3           \$16 million, we're now down to 1.5, 10 percent,  
4           there's some reality to what's doable. And who  
5           knows, the Navy may ultimately be forced to  
6           simply walk away from Treasure Island and leave  
7           it as it is. Who knows what the next  
8           administration is going to bring.

9                        I think that the planning process and  
10           the remediation process, it's the chicken and the  
11           egg, which comes first. The planning people need  
12           to have a sense of what is required physically in  
13           terms of remediation, which we hopefully can  
14           provide them with some input on. And we need to  
15           know what the planning people are thinking about  
16           so that we understand what level of remediation  
17           might be realistic and required.

18                      So it would seem to me that we're  
19           going to spin our wheels, perhaps spin our wheels  
20           uselessly, if we don't have an ongoing detailed

1 interface with the planning people and understand  
2 exactly what the planning people are looking at  
3 for Treasure Island. Not just the Navy and the  
4 regulators.

5 MR. WONG: Okay.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: I'd like to maybe try  
7 and put a little silver lining on this. And that  
8 this is a big program. There's a lot of things  
9 going on that we haven't even been able to get  
10 into a lot of detail with you on. And I've  
11 been -- I've attended other RABs at other bases.  
12 And where the programs are moving faster, you  
13 know, the RABs are -- it's much more difficult  
14 and challenging for them to keep up with the  
15 documents. So perhaps we have an opportunity  
16 here, with the funding moving a little slower, at  
17 least for 1996, is to get into, have time to  
18 study the issues and get a better understanding,  
19 so that when the documents do start to move more  
20 quickly in maybe the latter half of 1996 and '97,

1 that we already have discussed them and have a  
2 better base to make decisions on.

3 MR. WONG: I'd agree with that. And I  
4 think what we're asking for is your guidance on  
5 exactly what those issues are we should be  
6 focusing on, given the new fiscal realities here,  
7 and so that we can get out ahead and do that.  
8 And that's what we're asking for, or I'm asking  
9 for, for the next interim meeting, so that we can  
10 decide that and we can move ahead.

11 I think we need to refocus what we're  
12 going to be concentrating on given the realities  
13 of the fiscal constraints and what activity is  
14 going to be happening on Treasure Island. And I  
15 think you and the regulators know that better  
16 than we do at this point. We need your guidance.

17 A PARTICIPANT: Are there any groups,  
18 there must be, I assume, lobbying for increased  
19 funding for cleanup, because every few months  
20 we're talking about closing down more bases

1 without any more funds to remediate.

2 MS. CASSA: The state is lobbying for  
3 more money.

4 A PARTICIPANT: Are they lobbying  
5 Congress for more money to be able to distribute?  
6 There's only a certain amount that they can draw  
7 from.

8 A PARTICIPANT: There's, I know, ARC  
9 Ecology is intimately involved in that process  
10 and several other groups that are constantly on  
11 the Hill trying to lobby for it.

12 MR. WONG: Okay. If there are no  
13 other questions and all, do you want to move  
14 along with the agenda and wrap up?

15 CLOSING REMARKS

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I think we can  
17 speed along to wrap-up.

18 We would normally talk about agenda  
19 items for the next meeting, but we've already  
20 discussed that. And we've agreed that we'll

1 prepare a more refined list at the next interim  
2 meeting on the 10th of October. So that in turn  
3 will define the agenda for the next meeting, as  
4 well as probably November and December. So, that  
5 takes care of that item.

6 Review of new action items, I think  
7 we've got it all captured in the minutes, so I  
8 think we can pass on going through all of those.

9 You're also -- you're certainly  
10 welcome, once the transcripts are complete, to,  
11 you know, to take a look at a copy. We do have  
12 the advantage of not only having the minutes, but  
13 also the transcript of the meetings.

14 Then to close; just to identify our  
15 next meetings: We have our October and November  
16 meetings scheduled. The next mid month community  
17 meeting is Tuesday the 10th of October. And  
18 that's not here, that's the mid month meetings.  
19 The mid month meetings have been, and will likely  
20 continue to be, in our main administration

1 building. That's Building 1, the semicircular  
2 building as you come in the main gate, and that's  
3 in the second floor conference room. And we put  
4 signs on the doors to guide you to the room.

5 A PARTICIPANT: Did you say the mid  
6 meeting was the 10th?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, mid month. I was  
8 in error when we put the agenda together. It is  
9 meant to be the second Tuesday in October, which  
10 is the 10th of October, and I had it listed as  
11 the 14th. So the meeting is the 10th of October,  
12 Tuesday.

13 Also, this Saturday we have our tour,  
14 and it's in two parts. The original intent of  
15 the tour was to provide a tour of the cleanup  
16 sites. And that will occur from 10:00 o'clock to  
17 approximately 12:00 o'clock. And we'll be  
18 meeting in front of the parking lot of  
19 Building 1. That's the semicircular  
20 administration building at the front gate. And

1           there will be probably a white Navy school bus  
2           type vehicle that will take us around, so we'll  
3           be leaving promptly at 10:00. But I do have the  
4           bus available earlier in the morning, so between  
5           9:00 and 10:00 we will conduct a general  
6           non-environmental tour, particularly for the  
7           newer members, just to do a quick orientation of  
8           Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and how  
9           the Naval Station operates, and what discussions  
10          there may have been on proposed reuse, and I can  
11          point out the Department of Labor job corps site.  
12          So at the 10:00 to 12:00 o'clock tour we can  
13          concentrate more on the cleanup issues.

14                   A PARTICIPANT: Do you need to sign up  
15                   for the tour?

16                   MR. SULLIVAN: No. Anybody that shows  
17                   up at 9:00 o'clock will get a general tour, and  
18                   whoever shows up at 10:00 o'clock will get the  
19                   environmental tour.

20                   A PARTICIPANT: Is this just for RAB

1 members?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: We've billed it as RAB  
3 members because we've just got one bus, but  
4 should you want to bring along a guest, I would  
5 think with a full-size bus we would have room.

6 MR. WONG: I do have -- I don't have  
7 one for everyone, unfortunately my Xerox didn't  
8 work, but I do have the results of what everybody  
9 signed up for, for instance, the technical  
10 subcommittee and all of that. And feel free to  
11 take some of these so you remember what you  
12 signed up for, and I guess who is on what. And I  
13 think longer term that will help us with the  
14 process, especially as we start getting more  
15 documents.

16 Paul, did you have something?

17 MR. HEHN: Just for those people who  
18 have signed up for the technical subcommittee or  
19 others that might be interested in participating  
20 in a review, we now have three documents that

1           have been presented to us for review and comment  
2           by the time of the next RAB meeting. So the  
3           draft FOSL, the draft environmental baseline  
4           survey, so anyone who would be interested in  
5           reviewing and commenting on any of those  
6           documents, why don't you let me know right after  
7           the meeting and we can try to make that happen,  
8           discuss that, couple of weeks to review. And  
9           then we'll try to set up a technical subcommittee  
10          meeting to discuss those and prepare any comments  
11          that seem to be appropriate by the next RAB  
12          meeting.

13                   MR. WONG: Then, if there is no other  
14          business, can we get a motion to adjourn.

15                   A PARTICIPANT: So moved.

16                   A PARTICIPANT: Second.

17                   MR. WONG: Thank you.

18                   MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you very much.

19                   (The meeting was adjourned at 9:41  
20          p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

Virginia Corrie