

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

CERTIFIED COPY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
24 OCTOBER 1995
7:15 p.m.
FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER
TREASURE ISLAND
MEETING NO. 15

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR #1268

449

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

PARTICIPANTS:

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

JAMES ALDRICH

ARC ECOLOGY, CHRIS SHIRLEY

CHARLES BOATMAN

RUTH GRAVANIS

RICHARD HANSEN

FRED HAYDEN

PAUL HEHN

GARY JENSEN

DANIEL MC DONALD

KAREN MENDELOW

RICK NEDELL

PATRICIA NELSON

HENRY ONGERTH

PATSY REESE

DALE SMITH

THOMAS THOMPSON

T.I. CITIZENS REUSE COMMITTEE,

LAURIE GLASS

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

T.I. YACHT CLUB, HARLAN VAN WYE

USHA VEDAGIRI

JAMES WILSON

BEAU WRIGHTSON

BRAD WONG, COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR

REGULATORY AGENCIES

MARY ROSE CASSA (DTSC)

GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)

RACHEL SIMONS (U.S. EPA)

US. NAVY

LT. NANNETTE ROBERTS (NAVSTA TI)

JIM SULLIVAN (BEC and NAVY CO-CHAIR)

HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

SHARON TOBIAS

STACEY LUPTON

1 (The meeting was called to order at
2 7:15 p.m. by Mr. James Sullivan, Co-Chair.)

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we're
4 ready to get going.

5 Welcome to our October Restoration
6 Advisory Board Meeting.

7 The first item on the agenda is the
8 agenda. Everyone should have a copy. If you
9 don't, there are extra copies on the back table.

10 The first item of business is to
11 approve the agenda for tonight, so I would like to
12 open it up to comments regarding tonight's agenda.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: I have issues
14 regarding the agenda that came up.

15 I received a couple of phone calls
16 pursuant to Jim's memo, that came out on the 13th,
17 regarding the breakout sessions, and then the
18 agenda proper this evening. So after discussing
19 the agenda with a number of people, I wanted to
20 pose to everybody, and get a consensus here, of

1 which way you thought this evening's meeting
2 should go among three options.

3 One of the things that came out at
4 the last meeting is that it appears that the
5 process for Treasure Island is about to hit a bit
6 of a hiatus, since there is no reuse plan; and
7 that won't be voted on until April. So in light
8 of that, the funding available for remediation on
9 Treasure Island is at a lower priority than some
10 of the other Naval bases.

11 In light of the pressure being taken
12 off of this group in terms of needing to make a
13 lot of decisions in the process, moving ahead real
14 quickly, there is some opportunity to look at what
15 we want to do in the next four to six months.

16 One of the issues that came up, is do
17 we want to go ahead and just discuss it, go ahead
18 with the three breakout sessions, highlighted in
19 the memo that Jim sent us regarding the three
20 documents, the FOSL's, the EBS, and the asbestos

1 survey?

2 Or another option is to take a look
3 and address the issue in light of last month's
4 meeting to exactly what it is we're going to be
5 doing over the next three to four months.

6 Or the third option is to move ahead
7 with the agenda as it is, which is a combination
8 of both; so that, in addition to the three
9 document reviews, we also convene a group that
10 would discuss some alternatives on what the group
11 could be doing over the next four to six months.

12 And then all of them come back and
13 report and try to get a consensus from the group
14 tonight.

15 I would like to put it to the group
16 which of the three versions you'd like to go. If
17 you agree with the three, the third version, we
18 pretty much approved the agenda as is; but there
19 was discussion about just focusing in on one of
20 the other two alternatives.

1 Can I get somebody to make a motion
2 which one of the three alternatives of tonight's
3 agenda we should go with?

4 MS. SMITH: I would like to make a
5 motion that we open the floor to discussion of
6 this agenda.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: That is fine.

8 MR. VAN WYE: Second.

9 MS. SMITH: We spent a large amount
10 of time going over what we thought were issues
11 that would be appropriate to discuss at these
12 RABS, so that people came on a voluntary basis and
13 would be able to partake in a knowledgeable manner
14 on the environmental issues on base closure.

15 This meeting was actually supposed to
16 be the second of our meetings, I believe -- Brad,
17 am I wrong? -- or it would be the first of our
18 agenda, and our agenda is not here. And it seems
19 to me strange that we have an hour devoted to a
20 breakout session on FOSL's when we took about an

1 hour at the Technical Subcommittee to go over all
2 the FOSL's, all of them, every single one; the
3 ABF; the EBS; the Asbestos Survey. It did not
4 take an hour. We spent more time than an hour,
5 but it did not take an hour to go over the issues,
6 and yet somewhere along the line our Community
7 Co-Chair line of action items got misplaced.

8 And I think that somehow we need to
9 focus on what this group wants to have as a
10 meeting, as opposed to what may be Cal EPA or the
11 military wants to have for a meeting. We are
12 volunteers.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: That, I think, will
14 be picked up in one of the three alternatives that
15 we have before us here on what we want to discuss
16 tonight.

17 So I would like to put it to the
18 floor again, if there is a motion of which of the
19 three alternatives, strictly focus on review of
20 the environmental documents, or strictly focus on

1 what is the purpose of this RAB and where it is
2 going, or accept the agenda as it is, which is a
3 combination of the two.

4 MS. NELSON: Or modify the agenda as
5 it was presented to us at this meeting.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: If you look under
7 8:05 of this evening's agenda, there actually are
8 four breakout sessions already in the agenda. The
9 RAB focus and topics for the future plus the three
10 documents. So this actually represents a
11 combination of both, if we accept it as it is.

12 MR. HEHN: I might make a comment on
13 that.

14 One of the things that were mentioned
15 in our session at the Technical Subcommittee
16 meeting I did was put together a listing of all
17 the comments and questions that came out of that
18 discussion on the three documents; and if the RAB
19 would prefer to discuss strictly the RAB focus and
20 topics issue and wanted to just read the comments

1 that were prepared at the Technical Subcommittee
2 Meeting as comments for the various documents that
3 are under review, that would not necessarily
4 preclude anybody else from submitting additional
5 comments or written suggestions or whatever.

6 Then we might just focus on the RAB
7 topics issue, and we still have comments here
8 based on the Technical Subcommittee review of
9 documents as well, so we can get both issues done.

10 I submitted and prepared the comments
11 and questions that came out of the Technical
12 Subcommittee meeting as essentially a means to
13 provide a starting point for discussions at the
14 breakout sessions, but we could dispense with that
15 and just use them as actual comments to the Navy
16 on those documents.

17 MS. NELSON: Maybe you could
18 summarize these for the larger group.

19 MR. HEHN: We could go ahead and pass
20 it around. If people want to review those rather

1 than go through pages of comments on them, pass it
2 around to people, and look at them and see if they
3 want to use that for either purpose, either as
4 breakout agenda or for just submitting as comments
5 on those FOSL's and the other technical new
6 documents.

7 I will pass this around, and you can
8 take a look at them.

9 MS. NELSON: I would support Paul's
10 suggestion and so move.

11 MS. SMITH: I second the motion.

12 MR. VAN WYE: From a parliamentary
13 standpoint, there was a motion on the floor; and
14 that was seconded; and that needs to be dealt
15 with. I believe that was not dealt with.

16 CO-CHAIR WONG: To open it to
17 discussion.

18 MR. VAN WYE: I withdraw my comments.

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: Paul, could you
20 restate your motion? We need your suggestion put

1 into the form of a motion to vote.

2 MR. HEHN: I might offer a motion
3 that we accept the comments from the Technical
4 Subcommittee as comments and suggestions to the
5 Navy on those three documents; and in place of the
6 breakout sessions, focus on the RAB overall focus
7 of topic issue, in order to give that as an area
8 for all the RAB. That would be my suggestion.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
10 throw out, before you might agree to finalize
11 that, that there still may be some benefit from
12 discussion, either in the larger group or still
13 having some more limited breakout sessions, to
14 have a little bit smaller group discussion on the
15 technical documents, especially for those
16 community members who may not have been able to
17 make any of the Technical Subcommittee meetings.

18 We may not need that much time to be
19 able to really accomplish a lot in one night just
20 on the single issue of RAB focus and topics.

1 In fact, I still think it may also be
2 beneficial to have a smaller group discussing that
3 and to bring some ideas back to the larger group.

4 I think there is some efficiency in
5 having several smaller groups rather than have one
6 giant group discussion.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: Jim, would you be
8 recommending to accept the agenda as is, with the
9 four breakout groups, and have that discussion on
10 future focus and topics there, and report back
11 with the other subgroups?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That would be my
13 recommendation. I think in the smaller group,
14 there could be more discussions; and then that
15 could be brought to the larger group.

16 Whether or not there needs to be
17 exactly four breakouts or whether or not the
18 EBS/FOSL and the EBS Sampling Plan might be
19 combined as one group, that could be decided. But
20 I think there is a benefit in having some smaller

1 informal discussion, particularly on the RAB focus
2 and topics.

3 MS. NELSON: Point of information:

4 How many here did not participate in
5 the technical group that Paul was interested in
6 having such a breakout session? Did not
7 participate, that want to be part of the breakout
8 session? (Show of hands)

9 MR. VAN WYE: Maybe I'm repeating
10 Patricia's question. Of the four topics listed,
11 how many people will not be attending the
12 breakout, going for RAB focus and topics? (Show
13 of hands of two)

14 It seems like this is a big deal.

15 MS. NELSON: In order of priority
16 between all of the four breakout sessions, the RAB
17 focus and topics is the topic of broader interest
18 among the group.

19 MR. VAN WYE: We have a vote of about
20 28 to 2. May I suggest something.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: If I could summarize
2 the discussion here in the form of the motion, it
3 is then that we accept Paul's suggestion and
4 accept the memorandum here of the questions that
5 came out of the Technical Subcommittee, to be
6 submitted with the three documents, and ask if
7 people have additional comments on this, to submit
8 them to Jim in writing.

9 MS. MENDELOW: I attended the
10 mid-monthly meeting. There were not that many
11 people there, but we had a large discussion about
12 what was happening now that was important for the
13 RAB to comment on, and Jim suggested that there
14 were more documents than really just a couple of
15 people on the Technical Committee could go over,
16 and it probably would be a useful thing for
17 everyone to spend some time reviewing some of
18 these documents so that they could familiarize
19 themselves as the documents came along, to make
20 comments.

1 I feel that it is valuable for
2 everyone to break out and look at these things.

3 As far as discussing what the RAB is
4 going to be doing over the next couple of months,
5 I think we could devote some time to that. But I
6 feel looking at some of these documents is
7 important for the RAB to do.

8 MS. NELSON: Maybe, Brad, you can
9 clarify the purpose of the RAB focus and topics
10 based on the information Jim gave us last year,
11 based on budget and where we would be going in
12 '96, because there is not a lot of money for the
13 environmental work until the Re-use Committee gets
14 its act together.

15 MS. GLASS: I would like to let
16 people know, when you say the Re-use Committee has
17 to get its act together, the Re-use Committee is
18 not significantly off its schedule. I don't think
19 it is an accurate representation of the situation,
20 if there is an implication that the Re-use

1 Committee is sort of fooling around. I don't
2 think that is an accurate representation of the
3 situation.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
5 agree with Laurie. We don't necessarily want to
6 be castigating the Re-use Committee.

7 I agree with Laurie that they are
8 moving forward now, although the City of Alameda
9 and Vallejo were on a faster track with their
10 Re-use Plan; and as a result, they are further
11 along in proposals for both final uses and leasing
12 of the property; and as a result of that, they are
13 consequently getting six or seven times as much
14 money as we are.

15 MS. GLASS: Did this start at the
16 same time?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: Let me see if I can
19 summarize, as Pat asked some of the issues here to
20 try to put this into perspective:

1 Essentially what we found out at the
2 last meeting with respect to the Re-use Committee
3 and the funding is that what has happened in
4 Washington is that those military bases scheduled
5 for closure that have an approved Re-use Plan in
6 place have priority funding for the cleanup, both
7 the investigation side and the remediation side.

8 Because Treasure Island does not have
9 a Re-use Plan and won't have one in place probably
10 until late spring, it is my understanding Treasure
11 Island was on a lower priority funding list for
12 remedial cleanup funding.

13 This year it was requested to get \$16
14 million for this fiscal year; 1.5 million out of
15 that 16 million was funded.

16 Mare Island and Alameda Naval Air
17 Station both have approved Re-use Plans in place,
18 so they received a higher funding level because
19 they are a higher priority level. They received
20 about \$10 million each.

1 In light of this change, because of
2 what is going on in Washington and the way funds
3 are disbursed for these programs, the immediacy of
4 what we have to do in terms of approving or
5 commenting or advising on the cleanup process has
6 slowed down -- not completely stopped, but slowed
7 down.

8 What essentially my understanding
9 from last month's conversation is, there is
10 funding in place to complete a number of the
11 investigation programs over the course of the next
12 8 to 10 months; and so, by default, it means that
13 it looks like what this committee could do is to
14 be a technical review committee and review the
15 documents, which is a very important thing for us
16 to do; but it is something we have to acknowledge,
17 that is the status of the cleanup process for
18 Treasure Island right now.

19 So one of the thoughts was, that is
20 important to do, and we have a Technical

1 Subcommittee and a number of people on the Board
2 who are interested in doing that, and it looks
3 like they have prepared a very good document for
4 us all to review. But it is not something
5 everybody on this Board is interested in doing.

6 So we thought, since the pressure is
7 not on, so to speak, at Treasure Island, this
8 might be a good time to rethink what we want to do
9 over the next 4 to 6 months and maybe get reports
10 in from the Technical Subcommittee on the
11 documents and discuss them for some portion of the
12 meetings. But, also, it is a good time for us to
13 start learning some of the other issues so that
14 when the cleanup process as a whole picks up, when
15 there is a Re-use Plan, we are not trying to learn
16 and comment at the same time.

17 For instance, we could be learning
18 about some of the new, innovative, remedial
19 cleanup type of processes; what the different ones
20 are out there; what you use for different types of

1 pollutants and that type of thing. We might want
2 to get again -- there seemed to be a lot of
3 interest at the last meeting -- a layman's
4 knowledge of the geotechnical, the conflicting
5 geotechnical reports and re-usage, and things like
6 that, that have come out. And we have read up, so
7 again we can be up to speed on these things and
8 what their impact on the environmental cleanup
9 might be.

10 We might want to take a look at
11 cleanup standards and acceptable levels, and see
12 in terms of risk assessment, so this is a good
13 time for us to say, "okay, we can review
14 documents; we can also start setting up these
15 meetings so that we are all learning something
16 that is going to be coming at us down the road
17 when the Re-use Plan is used." And the other is,
18 there is not a lot of attendance, very poor
19 attendance, at the interim meetings; and I don't
20 know how the subcommittee meetings are; but to me,

1 after three or four months, I would say people may
2 not want to invest this type of time; so it might
3 be at this meeting that we would be able to
4 accomplish a number of things and economies on
5 everybody's time and make it productive.

6 That's a bit long-winded, but that is
7 summarizing what is going on. It is going to be a
8 pause at the overall cleanup process, and this
9 might bring us up to speed on some of the other
10 things down the road, as well as to review
11 documents.

12 MS. GLASS: I would like to return
13 back to the CRC issue. I don't think anything has
14 been said.

15 The CRC is not in the driver's seat
16 relative to the Re-use Plan. It's an advisory
17 board, it's an advisory committee, much the same
18 as the RAB is.

19 Who is in the driver's seat is the
20 Office of the Military Base Conversion, which is

1 San Francisco's Planning Department, the San
2 Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

3 Secondly, another aspect of the
4 schedule here is being driven by the McKinney Act;
5 and this is a federal requirement for certain
6 notification periods; and as you are aware, Jim,
7 there was a problem with the Navy actually giving
8 the proper notification, which may have affected
9 the schedule as well.

10 In addition, there is an amendment to
11 the McKinney Act, so once again I want to make it
12 perfectly clear it is not a good thing to ding the
13 Re-use Committee about the re-use planning
14 schedule.

15 MS. SMITH: I think we're getting way
16 off the subject. We were discussing whether or
17 not we would approve the agenda, and I think we
18 should get back to that, and Ms. Glass can comment
19 possibly under organizational business or any
20 other topic. But I think what we need to discuss

1 is our agenda as it is set up tonight, which was
2 not the way I thought it was going to be set up;
3 or are we going to change it?

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: The motion that was
5 put forward by Paul was to accept the memorandum
6 submitted by the Technical Subcommittee as is,
7 with people that want to additionally comment on
8 it to submit in writing to the Navy their comments
9 in addition to this and so focus this meeting on
10 the topic we have.

11 We're just discussing on what we want
12 the focus and direction of the RAB to be.

13 MS. SMITH: So we're ignoring public
14 comments?

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: We're still at the
16 approval of the agenda.

17 MS. SMITH: That is what I would like
18 to get back to, rather than having the Re-use
19 Committee come and feel they're being offended by
20 us.

1 Can we get back to the agenda?

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: The motion is to
3 accept Paul's motion to dispense with the breakout
4 sessions for document review and accept the
5 technical comments with the addition that people
6 can submit individual comments, if they would
7 like, and to spend the balance of this meeting on
8 discussing the focus and direction of the RAB,
9 with the understanding that we're going to go
10 through the public comments section and all that
11 as well, with the understanding all the other
12 administrative stuff we would handle; but instead
13 of the breakout sessions --

14 MS. SMITH: We're not going to bring
15 out the FOSL's, so comment from RAB members cannot
16 be accepted at this meeting, because you're going
17 to ignore it completely?

18 MS. NELSON: I think the comment was
19 about the breakout sessions.

20 MS. GRAVANIS: Everything else is the

1 same.

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: The FOSL's can be
3 addressed in the open session.

4 MS. SMITH: At 8:50 we are taking up
5 issues?

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: In the open
7 discussion and open questions and discussion, we
8 would bring up the topic of FOSL's, Dale, if that
9 meets with your approval.

10 MS. SMITH: Excuse me?

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: During the open
12 questions and discussion period, we could
13 certainly bring up the issue of FOSL's there.

14 MS. SMITH: Okay.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a question:

16 Is there a place where the Technical
17 Committee can brief the group on what they talked
18 about on this memo?

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: Yes. You mean in
20 terms of providing an update?

1 MS. SHIRLEY: Not only an update.
2 Who was there and if they agree whether this memo
3 captures what they talked about.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: Under 7:25, which we
5 passed a bit, there is a presentation by the
6 Technical Subcommittee.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: I don't want to see
8 this memo to stand as it is without some
9 discussion.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: I would like to see
11 if we can put the motion again to remove the
12 breakout session and have that portion of the
13 meeting focus on the direction and pertinent
14 topics for the Board, with the rest of the agenda
15 standing as is.

16 MR. THOMPSON: I so move.

17 MR. BOATMAN: Second.

18 (The motion carried.)

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will proceed
20 with the normal administrative portion of the

1 agenda. Next would be the discussion or approval
2 of the meeting minutes from the 26th of September.

3 Everyone should have received a copy
4 of the meeting minutes, although we do have some
5 extra copies on the back table if someone does not
6 have a copy.

7 I would like to open up the floor
8 regarding any comments or corrections to the
9 minutes of the 26th of September.

10 MS. CASSA: I have a recommended
11 change under V., number 4., the second paragraph.
12 The way it currently stands, it sounds like there
13 was going to be a presentation on moving the
14 underground storage tank activities from one
15 program to another. I don't think that was the
16 intent of the presentation, and I recommend it be
17 reworded to additionally keynote that, due to
18 scheduling conflicts, the agenda item regarding
19 the petroleum hydrocarbon program should be moved
20 to the November RAB meeting.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any other
2 suggestions?

3 MS. SMITH: Page 4, item 4., the
4 second line, remove the word "last."

5 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any others?

6 MS. GLASS: I just wanted to have the
7 record note that I called Ernie Galang, and he
8 reported to me a number of corrections on page 5
9 regarding the Citizens Re-use Committee update.
10 Several things I told him specifically, he would
11 have to provide a copy, because we don't want to
12 take the time here, and also a correction to the
13 phone number.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any others? Can I
15 get a motion to accept the minutes as amended?

16 MS. NELSON: I so move.

17 MR. HEHN: Second.

18 (The motion carried.)

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Next is our
20 public comment period, and we set aside this time

1 for any members of the public, other than the
2 Restoration Advisory Board, to have an opportunity
3 close to the beginning of the meeting to speak to
4 any topic, preferably related to the cleanup, but
5 it is an open comment period, so the floor is open
6 to any member of the public at this time.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: Are there any
8 requests or comments from anybody here?

9 MR. BOATMAN: I have a question:

10 One, I apologize for not being at the
11 last two meetings. I'm not sure what we mean by
12 comments, and I would like some clarification.

13 If we offer comments to the Navy or
14 to the regulators, will they amend the program; or
15 are the comments just for the record?

16 I'm trying to get a sense of what the
17 value of the comments are.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The value of the
19 comments, in some cases we would be able to adopt
20 the comments or recommendations. In some cases,

1 we wouldn't.

2 I think a good example would be --
3 our best example of that, to date, was earlier in
4 the year on the remedial investigation work plans,
5 where there was an extensive RAB community
6 members' comments; and then we addressed those
7 comments, in some cases making changes to the work
8 plan and, in others, explaining why we were unable
9 to make those changes.

10 It is kind of a give and take.
11 Clearly the RAB community members' comments are
12 not strictly for the record. We invite your
13 constructive criticism of the process, and many of
14 the comments that we receive from the community
15 members we have been able to incorporate, and we
16 expect to be able to continue to do so.

17 We said at the beginning of our RAB
18 process, about a year ago, that the overall hope
19 of this process is, when we get to the final
20 cleanup plan, that we will have been able to

1 listen and incorporate community comments to the
2 point where, when we announce our final cleanup
3 plans, the community at large will be accepting of
4 it, because there has been community participation
5 throughout the planning process.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any other comments?

7 MS. SMITH: I request permission from
8 the Board to allow for professional comments from
9 the public on an item that is later to come up
10 before this Board.

11 MR. ONGERTH: I did not hear all of
12 the sentence.

13 MS. SMITH: I request permission from
14 this Board for professional comment from the
15 public on an item that is to come up before this
16 Board later on this evening.

17 CO-CHAIR WONG: So noted.

18 MR. HAYDEN: Just a comment.

19 At the Technical Committee, I did
20 mention -- I did comment on an article that was in

1 the Telecommunications Edition of Geology about
2 the use of fill for the island, and I Xeroxed a
3 portion of that article, and I do have a Xerox of
4 illustrations from the article that show the
5 existing surface sediments of the shoal and the
6 surrounding area, and also show the rate of
7 compaction following the placement of the fill.

8 If anybody would like to have a copy
9 of that, during the break they can ask me; and
10 hopefully there will be enough for everybody who
11 is interested.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Anything anybody
13 brings in and we need to make extra copies, as
14 long as we're provided with a copy, we can make as
15 many copies as needed for additional people.

16 With that, we will close the public
17 comment period; and I would like to ask your
18 indulgence, partially in the interest of time and
19 partially because you have been swamped the last
20 month.

1 I would like to get permission to
2 drop the review of action items, because there
3 really has not been a lot of change between last
4 month and this month; and we can incorporate the
5 status of the action items in the minutes of the
6 meeting.

7 But I don't have anything significant
8 to report under the topic of "Review of Action
9 Items," so unless there is any other comment, we
10 will just move ahead.

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: Under "Organizational
12 Business," unfortunately I was out of town during
13 the meeting and not available, so I asked Paul
14 Hehn, the Community Co-Co-Chair, to chair that
15 meeting, and I asked him to report on it.

16 MR. HEHN: Actually, there were five
17 people at the interim Treasure Island meeting; and
18 we invited Jim to go ahead and join us at this
19 particular meeting to discuss some of the issues
20 that had to do with funding for the next year.

1 We also tried to look at some of the
2 options that we had for discussion purposes and
3 for training for RAB members. Some of those
4 things will be discussed tonight in more detail.

5 On the funding issues, we already had
6 a bit on that from Brad this evening already.

7 The other thing was, we looked at
8 what sort of alternatives we might have for the
9 RAB meetings, which has also been discussed, at
10 least in part, as to whether or not they need to
11 be regular monthly meetings and alternate meetings
12 and interim meetings, or whether that is too much.

13 One of the things that was discussed
14 in detail was the resolution of the map. It is in
15 the back. That was being prepared by PRC as the
16 overall map that shows the various IR sites, the
17 underground storage tank sites, that kind of
18 issue; and our recommendation at that particular
19 meeting to Jim was that they prepare that map on
20 separate layers and not an overlay map so it will

1 be more clearly understood and more readable and
2 something that can be used as a reference at
3 anytime. We're talking about various parcels or
4 IR sites or combined IR sites.

5 Finally, there was some discussion
6 also on the results of the September 30 site visit
7 for new RAB members who were interested in doing
8 that; and we discussed some of the questions that
9 came up; and Jim was able to answer a lot of those
10 questions that came out, like Charles today, the
11 sort of questions about the process.

12 CO-CHAIR WONG: Thank you, Paul.

13 The only other thing under
14 "Organizational Business" I want to bring up is
15 that everybody should have received, at long last,
16 a draft of a letter we wanted to send to DTSC
17 regarding the July 18 letter that the Bay Area RAB
18 has sent. And I would like to ask people to take
19 a look at that and fax me or give to me by the end
20 of the night any suggested edits or comments, so I

1 can incorporate them, and we really would like to
2 get this signed at the very latest by the next
3 meeting.

4 It is not obligatory. Anybody who
5 does not sign it, that's fine. And I think you
6 see the text is written so that it does not try to
7 say that that represents a consensus of this
8 group, but it is something that a number of us
9 felt should be sent to DTSC, to be sure they got a
10 balanced picture of the issues addressed in that
11 letter.

12 I wanted to call that to your
13 attention and ask you to get that to me as quickly
14 as possible with your suggestions or concerns.

15 MR. HEHN: One item on the interim
16 meeting is, we were discussing the resolution of
17 the map question, to make sure that Jim was aware
18 of the fact that we wanted to make sure that we
19 incorporated the comments that Pat and Rick had
20 submitted, to make sure that was complete; and

1 they had some questions about that; so we want to
2 make sure that was included in the final
3 preparation.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

5 Next will be the upcoming
6 environmental reports we're looking at now:

7 "Draft Finding of Suitability to
8 Continue the Lease for the Treasure Island
9 Elementary School."

10 We were closing out the comments
11 today, and we got the comments from the Technical
12 Subcommittee, likewise, the Baseline Survey
13 Sampling Plan and the Basewide Asbestos Survey
14 Report.

15 Two new documents, we expect sometime
16 towards the end of this month to get a copy of the
17 Former Underground Storage Tank Sites Report; and
18 that will be made available to the Technical
19 Subcommittee and others who are interested; and we
20 will have over 30 days. The comments will be due

1 at our December meeting, on the 19th of December.

2 And then the other document is the
3 Draft Final Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment
4 Work Plan; and Sharon tells me that will be
5 available the first week in November.

6 MS. SHARON TOBIAS: The first or
7 second week of November, and there is a signup
8 sheet for the Ecological Work Plan at the back of
9 the room, so anyone who signs that document, we
10 will make a copy and send it to you, which you
11 should receive prior to the next meeting.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: When do we need
13 the comments back on that, Sharon?

14 MS. TOBIAS: Thirty days from the
15 date it is sent out.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The comments will
17 be due pretty close to the December 19th meeting,
18 also, or maybe a week or so before.

19 MS. TOBIAS: A week or two before.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a comment:

1 At Mare Island there is a six-month
2 document review schedule that they do that shows a
3 colored chart, but I only have a black and white
4 copy. PRC does this. On one line for every
5 document, one line the scheduled delivery date,
6 and the second line has the actual delivery date,
7 and it is quite helpful.

8 I would like to suggest that Treasure
9 Island do something like this.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We would be happy
11 to look at this to see how we can adopt that.

12 Is that only for the remedial
13 investigation?

14 MS. SHIRLEY: No.

15 MS. KATHURIA: I am the project
16 manager for Mare Island, and it is not for
17 compliance.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: Only surplus, but it
19 can be considered a model. I find it very useful,
20 and it is six months out and helps us plan our

1 time.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, we can get
3 a copy of that from Gina.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: Could we note that as
5 an action to develop a six-month document downline
6 based on the Mare Island circular timeline, but to
7 include compliance documents as well.

8 MS. KATHURIA: It is two months in
9 the past and four months in the future.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

11 Next we will move on to "Program
12 Updates." Rachel is going to comment on our BRAC
13 cleanup meeting last month.

14 MS. RACHEL SIMONS: On October 3rd,
15 the regulators met with the Naval regulators for
16 the UST Program, mostly run by the Water Board;
17 but we discussed the status of the UST Program and
18 current delivery modes, funding for the program,
19 and also a UST inventory data base that the Navy
20 is preparing.

1 On October 16th, we had our monthly
2 BCT meeting, where we discussed a new project
3 schedule. FOSL's for the elementary school site,
4 the status to be remedial investigation field
5 work.

6 On October 23rd, the regulators met
7 without the Navy to discuss the new project
8 schedule that will hopefully turn into a revised
9 FFSRA schedule.

10 Today we had another meeting to
11 review data, and we discussed data from site 12,
12 20, 21 and 24.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

14 Incidentally, we made copies of the
15 FFSRA available earlier, but I had a box with some
16 additional copies, so there are additional copies
17 of the Federal Facilities Site Remediation
18 Agreement available. I'm sure there is enough for
19 anyone who would like one.

20 The bulk of the document is legalese;

1 the heart of the document is really the schedule;
2 and the current schedule that is in the document
3 is the same schedule from the March BRAC cleanup
4 plan; so it is no different; and what we're
5 referring to in the BRAC cleanup meetings is that
6 we will be amending that schedule in the future;
7 so that will be in the first official amendment to
8 the Federal Facilities Agreement.

9 MS. SMITH: This is the old
10 agreement, not the update?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is the
12 existing agreement, and the existing agreement
13 actually has a very old schedule in it, but I
14 inserted the schedule from the BRAC cleanup plan
15 of March 1995, which is a schedule closer to
16 reality. But that schedule will be officially
17 changed and updated and will become officially a
18 part of the FFSRA.

19 MS. SMITH: That is figure 5.2?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Appendix D. This

1 is a one or two-page original FFSRA schedule, and
2 I noted on the original schedule that it has been
3 superseded by the BRAC cleanup, and right behind
4 it I have included about six or so pages, which
5 you are leafing through, not from the BRAC cleanup
6 plan, so it will be a further schedule change, and
7 an official amendment to the FFSRA in the next
8 several months.

9 Next would be the Prioritization and
10 Fiscal Subcommittee Report.

11 Jim, did you want to comment on that?

12 MR. ALDRICH: I have not been able to
13 convene a meeting of the subcommittee. However, I
14 did meet with Jim on October 10th, before the
15 interim meeting, and had an opportunity to learn a
16 little bit more about the fiscal issues, the
17 issues behind the budget that was funded in the
18 amount of about \$1.5 million out of a \$16 million
19 request.

20 Jim discussed with me the process

1 that was undertaken to prioritize. Basically, he
2 said that the items that are going to be
3 undertaken with the funding that was approved are
4 things that are underway -- groundwater soil
5 sampling and things like that -- for which there
6 are contracts; and they are already underway.

7 One big item that we discussed that
8 was not currently funded but is ready to go out to
9 bid is the underground storage tank fuel line
10 process. Jim, would you want to elaborate if
11 there's anything I left out?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, the
13 \$1.5 million is going to finish the remedial
14 investigation, so that process is unaffected.

15 The remaining four to five hundred
16 thousand dollars is related to the environmental
17 baseline survey. The biggest chunk of that is to
18 perform the actual sampling work and produce a
19 report from the sampling plan that has been under
20 review. And then the remaining money is primarily

1 to do any additional findings of suitability to
2 lease or findings of suitability to transfer of
3 property during 1996 or that might need to be done
4 by the end of 1996, so that property can be leased
5 or transferred either during '96 or during '97.

6 So we had a budget of projected
7 requirements of about \$16 million. The amount
8 that was unfunded, the biggest chunk of that goes
9 to underground storage tank work; and then we did
10 have a project that was all ready to go to bid;
11 and that is for the removal of almost a
12 million-dollar project of the underground fuel
13 lines at Treasure Island and the cleaning and the
14 abandonment in place of the underground fuel line
15 at Yerba Buena Island.

16 But that project is sitting on the
17 shelf, awaiting funding, although it is one of our
18 highest priority projects; and there is a hope
19 that sometime during this year, about the middle
20 of the government's fiscal year, which is the end

1 of March of '96, if additional money becomes
2 available, we may be able to do some additional
3 work both on the fuel lines and possibly on the
4 underground storage tanks and other things like
5 asbestos and lead-based paint work.

6 MR. VAN WYE: The underground fuel
7 line removal is definitely funded?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, it is not.
9 The only things funded were the continuation of
10 the remedial investigation report, the IR Report
11 on the surplus sites, and the miscellaneous work
12 regarding the baseline survey, basically the
13 environmental condition of all of the property.

14 What is not funded is any actual
15 cleanup work which would include the removal of
16 the underground fuel line.

17 MR. VAN WYE: In the context of the
18 removal of the underground fuel line, is there any
19 estimate what the cost range for this project
20 would be at Treasure Island?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The project is
2 somewhere in the neighborhood of three-quarters to
3 a million dollars, and that covers work on about
4 10,000 lineal feet of fuel line on both Treasure
5 Island and Yerba Buena Island.

6 MR. VAN WYE: And whether that
7 project should be done some other way, rather than
8 removing, is that something that will come into
9 our scope of review as the BRAC?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The plans have
11 already been developed, and I think it is pretty
12 much a given that, for the fuel lines at Treasure
13 Island, we know that they have leaked; and they
14 probably have some products still in them; and
15 they really need to come out of the ground. That
16 is really going to both removal of potential
17 source of pollution; and also in the course of
18 removing them from the ground, we will be able to
19 remove additional contaminated soil and do an
20 investigation at the same time.

1 The condition of the fuel lines at
2 Treasure Island is very poor, and the only logical
3 decision is to yank them out. There is no way we
4 can deal with them while they are still in the
5 ground.

6 MS. GLASS: I had a question, Jim.

7 At another meeting, I heard somebody
8 say that they had communication with the
9 Department of Defense, saying something about the
10 Navy not being in line for any more environmental
11 cleanup funds after 1997. Do you have any
12 information about that?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm not sure
14 exactly what the context was. I know there have
15 been some discussions that the BRAC law, the Base
16 Closure Law, does expire at some point in time;
17 and there was some question about how additional
18 base cleanup would be funded after the Base
19 Closure Law expires.

20 It was generally acknowledged, from

1 what I have heard, that the money would be found;
2 it would be appropriated by Congress.

3 The cleanup of all the bases,
4 Treasure Island and the others in the Bay Area, is
5 going to be completed. What the schedule is for
6 that completion, we don't know yet; but there is
7 no doubt that the cleanup is going to be done or
8 the cleanup will be done to the point that
9 property will be usable for some purpose.

10 The BRAC law does have a timeframe,
11 but it is generally understood that the cleanup is
12 going to have to go beyond the timeframe that the
13 BRAC law exists, and I think it is more of a
14 governmental administrative issue, and I have no
15 doubt that we will continue to receive funding
16 until the cleanup is completed.

17 Next is the External Affairs
18 Subcommittee Report.

19 MR. MC DONALD: There really is not a
20 report. Laurie has mentioned that the work is

1 ongoing. If you would like to elaborate on that?

2 MS. GLASS: Dan has been out of town
3 for a couple of meetings.

4 There has been some preliminary
5 sketching of re-use alternatives; and at the next
6 meeting, which will start at 3:30 instead of 4:00,
7 3:30 to 5:30, instead of 4:00 to 6:00 --

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is that going to
9 be a regular change?

10 MS. GLASS: It may be.

11 And at that meeting, there will a
12 sort of a refinement of the preliminary re-use
13 alternatives; and it pretty much looks like the
14 direction things are going in is for pretty much
15 human use, pretty much over the whole island.

16 There are various alternatives.
17 Maybe there is a ban of 500 feet around the
18 natural habitat, but it is pretty much for human
19 use.

20 There was some question in the past

1 about the human use, what the human use of the
2 island will be. Preliminarily, it looks like it
3 is pretty tending toward -- I don't know if you
4 would call it intensive, but it is extensive.

5 One of the alternatives -- this is
6 very preliminary -- is for a golf course.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next CRC
8 meeting is on the 13th of November, and the
9 meeting time has been changed from 4:00 to 3:30.
10 Normally, the meetings have run from 4:00 to 6:00
11 p.m.; and on the 13th, it will run from 3:30 to
12 approximately 5:30 p.m.

13 We will continue to put the CRC
14 meeting schedule on the back of our meeting
15 agendas.

16 MS. GLASS: Earlier on, there was an
17 agreement to put the available CRC minutes with
18 the minutes of the RAB. That did not happen this
19 time.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are a little

1 out of sync. I think the timing works well for
2 you -- you get our minutes --

3 MS. GLASS: I just put the available
4 minutes, whatever they happen to be.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our intent is to
6 continue to provide the minutes of the CRC. I may
7 have missed the minutes.

8 MS. GLASS: There was a set
9 available.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Normally, I have
11 been sending them out as we receive them, rather
12 than wait until we send our next minutes out; but
13 Laurie and I will continue to work on this to make
14 sure that I am able to put the minutes of the CRC
15 or provide the minutes of the CRC to the RAB,
16 whether it is with the RAB minutes or a separate
17 mailing.

18 Laurie has been consistently putting
19 out the RAB minutes, addending them to the
20 Citizens' Re-use Committee meetings.

1 MS. VEDAGIRI: Does CRC include only
2 Treasure Island?

3 MS. GLASS: It is for Naval Station
4 Treasure Island. It is also Treasure Island as
5 well as Yerba Buena Island.

6 MS. VEDAGIRI: When you said human
7 use over the whole island, you meant even over the
8 portions of Yerba Buena?

9 MS. GLASS: You are right, and I need
10 to make sure I make that explicit.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We tend to
12 casually throw the term "Treasure Island" around,
13 but oftentimes we mean Treasure Island and Yerba
14 Buena Island, because the Naval Station consists
15 of all of Treasure Island and most of Yerba Buena
16 Island, except for the Coast Guard Base, which is
17 totally excluded from this process.

18 MS. MENDELOW: There is a potential
19 to have an Expo '99 here on the Island. Is that
20 something that would be as a plan for re-use?

1 MS. GLASS: It is looking from like
2 what has been available information that, first of
3 all, the planning process for that is separate
4 from the Citizens' Re-use Committee. It has its
5 own committee and feasibility and its own process.
6 So there is not a hundred percent congruance on
7 the information, but it is also looking like
8 anything like that would be what is considered an
9 interim re-use. It wouldn't be an end use; it
10 would be an interim re-use, because its duration
11 is fairly short, 8 months or something like that;
12 and it would occur in the nearer term rather than
13 10 or 20 years out.

14 MS. SMITH: I have a question:

15 Will we be getting FOSL's for every
16 single parcel on this island for Expo '99?

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I can answer
18 that.

19 The FOSL process, anytime the Navy
20 goes to either lease or transfer a piece of

1 property, a FOSL or FOSD will be prepared.

2 MS. SMITH: We're not talking about
3 FOSD, just an FOSL.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there were
5 firm plans for an Expo or any other lease for
6 interim use, there would be an FOSL produced for
7 that.

8 MS. SMITH: And what would the
9 timeframe be for us to review that FOSL,
10 considering it would be the entire Treasure Island
11 only?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would imagine
13 that the timeframe for review would be consistent
14 with the size of the document. The Expo, I think
15 they're envisioning as much smaller than the
16 original '39 or '40 fair; it is more on the order
17 of maybe half of the island or so.

18 MS. GLASS: At the most.

19 MS. SMITH: That is 10 FOSL's.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: For a single use,

1 there would be a single FOSL, even though the use
2 might incorporate 10 or 15 or however many
3 parcels. It will be a single document, just like
4 the movie studio FOSL consists of actually two
5 parcels, but it is one FOSL, and likewise the FOSL
6 for the elementary school cut across several
7 parcels, but we made the decision to take the
8 footprint of the school, even though it covered
9 several parcels.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: The questions about
11 the FOSL are valuable; but since that is still too
12 speculative, there will time down the road.

13 MS. SMITH: I'm just concerned that
14 we get it dumped all onto our heads, and we don't
15 get the asbestos; we don't get the EBS; we get an
16 FOSL and sign off in 30 days.

17 I'm raising the issue now so that the
18 military and Cal EPA are aware that this is
19 something that should not be dumped on our heads.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: Notice is duly

1 served.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the document
3 timeline will help.

4 MS. SMITH: It would not help
5 something like that, because it is going to be
6 traveling on its own timeline. This other
7 document would be good, but I am concerned about
8 something like that.

9 CO-CHAIR WONG: The other issue on
10 the External Affairs part is -- I don't know if
11 people are aware that there is a larger body than
12 this RAB that meets, that is called the Statewide
13 Advisory Board, and they met last week for a day
14 over at Fort Mason, and I think some people here
15 attended that.

16 We were looking to see if we could
17 give people an idea of what that is, so they have
18 this RAB context in the overall process, and maybe
19 some of the highlights of what was discussed last
20 week, because I think it is important for people

1 to realize that we're not isolated. There is
2 larger activity similar to this going on
3 statewide.

4 Did anyone attend?

5 MS. SMITH: I was going to do a
6 report. I did not attend, but I got a report.
7 There was interest in forming a statewide caucus,
8 and I do not wish RAB to get all worked up over
9 the word "caucus," but that is what Cal EPA is
10 calling this statewide group of RAB, and there
11 were a number of issues that came up.

12 One of the bigger concerns was
13 funding again. There are no funds for this
14 statewide caucus.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: There are no funds.
16 The funding for the Statewide Advisory Board is
17 limited. It is not the caucus. The caucus is a
18 separate issue, completely separate, different
19 organization, not related at all.

20 MS. SMITH: Why don't you do it,

1 because I thought it was.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: I was not there at all
3 at the meeting, but the first question on the
4 table at the Statewide Advisory Board was whether
5 the group should continue, given the limited
6 amount of funding available and interest in the
7 group.

8 CO-CHAIR WONG: Could I interrupt?

9 For the people who are not familiar,
10 could you set the context what the Advisory Board
11 is, and whose Advisory Board it is, and what its
12 purpose is.

13 MS. STACEY LUPTON: I can address
14 that.

15 It is called the California EPA
16 Advisory Group, and it was set up initially to
17 advise Cal EPA on issues impacting cleanup and
18 closure at closing bases throughout the state.

19 It is sort of a counterpart to what
20 was set up as the California Base Closure

1 Environmental Committee. That was something set
2 up to bring together regulators, DOD services, as
3 well as the Governor's Office and other folks
4 involved with cleanup and closure issues. And
5 they were going to be the community ^{perspective} prospectus.
6 There are folks from local government.

7 You are shaking your head.

8 MS. SHIRLEY: I disagree that it is
9 supposed to be the community ^{perspective} prospectus. It is an
10 advisory group.

11 MS. LUPTON: The actual charter says
12 ^{Johnson} to Cal EPA, it is to clean up closure site on
13 CMECC. CMECC is an expanded version of the Base
14 Closure. It was set up by the California EPA. It
15 is the California Military Environmental
16 Coordination Committee. That is the same thing I
17 just mentioned before. It is an expansion of the
18 Base Closure --

19 MS. SHIRLEY: Its membership is
20 appointed by the Governor.

1 MR. VAN WYE: How many members are
2 there, who funds it, and what is the level of
3 funding?

4 MS. LUPTON: The Advisory Group, I
5 would guess, is like 60, and Actual Advisory
6 Board, I would guess probably 50 or so. I can't
7 give you the exact number, but it is a fair number
8 of folks.

9 We had the meeting last week; there
10 were probably more like 30 of the actual Advisory
11 members who showed up; but it is funded through
12 DOD and the State. They have a Memorandum of
13 Agreement. There is a funding that comes through
14 DOD to the State, and there is a certain part of
15 the money that goes to the State of California,
16 because it is funneled through Cal EPA, and EPA
17 funds it.

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: Was anything
19 discussed last week that affects our RAB or the
20 RAB process as a whole that we want to be aware

1 of?

2 MS. LUPTON: I only attended the
3 Wednesday meeting to help the Advisory Board about
4 their mission, where they are headed. One of the
5 issues that came up is what is their role? And
6 one role is as the Statewide RAB to address common
7 issues that may be impacting RAB at installations,
8 and have this group play a role in assisting them
9 resolve and address one of the issues.

10 I was not at the Thursday meeting. I
11 think Sol can address that.

12 MR. SOL LEVINE (Member of the
13 Public): There were only 20 people from CMECC
14 that attended the meeting. You have to understand
15 what the makeup of the membership of that Board
16 is:

17 There were people like county
18 executives; most of the people were from
19 regulatory boards; and the RAB Caucus had invited
20 people from all over the state.

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

We got people from Southern California, from the Bay Area, from Monterey to this; and our purpose of being there was to try to coordinate, not to become part of but to coordinate and work with the Cal EPA Board; and the consensus came out on Thursday that it might be a good idea, because of the lack of funding and the lack of attendance of the people.

They meet only quarterly, and it is very difficult, because they don't have the money to get the people from other parts of the state to come up, because it is a costly operation.

What the outcome of that meeting was, is that on a voluntary basis, the RAB Caucus was going to see if they could coordinate their activity with the Cal EPA, because we thought it was important to be able to find out what the other parts of the state are going through.

The two biggest issues that came up was the discussion of the bases that were to

1 remain open and how we could get money so that we
2 can bring everyone together. We were very
3 fortunate in being able to get a grant from the
4 Golden Foundation to bring people together.

5 It was quite productive. Where it
6 affects Treasure Island and the other RABs, there
7 seems to be a great interest in networking of the
8 various RAB members, and I think that is
9 important, because we all heard from each other.

10 That is about it.

11 MR. HAYDEN: Where did this meeting
12 take place?

13 MS. TOBIAS: It has been in place for
14 a couple of years.

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: They heard they were
16 going to get representation from each of the RABs
17 statewide, and I'm wondering if we, as an
18 independent RAB, separate from the Caucus, can be
19 notified about that and be sure to have an
20 opportunity to perhaps have a member of our RAB

1 serve on that, since it would be a good idea for
2 us to understand what is going on in the process.

3 MR. LEVINE (Member of the Public):

4 Any RAB member is invited to come to the RAB
5 Caucus.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: I'm talking about the
7 Statewide Advisory Board.

8 MR. LEVINE (Member of the Public):

9 They are trying, putting that under advisement.

10 There were two questions: whether
11 they wanted to continue, whether they had the
12 funds to continue; and whether they had the will
13 to continue.

14 And I feel, and I think some of the
15 other people there agreed, that, I guess, the push
16 of the RAB Caucus people -- I should say
17 individual community members that had been there,
18 who wanted this to continue. The RAB Caucus is
19 just individual people. Everybody has to
20 understand that.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: Sol, I don't mean to
2 cut you off. I want to make it clear that the
3 Statewide Advisory Board at one point was going to
4 solicit each individual RAB to have a member sit
5 on that, since they are --

6 MS. SMITH: I don't think so. It is
7 all government.

8 CO-CHAIR WONG: If it has changed, so
9 be it; but I wanted to be sure this RAB is
10 notified when that call goes out.

11 MR. LEVINE (Member of the Public):
12 Your RAB will be notified if they come to the
13 various meetings and attend, which we did. We
14 wanted to find out, because we feel it is very
15 important, because we are coordinating with three
16 other RABs, because we have the same contractor
17 who is doing the contract, and we have to
18 coordinate it.

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: That is a very good
20 point, and I would like to see what the mechanism

1 is, since most people here didn't even know this
2 meeting happened last week, that we can be
3 informed on a timely basis.

4 MS. TOBIAS: They do a mailing list.
5 It is open to the public, and a lot of the public
6 and RAB representatives were there, who may not
7 sit on the Statewide Board. I understand that the
8 Membership Committee is looking at the membership.
9 That might be a possibility.

10 MR. LEVINE (Member of the Public):
11 There is a Membership Committee. They passed
12 along a sheet asking for volunteers, and I would
13 suggest that anyone here can submit their name to
14 the Membership Committee, because they're looking
15 to expand.

16 MR. VAN WYE: That is appointed by
17 the Governor of the State.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: They are an advisory
19 board to a group appointed by the Governor.

20 MR. MC DONALD: Let me suggest that

1 the Internal Affairs Subcommittee -- I am the
2 chair and the sole member -- that I could use some
3 assistance in this; and if anyone is wishing to be
4 more involved in either the RAB Caucus or the Cal
5 EPA Advisory Board, to contact me; and I will work
6 with PRC to see how we can get on the mailing list
7 so we can cut through this.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to
9 take one minute to briefly mention two other
10 meetings, because both of them relate to re-use.

11 I got a notice of a seminar that the
12 American Institute of Architects and SPUR are
13 sponsoring, and I mailed out a copy to everyone.

14 There was a seminar on base re-use,
15 which is related to both Treasure Island, Hunters
16 Point and The Presidio. The first seminar was
17 held last Wednesday night, and the second seminar
18 will be tomorrow night, although they are charging
19 \$30.

20 Everyone should have gotten a notice

1 of that; but it is really related to re-use; and
2 if you have any questions about that, you can see
3 me at the break or after the meeting.

4 Secondly, I just got another notice,
5 although again this is re-use, there is a State
6 Senate Select Committee on Defense Base Closures
7 and Re-use; and they will be conducting a hearing
8 on Treasure Island and on Hunters Point Shipyard
9 progress towards re-use. That is this Monday,
10 October 30, from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the
11 War Memorial Opera House. And I made 15 or so
12 copies of that.

13 MR. HEHN: We got copies of that.

14 MS. GLASS: I'm sure it said 10:30 to
15 4:30.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I have copies of
17 that from the Senate Hearing on Base Closure.
18 Again, it is relating primarily to re-use, but I
19 will have copies of that at the back, and that is
20 the extent of what I know about -- this is what I

1 received, the one-page letter.

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: Lastly, before we
3 break -- and our timing is all off; we have shaved
4 some of it off, the breakout sessions, Paul can
5 give us a review of the Technical Subcommittee,
6 especially in regards to the memorandum.

7 MR. HEHN: We had a meeting of the
8 Technical Subcommittee on October 17. We had six
9 people of the Technical Subcommittee members
10 attend that meeting; and in addition to covering
11 the issues of the document review, which is
12 summarized in the handout I gave out tonight, what
13 I tried to do is capture as many of the comments,
14 questions, discussion that we had during the
15 subcommittee meeting on that particular
16 memorandum; and that also includes some comments
17 that were submitted to me by Pat Nelson and Chloe
18 Jue.

19 Those are incorporated in the
20 comments as well, so I won't go over those

1 comments. They are pretty well laid out there.

2 There were a couple of other issues
3 that came out of our discussion, that are probably
4 worth at least mentioning, that were discussed
5 during the Technical Subcommittee meeting:

6 One was, it seems that the question
7 came up that Yerba Buena Island has disappeared
8 from our radar screen. We have not heard what is
9 happening to that, particularly the landfill.

10 Fred Hayden also discussed the
11 geotechnical report on compaction and based on the
12 landfill, the filling of the Treasure Island that
13 happened in 1939. You got copies of that tonight.

14 There was also discussion that one of
15 the things that would be beneficial to our
16 understanding of the subsurface, as we look at
17 some of the compaction issues, and the
18 remediation, how it is going to affect the
19 remediation.

20 One of the things we brought up

1 earlier was the request for a cross-section across
2 Treasure Island, and that question arose again,
3 and that is what we might want to put back onto
4 the request to PRC to prepare something like that.

5 There was also a question of the
6 results of PRC sampling throughout the island, and
7 maybe that showed up in one of the other
8 documents. I'm not aware of that.

9 Finally, there was a discussion about
10 getting the results of the earthquake study from
11 1989. We talked about that once before, and I
12 think there was also a request as to looking at
13 what buildings were removed or destroyed as a part
14 of that earthquake as well.

15 MS. SMITH: Paul, if I could add one
16 small thing, there was an issue that came up that
17 we're working on, an FOSL for the school. There
18 was no asbestos report. We just got an asbestos
19 report that went with parcel 5 and 6. It would be
20 really helpful, seeing how we don't get the full

1 FOSL, which is not in this document that was
2 distributed tonight, that we get the relative
3 subcomponents of those bigger documents, like the
4 asbestos report for the particular FOSL, the
5 report for the particular parcel, and the EBS for
6 the particular parcel, along with the FOSL, rather
7 than having no information on parts of it, which
8 clearly exists, because the regulatory agencies do
9 talk about this.

10 So if everything could be sort of
11 compartmentalized and we get all the little pieces
12 as one document, it makes it easier for us,
13 especially when the asbestos report is done.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: Was there another
15 comment that somebody wanted to be sure to bring
16 up during this portion?

17 MS. NELSON: I just did not want to
18 forget the drawing that appeared in the back of
19 the room, that has been reviewed, showing the
20 boundaries for the IR, the IR site, the EBS zones,

1 and the other thing.

2 I spent a good deal of time looking
3 at a matrix that summarizes all of this
4 information in tabular form and comparing it to
5 the drawing, and there are inconsistencies between
6 the two of them.

7 Last month I submitted to Jim some
8 draft comments. I will make them available so
9 that everybody here can have them in the next
10 mailout, summarizing tonight's meeting. That
11 clearly is a bit of work that needs to be looked
12 at more closely, because there are inconsistencies
13 and omissions.

14 Rick's letter reviewing it -- maybe,
15 Rick, you have some comments?

16 MR. NEDELL: There is a lot of
17 information; and in general, it certainly presents
18 everything we talked about; but I'm not so sure it
19 is decipherable in every case; and it would help
20 to clarify some of the legends and to change the

1 lines. It is more of a cosmetic comment.

2 I think Paul mentioned earlier that
3 there is so much information that perhaps it needs
4 to be separate, presented on separate sheets.

5 I don't know how we resolve this
6 apparent inconsistency, because it was my goal to
7 have it so you could look at it and see
8 everything.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: I think at the meeting
10 we discussed having one map, but then having
11 several --

12 MR. NEDELL: Layers, separated.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: Not layers so much but
14 having separate maps so we can visualize how the
15 layers separate.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Have it printed
17 in different versions, not having a plastic
18 overlay.

19 MS. SMITH: What Rick is back to is
20 the same thing he had problems with in the

1 beginning, except this one is in color.

2 CO-CHAIR WONG: Is it fair to say
3 there are a number of comments on the maps?

4 MR. NEDELL: Pat has summarized some
5 excellent things. I have made a few comments, and
6 we can discuss those.

7 CO-CHAIR WONG: This has been a
8 standing action item for a number of times. Would
9 it be fair to say to submit it to Ernie Galang and
10 to contact either Pat or yourself, and we will
11 take a look at the next version.

12 MR. NEDELL: I think it will be me,
13 because Pat is going on vacation.

14 MS. NELSON: I can finalize my
15 comments.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The comments are
17 still evolving. Are they going to be cumulative
18 comments or a single submission of cumulative
19 comments?

20 Pat has done that, and I'm just

1 adding an addendum.

2 You will provide cumulative comments.

3 CO-CHAIR WONG: Why don't we take a
4 10-minute break?

5 The suggestions on the direction, Jim
6 didn't think it would take the whole meeting
7 anyway, so we can get back on track.

8 (Recess taken)

9 CO-CHAIR WONG: If we can get started
10 here.

11 I think there are two big issues that
12 remain and we want to be sure to cover, and we
13 still want to get out of here as close to 9:30 as
14 possible.

15 The first is to get some general
16 agreement and consensus among the RAB, especially
17 community RAB members, as to the direction, focus,
18 and maybe the structure of these meetings for the
19 next six to eight months.

20 And the other is, we want to be sure

1 to address the issue Dale brought up regarding
2 discussion regarding the FOSL.

3 If I may, I want to open it to
4 discussion to maybe frame in the way the
5 conversation on this part, in terms of the
6 direction of the RAB and what we should be
7 focusing on and what it might entail.

8 Rather than focusing on very specific
9 topics to be discussed, although it might be
10 helpful to just agree to come up with a laundry
11 list of those, I think it would be helpful to come
12 up with an agenda structure that allows for three
13 things at this point, given the changes that we
14 talked about before:

15 One is to take care of the ongoing
16 things, and we can do that, hopefully, in a more
17 timely fashion, but allowing a lot of time on the
18 agenda to review and to discuss any issues that
19 come out of document review, and maybe a model
20 that seemed to work okay this evening for everyone

1 is that, if the Technical Subcommittee would
2 report back to this group on their findings on the
3 pertinent documents for that time period. We can
4 discuss those issues and amend the issues or
5 questions, as appropriate, and maybe come to some
6 sort of consensus as community members that, yes,
7 these are the questions we would like to submit
8 for the document in question.

9 And then, since again the process is
10 not moving along as fast as it would if there were
11 a plan in place and more funding, that we dedicate
12 a certain amount of time to educate everybody on
13 issues of interest to us all as they relate to
14 environmental issues, but to lay the groundwork
15 now for the issues, that when the process does
16 move ahead, we need to be knowledgeable about this
17 in order to make informed comments and give
18 informed advice to the BCT.

19 For instance, what are the various
20 remediation options? Are there new ones that are

1 more cost-effective? What are the standard ones?
2 What are the different remediation actions for
3 different types of pollutants?

4 One of the things that needs to be
5 done is determination of cleanup levels based on
6 the future re-use of property.

7 It might be helpful for those of us
8 who are not in the field to understand what the
9 issues are surrounding this, how they are
10 developed, what they mean, and things like that,
11 so when we start reading about them, we have a
12 clear understanding of how these values were
13 derived -- geotechnical seems to be one that
14 filters up to the top, and any other type of
15 topics that we might come up with that we could
16 build into the structure of the agenda, maybe come
17 with a list of topics that we would like to talk
18 about in each of these, and then we can develop
19 the agendas down the road, given those parameters.

20 That is my introduction to this part

1 of things to get your feet back on where you think
2 we should be going and spending our time, and what
3 is beneficial and meaningful to all of you in ways
4 that we can contribute.

5 MS. SMITH: We had an interim meeting
6 in September where we came up with some ideas that
7 we wanted to see discussed at these bigger
8 meetings, and none of it has been implemented.

9 We are now two months behind schedule
10 in implementation for whatever reason, and I don't
11 think it is anything you did not do.

12 We had a weak status report on the
13 work plan in September that did not answer any of
14 the questions that you proposed. We did not have
15 a discussion on it in November, and we don't seem
16 to have a geotechnical report from either of the
17 firms that did the geotechnical work on the
18 island.

19 Why should be bother where we are
20 going to go, when we spend two hours on this stuff

1 one evening, when it is not implemented?

2 If we're going to spend the time as
3 volunteers doing stuff --

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: That is a very good
5 point, and my recollection of how that discussion
6 developed last evening is we presented this as
7 proposed topics, and there was some question as to
8 whether or not they were appropriate to implement,
9 and the problem is, that issue never got resolved
10 at the last meeting. That is why we want to pause
11 tonight to get agreement among ourselves and the
12 structure and the list of different topics, so
13 that it does not drag on any further, so we can
14 get agreement here and start implementing this.

15 MS. SHIRLEY: I support that list
16 that was drawn up before as a starting point, and
17 I would like to add one thing to it, and that is
18 overview of the IR process and, in particular, how
19 health risk assessment drives the process, so that
20 we get to the point where we are looking at

1 perfection and health-based levels that people
2 understand the terminology.

3 CO-CHAIR WONG: Any other comments in
4 terms of how to structure these meetings so there
5 is a more meaningful agreement on that type of a
6 structure and alternative structure?

7 MR. HANSEN: I appreciated some
8 earlier comments. Since there is sort of a lull
9 right now, this is the time we should get up to
10 at least a layman's level of understanding the
11 problems.

12 We need to emphasize still again that
13 we would appreciate the geotechnical people coming
14 in and presenting some data. There is much we
15 need to share, and we need to have a better
16 understanding.

17 MS. NELSON: Is there a schedule of
18 reports coming out over the next six months, so we
19 can have the subjects presented for our review?

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is what we

1 can do with the six months if we follow the Mare
2 Island model, two months' backward look, four
3 months ahead look.

4 I sort of tried to accomplish that
5 with the upcoming environmental review schedule;
6 but I agree with you, that may not be looking far
7 enough ahead; and the Mare Island schedule may
8 help to take a longer look ahead.

9 There is no reason why we should not
10 be able to provide a better long-range list of
11 documents.

12 MS. NELSON: That would also include
13 the UST Program and other compliance programs, so
14 we can get a global issue and the Re-use Committee
15 work over the next six months, so we can look at
16 things on a systemic basis, maybe the upcoming
17 FOSL's.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We certainly
19 should be able to include all the departmental
20 documentation that the Navy produces. How we

1 integrate the City's re-use planning, I'm not
2 quite sure. We might have to discuss that with
3 the City, whether we want to have a joint document
4 or, through Dan or Laurie, provide documentation
5 on the schedules.

6 MS. NELSON: As an example, the
7 geotechnical report seems to be of great interest;
8 and that kind of hit us cold, because we were not
9 expecting that to come out. That is something
10 that will be germane once we start talking about
11 remedies and what we can do in areas about what
12 we're thinking on the island.

13 It would be nice to be able to check
14 that out and identify those sorts of technical
15 documents that will be germane to what we're doing
16 in another eight to ten months.

17 MR. ONGERTH: Patricia, may I ask you
18 a question:

19 In relation to a geotechnical report,
20 it provides some fundamental information about the

1 situation as it applies to whatever the
2 environmental impact is from something that is not
3 correct, not up to standard to the use of the
4 area.

5 Now my question is, how far does that
6 advisory group go in contrast to the procedure
7 that the regulatory people will be going through
8 in ultimately setting some requirements on it?

9 Do you visualize a parallel operation
10 by this group, an operation by this group parallel
11 to what the regulatory agency is doing in
12 ultimately producing an end requirement, and we
13 come up with our own proposal for an end
14 requirement? Is that your thinking?

15 MS. NELSON: My thinking is -- and
16 this is just a hypothetical something that crossed
17 my mind -- that if a pump or some sort of water
18 extraction remedy is deemed appropriate but is
19 located in an area that is geotechnically unstable
20 or suffering from subsidence, that is something

1 that would need to be addressed in this
2 hypothetical.

3 I have not seen the geotechnical
4 report; but if we are pumping out water in an area
5 that is subsiding, that would exacerbate a
6 condition that maybe should be addressed on a
7 systemic basis, looking at all the information
8 available in an area of what should and should not
9 be done in an unstable area.

10 That is just a hypothetical.

11 MR. ONGERTH: Let me respond -- have
12 we got time for this kind of discussion now?

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: Sure.

14 MR. ONGERTH: Let me respond in this
15 way: Let's assume there were no RAB here, and the
16 Navy is going through the process of ultimately
17 cleaning up the property, and what drives the
18 process is the requirements by the regulatory
19 agencies.

20 To carry the process through to meet

1 those requirements, somebody has to do some
2 engineering work.

3 MS. NELSON: I would hope.

4 MR. ONGERTH: And that involves what
5 you're talking about, as I see it. That is
6 something that the Navy obtains through the
7 contractors; they purchase it.

8 Do we parallel, try to parallel that?
9 Do we try to review the engineering work that is
10 done? Are we a super-review agency with relation
11 to the engineering of this material?

12 MS. NELSON: If I understand your
13 question correctly, that is something up for
14 discussion in this group. What is our purpose?
15 Certainly if the process worked perfectly, there
16 wouldn't be a need for a RAB or our community
17 involvement. It goes well beyond just addressing
18 the geotechnical or the hazardous waste remedy.

19 Here we are. I'm just suggesting
20 that we have the information before us, so we can

1 look at the island and its environmental
2 complexities and reduce issues on a systemic basis
3 so we have all the cards and can consider them in
4 our review, because in my view that would make me
5 a responsible community RAB member.

6 If I tried to operate in a vacuum and
7 didn't realize what it being considered here, that
8 it is something that should be considered with
9 another piece of information, if it is not being
10 presented to the RAB, it may or may not be getting
11 to the agencies in a systemic manner, either.

12 MR. ONGERTH: I think it is a subject
13 worthy of discussion among the group.

14 MR. HANSEN: I agree with Henry; this
15 should be discussed. An example of what the group
16 should do is what Paul presented to us tonight.

17 We are an advisory group. We have a
18 lot of documents. Some of them are really dull.
19 We look at them with an open mind.

20 We have a certain level of technical

1 expertise, which may be more or less than the
2 people who prepare the document; and we gave
3 advice and we asked questions; and in a democratic
4 society, that is what an advisory group does.

5 Whether the Navy, represented by Jim
6 Sullivan, wants to accept the advice or not, that
7 is for him to determine. But if we feel strongly
8 about it, we can pressure him. That is what an
9 advisory group does. We're really no different
10 than The New York Times.

11 MR. ONGERTH: We discussed that
12 matter of pressuring among ourselves through the
13 last year. It is not a new subject. Maybe it has
14 not gotten into the minutes, but it is not a
15 subject that has been forgotten.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The litmus test
17 of this whole process really occurs, at least with
18 the IR sites, at the Record of Decision. Because
19 in addition to the Restoration Advisory Board,
20 there are certain points in the process in which

1 we have to have general open public comments; and,
2 in fact, we will reach that, also, at the
3 publication of the Remedial Investigation Report.

4 But the ultimate comment, open public
5 comment period is at the Record of Decision; and
6 if we have not involved the public and we produce
7 our Record of Decision that we're going to clean
8 up these sites using these means to this level,
9 and suddenly there is a public outcry that we are
10 180 degrees wrong, then we have not done our job
11 in communicating with the public.

12 Our hope is, by this process of the
13 RAB, as well as the mandated open public comment
14 period that we have at various points in the
15 process, that we will end up in general agreement
16 with the public at large, so that when the end
17 result is produced, there will be a general
18 acceptance of it.

19 I think we can recognize individual
20 community RAB members may not be able to do a

1 super-detailed evaluation of every document, but
2 we would certainly want to -- I would certainly
3 hope that at least we would get kind of a general
4 upcheck or downcheck on the general directions we
5 are heading and, where appropriate, on specific
6 technical details.

7 MR. NEDELL: I'm still not altogether
8 understanding what the actual impact of this
9 fiscal funding change is on the process here.

10 What I have heard is that, of the
11 \$1.5 million that has been allocated, the study
12 will continue; but the implementation of the
13 remediation steps will not move forward and that
14 that will depend at some point upon the Citizens'
15 Re-use Committee coming up with a report of re-use
16 alternatives for the site.

17 When they produce that report the
18 next spring -- April, May, whatever -- whoever
19 produced the report, does that mean that suddenly
20 you are vested with a pot of money and now things

1 move forward with great speed, and we're trying to
2 figure out how to tread water between now and that
3 point?

4 Is it possible that next spring the
5 Citizens' Group, ABC, whatever, puts out this
6 report and the Navy still does not get the
7 funding, we're still sitting here in one year and
8 the consultants have gone away because they don't
9 have any money? Where does this go?

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I basically agree
11 with your analysis. Even when a re-use plan is in
12 place or even when there is plans for interim
13 leasing, we will still be competing for, or at
14 least as it appears in the Congress, we will be
15 competing for a limited pot of money.

16 Even if there were a re-use plan for
17 every base, there is not enough money right now
18 being appropriated by the Congress to fully fund
19 the cleanup programs of every base for every year.

20 So I would expect that once when

1 there are firmer plans for additional leasing or
2 transfers of property, that we will be more
3 competitive for funds. Whether or not we receive
4 all the funds we asked for, I don't know.
5 Probably not. We will probably never receive as
6 much as we asked for, but we should receive a
7 higher percentage when that funding will lead to
8 additional leases or transfers, particularly
9 transfers of property.

10 MS. SMITH: But that will drag by at
11 least a year.

12 MR. HAYDEN: I was going to pull back
13 to part of the original concerns that we were
14 talking about, as far as what the functions of the
15 RAB Board are and what the members do.

16 It seems to me what they do is, they
17 provide, try to shed light on the issues that are
18 brought up; and in order to shed light on the
19 issues that are brought up, they approach the
20 issues from their different perspectives; and they

1 share information about what they know.

2 And part of that process, which to me
3 is just as good as consensus between two competing
4 groups of engineers as to what should be done,
5 which seems to me what is going on between Bechtel
6 and Roller-Tredwell in terms of the nature of the
7 site, is that we need to, from our different
8 perspectives and in order to shed light on the
9 issue, we need to have a sense of what is involved
10 in the issue.

11 Right now, from my perspective as a
12 geologist, I still haven't seen a
13 three-dimensional nature of the island. I have
14 not seen a cross-section. I am still curious what
15 is happening with the offshore sediments.

16 I know there is a sampling program in
17 process, but that is another element. When that
18 is brought into view, it will help those who are
19 technically inclined in that direction to develop
20 an opinion and to share with others, so that the

1 others can present a point of view.

2 Just as an aside, I should mention in
3 this report that I Xeroxed some copies concerning
4 the fill of the island. There are two separate
5 engineering groups who are doing the studies, and
6 one of them proposed a method of coping with the
7 fill that was felt to be too expensive, and
8 another group of engineers then were given the
9 go-ahead.

10 And part of the consequences of that
11 was that, in a portion of the fill of the island,
12 they suddenly had about 150 feet of the wall that
13 they had built just sink out of sight into the Bay
14 mud; and they had to go through a process of
15 correcting in mid-course what was needed to be
16 done.

17 It is still a question as to, in the
18 long run, which was more expensive, the original
19 design that was not approved or the design that
20 was approved and then had to be followed up with

1 modifications later on.

2 Anyhow, all I'm saying is that a
3 group such as ours, pursuing this question is the
4 best way to provide informed opinions.

5 MS. SMITH: I'm just concerned that
6 Jim's answer to Rick's question is factually
7 incorrect. I do not know of the federal
8 government funding projects during a fiscal year.
9 I think they would be a year out before there
10 would be new funding done for this kind of
11 project, and most funding is done over a 5-year
12 basis.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: I think that is good
14 to point out.

15 I would like to say that that is all
16 speculative right now, and that would detract us
17 from what we are trying to do. We know what the
18 reality is of the funding at this moment, so what
19 do we want to spend our time with?

20 I would like to throw out on the

1 comments here, it might be important for us all to
2 separate out the purpose of the RAB and the
3 process, of which I think everybody is very
4 familiar with.

5 The purpose of the RAB is to provide
6 advice on environmental cleanup issues, whether it
7 is the investigation phase or the remediation
8 phase. But what we're also hearing is that the
9 process for the island has slowed down.

10 So what we're trying to do is not to
11 engage the process, because it is pretty clear
12 what we have to do is provide commentary on
13 investigation documents at this point. What we're
14 saying is, is there also another track we should
15 pursue in the interim time, since the process has
16 slowed down, which is the education of the Board
17 members about the issues that will be coming down
18 the road when the process gears up again, of which
19 we're going to be asked to comment on.

20 It could be different remediation

1 techniques, standards setting, a whole host of
2 things; so it is really a question of how does
3 this Board want to spend its time in the
4 intervening months, in addition to reviewing
5 documents?

6 MR. VAN WYE: I don't want to spend
7 my time blowing smoke up someone's posterior.

8 We have to take the funding realities
9 into account in what we do. In the absence of
10 things moving forward fully funded, and I don't
11 think that is going to happen in the near future,
12 certainly spending some time educating ourselves
13 as to the issues that are going to be facing us is
14 probably the best we can spend the time now, and
15 I'm not firmly fixed in that opinion. I would be
16 open to listening to others.

17 It seems to me, in terms of going
18 forward as a RAB, we need to have a very close
19 interface with the Citizens' Re-use Committee,
20 because it is a chicken and egg problem, as I see

1 it.

2 What amount of environmental
3 remediation is going to be necessary depends in
4 large part about what uses are going to be made of
5 the island. And, conversely, what uses are going
6 to be made of the island depend, to a certain
7 extent, on how much it is going to cost to clean
8 things up. And it is, in a sense, having two
9 different committees that are not talking to each
10 other as directly, and I'm not sure how productive
11 that is.

12 I, for one, would be very interested
13 to have considerably more input as to what the
14 City Planning Commission, the Redevelopment
15 Agency, is thinking as to what they want to do
16 with Treasure Island, so that I have and my fellow
17 RAB members here have a better sense as to what
18 remediation is required.

19 Then I think we need to hear from the
20 Navy and the Department of Defense as to what

1 conceivable funds may be available, given the
2 fiscal constraints that the United States
3 Government is operating under now.

4 Frankly, I can easily envision a
5 scenario where a year or so from the now the
6 Congress says, "San Francisco, Treasure Island is
7 yours. San Francisco, we're not going to provide
8 any funds. If you want to clean it up, figure out
9 a way to do it."

10 MS. SHIRLEY: I would like to ask Jim
11 Sullivan who, on the base, is responsible for
12 selling the TI Program? We are competing for
13 funds; obviously some proposal has to be made;
14 someone has to champion Treasure Island. Who
15 would be doing that?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would.

17 Actually, it is more complicated. I
18 certainly go to Congress. The Engineering Field
19 Activity West, which is the Navy's regional
20 engineering center, they put together a program

1 for all of the bases in this area, and we went
2 through a process over the last few months of
3 first prioritizing each individual base's
4 projects, so we prioritized all the Treasure
5 Island projects from 1 to 100.

6 And then we went through another
7 process, another iteration of taking the
8 individual base priority list and prioritizing
9 those or providing one priority list of the entire
10 Bay Area; so the number one project on our list
11 might not be the number one project on the entire
12 Bay Area list.

13 And Cal EPA and EPA were at times
14 invited to participate in that, so that the end
15 result was that Engineering Field Activity West,
16 which is the regional engineering center, sent a
17 combined list to Washington.

18 That, in turn, was combined with the
19 other Navy regions; and that, in turn, went up and
20 was further combined by DOD and ultimately was

1 competing for the funds available from Congress.

2 The end result was that the
3 Engineering Facility West received a slice of
4 funding for fiscal year '96, which was further
5 sliced for each base.

6 MS. SHIRLEY: How does the Re-use
7 Plan fit into that? I did not hear re-use coming
8 into that.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It does.

10 If there was cleanup required in
11 order to lease or transfer a piece of property, it
12 would have a higher priority than if there was no
13 leasing or transfer.

14 Consequently, since our property here
15 is right now leasing and transfers are not
16 significantly impacted by the cleanup, we had a
17 relatively lower priority than Alameda or Mare
18 Island, where there might be a particular proposal
19 to transfer or lease a property that needs X
20 dollars of cleanup.

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

CO-CHAIR WONG: It is currently 9:30.

I want to get a sense if you find the conversation is productive here. We did not start the meeting until a quarter past seven, to allow people to get here. Should we agree to continue for another 15 minutes, but limit discussion for 10, and wrap up in 5? Does everybody agree with that, or do you think we have enough now that we can wrap up now how we want to operate over the next few months?

MR. BOATMAN: I think we should continue, if we answer the questions. We had some great comments, but we have not answered the questions yet.

MR. NEDELL: I agree with you, Charles; but the idea is, we are not sure we can up with a plan unless we know what it is we're trying to plan for.

I want to add something to what Harlan said; and sort of harking back to 14 months ago, we all sat in this room; and one of the first

1 things we did is, we went around the room and
2 said, "Why are we here?"

3 I said, "I'm here because I want to
4 make sure that what we do here, the implementation
5 of the cleanup, is done in a manner that is cost
6 effective and we're not spending a lot of money
7 that we don't need to," which somewhat dovetails
8 with what Harlan said.

9 I take some exception to what Brad
10 said a few minutes ago, that our role here is to
11 advise, because I think it is not to advise, it is
12 to comment. It is to respond to the plans that
13 are set forth by the Navy.

14 Ultimately, the Navy is going to make
15 the decision on how many dollars they're going to
16 pour into this base and whether we advised them to
17 put more money into it or not is irrelevant.
18 They're going to do what they can do.

19 My goal here was the implementation
20 to see something get done. I frankly am not

1 interested to sit here and study this thing until
2 it turns into another Hamilton Airfield.

3 So perhaps we ought to be thinking
4 about what it is we can do to get something done
5 here. Otherwise, I think everything we have done
6 to date is probably for nought.

7 I think San Francisco likely will
8 inherit this base, as was stated, "If you want it,
9 it's yours. Clean it up. Do what you want with
10 it. We are out of here."

11 I think that is a real possibility.

12 MR. ALDRICH: In the interest of time
13 I will make a real brief comment:

14 I don't think we should use these
15 meetings to set the agendas for future meetings.
16 We ought to use the intra meeting to try to set
17 that. I strongly favor the education on issues.
18 We do need to cover a couple of basic agenda items
19 on an ongoing basis, and document review, and so
20 on.

1 If we can use the interim meetings to
2 establish a solid agenda, bring in the education
3 and other information that we need, we may make
4 productive use of our time.

5 MS. GLASS: I want to say I'm not
6 speaking strictly from the Citizens' Re-use
7 Committee but from the re-use side of things.

8 Following up on what Harlan said,
9 what would be useful from the RAB -- it's a
10 chicken and egg -- would be some validation of the
11 consultants' statements or independent view of
12 which kind of cleanups are most important, in
13 other words, a prioritization of the cleanups; and
14 that becomes what use is projected for things and
15 what affects re-uses; also, what is the amount of
16 time it would take to do the cleanup?

17 Once again, assuming that funds would
18 be available, just from that point of view, to put
19 that in the hopper here, what the RAB might be
20 doing.

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

MR. HEHN: My response to that,
Laurie, it is one of the things we can do as part
of our meeting agendas; and I would very strongly
recommend that we do some of these agenda items
that we set up here a month ago; because those
will help us to understand what the options are to
take on these particular remediation programs for
particular sites.

One of the things is that if we look
at reduced financial support for the various
remediation options, the more cost effective it
would make that, and that is very important. The
better we understand those issues, the better we
can address them. This is something that would be
cost effective, will not cost \$10 million to do,
and will help the CRC how it can be done.

We don't want to be a super-agency,
as Henry suggested. We're not trying to do all of
the work for everybody there, but we want to
understand the issues, because we have to

1 synthesize that together, to make sure the
2 remediation options, which recommendation, and
3 advice, and comment are appropriate to the site,
4 and what the potential use might be.

5 So I think that is kind of a golden
6 opportunity for us to really understand some of
7 these things, so when these issues do come up, and
8 whether they would be at the funding level that
9 Jim would like to see, or reduced funding level,
10 we can understand and at least discuss the various
11 options to particular sites that might be coming
12 up.

13 So it is good for us to understand
14 that and come up with the ideas and know what is
15 really going to be appropriate.

16 I think there are a number of things
17 we need to do:

18 We still have Phase II, and it would
19 be helpful to get the information and not waiting
20 for the final report, but to give us this

1 information as we go along so we can work with PRC
2 and the regulators and look at the issues.

3 We may have a different view of how
4 things might be done and make our comments on
5 that. That is what we do.

6 MR. MC DONALD: The collaboration
7 between this Board and the CRC is one that is
8 fairly new. Laurie is a representative, a staff
9 member that works for the CRC. She is a
10 Redevelopment Agency or Planning Department
11 employee.

12 MS. GLASS: I work for the CRC.
13 Let's leave it at that.

14 MR. MC DONALD: It is a complicated
15 joint venture.

16 We did receive permission from the
17 CRC to have a representative. I was elected to
18 fill that seat for now. We got the Mayor's Office
19 to approve that. That only happened in August.
20 There was a member of this Board, who was the

1 original RAB member, Don Angus; and he was a
2 member of the CRC; and due to ill health and his
3 subsequent passing away, he never came to one of
4 these meetings since I have been on this RAB.

5 MS. SMITH: He came once.

6 MR. MC DONALD: So that collaboration
7 never took place until now, and I think this is an
8 iterative process that we have to go through.

9 The CRC has to understand our
10 concerns. We have to appreciate their issues. We
11 have to feed them information; they have to feed
12 us information.

13 I think that will accelerate and will
14 be a powerful process for both sides to exchange
15 information and for this group to comment on
16 issues that affect re-use planning.

17 The amount of work that is left to be
18 done on characterization hampers that, because we
19 can't always tell the CRC where some of the
20 problems are and the extent of the cleanup,

1 because the investigative work is not completed.

2 MR. ONGERTH: I want to respond to
3 something Laurie said earlier, and that had to do
4 with the matter of priorities.

5 I very much agree with that and also
6 with what Paul said about options. Jim mentioned
7 that the Twelfth Naval District set priorities,
8 which I'd like to know what those priorities were
9 for this base.

10 I think all of that would help us
11 deal with this matter of setting priorities and
12 identifying options ultimately.

13 MR. VAN WYE: I would like to
14 subscribe to the comments of the last five
15 speakers and particularly the comments of Laurie.

16 It would seem to me we are operating
17 somewhat in a blind area here, although obviously
18 not totally; and I would like to suggest and
19 perhaps try to get the words for a motion out
20 here, that we communicate with the CRC to ask

1 them, in general, where do they think that
2 Treasure Island is going to go in the sense of
3 what type of things are going to be done here on
4 the island, in a very general sense, and ask them
5 what input from us would be helpful in this
6 process.

7 And then I think if we had some
8 general sense as to what was going on with the
9 re-use, then we can focus our attention to what is
10 doable, what is not doable, what costs might be,
11 and what are the problems; and we should ask them
12 to tell us what they need.

13 And if I can get that in the form of
14 a motion, so be it.

15 MS. SMITH: I second the motion.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Is that a motion?

17 All in favor, say aye; opposed, no.

18 (The motion carried.)

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: Our ten minutes is
20 up. I wanted to see if I could just summarize

1 what was said and see if we can get agreement on
2 the topic in terms of how to structure these
3 meetings and our purpose for the next six months.

4 In terms of the cleanup process, the
5 way it shakes down is that the document review
6 schedule will drive what we're able to participate
7 in over the next six months.

8 We can review it at that time in
9 terms of what we're commenting on or advising on
10 in terms of the actual cleanup process through the
11 technical review of the documents. That is going
12 to be driven by when the documents come out and
13 when they need comment by, the two that need
14 comments by December 19th.

15 What we're also introducing is an
16 educational component to take this time to build
17 an educational component in the meeting, and there
18 is a whole range of issues, starting maybe with
19 the list we developed at the last meeting, that we
20 can develop in conjunction with the Navy and the

1 regulators through the interim meeting process,
2 develop which one of the educational topics we
3 would talk about at the subsequent meeting, to
4 prepare us all for some of the issues that will
5 come down the road that we should be aware of,
6 whether it is the re-use, the geotechnical
7 remediation techniques, or what have you.

8 That is really what this boils down
9 to. If we can get a motion that we continue the
10 cleanup process end of things in the Technical
11 Review Subcommittee, and have presentations to
12 this group for discussion in terms of our comments
13 to documents, and then develop a pool of
14 educational topics that we can use over the next
15 six months to get us up to speed on some of the
16 issues that will be coming up down the road.

17 MS. SMITH: We have to add --

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: The third is to --

19 MR. VAN WYE: Communication with CRC
20 and ask them what we can do for them.

1 CO-CHAIR WONG: That could be one of
2 the agenda items, to bring them in.

3 MR. MC DONALD: To bring who in?

4 MS. GLASS: I can bring it up at the
5 next meeting, but not to have them come here.

6 MR. MC DONALD: May I suggest, we
7 have an External Affairs Committee, we have the
8 opportunity to present to that organization and to
9 any other group our position and that it is the
10 consensus or the vote of this Board to make that
11 inquiry, that we should do that by letter through
12 that process.

13 CO-CHAIR WONG: We should do it
14 through the External Affairs Subcommittee. Can we
15 get a motion that is to be handled through the
16 External Affairs Subcommittee?

17 MR. HANSEN: I so move.

18 MR. BOATMAN: Second the motion.

19 MR. HANSEN: Adding on to that -- and
20 having an External Affairs Subcommittee is just

1 marvelous -- but since both Jim and I attended the
2 SPUR meeting last Wednesday and the next followup
3 meeting is tomorrow night, we should encourage Dan
4 to go down to that.

5 SPUR is fairly new to me, but it is
6 obvious there are a lot of people there in
7 three-piece suits. They charge us \$30 for hors
8 d'oeuvres. They are influential. They are not a
9 partisan group but very interested in overall
10 planning.

11 They are a force to be contended
12 with, and External Affairs should be interacting
13 with them, also.

14 Additionally, I think we should start
15 interacting with the next Mayor of the City of San
16 Francisco, because he will play a large role with
17 what happens to Treasure Island -- as soon as you
18 find out who that is.

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: Can we put this to a
20 motion, to try a resolution on this, two tracks --

1 one, continue the cleanup process through the
2 document review schedule and whatever else comes
3 down the line that we need to comment on; and the
4 other is to add an educational component and have
5 each of the community members maybe submit to me,
6 if you can fax them to me and call me, and we will
7 develop a pool of topics of interest that we want
8 to learn about over the next six months, and we
9 can work those into the schedule with consultants.

10 MR. HEHN: I make the motion.

11 MR. BOATMAN: Second.

12 (The motion carried.)

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I won't ask for a
14 motion, but just a specific recommendation in
15 answer to Dale's comments about the agenda, that I
16 would propose at the next interim meeting, which
17 will be on the 14th of November.

18 I would recommend that we discuss the
19 meeting agendas for January and beyond at that
20 meeting. I think for November and December we're

1 somewhat locked in by the need to look at
2 documents that are available, and that will be the
3 UST Report and the Ecological Risk Assessment work
4 plan.

5 I think both of those are enough food
6 for thought for November and December.

7 So I think we can have a more
8 long-range agenda beginning for January and
9 beyond.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: Can we get a motion
11 to begin the educational component in January, due
12 to the heavy report load in November and December?

13 MS. MENDELOW: The petroleum
14 discussion is out for next time?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is in.

16 We're going to have a general
17 presentation of petroleum issues, and that will be
18 for the review of the UST Report as well as the
19 groundwork for other discussions regarding
20 petroleum.

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

MR. ALDRICH: I so move.

MR. WILSON: Second the motion.

(The motion carried, and the meeting
adjourned at 9:45 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE

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

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

Paul Schiller

OCT 3 0 1995

(Signature)

(Date)