

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

COPY

MEETING OF THE  
TREASURE ISLAND  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

Tuesday, February 27, 1996  
Admiral Nimitz Conference Center  
Treasure Island  
San Francisco, California

REPORTED BY: PAUL SCHILLER, CSR 1268

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

ATTENDANCE

U.S. NAVY

ERNIE GALANG (RPM)

HUGO BERSTON (NAVSTA TI)

JAMES SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

SHARON TOBIAS

STACEY LUPTON

CHRISTINA GODDARD

REGULATORY AGENCIES

GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)

RACHEL SIMONS (U.S. EPA)

MARTHA WALTERS (SFDPH)

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

JAMES ALDRICH

JOHN ALLMAN

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

CHRIS SHIRLEY (ARC ECOLOGY)

RICHARD HANSEN

CHLOE JUE

CLINTON LOFTMAN

DANIEL MC DONALD

KAREN MENDELOW

RICK NEDELL

PATRICIA NELSON

HENRY ONGERTH

DALE SMITH

THOMAS THOMPSON

LAURIE GLASS (TI Citizens Reuse Cte)

HARLAN VAN WYE (TI Yacht Club)

USHA VEDAGIRI

BRAD WONG (Community Co-Chair)

BEAU WRIGHTSON

GUESTS

SUSAN HOOTKINS

ANDY HARRISON

1

2

(7:13 p.m.)

3

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our

4

February Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

5

Everyone should have a copy of the

6

agenda. There are extra copies on the back table

7

if you need one.

8

The first item of business would be

9

to approve the agenda, but I would like to make

10

one proposed change. I would like to have the

11

Education topic, "Human Health Risk Assessment,"

12

moved up, first, to 7:20. And the reason for that

13

is to allow us to have that presentation before

14

the break so that you will be able to have any

15

informal discussion regarding the presentation

16

during the break time.

17

If you do it after the break, there

18

will be limited time for questioning. So unless

19

there is any comments, I would like to move the

20

Health Risk Assessment to 7:20, and a discussion

1 of the BRAC Cleanup Plan to 8:15.

2 Okay, we will make that change.

3 The next item is discussion and  
4 approval of the January minutes. I have extra  
5 copies of the minutes on the back table, also.

6 Are there any comments concerning the  
7 January meeting minutes?

8 MS. SMITH: As John Allman would say,  
9 I am misquoted on page 2. I did express concern  
10 that a recreation facility will require higher  
11 cleanup levels than an industrial reuse will  
12 require, because the Department of Toxic Substance  
13 Control is unwilling, along with the Navy, to do  
14 that higher level cleanup; and I would like that  
15 included.

16 That is my concern, talking lower  
17 than recreational use, which is the highest form  
18 of cleanup; and that has been resisted by Mary  
19 Rose Cassa.

20 CO-CHAIR WONG: What is the change?

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

MS. SMITH: I want the addition to that, because that level of cleanup has been resisted by the Department of Toxic Substance Control.

MS. KATHURIA: Is that accurate?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Mary Rose is not here.

MS. SMITH: But repeatedly she has said that that is too expensive.

MR. UNGERTH: Was that said at the meeting? These are the minutes of the meeting. Was it said?

MS. SMITH: I said that I felt -- this is my opinion -- I felt that the Department of Toxic Substance Control was resistant to cleaning up to that level.

That is not included in these minutes. That was my statement.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's fine. I will check the verbatim transcript to make sure

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

that you were accurately quoted.

MS. KATHURIA: Maybe it is not accurate, Mary.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Mary Rose couldn't be here. She had an unexpected --

MS. SMITH: It is a representation of my statement.

MS. KATHURIA: But if Toxics does not feel that way --

MS. SMITH: That is my opinion. I'm sorry, but my opinion has to be recorded. Regardless of what the State and the Regional Board want, my opinion has to be recorded.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I agree with you, Dale.

Are there any other comments?

With that, we will approve the January meeting minutes. Thank you.

Now, we move into the public comment period. We afford a 5-minute period at the

1 beginning of each meeting for any member of the  
2 general public to be able to make any comments.

3 Are there any open comments?

4 MS. SHIRLEY: ARC is having a meeting  
5 with DTSC at our offices at six o'clock on  
6 February 29, on Thursday, to talk about how DTSC  
7 used their role on the draft and how the community  
8 used its role, to try to work out some issues that  
9 have been expressed over a couple of years at the  
10 various RABs. It is the 29th, 6:00 p.m., and for  
11 community RAB members.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And the address  
13 of ARC is?

14 MS. SHIRLEY: 833 Market Street, and  
15 it will be on the 8th floor.

16 If you want any information; you can  
17 call me at 495-1786.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

19 With that, we will move into the  
20 program updates.

1 Rachel will present a brief update on  
2 our BCT activity.

3 MS. SIMONS: We had a workshop on the  
4 Ecological Risk Assessment on January 30th, in the  
5 evening. On February 2nd, we had a BCT meeting  
6 with two main topics.

7 First, we reviewed some of the  
8 preliminary results of the Phase 2 Remedial  
9 Investigation and identified potential  
10 petroleum-only sites.

11 We also reviewed and began to update  
12 the BCT, which is the BRAC cleanup time.

13 On January 7th, we had our monthly  
14 project managers' meeting, and the topics included  
15 coordinating with the City on cleanup and reuse.  
16 We also discussed our comments on the EBS Sampling  
17 Plan, and that was about it.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay, thank you.

19 Now, Laurie, can you make the  
20 presentation of the activity of the Citizen Reuse

1 Committee.

2 MS. GLASS: A couple of things:

3 The minutes mentioned that we had two  
4 CRC meetings in January. There was also a meeting  
5 February 5th.

6 At the January 22nd meeting, there  
7 was a resolution approved supporting the retention  
8 of the Treasure Island Museum and the retention of  
9 the museum in Building 1. It was Claire Isaacs,  
10 who's a member of the Museum Association Board,  
11 who took it to Washington, D.C.

12 This is just to let you know an  
13 activity that occurred.

14 More importantly, at the February 5th  
15 meeting, the CRC approved a conceptual planning  
16 framework and some eight recommendations for the  
17 preferred use concept, and I have copies of that  
18 here. A number of people have gotten copies at  
19 the interim meeting; but if anyone else would like  
20 a copy of this, they are here.

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

This represents kind of the first step in preparing our Reuse Plan.

The other thing that I think was significant at this meeting, it asked for CRC's support for redirecting UST funds to Treasure Island; and that is in the process.

That is about the most that is relevant here. You will probably be getting two packages this week, minutes for the January 22nd meeting and then a second envelope with minutes for the February 5th meeting.

MR. HANSEN: Laurie, can you comment about the report that Mayor Brown decided that there will be a female prison on Treasure Island?

MS. GLASS: I read this in the newspaper, as you did. I think Mayor Brown is a really energetic mayor, who has lots of good ideas; and he is contributing to the creative process in thinking about uses for Treasure Island.

1 I think this is one of the ideas, and  
2 it is being investigated for feasibility.

3 MR. HANSEN: Basically a trial  
4 balloon that he is sending up?

5 MS. GLASS: I would not say that. I  
6 think the papers catch every word that he says and  
7 play them in large headlines, and it is hard for  
8 me, not having conversations with him, to know how  
9 real that is going to be or not.

10 I wouldn't say -- it may be much,  
11 much more than a trial balloon; and then, again,  
12 it may just be something that someone overheard  
13 and reported.

14 MR. HANSEN: So we have the  
15 framework -- this is the same gentleman who  
16 proposed Las Vegas for Treasure Island.

17 MS. GLASS: In the same article, when  
18 a reporter asked him about it, he said, basically,  
19 "that was then; this is now." He read the Issues  
20 and Opportunities Report and noted it was a

1 possible use that was mentioned in the Issues and  
2 Opportunities Report, and was very astute in that  
3 way.

4 He just mentioned it; and, once  
5 again, the press felt that is the most newsworthy  
6 thing that he said and ran with that.

7 I think what I read recently in the  
8 press was saying the casino does not seem feasible  
9 at this time. I think that is my recollection.

10 Once again, we're very fortunate that  
11 the mayor is very interested in Treasure Island  
12 and has lots of good ideas; and it is always  
13 useful for people -- if anybody feels they have  
14 input about possible uses, it is always beneficial  
15 to make your thoughts known.

16 MR. HANSEN: Is that being presented  
17 as an addendum to the alternatives?

18 MS. GLASS: Especially if it is  
19 implemented in the near term -- I don't know; it  
20 may be a long-term use, but it would be initially

1 considered as an interim reuse or initial reuse.

2 In that way it would not be included  
3 in the Alternatives Report. There may be several  
4 uses that are not seen as long-term uses, and the  
5 Alternatives Report is supposed to focus on  
6 long-term, rather than what we might do in the  
7 meantime.

8 MR. HANSEN: To move out here, he  
9 wouldn't move out here unless it was for 10, or  
10 20, or 30 years, for a prison.

11 MS. GLASS: I wouldn't know. I know  
12 they are in dire straits at the existing  
13 facilities.

14 CO-CHAIR WONG: If there is nothing  
15 else from the last meeting, there is still a lot  
16 up in the air; and I did get a chance to take a  
17 look at the planning framework that was approved  
18 by the CRC; and that, in itself, is really quite  
19 vague and allows for a lot of flexibility.

20 I would like to see if we can't keep

1 focused on environmental issues, and a lot of  
2 these things are going to surface in the next six  
3 months or couple of years, and we will deal with  
4 them, if they come up, if it affects our cleanup  
5 process.

6 MS. GLASS: Generally, there are  
7 several very articulate people who are attending  
8 CRC meetings -- Dan and Martha Walters, who are  
9 very articulate, who are bringing the  
10 environmental cleanup issues to the forefront; and  
11 Jim Sullivan.

12 There were a lot of people there who  
13 were articulate about those kinds of issues. They  
14 are being brought to the forefront; and if there  
15 is a situation where there is an interim use being  
16 proposed that is not suitable, it is safe to say  
17 it won't occur.

18 CO-CHAIR WONG: Thank you, Laurie.

19 I think that would be out of the  
20 purview of our Board, but as Laurie says, we have

1 good representation on the CRC.

2 Is there anything else you have,

3 Laurie?

4 MS. GLASS: No, that is it.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next CRC

6 meeting is this coming Monday.

7 MS. GLASS: The 5th.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We talked about

9 this before. I know they're not going to hold any

10 formal workshops, but when would be the next

11 opportunity, other than the CRC public discussion?

12 MS. GLASS: Jim, I would have to say

13 that that apparently is in change. You got with

14 the minutes a copy of the schedule that was

15 discussed at the January 22nd meeting. Things

16 change daily; the schedule expands and contracts.

17 What will happen in a thing like that --

18 I will make sure that the RAB members

19 get advance notice of that. I will send it out

20 specifically.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

MS. GLASS: When it happens, there will be advance warning; and you will know.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And all CRC meetings are open to the general public, and a number of RAB members attended in the past.

We will move on to the Education topic, which we moved up to 7:20.

With that, I will turn it over to Christina.

MS. CHRISTINA GODDARD: I understand you had a series of eco sessions here in the RAB and a breakout group, where you got a little bit more in human health risks; and this human health risk assessment session today is to provide you with a very general overview.

Mind you, this is a 15-minute presentation; and in the consulting world, you can go and do this for a week long.

Those of you who do know something

1 about human health risk assessment will find it to  
2 be a review of the basics; but those of you who do  
3 not know, I hope I can afford you with a very  
4 basic framework; and at the conclusion of the  
5 session, if the RAB are interested, we can also  
6 have another training course in addition to the  
7 one that was conducted for the eco training.

8 I plan on speaking for 15 minutes or  
9 so, and we will have questions at the end; or if  
10 you have questions as the presentation is going  
11 on, please don't hesitate to ask.

12 You also have these handouts in your  
13 packets, "Objectives of the Human Health Risk  
14 Assessment."

15 What are the objectives of the human  
16 health risk assessment?

17 On the most fundamental level, what  
18 we're trying to do is take information we know  
19 about the site, such as concentrations of  
20 contaminants that are found at the site, and

1 estimate if there is a potential health hazard for  
2 humans and whether it is related to carcinogens or  
3 noncarcinogens.

4 At the end, the information that you  
5 get out helps in the decision-making process to  
6 define if or where a response action is needed at  
7 the site. It is one piece of information that  
8 goes into that decision, but it is an important  
9 piece of information.

10 The EPA Risk Assessment Grid defines  
11 the risk assessment process in four steps. Those  
12 four steps are data collection and evaluation;  
13 toxicity assessment and exposure assessment, which  
14 are conducted concurrently; and the final outcome,  
15 the human risk assessment process, the risk  
16 characterization.

17 In the talk, I'm going to go over  
18 each of the four steps; and we will wrap it up  
19 with the fourth.

20 MS. SMITH: Why are you doing

1 Superfund, since this is not a Superfund?

2 MS. GODDARD: They follow CERCLA, and  
3 CERCLA is Superfund law. It is not an NTL site,  
4 not a National Priority Risk site, but the  
5 environmental work that we do follows the plan.

6 The first step of the human health  
7 risk assessment is the data collection and  
8 evaluation step. This is the step where we really  
9 see an interface between the work that has been  
10 going on and the human health risk assessments,  
11 where it starts to get involved.

12 The first three boxes are what the  
13 remedial investigation is all about, the site  
14 investigation approach; sampling design; trying to  
15 figure out what do we have out at the site and  
16 where do we have it, what is the nature and  
17 extent?

18 By the way, risk assessment is  
19 involved in the entire process in helping to  
20 develop the sampling plan; but when we start

1 collecting the data, we get a statistical analysis  
2 of the data; we get a data distribution; and the  
3 selection of chemicals of potential concern. That  
4 is what the COPCs are.

5 There are three selection criteria  
6 that we use to help us define what our COPCs are.  
7 Those include background for metal; data quality  
8 assurance; and quality control.

9 What do we know about our data  
10 quality? Is it of high quality? Is there a lot  
11 of data rejected with a problem with the  
12 laboratory, or do we have high quality data we can  
13 use in the risk assessment?

14 Finally, we screen for toxics in  
15 extremely high doses that you don't normally see  
16 in the environment.

17 The second step of human health risk  
18 assessment is the exposure assessment. This step  
19 really defines the who, the where, the what, the  
20 how long an individual is exposed.

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

When we talk about identifying exposed individuals in the population, in risk assessment lingo or jargon, we talk about these individuals as receptors; and this is a term you might have learned in your eco training as well.

We are concerned with humans. Eco assessment has a variety of species that you are concerned about, so it is more complicated in the ecological assessment.

Identifying how are people in contact with contaminants -- are they eating it, drinking it, breathing it? Are they dermally in contact with it?

That is connected to the scenario, looking at potential future uses at the site; and this is a big issue for Treasure Island, because future uses are unknown. So for the risk assessment that we're doing at Treasure Island, we're looking at three possible land use scenarios: industrial land use, recreational land

1 use, and also unrestricted residential land use.

2 Depending on what the land use is  
3 predicted to be, hopefully we have it covered  
4 under one of those scenarios; and if we don't, we  
5 can do so.

6 MR. ALDRICH: You do exposure  
7 assessment for each of the COPCs?

8 MS. GODDARD: Yes, we do.

9 MR. ALDRICH: You follow this process  
10 for each one?

11 MS. GODDARD: This does not fit. The  
12 intake part of it is specific to the COPC. In  
13 trying to identify who is going to be at the site,  
14 that is independent of the chemical or potential  
15 concern to an accident. We try to predict who are  
16 the individuals exposed to it, and we use that  
17 information in conjunction with the chemical  
18 concentration COPC-specific, and we derive that  
19 intake.

20 Does that answer your question?

1 MR. ALDRICH: Is it a complicated  
2 process? Do you have formulas you use?

3 MS. GODDARD: Unfortunately, in 15  
4 minutes it is limited. There are formulas that  
5 help you derive what an intake is, and those  
6 formulas include things like body weight; how much  
7 does an adult eat per day; how much does the  
8 average child eat per day; what is an inhalation  
9 rate?

10 MR. ALDRICH: Roughly, how many COPCs  
11 are there in the world of risk assessment?

12 MS. GODDARD: It depends on the site.  
13 At some sites at Treasure Island, we will see the  
14 TPH; some sites we see volatile, semi-volatile  
15 TPH-related; metals, you're always going to find a  
16 gamut of metals. Some of them may screen out by  
17 background, and we have had a list of 40 DRD.  
18 This is a very involved list. Usually a lot of  
19 things get screened out ahead of time.

20 MR. ALLMAN: How do you do the

1           quality control and quality assurance? Do you  
2           have algorithms? Are they 20 feet away, but the  
3           calculation says they're safe, and then you use  
4           common sense?

5                       All you're doing in these  
6           calculations is to determine quality assurance of  
7           what is on the site. Are people going to be safe?  
8           But it is all theoretical at this point.

9                       MS. GODDARD: It is, definitely.

10                      MR. ALLMAN: Your maximum,  
11           approximation, how many people are going to be  
12           here and live here? I don't know, maybe you're  
13           using the most current CRC evaluation, how many  
14           people would live here if they kept X number of  
15           units?

16                      The density of the population and  
17           number of adults and kids is important to the  
18           calculation, so how can you predict it?

19                      MS. GODDARD: Actually, how many  
20           people are going to be exposed does not factor

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

into this equation at all.

If one kid is being exposed, it does not matter if it is a million or one; but what is the likelihood of that person getting an adverse effect?

So the number of people who are at the site does not matter as much as the input for an exposure value that you put in, such as the ingestion; and EPA and Cal EPA have inputs for these; but we don't have site-specific information. We use default values and the benefit, if we do a risk assessment here at Treasure Island, it is comparable to Alameda; and you have a sense of comparability.

MR. ALLMAN: I'm sure people do these calculations every day. But if you're going to have 50 kids in a playground or 5 kids in a playground, or a day care center, or an elementary school, that increases the probability of one in a million.

1                   Let me get a feel for this. Now I  
2 will stop and see what comes out of the rest of  
3 the talk.

4                   You are depending on these numbers.  
5 You're making decisions that may be greatly  
6 changed when the City comes out with its final  
7 plan what they're going to do with the island.

8                   MS. SMITH: I would like to add, are  
9 your assessment values based on people working  
10 here and going away or living here, children  
11 growing up here? How do your assessment levels  
12 and your algorithm factor in that one per? Does  
13 the one person live here, work here, or go away?  
14 How do you figure one person, what his life style  
15 is that you can protect children?

16                   MS. GODDARD: That is a very good  
17 question, because what EPA and Cal EPA and the  
18 Navy look at is protecting the most reasonably  
19 maximum-exposed individual.

20                   The assumptions that we use are in

1 our exposure parameters. They are high end.

2 We run two scenarios. One is average  
3 Joe, a person who is average and eats an average  
4 amount of food -- you're right, it is very hard.  
5 Risk assessment is an estimate. I'm not telling  
6 you, at the end of the process, we're going to hit  
7 the nail on the head with the hammer. It is an  
8 estimate, but we look at the average and the  
9 reasonably maximum-exposed individual.

10 The child that eats a lot of soil  
11 more than the average child, some children have  
12 certain habits; and we do look at those  
13 individuals.

14 MS. SMITH: The elderly, who would be  
15 immobilized.

16 MS. GODDARD: And spend most of their  
17 time in their homes.

18 I would like to move on, because  
19 we're very short on time; but I would love to  
20 talk to you during the break.

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

The outcome of the exposure is the calculated intake, and that is the amount of chemicals that a person takes into their body on a daily basis.

CO-CHAIR WONG: I have a question, if I may; and I know you're watching the clock; but we have set these meetings up to allow for a free dialog at this point.

I'm not somebody that is well versed in the science of all of this at all; but if I listened to the questions that were posed and your presentation here, it seems to me that you were about to go into a process where you are taking a single human exposure and are going to make some assumptions that go into a mathematical model or something that will calculate values.

MS. GODDARD: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR WONG: What needs to happen? Those sets of assumptions have to be defined by the ultimate reuse of the property, and they might

1 include population, not just individuals.

2 So I guess, for me, what would be  
3 important is to understand what the process is  
4 that we could expect in terms of running some  
5 preliminary calculations on individuals before you  
6 know what the reuse is, but which would be the  
7 process to develop the assumptions that are going  
8 to be used once a reuse plan is in place. Because  
9 it seems to me, it will have an effect on the  
10 values here.

11 MS. GODDARD: Actually, it won't; and  
12 I'm afraid that I either misspoke or there is a  
13 little misunderstanding in the audience.

14 There is no such thing as doing a  
15 risk assessment on the population versus the  
16 individual. When I say risk assessment, it does  
17 not matter whether it is an entire city or an  
18 individual. If it is an entire population, you're  
19 going to still pick the most reasonably  
20 maximum-exposed individual out of that population.

1                   Every person in this room drinks a  
2                   different amount of water each day, for example.  
3                   In order to be protective, contaminants that are  
4                   in the water, we would take the person who drinks  
5                   the most groundwater and say, "We want to protect  
6                   that individual."

7                   It does not matter if it is a  
8                   population or individual. By protecting the  
9                   individual, you protect the population.

10                  Does that help to clear it up a  
11                  little bit?

12                  CO-CHAIR WONG: Are the results of  
13                  this process, then, completely independent from  
14                  reuse?

15                  MS. GODDARD: Because we don't know  
16                  what the reuse is and we want to evaluate what the  
17                  risks are out there currently, we're going to  
18                  evaluate these three potential future use  
19                  scenarios, meaning the recreational, the  
20                  residential, and the industrial. Each site likely

1 will have one of those uses, and the Risk  
2 Management will be able to make a decision based  
3 on the information in the document.

4 We don't wait until the reuse is  
5 done, which would mean for a site to evaluate only  
6 one scenario.

7 MS. VEDAGIRI: Are you doing a  
8 separate risk assessment for every one of the  
9 sites?

10 MS. GODDARD: It is going to be  
11 all-encompassed in the IR Report. Each site is a  
12 chapter; and that is one result of the human  
13 health risk assessment; but we are looking at it,  
14 we're doing all the sites.

15 MS. VEDAGIRI: A lot of the sites are  
16 very close together, so you can really have a  
17 cumulative exposure for one person arising from  
18 several sites?

19 MS. GODDARD: You could.

20 MS. VEDAGIRI: I would have a chapter

1 at the very end which looks at one person who  
2 would go over the whole island and might be  
3 exposed to multiple sites.

4 MS. GODDARD: We could do that. It  
5 arises here when we calculate our exposure point  
6 concentrations. These concentrations are based on  
7 average exposures.

8 What would happen if we looked at a  
9 base-wide exposure or assume you have two sites;  
10 one has some fault organic compounds; another has  
11 some petroleum. Because of the way we calculate  
12 the concentrations, we do the average. We group  
13 those two sites together. The fossil compounds at  
14 one site, if they're not detected, the  
15 concentration would be decreased; and the risk  
16 assessment would not be as conservative.

17 It depends on what the use is going  
18 to be; but if we look at areas of concern or  
19 higher levels of contamination, we start adding  
20 other areas to that; and it ends up diluting

1 concentrations of chemicals; and that is not  
2 health protective.

3 MR. MC DONALD: You mentioned three  
4 typical scenarios -- industrial, recreational, and  
5 residential.

6 MS. GODDARD: That is what we're  
7 looking at.

8 MR. MC DONALD: Given the potential  
9 reuse scenarios discussed by the Citizens Reuse  
10 Committee, it excludes industrial. Would it not  
11 make sense to substitute another scenario that  
12 might be within the realm of possibility of what  
13 could be out there, since industrial has been  
14 ruled out of hand as not being economically  
15 feasible?

16 MS. GODDARD: When I say industrial,  
17 I should be saying commercial or industrial. The  
18 exposure assumptions that are involved with  
19 evaluating a commercial worker, if there was a  
20 theme park, that could be an executive who worked

1 at the theme park, or an office worker, and the  
2 going into industrial is similar. By doing the  
3 one scenario, you can estimate risks of  
4 populations.

5 If they are commercial, industrial  
6 can be substituted.

7 MR. MC DONALD: What about the  
8 situation where someone might work and live on the  
9 island, so they go home and their house sits on  
10 one IR, and they work on another. Is that a  
11 situation where the exposure indices are  
12 different, because you are around it 24 hours a  
13 day?

14 MS. GODDARD: Right, I understand.

15 We account for that in the human  
16 element for people who both work on site or live  
17 on site or people who do both.

18 MS. SMITH: Would you please clarify,  
19 you mentioned that you're studying individual  
20 sites, so you're looking at individual IR sites

1 and doing an analysis, a risk analysis for each of  
2 the what, 21, 25 IR sites --

3 MS. GODDARD: Yes.

4 MS. SMITH: -- on the island; is that  
5 true?

6 MS. GODDARD: That is correct.

7 MS. SMITH: Even though the City of  
8 San Francisco might want to acquire a bunch of  
9 them, you will have individual risk assessments  
10 for all of those individual sites within the  
11 group?

12 MS. GODDARD: That is correct.

13 MR. ALLMAN: This relates to it, and  
14 that is the only reason I bring it up tonight:

15 If the IR sites -- we're getting the  
16 ecological risk assessments overview; I had some  
17 letters dealing with some receptors that were not  
18 included with the study, because they were outside  
19 of the IR site boundaries; so they were not  
20 included as part of the ecological risk

1 assessments.

2 If there is some factor outside, say  
3 there is a tank that is not at an IR site but  
4 could potentially affect that site, do you include  
5 that in the calculation, or only the contaminated  
6 zones that are in the boundaries of the IR site?

7 MS. GODDARD: We just include the  
8 areas in the IR site. If we had a UST directly  
9 adjacent to the site, we clean that UST up; so an  
10 individual standing right on that location would  
11 be safe. Therefore, if there is an individual  
12 adjacent to the location --

13 MR. ALLMAN: Suppose the adjacent  
14 area is not an IR site, which is the issue that  
15 came into question with the ecological risk  
16 assessment?

17 MS. GODDARD: Yes?

18 MR. ALLMAN: That means it might be  
19 cleaned up under different criteria than the IR  
20 site. It might have a completely different basis.

1 It may not be cleaned up at the same level as the  
2 one area that the City of San Francisco is taking  
3 over. It is an IR site, because it is going to be  
4 used for something else; but they may not clean it  
5 up to the level that you clean it up for the  
6 humans to live there.

7 That may still affect the IR site.

8 MS. GODDARD: I would disagree with  
9 that.

10 First of all, what we are doing in  
11 the risk assessment, we are providing the Risk  
12 Management with a piece of information whether the  
13 site needs to be cleaned up or not.

14 And the scenarios we're doing is  
15 residential, the most conservative, unrestricted  
16 land use; industrial; commercial and recreational.

17 MR. ALLMAN: Are you taking all the  
18 IR sites that you're considering this risk  
19 assessment for as all under one scenario, all  
20 under scenario B and all under scenario C, or do

1           you calculate each scenario for each site  
2           independently?

3                       MS. GODDARD:  Yes.

4                       MR. ALLMAN:  You're not taking under  
5           consideration one IR site could be residential.  
6           Are you in any way linking that to a calculation  
7           that was done on a neighboring site that would be  
8           industrial-commercial, that needs a different  
9           level of cleanup?

10                      MS. GODDARD:  What we're getting into  
11           here is a little bit of a confusion between the  
12           risk assessment and the cleanup level.

13                      By the time we establish what the  
14           cleanup level is, the reuse will be known.

15                      If you have a residence right  
16           adjacent to the soccer field and it needs to be  
17           cleaned up to a recreational scenario, the  
18           residence will be cleaned up, because we are  
19           assuming that there is an individual 24 hours a  
20           day on that site.

1 For the soccer field, maybe there is  
2 an individual there for two full days a week.

3 MR. ALLMAN: You're going to clean  
4 them up to the most conservative level?

5 MS. GODDARD: It depends on what the  
6 reuse is.

7 MS. SMITH: The soccer field could  
8 have been a toxic zone that, for reasons of  
9 convenience, they decided to pave. The  
10 residential area next to it would be exposed to  
11 higher levels than it ought to be, simply because  
12 there is exposure paths that are not defined,  
13 because the soccer field was not cleaned up to  
14 adequate level.

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: One of the things  
16 that Jim offered at the beginning here is that it  
17 might be beneficial for us to hold a workshop,  
18 much like the Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop,  
19 where we can get into some of these things in more  
20 depth.

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

I would like to propose not to lose track of that question, but that might be something that might be better handled at a workshop.

We can vote on that afterwards and pick a date to do that, but I would like to continue with the presentation, and get a feel for the rest of the process, and get some insights that might be helpful for developing a workshop down the road.

Can we move on further in the presentation.

MS. GODDARD: We were at calculating intake.

The ultimate outcome of the exposure assessment is to calculate the intake, how much is the individual taking into their body on a daily basis.

The next on-site topic is different exposure routes. How do contaminants enter the

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

body?

There are different ways, three that we look at -- inhalation, ingestion, and dermal contact.

You can inhale gases in the form of volatile or airborne dust.

You can ingest soil, water and food, including food that is grown on the site; and you can determine all contacts with soil and water, because the groundwater is currently not being used; and there is a high likelihood it will not be used in the future, except for acid level that we are evaluating.

CO-CHAIR WONG: This may be a silly question:

Can't it be dermally contacted by air, too?

MS. GODDARD: I suppose you could, if you think about dermal contact with dust. It would be very similar to dermal contact with soil.

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

We don't typically evaluate that. I have to think about that. Probably it is not considered to be as primary of an exposure pathway than if you are directly eating the soil.

The third step on the risk assessment is the toxicity assessment. This is where we know what our COPCs are. We obtain information how toxic are these compounds to humans, and what we look out in the risk assessment are compounds that are carcinogens and noncarcinogens.

There is a safe dose, a dose below which you won't have any health effect. As an example, an effect of a noncarcinogen might be aspirin that you have in your own home; and on the back of the box, there is a dosage, two pills every 4, 6, whatever hours. That is considered safe. That is an example of noncarcinogen that has a safe dose.

Carcinogens don't have a safe dose. It is thought that any exposure to cancer-causing

1 agents increases your likelihood of getting cancer  
2 in your lifetime. It may be an incredibly small  
3 one, but nonetheless there is no dose for  
4 carcinogens.

5 Toxicity values, risk assessment is  
6 linked to toxicity values, which are called slope  
7 factors for carcinogens; and for noncarcinogens,  
8 they are called reference doses; and it factors  
9 into the next slide, which is the risk  
10 characterization, step 4 in the risk assessment  
11 process.

12 This is the results of the previous  
13 steps which are assimilated and compiled into your  
14 risk assessment for a site.

15 Just as for toxicity assessment,  
16 carcinogens and noncarcinogens were treated  
17 separately as a step in the risk assessment.

18 When we calculate risk from  
19 carcinogens, we take the intake; and this is what  
20 is determined in our exposure assessment,

1 multiply it by the slope factor and come up with  
2 the risk for a chemical.

3 Because we don't know what kinds of  
4 effects there are when you are exposed to multiple  
5 chemicals, we do add all the risks together; and  
6 we come up with a final cancer risk number for a  
7 site.

8 MR. ALDRICH: Can you compare one  
9 chemical to another? You have two different  
10 numbers; how do they compare with each other?

11 MS. GODDARD: It depends on the  
12 toxicity.

13 MR. ALDRICH: The higher number is  
14 for more exposure.

15 MS. GODDARD: If you're talking about  
16 ingestion of soil at a site, the intake, chemicals  
17 that are more toxic have a higher slope factor and  
18 translate into a higher risk.

19 That is how they relate the intake,  
20 which is, how much are you taking in today versus

1                   how toxic is the compound?

2                   MS. GLASS: Are there standard values  
3 for the slope factors?

4                   MS. GODDARD: Yes, there are.

5                   MS. GLASS: Where is there a standard  
6 reference? In other words, all companies use the  
7 same?

8                   MS. GODDARD: U.S. EPA has a data  
9 base that is called the Integrated Risk  
10 Information; and that has a lot of data, both in  
11 carcinogens and in noncarcinogens; and Cal EPA has  
12 its own slope factor for carcinogens.

13                   MS. GLASS: The exposure assessment  
14 heavily relies on the --

15                   MS. GODDARD: Cal EPA values.

16                   MS. SMITH: What about the chemicals  
17 for which there are no analyses done? I know the  
18 City of Berkely had problems with the fact that  
19 there are no Cal EPA and no Department of Toxic  
20 Substance Control values for chemical exposure.



1 example, we know that groups of carcinogens,  
2 benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, we don't have  
3 information on all the compounds; but we know  
4 they're all carcinogenic. Therefore, we use a  
5 toxicity weighing scheme, benzo(a)pyrene, on which  
6 there is a lot of information.

7 MR. WRIGHTSON: That would be the  
8 best, on some chemical makeup, as opposed to  
9 medical evidence?

10 MS. GODDARD: There is medical  
11 evidence that they are all carcinogenic, but not  
12 enough information to be actually able to derive a  
13 toxicity value for all of them; and so it is based  
14 on both.

15 MR. NEDELL: You indicated if there  
16 are several chemicals, you add the risk  
17 assessments on each one. The cumulative risk is  
18 just an arithmetic sum of the individual risks?

19 MS. GODDARD: That's correct.

20 MR. NEDELL: Is there any effort to

1 determine if there is any synergism that would  
2 cause one to be a catalyst to enhance the risk of  
3 another?

4 MS. GODDARD: That is one of the  
5 reasons why the risks are added.

6 MR. NEDELL: Just adding them is not  
7 geometrical multiplication. The risk of two  
8 chemicals together is four times worse than the  
9 risk of either one?

10 MS. GODDELL: Multiplying the  
11 effect -- is what you're saying what happens when  
12 they derive toxicity values, but inherent in the  
13 process are a number of uncertainty factors that  
14 get tacked onto the toxicity number, and that  
15 includes whether or not information exists on the  
16 compound; whether it is a reproductive toxicant.

17 If information exists, fine; if it  
18 does not, a certain uncertainty factor is added  
19 onto to the toxicity value.

20 MR. ALLMAN: Let me give you an

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

example.

If you have purely lead contamination, you can get enough lead that 99 out of a hundred rats will die. And if you give that amount of lead to somebody, they're going to die, with a 99% probability.

Then you give somebody an amount of cadmium that would only kill one rat in a hundred, if you gave that dose to the rats. You have one in a hundred probability of dying.

You can take the same amount of cadmium that would kill one rat in a hundred, and you give the same rat the amounts of lead that will kill 50 out of a hundred, and you can be above the value of the rat that has a 1% chance of dying, because of the interaction of the cadmium with the lead.

So what I think what Rick is asking, are you taking into consideration benzene plus lead is worse than either by themselves? You

1 can't add them together and get a realistic  
2 figure, so you have to have some studies to get  
3 synergism, or some anticipation; but that needs to  
4 be included in any kind of calculation that you  
5 want to take seriously.

6 I am skeptical in general about risk  
7 assessments. If you look at the number of apples,  
8 how much of a certain pesticide you are allowed to  
9 have in an apple, 50 parts per billion of that  
10 pesticide, you can look at the same table for  
11 spinach -- and that is a table we use in the lab  
12 manual -- and you can have .01 parts per billion  
13 in spinach. And if you are above that level, you  
14 can't sell the spinach with the same pesticide.

15 MS. GODDARD: That may be for intake.

16 MR. ALLMAN: The apple lobby pays  
17 somebody to calculate they can have more of their  
18 apples than --

19 CO-CHAIR WONG: At the risk of  
20 insulting the apple lobby, to me, I think again

1 this is a valuable thing to discuss; and one of  
2 the things my understanding is that, before they  
3 do the human health risk assessment, there is some  
4 opportunity to get some insights into the  
5 assumptions going into the process.

6 I would like to recommend that the  
7 synergism of multiple compounds discussion, as  
8 well as the other topics, be added to a workshop  
9 so we can explore them in more detail.

10 MR. HANSEN: I would request that the  
11 speaker be given five minutes uninterrupted.

12 CO-CHAIR WONG: Go ahead.

13 MS. GODDARD: As I was saying, for  
14 cancer risk, we multiply the intake, which is  
15 determined from the exposure assessment by the  
16 toxicity value, and derive the cancer risk.

17 EPA, in the National Contingency  
18 Plan, which are the regulations that define  
19 CERCLAS, has defined a target cancer rating 10 to  
20 the -4, to ten to the -6.

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

The next slide interprets what the numbers mean in more normally used terms.

What EPA means by 10 to the -4 and by 10 to the -6, they are looking at a target risk range from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in a million individuals getting an increased chance of cancer in their lifetime.

I want to give you example of what those numbers mean. I am always a little bit overwhelmed what a number like 1 in a million means.

Let's assume, in the future, we have a city of a million people on Treasure Island. The American Cancer Society says that 1 out of 3 of these people will develop cancer for reasons that relate to lifestyle, genetics, diet, whatever. That would be 333,000 people.

If you talk about an increased chance of 1 in a million, the total cancer risk in the population would be 333,001 people. It is a small

1 number, but EPA is concerned about that one  
2 individual and that target risk range.

3 If you're talking about 1 in 10,000  
4 people, it would be 333,100 people. You are  
5 talking about that kind of impact on the overall  
6 cancer incidence in the population.

7 MR. UNGERTH: You should add that the  
8 ability to measure to that fine a point does not  
9 exist.

10 MS. GODDARD: Yes, thank you for  
11 bringing that out.

12 Now, this is how we calculate the  
13 hazard for the noncarcinogens, which is a "hazard  
14 quotient."

15 To calculate the hazard quotient,  
16 which is basically comparable to what we compared  
17 the intake, how much is the person taking in,  
18 divide it by the reference dose or the safe dose.  
19 If the amount the person is taking in is equal to  
20 the reference dose or safe dose, this proportion

1 becomes 1; and EPA's action level is one.

2 What EPA says, if the hazard quotient  
3 is 1 or less, it is considered acceptable or fine.  
4 If it is greater than 1, which would happen if a  
5 person was taking in or ingesting more of the  
6 contaminants than considered safe, you need to  
7 take action.

8 MR. ALDRICH: Earlier you said  
9 "reference dose" for noncarcinogens as toxicity  
10 values. Right now you say it is a safe dose.

11 Could you define a little more  
12 clearly?

13 MS. GODDARD: I am using these terms,  
14 the toxicity value, and as a safe dose, I used the  
15 aspirin analogy.

16 MR. ALDRICH: The upper of safety.

17 MS. GODDARD: And, in addition, it  
18 has certainty factors built into it.

19 Where I would like to wrap up the  
20 presentation is what risk assessment will and

1 won't do for you.

2 It does give you an estimate of risk  
3 at a site.

4 What are some of the estimated risks  
5 that we might be forecasting here?

6 It gives a piece of information to  
7 help you determine whether some kind of response  
8 is warranted.

9 It identifies chemicals that are  
10 contributing to the majority of the risk and  
11 exposures that need to be addressed.

12 And finally, it helps to identify  
13 data gaps. If we don't have further information,  
14 that would be a way the risk assessment can help  
15 the RI process.

16 Finally, what does the risk  
17 assessment not tell you?

18 It does not tell you if action is  
19 required. It is one piece of information in the  
20 risk management process.

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

It does not identify what your final cleanup criteria are.

It does not identify the actions to take or give all the information that is required to make that risk management decision.

And, unfortunately, it does not provide "the answer." It provides a piece of the answer.

MR. NEDELL: I have one other question I would like to ask:

Can you use risk assessment as a tool to help you decide to what level of cleanup you can go to?

MS. GODDARD: The final cleanup level is based on much more than risk assessment, but you can use the assumptions in the risk assessment for preliminary cleanup goals, and those get further defined as the process goes on.

MR. ONGERTH: Would you elaborate on your use of the word "safe?"

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

MS. GODDARD: Without carcinogenic health effect.

MR. ONGERTH: I was afraid you would say that, because I can't accept that.

Safety is not an absolute. It is a relative matter. It is not a scientific matter; it is a political matter.

What is an acceptable risk is not a scientific issue; it is a political issue.

MS. GODDARD: I agree with you.

What I meant to say by saying "safe," it does have no appreciable health effect.

MR. ONGERTH: That is not right. It may be appreciable. It is a matter of what is acceptable to society.

There is a risk in flying in an airplane. There is a risk in riding in an automobile. But those risks are considered acceptable by the public. They are not matters of safe or unsafe, and that is an important concept

1 to understand.

2 MS. GODDARD: I understand what  
3 you're saying about acceptable and unacceptable.

4 How I was using "safe" in the  
5 presentation, what I meant by that was a  
6 measurable health effect. I was not saying it was  
7 acceptable or unacceptable. This is as defined by  
8 EPA.

9 MR. ONGERTH: Okay, I accept that.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: At this point, I  
11 would like to suggest we take a 5-minute break;  
12 and we time this so Christina could answer initial  
13 questions people may have.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: I want to make a plea  
15 for help, actually.

16 At Hunters Point the health risk  
17 assessment and RI is out on the street and being  
18 reviewed, and I'm the only person reviewing it  
19 outside of the agency.

20 If anyone wants to help me, there are

1 16 volumes. If anyone wants to help me, please  
2 let me know. I would be most happy. And if  
3 anyone wants to call, please feel free.

4 (Recess taken)

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our next  
6 presentation is on the Administrative Records and  
7 Information Repositories.

8 HUGO BERSTON: I'm Hugo Berston. I'm  
9 sure you know my name, and I am the manager of the  
10 Information Repository here on Treasure Island.

11 You should have the handout, the  
12 information repositories in administrative  
13 records, and also a sheet, a glossary, and the  
14 model file structure. The title is "Information  
15 Repositories and Administrative Records."

16 What is the information repository,  
17 and what is the administrative record, and where  
18 do the documents belong?

19 Now, the information repository is,  
20 in a sense, the outer circle, since it contains

1 both the site files and the administrative  
2 records. And the administrative record is a  
3 subset of the site file and the IR.

4 Essentially, the administrative  
5 record contains all the documents that are  
6 important and is the paper trail to be filed for  
7 later use in case of legal problems.

8 MR. NEDELL: I have a question for  
9 you:

10 What happens to the information that  
11 is obtained and the site record that is not in the  
12 information repository, nor in the administrative  
13 record? Is that stuff that is just disposed of?

14 MR. BERSTON: No, all is maintained.  
15 Nothing is thrown away. It is just that certain  
16 categories fall within the administrative record  
17 and others in the site files, but it is available  
18 if necessary, especially if it has been important  
19 in helping to make a decision.

20 MR. NEDELL: Do you make a

1 distinction between the site file and the  
2 information repository? I don't understand what  
3 that distinction is.

4 MR. BERSTON: The site file contains,  
5 as you can see in the handout, the draft documents  
6 and invalidated data, and it is basically set up  
7 for each individual site. That is the site file.

8 MS. SMITH: It is raw.

9 MR. NEDELL: Does it ever make it to  
10 the information repository?

11 MS. LUPTON: The IR is more for the  
12 public, the general public. The AR is the legal  
13 file. You're going to have reams of documents in  
14 the course of the project.

15 MR. ALLMAN: They have unlimited  
16 retention time, or do some of the files get  
17 discarded after so many years? That is what I'm  
18 curious about.

19 You mention about legal problems  
20 coming up. You can use the data or information to

1 help out. But if you are the sole source of the  
2 data for everything that went on through all the  
3 years of the transfer, you might think something  
4 that you might want to get rid of, because it is  
5 some quality control data for a test that was  
6 done, and another party may want the data to show  
7 that test was not done properly.

8 That is where the retention time  
9 comes in.

10 MS. LUPTON: The remedy that would be  
11 selected would be maintain it in the IR. Anything  
12 that helps you decide to clean up the site goes  
13 into the AR.

14 If you dispute something that  
15 supported that remedy, that would be in the AR.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Let's go ahead  
17 and move through. Maybe that will answer some of  
18 the other questions.

19 MR. BERSTON: Since the AR, the  
20 administrative record, is maintained at or near

1 the facility, the facility site, in this case,  
2 there are two repositories in San Francisco. The  
3 public library is one with a duplicate set, and  
4 here in Building No. 1, Room 306 is where the  
5 other set is maintained.

6 As part of the Navy's community  
7 relations program, of course, both of these sets  
8 are available for research.

9 Now, for the information repository,  
10 you can see by your handout, it is required by the  
11 EPA; and its purpose is to allow the public to  
12 have access to documents that are important, that  
13 explain the actions that have taken place.

14 As indicated before, the information  
15 repository contains a variety of documents, both  
16 the administrative record and raw data.

17 The administrative records are the  
18 specific collection of documents, as mentioned,  
19 that are relied upon by government agencies in  
20 making their decisions.

1                   They contain all the documents that  
2                   form the basis for the decision that leads to an  
3                   ultimate CERCLA response action and, as I said  
4                   before, the paper trail that can be reviewed in  
5                   case of problems, of challenges in the future.

6                   Now, the administrative record is  
7                   different from the site file, because it has less  
8                   information than the site file. The site file has  
9                   the raw data and working documents.

10                  Again, the administrative record  
11                  contains the information that gives the basis for  
12                  the selection of the final response. The  
13                  administrative record is required to be kept near  
14                  the facility; and as I said, it is here in  
15                  Building No. 1 on Treasure Island. It tells the  
16                  story of the whole response action, its past  
17                  history, and how the results were arrived at.

18                  It is very important to decide where  
19                  the documents belong. Of course, EPA has a  
20                  standard list of documents that are to be

1 included; and the examples are transcripts of  
2 formal public meetings, fact sheets, RAB meeting  
3 minutes, and community relations plans. They all  
4 go into the information repository.

5 As you can see, the rules and  
6 regulations for determining where the documents  
7 belong say that the lead agency may not edit the  
8 AR in a manner that removes comments and technical  
9 data simply because they do not support the final  
10 response selection; and the AR is not restricted  
11 to documents that support the selected response.

12 Finally, the source of the document,  
13 from a contractor or federal facility, is not  
14 important.

15 We return to the circle example,  
16 since the information repository contains both of  
17 these types of information; and all documents are  
18 necessary and important in selecting the response.

19 Are there any questions?

20 MS. SHIRLEY: I have two:

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

First, can you tell me where the standard list of documents is?

MR. BERSTON: Yes. The index is kept.

MS. SHIRLEY: You say EPA has developed a standard list of documents to be included in the AR. Can you tell me where that is?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is included in the fact sheet. There is an EPA fact sheet.

MS. SHIRLEY: That directive --

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That describes the types of documents.

We will have to take that as an action item.

MS. SHIRLEY: Because I don't think that is like law; it is like suggested.

MS. SIMONS: Recommended. I can look and see. We have a list of fact sheets, Superfund.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What you're looking for specifically is, what is this list of documents that are to be placed in the administrative record?

MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.

My second question is, I'm wondering, this is kind of a follow-on, how much discretion there is as to what goes into the administrative record? How much leeway is there? If it is on the list, it goes in; if it is not, it does not?

I would like to know who decides and on what basis. I want to know how much discretion the RPM has about what goes into the administrative record.

Right now, I'm quoting like RAB meeting and the information, other documents.

MR. GALANG: From our investigation, it goes into the Ad record file. When the administrative record is being gathered for that removal action, then you start selecting again all

1 those documents, either in the information  
2 repository or the file relevant to it.

3 MS. SHIRLEY: There is a review  
4 process as it gets toward the decision?

5 MR. GALANG: Right now we are  
6 indexing all the documents. I put information in  
7 the administrative file; but when we go to the  
8 final cleanup and remediation, we have to go back  
9 and check what kind of documents, as long as  
10 they're indexed, we prepare an administrative  
11 record file for this removal action.

12 So all these documents will be sited  
13 in the process.

14 MS. SHIRLEY: I guess I have three  
15 questions.

16 My next question would be, if someone  
17 on the RAB wanted something specifically to be in  
18 the administrative record, can they ask for that?

19 MR. GALANG: The RAB meeting, I put  
20 it in the information repository. If that

1 decision affects that point, that point would  
2 affect the decision to the removal or cleanup, we  
3 can put a document saying these meeting minutes  
4 will be in the administrative file.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Say if you wanted  
6 to have a particular EPA guidance document added  
7 to the file?

8 MS. SHIRLEY: I was thinking  
9 specifically of a comment for a piece of ancillary  
10 research that someone on the RAB did, and they  
11 wanted this included in the record, or if there  
12 was a dispute, and the RAB wanted a summary of the  
13 dispute in the record, can we request that this be  
14 placed in the administrative record?

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that is a  
16 good question. We can't give you a yes or no  
17 answer, so that is another item we will have to  
18 take for action.

19 MS. SMITH: I have two questions:  
20 Who is the remedial project manager?

1 I assumed it was Jim, but I assume it is Ernie?

2 MR. GALANG: I am.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, the  
4 distinction -- Ernie is the remedial project  
5 manager for the CERCLA cleanup. He's not doing  
6 the underground. The underground storage tanks  
7 are not in IR sites, or the asbestos, or the lead  
8 abatement; and he is involved with everything in  
9 the cleanup process to transfer the property.

10 MS. SMITH: Would those other items  
11 also go into the administrative records?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is an  
13 excellent question.

14 MS. SMITH: You're not going to tell  
15 us it is another action item?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That is an  
17 excellent question. The administrative record and  
18 information repository process -- a creature of  
19 CERCLA, and there is no counterpart for, say, the  
20 asbestos survey. So at this point in time, the

1           only documents that are going into the  
2           administrative record, which Ernie is maintaining,  
3           are those related to the IR cleanup.

4                         But that also includes the RAB  
5           documents, because the RAB is discussed in the IR  
6           cleanup. It does not, for example, include a copy  
7           of the asbestos survey.

8                         What I have been doing on the  
9           information repository site, which is at our  
10          discretion, is keeping every record applicable to  
11          every aspect of the cleanup.

12                        MS. SMITH: My final question is, how  
13          long do you anticipate having to keep these  
14          records; or do you turn them over to the City of  
15          San Francisco and little old ladies can come out  
16          in 70 years and sell them at the book sale?

17                        How long? Do you have a specific  
18          number of years you're supposed to maintain these  
19          archives, or is it kind of indefinite or vague?

20                        CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think the

1 intent -- and I can't think of a specific  
2 citation -- but I think the intent of the  
3 administrative record is to at least live long  
4 enough to resolve any disputes over the record of  
5 decision. How long that is, I don't know.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: If I may, I have a  
7 question here:

8 We have been doing this for 18 months  
9 now, and I guess what I'm hearing is that nobody  
10 seems to know -- the administrative record, as I  
11 understand it, whatever is in that record at the  
12 time a record of decision is issued, is the only  
13 information that can be used if there are any  
14 legal challenges to the decision-making process or  
15 the cleanup process for closing one of these  
16 bases.

17 And what I'm hearing is, we have been  
18 doing this for 18 months; nobody knows what the  
19 legal requirement is for what types of information  
20 goes in there. Nobody is really sure on what the

1 criteria are for what goes in there, and yet I  
2 would wager nobody knows exactly what is in the  
3 administrative record at this point. And yet it  
4 is a very important entity in this whole process.

5 A related comment -- and I suppose a  
6 question -- is, how do people view?

7 We have a lot of people on this board  
8 that are very technically capable, and there are  
9 disputes in methodologies on whether or not  
10 certain assumptions in the cleanup process are  
11 correct. We're spending a lot of time writing  
12 memos to BCT to express those.

13 I would mean to interpret that needs  
14 to go into the administrative record, because that  
15 is part of the decision-making process, because it  
16 forces the BCT to say, "Gee, they might have a  
17 point. They may not have a point. They might be  
18 off base. We have to resolve these issues before  
19 we move on."

20 I'm not hearing anybody telling me

1           whether those go in or not and are legally  
2           required.

3                       I would like to get the specific  
4           laws, guidelines, policies from the specific  
5           agencies that govern these things; and it would be  
6           nice to see some case law on this as to what is  
7           accepted.  Otherwise, I would say we're wasting  
8           our time if we are providing input and it is going  
9           out into oblivion.

10                   MS. SMITH:  Especially if there is  
11           possibility of contention later on.

12                   CO-CHAIR WONG:  This whole process  
13           revolves around the ability to look at the  
14           information in the administrative record at the  
15           time that a record of decision is issued; and if  
16           the information is not there, it cannot be entered  
17           into evidence in any kind of legal activity  
18           regarding the ROD; and I think it is very  
19           important that it gets addressed sooner rather  
20           than later; and it is very clear as to what goes

1 on and what doesn't.

2 Chris' comment, if I specifically ask  
3 for a document that I write as a member of the RAB  
4 that this agrees with the methodology or some  
5 assumptions to go into the administrative record,  
6 we can't even be told whether that is legally  
7 something to go in there or not.

8 So I would like to make a specific  
9 request that we find out definitively what laws  
10 govern what goes in and does not.

11 MR. ALLMAN: It is clear from that  
12 that unvalidated protocol and apparently a lot of  
13 the workup data coming out of the final table,  
14 that ends up on the slide, that data gets in the  
15 site file and not in the administrative record,  
16 and is clearly excluded, from what we're told  
17 today.

18 I am concerned about that, because  
19 you don't know what you're going to need the data  
20 for later, because the person that is making a

1 decision is an interested party on one side of the  
2 people doing the cleanup.

3 I recently consulted for the State  
4 Public Defender's Office on some criminalistic  
5 tests that were done incorrectly. They wrote up a  
6 report; they got the person on death row. If you  
7 look at the raw data, it shows they did testing;  
8 and that data should not have been used to make  
9 the decision.

10 I would like to find out, even if the  
11 law says certain things are part of the  
12 administrative record, what chance do we have to  
13 say, "This should also be included before the  
14 opportunity of its being discarded," or does the  
15 opposite party, which would be in a potential  
16 conflict, such as the City of San Francisco, have  
17 the option of keeping anything? You say: "We're  
18 going to get rid of the immunoassay results. Do  
19 you want to store the data yourself? We don't  
20 want to store it."

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

That would be reasonable.

CO-CHAIR WONG: I don't know how much more we can accomplish tonight, since it has been pretty much stated that we're not sure of the rules, but to leave this as a topic for a future meeting to get to the bottom of the legalities.

MR. NEDELL: Brad, I have a slightly different interpretation of what the administrative record is. I would like to just explain what I think this is intended to do.

It is the background information which the deciding agencies use to substantiate their decision.

It does not mean that it is the only body of data that are useful, if you want to mount a challenge.

MS. SHIRLEY: That is not true. The law very explicitly says a judge can only review what is in the administrative record, nothing else.

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

MR. NEDELL: If you put something here and it can go into the administrative record, they have to respond. The agencies that respond, they make a decision that "We're not going to clean it up or clean it up to this level," and that justifies their decision.

Those are the documents they're using to justify their decision.

If you write a challenge, and they're responsive, and they say "We still don't agree with your opinion or your data," it does not mean that it is necessarily excluded from the administrative record.

MS. SHIRLEY: I have not heard any convincing evidence that that kind of information is in there.

CO-CHAIR WONG: And that is what we're looking for, what actually goes into who makes the decision.

Would everybody agree that this would

1 be something -- I think Hugo's overview is very  
2 helpful to get the discussion going and get better  
3 insights -- but we would like to get something  
4 much more concrete in a future meeting?

5 MS. NELSON: I did not get the bold  
6 type, it looks like a legal paper trail. Is there  
7 some bold type?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It is legal paper  
9 trail. It is referring to that portion of the ad  
10 record.

11 MS. GLASS: I have one question, too:  
12 What is an operable unit?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: An operable unit  
14 would be a group of IR sites. In the case of  
15 Treasure Island, all of the sites are moving at  
16 the same pace; so we have not yet seen a need to  
17 break them off.

18 Each operable unit would have its own  
19 record of decision.

20 At this point in time, all of the

1 sites are moving at the same pace; so we would  
2 have the record of the decision at the same time.

3 MR. GALANG: We have one operable  
4 unit, Site 13.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Excuse me.

6 CO-CHAIR WONG: Since we agreed that  
7 we can make this an agenda item for future  
8 meetings, I would like to entertain one more  
9 question on this.

10 MR. MC DONALD: This is a question  
11 for the later discussion.

12 I would like to find out what  
13 organization or agency is responsible for all the  
14 completeness of the administrative record. Is  
15 there a group within the Department of Defense or  
16 the Department of the Navy or EPA that comes and  
17 says, at some point, when the record of decision  
18 is rendered, that the administrative record  
19 contains all the pieces of data, all the documents  
20 that it is supposed to?

1                   So if something got missed and we  
2                   have gone past the record of decision, how could  
3                   that be remedied? That is a subset.

4                   If you missed it, you audited and  
5                   missed it, later if you found out there is a  
6                   critical transcript or critical document data that  
7                   was supposed to be there, how is it possible to  
8                   remedy the record content?

9                   CO-CHAIR WONG: Okay.

10                  CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I would like to  
11                  close with a couple of super-brief comments:

12                  I don't want, at least in my opinion,  
13                  I don't want people to be overly concerned at this  
14                  point. I think two of the key items that we do  
15                  place in the administrative record are the minutes  
16                  of the RAB meetings, including the verbatim  
17                  transcripts.

18                  MS. TOBIAS: That goes into the IR.

19                  MS. SHIRLEY: According to this, it  
20                  goes into the IR.

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

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

MR. ALLMAN: That is one of the things I brought up.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Obviously, we need to clarify that.

I think the intent, or at least the thought of the RAB, was not that we would end up in some sort of legal litigation at the end of the process, but that it was an open forum, more so than would be the formalized public meetings, which tend to take place toward the end of the process.

It was to create an ongoing dialog between the community and the Navy, so we can discuss the issues and incorporate your comments, and that is basically what we're doing.

I see the record and the information repository as being more of the worst case scenario, but I understand your concern.

CO-CHAIR WONG: I think we could

1 probably move on, because it is clear we need  
2 clarification on that.

3 I would like to just recommend that  
4 we move on, and it is something that is not  
5 imminent today, but something we might want to  
6 discuss further down the road.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay.

8 The next item is going to present a  
9 discussion on the BRAC Cleanup Plan; but I don't  
10 have a formal discussion; and as a result of this  
11 discussion with Brad, I understand that the  
12 community members would like to have some  
13 additional time in looking at the BRAC Cleanup  
14 Plan.

15 It sounds like if the RAB members are  
16 possibly getting together next week, that that can  
17 be arranged, or just providing some additional  
18 days.

19 I have to incorporate whatever  
20 comments we have next Wednesday -- and I am really

1 constrained by the budget process in Washington --  
2 in order to get this document in. So what I would  
3 like to do is make the additional time available  
4 until Wednesday morning or Tuesday night, to take  
5 whatever comments are available; and it sounds  
6 like there may be a possibility of maybe a Tuesday  
7 meeting, at which, in our discretion, I could  
8 participate either completely or at the tail end,  
9 to pull in all the comments.

10 MR. ALLMAN: That is a good idea.

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: What I would like to  
12 recommend, I think it was really gracious of Jim  
13 and the Navy to give us some additional time to do  
14 this work. I think it shows a lot of good faith,  
15 and unfortunately Washington is dictating when  
16 this stuff has to be done.

17 I was going to propose that we  
18 consider either moving the interim RAB meeting up  
19 to next Tuesday evening or just create and  
20 additional meeting next Tuesday just for this

1 purpose, and maybe it would work well for the  
2 first hour, and Jim has been very gracious to  
3 agree to this scenario, that we meet among  
4 ourselves, the community members, so we can have  
5 an open discussion of some ideas and then invite  
6 Jim in afterwards to relay those, any issues or  
7 questions to him, to give him time to pull it  
8 together Wednesday.

9 MS. SMITH: We can have a Technical  
10 Subcommittee on Tuesday, at which any RAB member  
11 would be welcome to attend; and then you can have  
12 your interim meeting at another time; so we are  
13 not constrained with the one hour so we have a  
14 little more flexibility.

15 CO-CHAIR WONG: I am totally open.  
16 I'm just throwing it out.

17 One, is there enough interest among  
18 the community members to get together next Tuesday  
19 evening? Part of the meeting, at least, is to  
20 review the BRAC Cleanup Plan here.

1 MS. MENDELOW: How does this fit in?

2 Are we changing what we had from last year? Is  
3 there a specific section that changes?

4 MR. NEDELL: The shaded text is  
5 changed.

6 MS. TOBIAS: What we did with the  
7 shading is for new text, and we deleted old text,  
8 things that have already been done or are no  
9 longer applicable.

10 What we have is in our binder. The  
11 spacer, you will get on March 15, at the time you  
12 will get the changes again, whatever changes the  
13 PCT has, or the City, or the RAB has on it.

14 One of the major things, there is a  
15 chapter 3 and a chapter 4, so we take all the  
16 Installation and Environmental Compliance Program,  
17 which is chapter 3; the Status and Strategy should  
18 be presented together, instead of having it  
19 clipped back; and it will make it easier to figure  
20 out what the Navy is doing.

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

Chapter 4 focuses on the environmental condition of the property, what the conditions are, and community relations. These are really the more significant changes.

MR. WRIGHTSON: Can you check against what was removed?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: You have to bounce that against your existing copy.

MS. GLASS: I would like to ask you, how would you describe the items that were deleted, if they are, in your judgment, anything significant?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We deleted the RAB members who are no longer members.

I did not say, "Here are things to delete." It was things that were no longer applicable.

If you had a discussion in chapter 4, I know that the investigative technique was deleted; it was not applicable anymore.

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

In chapter 6, we added a new area on groundwater modeling we planned on doing.

I think we might have deleted stuff about -- I can't remember exactly everything we deleted.

CO-CHAIR WONG: If I could, I would like to see if we can push this on consensus.

It sounds like there is enough interest to hold a meeting on Tuesday night, 7:00 p.m.

Jim, could we use the conference room in Building 1?

The meeting's focus is to review and discuss for the first hour or so the BRAC Cleanup Plan, and then to spend the balance of the time relaying our questions and concerns to Jim to get incorporated into the final version.

Can I get a motion on that?

MS. SMITH: I will make that motion.

MS. SHIRLEY: I second it.

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

(The motion was put to a vote and carried.)

CO-CHAIR WONG: Great, 7:00 p.m., Tuesday.

MR. ALLMAN: Is there a pressing reason to have another interim meeting, to have another interim meeting before we plan two more meetings in the middle of the month, right after another? If there is a reason to have another meeting, if we have documents to review --

CO-CHAIR WONG: Should this meeting supersede the interim meeting that would have been on the 12th?

Dale, you didn't want to take the time out?

MS. SMITH: I am saying people who would like to have an interim meeting, but are not interested in reviewing this technical document and talking about parts per billion, might want to have the interim meeting.

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

MR. ALLMAN: Is there business we have to discuss?

MS. SMITH: I don't know.

MR. ALLMAN: If we're getting more documents, what is going to change anything we don't have now?

CO-CHAIR WONG: Who would like to have this meeting this Tuesday supersede the interim meeting so we don't need to worry?

MS. GLASS: Was there some kind of draft agenda for the interim meeting?

CO-CHAIR WONG: No, there is not.

(Show of hands)

CO-CHAIR WONG: It looks like, by a hand vote, that the majority of people would like this meeting to supersede the interim meeting; but, as always, it does not preclude other groups of people to get together, if they like.

If the Technical Subcommittee under Paul's leadership would like to get together to

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

discuss --

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next item is Review of Action Items, and this refers to pages 6 and 7 of the minutes from the last meeting.

The list is growing, and a number of items are in progress, but I have to say that the only thing that is actually completed is that we presented a discussion of the information repository, and we do have additional action items, so I think the next meeting minutes will reflect the same action items and include the need for additional discussion on the administrative record and information repository.

Are there any questions or comments regarding specific action items that they are particularly interested in?

MS. SMITH: Paul asked that the RWQCB give a presentation at this meeting to discuss how policy will be implemented by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. That did not get into the

1 new action items.

2 I don't know if that was intended to  
3 be an issue, but I am interested in it not only  
4 for this body but for others.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: It did not get  
6 in. We were talking about it, but everyone  
7 thought we should have a presentation.

8 MS. SMITH: It is not an action item.

9 MS. KATHURIA: We can do it.

10 CO-CHAIR WONG: I spoke with Gina  
11 before the meeting, and what we are looking to do  
12 is to have a presentation by the Board at the  
13 March meeting, to review the Lawrence Livermore  
14 Study and its implications to DOD and base  
15 cleanup; and it is going to be in the process to  
16 see if people from the Board could come.

17 MS. SMITH: Could we ask that you go  
18 beyond the control issues, thought?

19 MS. KATHURIA: The presentation is  
20 going to be limited to the Lawrence Livermore

1 Report, but you are asking for --

2 MS. SMITH: If it could go beyond the  
3 Lawrence Livermore Report, which is focusing  
4 exclusively on hydrocarbons.

5 It seems that the Regional Board is  
6 moving beyond that at this point.

7 MS. KATHURIA: Maybe that could be  
8 two separate presentations.

9 MS. SHIRLEY: It seems like a rather  
10 large issue.

11 CO-CHAIR WONG: This has come up in  
12 the context of action items, and we have addressed  
13 that action item, if nothing else. It is on the  
14 agenda and will be in the works for the next  
15 meeting.

16 If there are no further questions  
17 regarding the action items --

18 MS. NELSON: It would be useful, if  
19 there is a laundry list to be completed, if we can  
20 forecast when it will be completed.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I will take an  
2 action item to provide more realistic dates on  
3 those action items.

4 CO-CHAIR WONG: If we can move on to  
5 the organizational business.

6 The first topic is an overview of the  
7 interim meeting; and for that meeting, what  
8 happened, there was no set agenda.

9 About a half-dozen people came  
10 together and received a good overview of the  
11 conceptual planning framework that the CRC  
12 recently passed; and from there, a good lively,  
13 ongoing discussion ensued about that, what that  
14 means in relation to the RAB.

15 But nothing really specific came out  
16 in terms of any kind of action items or anything  
17 of that sort.

18 Then the conversation moved to the  
19 next topic, which is nominations for the Community  
20 Co-Chair for the upcoming year or six months, and

1 what is involved with that, and things of that  
2 sort.

3 Unless those people who were at that  
4 meeting think I have forgotten something that you  
5 would like to relay, I would like to move on to  
6 the next topic, if we could.

7 By way of setting the stage for the  
8 selection of the Community Co-Chair, I pulled out  
9 our draft Final Operating Procedural Guidelines  
10 from November 30th, which are our official  
11 guidelines as of this point, that we all felt  
12 comfortable leaving in place.

13 The rules covering this transaction  
14 are under section 2, paragraph B, and they simply  
15 state:

16 "The Community Co-Chair will be  
17 nominated and selected by the RAB community  
18 members and will serve a minimum of one  
19 year. The Co-Chair can be replaced or  
20 re-elected by a simple majority of the

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

community members."

The only thing that we reserved, I guess, as a right is that we have set the terms to be less than one year by, again, a majority vote of the community members.

So if it is the will of the group, I would assume you could do that again.

At this point what I would like to do is put a call out for nominations for Community Co-Chair, but we're also going to look at nominations for the Alternate Community Co-Chair as well.

If it is okay with the group, I would like to handle the Co-Chair first and then move into the Alternate Co-Chair. I would like to entertain nominations for Community Co-Chair.

MR. ONGERTH: I nominate Patricia Nelson for the RAB Community Co-Chair for 1996.

CO-CHAIR WONG: Are there any other nominations?

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

MR. HANSEN: I would like to nominate  
Brad Wong.

CO-CHAIR WONG: Thank you, but I  
respectfully have to decline. But thank you.

MR. ALDRICH: Is Paul a contender?

CO-CHAIR WONG: I spoke with Paul.  
He regrets he can't be here; he's out of town this  
week. He has expressly said that he does not wish  
to be considered Community Co-Chair.

Is there a second to the nomination  
of Patricia?

MR. NEDELL: I second the motion.

(The motion was put to a vote and  
carried unanimously.)

CO-CHAIR WONG: Pat, congratulations.  
I pass the gavel.

I would like to move on, then, to the  
Alternate Co-Chair position. Here again, Paul had  
asked me to relay that he would be more than happy  
to go by the will of the community members if

1           there is somebody new that would like to serve in  
2           the Alternate Co-Chair position; but he also  
3           wished me to express that he would be happy to  
4           fill that position again for the upcoming year.

5                        So I would like to ask for  
6           nominations.

7                        MR. ALLMAN: I would like to nominate  
8           Paul for the position.

9                        MR. ONGERTH: I second the motion.

10                       CO-CHAIR WONG: Any other  
11           nominations?

12                        (The motion was put to vote and  
13           carried unanimously.)

14                       CO-CHAIR WONG: We've got the team in  
15           place for next year.

16                        With that, I would like to say thank  
17           you for your patience, cooperation; and I really  
18           enjoyed working with you all over the past year  
19           and look forward to working with you once I climb  
20           over the fence.

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

CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we all owe  
Brad a wonderful round of applause for his good  
work. (Applause)

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The next item is  
open questions and discussion. Given that we have  
gone over a couple of items, I would like to, with  
your concurrence, proceed beyond that, unless  
there is some remaining discussion.

MR. ALLMAN: I just wanted to say,  
this is just an end-of-the-meeting item, on April  
1 through 3, the State of California Water  
Resources Control Board is having workshop that is  
open to anybody that wants to pay the fee.

I will be going through my work, but  
you're welcome to go as a non-government person  
for \$125.

This will be in Anaheim. It will  
last three days, and one and a half of the day  
sessions will focus entirely on the Livermore  
Radiation Plan. There is a lot of confusion how

1 that should be interpreted, even within the  
2 Agency; and they have concurrent meetings for  
3 2-1/2 days for monitoring issues for tanks.

4 But as far as remediation, they will  
5 be covering that for a large portion of the  
6 meeting.

7 I received copies of the application.  
8 One catch is you have to send it off by March 1st  
9 or you have to pay the late fee, which makes it an  
10 extra \$25.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

12 Proposed agenda items for next  
13 meeting.

14 It appears that we will have the  
15 Regional Water Quality Control Board here to  
16 discuss -- that is tentative at this point -- and  
17 then we will also be following up with answers to  
18 the questions concerning the administrative record  
19 and information repository.

20 Are there any other topics that you

1 would want to see covered in the next meeting? We  
2 can finalize it in the interim and firm it up a  
3 little more in the interim meeting.

4 MR. WONG: One thing I would like to  
5 request under the new action items is that we  
6 don't lose track of setting up a workshop to  
7 further discuss the human health risk assessment.

8 I think there was a lot of interest.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: As far as the  
10 health risk assessment workshop, we need at least  
11 30 days.

12 MS. TOBIAS: At least 21 days.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe the week  
14 after the March RAB meeting, which I think is  
15 April 1st. The next RAB meeting is March 26th;  
16 and if we had a workshop the week after that, I  
17 believe that is April 1st.

18 MS. SHIRLEY: That is school spring  
19 break.

20 MS. TOBIAS: That is a holiday week.

1 I think that we might be a little hard pressed to  
2 do it before the next RAB meeting, so that maybe  
3 then, if we made it the second Tuesday in March?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: In April.

5 MS. TOBIAS: Does everyone feel  
6 comfortable April 9th, human health risk?

7 MR. WONG: Does April 9th agree with  
8 everyone for a workshop on human health risk  
9 assessment? That is a Tuesday.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Tuesday, April 9,  
11 7:00 p.m.; and we will provide further  
12 information.

13 With that, the new action items,  
14 several action items relate to the administrative  
15 record and information repository, such as  
16 providing a specific list of AR documents, citing  
17 specific laws and regulations and identifying who  
18 has oversight and inspection over the  
19 administrative record.

20 Secondly, to have the RWQCB make a

1 presentation on petroleum issues and the Lawrence  
2 Livermore Report, more specifically on the  
3 Lawrence Livermore Report.

4 Are there any other new action items?

5 MS. VEDAGIRI: Is that separate?

6 MS. SHIRLEY: That we talked about  
7 the interim meeting?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, that is  
9 separate.

10 With that, I think we can close the  
11 meeting.

12 Our next meeting is Tuesday, the 26th  
13 of March. The next CRC meeting is this coming  
14 Monday, the 4th of March. And then there will be  
15 a special meeting on the BRAC Cleanup Plan next  
16 Tuesday night at 7:00 p.m., which is in Building  
17 1, in the second floor conference room.

18 Thank you very much.

19 (Whereupon the meeting adjourned at  
20 9:30 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*

MAR 04 1996

(Signature)

(Date)