

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

---o0o---

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

20 MAY 1997
7:00 P.M.

ORIGINAL

FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ CONFERENCE CENTER
TREASURE ISLAND
MEETING NO. 33

---o0o---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

REPORTED BY: STEPHEN BALBONI, CSR NO. 7139

A T T E N D E E S

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

U.S. NAVY:

- JAMES B. SULLIVAN (BEC and Navy Co-Chair)
- ERNIE GALANG (RPM)
- HUGO BURTON (NAVSTA TI)
- RYAN BROOKS (Community relations)

PRC ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, INC.:

- STACEY LUPTON
- RICHARD KNAPP
- REBECCA SUGERMAN
- NICOLE PIERCE (URIBE & ASSOCIATES)
- WINNIE ZHANG (URIBE & ASSOCIATES)
- GERRY SLATTERY (URIBE & ASSOCIATES)
- JOHN BORREGO (URIBE & ASSOCIATES)

GUTIERREZ-PALMENBERG, INC.:

- DARLENE B. BROWN
- SANDRA LUNCEFORD
- BARRY GUTIERREZ

1 REGULATORY AGENCY:

2 MARY ROSE CASSA (DTSC)

3 GINA KATHURIA (RWQCB)

4 RACHEL SIMONS (US EPA)

5 MARTHA WALTERS (SFRA)

6 BILL LEE (San Francisco City Administrator)

7 COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

8 JAMES ALDRICH

9 JOHN ALLMAN

10 PAUL V. HEHN (Alternate Community Co-Chair)

11 GARY JENSEN

12 CLINTON LOFTMAN

13 RICK NEDELL

14 PATRICIA NELSON (Community Co-Chair)

15 HENRY ONGERTH

16 USHA VEDAGIRI

17 BRAD WONG

18

19

20

1

---o0o---

2

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Welcome to our May

3

Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

4

This actually is the last official meeting,

5

or last official Navy function in the Nimitz Center

6

before it closes at the end of this month. I think

7

that might be the reason they put these flags out.

8

We didn't ask for them relative to where we

9

might meet next month, even though the Nimitz Center

10

closes officially at the end of this month.

11

I was told earlier today, if there is still

12

furniture in the building in June, we may still be

13

able to squeeze in the June meeting here even though

14

the building will be officially closed. But more than

15

likely, beyond June, we will have to relocate, most

16

likely to the conference room in the Bachelor

17

Quarters, the dormitory type building, directly to the

18

east of here, Building 369.

19

MR. ONGERTH: To the east?

20

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To the west, thank you.

1 So next month, it will either be here or it
2 will be next door, but we will know a couple of weeks
3 ahead of time.

4 So the first item of discussion is the
5 agenda. Everyone should have a copy.

6 There are additional copies in the back with
7 Hugo.

8 Are there any comments concerning tonight's
9 agenda?

10 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we had an
11 addition.

12 If we could add the status of the California
13 Agency Oversight, maybe in the beginning, and the item
14 for the RAB is, I guess, there are some considerations
15 of removing DTSC from their role as a participant in
16 this RAB as an oversight agency, and we wanted to have
17 discussion of that among the RAB, if we could.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think we can
19 probably talk through that. We can speak to that a
20 little bit.

1 I don't think it may be happening in that
2 vein. That's something I can actually say a few words
3 about right now.

4 MS. WALTERS: Good. Why don't we talk about
5 that right now?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I guess the basic issue,
7 and I probably, Ernie may know a little bit more, too.
8 The extent of my knowledge is that the Navy under an
9 agreement, the Department of Defense under an
10 agreement with the State of California reimburses the
11 state for the time it spends in oversight of Navy and
12 other DOD projects, and, apparently, that
13 reimbursement is subject to budget changes, and, in
14 some cases, that amount has been reduced. And that,
15 in turn, affects the ability of the state to expend
16 resources on the project.

17 As far as I know, there is no, no definite
18 decision to make any change in the state's oversight,
19 although there may be cases where more than one state
20 agency is involved, that maybe not every state agency

1 would be present at every meeting, that there might be
2 some minimization of state people present.

3 That's kind of the extent that I understand
4 it, but I don't think there is anything that's been
5 firmly decided.

6 MS. CASSA: Well, there is a list for the
7 Bay Area. The idea is to completely give the
8 oversight, the responsibility to one agency or the
9 other instead of a joint cooperation as part of the
10 regulatory oversight process.

11 And so in the Bay Area, Point Millati
12 (phonetic) would be the Water Board. Hunter's Point
13 would be the Water Board.

14 MR. ONGERTH: You're not speaking very loud.

15 MS. CASSA: Treasure Island would be Water
16 Board.

17 And DTSC would have Cisco, Alameda, for the
18 Alameda Station, and Mare Island.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, basically, then,
20 we're at sites where the major issues were petroleum

1 related, and the Water Board would be more likely the
2 agency involved.

3 MS. KATHURIA: We are not sure of the
4 criteria that was used to divide the sites, but
5 petroleum was one factor, so was the ecological
6 issues, and, then, I guess, also how far the site was
7 along in the process as well and whether each agency
8 had an order.

9 So there was a lot of factors, and we are
10 not sure exactly what was used to divide the sites up.

11 MR. ALDRICH: So DTSC, if I'm understanding,
12 the Water Board, if I'm not mistaken, would be the
13 lead agency, but DTSC would then be absent.

14 MS. KATHURIA: Right.

15 MS. CASSA: From Treasure Island and
16 Hunter's Point.

17 MR. ALDRICH: That's preposterous. That's
18 ridiculous. You've been working on the remedial
19 investigation. You've been here from the beginning.
20 You had a break in between, but you're still covered.

1 MS. KATHURIA: But so have I.

2 MR. ALDRICH: Yes, but how many issues have
3 you dealt with that are CERCLA-related issues? How
4 much of the paperwork have you dealt with?

5 MS. KATHURIA: A lot of it. We share the
6 workload.

7 I agree. Two is better than one, but with
8 the way the budget is going, management has made the
9 decision to divide sites, and there is going to be
10 sites where there is no Water Board, but DTSC.

11 MR. ALDRICH: Because my big problem with
12 that, if you remember at the workshop last week, I
13 asked about a document called SWA846, and whether it
14 was in use or not.

15 I was very surprised, and I understand that
16 the regulators have a lot to contend with. And as
17 Rachel put it, you have a lot of guidance to deal with
18 on a daily basis. You can't cover all the bases and
19 all the guidance.

20 But SWA846 is the document by which

1 virtually every analyses, including proposed inclusion
2 for the immunoassays, every one of the methods that
3 are called for come from that document.

4 So basically what I'm saying is, at the load
5 that you have now, you have no guidance within your
6 individual agency.

7 I think it would be remiss of Cal-EPA to
8 suddenly have you dealing with CERCLA issues and
9 keeping track of what CERCLA needs, and learn about
10 the CERCLA regulations.

11 How much practice do you apply?

12 MS. KATHURIA: I agree. Mary Rose and I
13 should be working together. It's better that way.

14 I would encourage the RAB to somehow let
15 upper management know or someone in the Navy, or
16 someone like that.

17 MS. WALTERS: Well, I spoke to a gentleman
18 at Cal-EPA today in Sacramento.

19 He said that it's a proposed list and hasn't
20 been finalized.

1 So if any of the RAB members want to write a
2 letter to -- I'm not sure who -- probably Paul Blades
3 is the person to write to, do so immediately, fax it
4 to him.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Is it the consensus pretty
6 much of the community RAB, do we have enough to,
7 because I think if they are going to be deciding any
8 day now, we don't want to go through the process of
9 going organizing the letter, getting it reviewed, I
10 wonder if we can sort of have some consensus between
11 the RAB matters that, between Pat and Paul, that can
12 draft a letter, basically trust them to draft a
13 letter, and I'm making a motion we have a letter
14 drafted to say: We don't agree that this would be a
15 good idea. We are shorthanded enough for regulatory
16 review as it is. There are enough documents to look
17 at at the existing sites, and, basically, we would
18 highly request you don't do this at this point.

19 MR. HEHN: I think there are some important
20 points to consider.

1 In looking at the current division of duties
2 of the regulatory agencies, certainly the regional
3 board has a lot of activities to take care of as far
4 as the groundwater is concerned -- we are certainly
5 coming up in the cap program -- and granted there are
6 a large number of hydrocarbon sites on Treasure
7 Island, but there are also a number of CERCLA concerns
8 and probably more as we get into the investigation of
9 site 12.

10 And, also, we are looking at the issues as
11 far as what's happening with the FOSLs, the FOST, the
12 transfer of ownership issues. I think that those are
13 real critical things that the DTSC can lend a
14 significant amount of input to that particular
15 process.

16 And I think the other thing is that there is
17 an ongoing and probably continuing increase in risk
18 considerations with this. I think that's something I
19 know, that the Regional Board has some risk assessment
20 capability, but I think that maybe that might be a

1 place where the DTSC can lend considerable support to
2 how this particular process is taken care of.

3 I think that the current dual regulatory
4 agency, or triad, if you will, when we get to the
5 EPA's comments on these issues, especially things like
6 the immunoassay issues, the regulatory issues, as far
7 as the EPA documents and guidance, I think it works
8 very well, and I think that it would be really remiss
9 for the state to put that onto one agency's shoulders.

10 So I would certainly be very inclined to
11 suggest that the RAB draft such a letter, even though
12 this has not been determined at this particular point,
13 I think that our community input and our concerns as a
14 community organization would lend a lot of credence to
15 the fact that this needs to be continued and they need
16 to really seriously look at this before they change
17 the way that this process is going right now.

18 So I would certainly be happy to get
19 involved in trying to draft such a letter to whoever
20 seems to be appropriate, and the person or persons who

1 need to be informed of that as to that particular
2 basis.

3 MR. ONGERTH: Mary Rose, you have had a lot
4 of relationships -- I realize you have been away for
5 the immediate past, but I'm sure that's another
6 factor -- you have had a lot of relationships with the
7 regional board staff.

8 Do you think that the regional board staff
9 can carry on adequately to represent the DTSC? I know
10 this is putting you in a spot, but if you don't dare
11 speak, so be it.

12 MS. CASSA: I think that in either case,
13 whether Water Board oversight only, it's a heck of a
14 lot of work for one project manager, and it has worked
15 very well for project managers to share the
16 responsibility.

17 There are areas where, by virtue of their
18 agency mandate, they develop specialization.

19 And, similarly, every day I have talked to
20 people on the Water Board who, you know, their plate

1 is very full with respect to work and we are sharing
2 the load.

3 So I don't think, you know, it would be both
4 ways. Either agency would be strapped.

5 MR. ONGERTH: Well, I maybe misunderstood
6 the discussion that was just taking place.

7 I thought our position was that we wanted
8 both organizations represented.

9 MS. CASSA: Right.

10 So for both organizations to be represented
11 would be pretty much status quo and we could get the
12 work done.

13 And for either agency to do it by itself
14 would be very difficult.

15 MR. ONGERTH: You're emphasizing workload.

16 MS. CASSA: Yes.

17 MS. VEDAGIRI: Apart from the project
18 manager responsibilities, if the proposal is that DTSC
19 will be absent, does that mean that Gina will not have
20 access to any of DTSC's technical resources at all?

1 MS. KATHURIA: We don't know how the flip is
2 going to be. We don't know.

3 We definitely will either somehow contract
4 the work out to DTSC or hire our own in-house experts
5 or something.

6 But we are not sure exactly how it all will
7 play out.

8 MS. CASSA: I think that the proposal, the
9 way that the budget would end up being split, it's not
10 clear where the funding would come to for one agency
11 to obtain the extra funding.

12 MR. ONGERTH: What is driving this thing?
13 We read in the newspaper that the state is flush
14 again.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, no --

16 MS. CASSA: Federal money, grant money.

17 MR. ONGERTH: I thought we were talking
18 about the state making a decision.

19 MS. CASSA: We are.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right.

1 MS. CASSA: In this cooperative arrangement
2 that we have that's governed by this federal facility,
3 it's a cooperative arrangement. It's funded by
4 federal money. If there were no federal money, we
5 would rely on the conventional site type approach.

6 MR. ALDRICH: I'm very confused.

7 Say you're on two RABs from your office.
8 Now, you pull off RAB number two. The Water Board
9 pulls off of RAB number 1. So you're running 11 of
10 RAB number -- whichever one you end up on.

11 So doesn't that double your workload there?
12 Plus you have to learn the additional regulations.
13 Where does that reduce your workload? Because now you
14 do double work on one board instead of being on two
15 boards doing half the work in your specialty.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's a good question.

17 MR. ALDRICH: It's a paradox.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think we need to watch
20 our time. We introduced this, and I would like to,

1 with Brad's comments or questions, to wrap up the
2 discussion.

3 I have circulated index cards. It's
4 something that we can respond to.

5 But I think what we would like out of this
6 is a motion or some direction.

7 MR. ALDRICH: There was one motion now,
8 right?

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is there a motion on the
10 floor?

11 MR. WONG: I have a quick comment or
12 question.

13 I think with regards to our letter to the
14 appropriate people, DTSC, I think we should oppose
15 this on two points.

16 One is that it will seriously narrow the
17 scope of expertise available for a complex
18 installation, as well as it will seriously overtax the
19 project managers. So I think it will be a quality
20 issue as well -- things will not be reviewed in a

1 timely fashion. So I think there is qualitative and
2 there is a range of expertise thing.

3 But I'm also curious: Does this shift
4 affect how the FFSRA was written at all? Is that
5 written at all contractually that the DTSC is the lead
6 agency? Who has that document?

7 MS. CASSA: No. It's a dual, it's
8 definitely with respect to the two regulatory
9 agencies. It's shared.

10 There was some guidance or directive made by
11 the governor two or three years ago, that said that
12 for the military, the DTSC had a lead on behalf of
13 Cal-EPA, and that's not captured in the FFSRA.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: FFSRA predates it, back
15 when there was a separate DTSC and separate regional
16 Water Board.

17 MS. KATHURIA: Can I get some clarification
18 about the letter?

19 Is the letter going to emphasize how DTSC
20 Water Board is brought to the project, or is the

1 letter more, you know, that you guys want DTSC?

2 MR. ALDRICH: No, no, no, no. The point, it
3 works both ways. Had you been appointed to our RAB --
4 well, you are -- but if you were taken off the RAB,
5 the discussion would have been the same way. I mean,
6 there is enough work that everybody is pretty busy
7 now.

8 MS. KATHURIA: I think it should be more to
9 keep the two agencies on board.

10 MR. ALDRICH: Yes, or ask them to explain
11 the rationale when your work is going to be doubled
12 with less of your specialty if you go on the one RAB
13 instead of being able to share the work and
14 brainstorm.

15 MR. HEHN: I think the only thing is to make
16 sure to field that.

17 Limiting the number of agencies that might
18 be involved will also be potentially limiting how much
19 protection the public interest in public health can be
20 done at that particular point, too.

1 So if there is a public health issue, I
2 think it's real important here to make sure it's all
3 covered.

4 MR. ALDRICH: I apologize, Gina.

5 MS. KATHURIA: No, no.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I know that there were
7 some questions that might have put both Gina and Mary
8 Rose on the spot. The intent was not to do that.

9 MS. CASSA: I don't know. It sounds like
10 you're going to target DTSC, maybe the State Water
11 Board, too.

12 MR. ALDRICH: Whoever is deciding.

13 MS. CASSA: I guess it's a joint decision.

14 MS. KATHURIA: The decision was made between
15 DTSC and the State Water Board.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: So who was at the State
17 Water Board?

18 MR. ONGERTH: I'm not clear at all now.

19 CAL-EPA receives less money. They must have
20 made the decision that you're going to split the work.

1 MS. KATHURIA: Right.

2 MR. ONGERTH: Well, shouldn't that letter be
3 directed to Cal-EPA?

4 MS. CASSA: Well, the decision is being made
5 at the level of the agency. It's being made among two
6 sister agencies within Cal-EPA -- DTSC and Water
7 Board, State Board, so I don't think Cal-EPA is really
8 involved.

9 MR. ONGERTH: Well, it's not clear to me
10 what --

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe Martha could
12 provide some assistance.

13 MS. WALTERS: Paul Blades is making the
14 decision. He's the deputy director.

15 MS. KATHURIA: And the person from the State
16 Water Board, specifically, is John Adams from the
17 State Water Board.

18 MR. ONGERTH: This decision was made, you're
19 saying, at the staff level?

20 MS. WALTERS: No, upper management level.

1 MR. ONGERTH: Well, it's not the Board
2 level.

3 MR. WONG: It doesn't make sense. If these
4 are two units of a larger agency of Cal-EPA, this
5 strikes me as a major policy shift.

6 So I don't think two smaller agencies within
7 a larger agency can make this kind of a policy shift
8 without input from the top. So there must be somebody
9 further up in Cal-EPA.

10 MR. JENSEN: This isn't a big policy shift.
11 This is a pretty standard procedure.

12 You have a number of sites out there where
13 one lead agency is assigned. And they handle all of
14 the regulation for that site and then coordinate as
15 necessary with the other agencies.

16 So this is not a radical and unusual
17 decision.

18 MR. WONG: Except they're removing DTSC from
19 this project.

20 MS. KATHURIA: Right.

1 But, for instance, all the state super fund
2 sites were split between DTSC and Water Board, so each
3 agency had its own projects in that way.

4 We don't have the element of reuse and all
5 these other elements.

6 MR. ONGERTH: We are told that this is
7 driven by a cutback in available funds.

8 MS. WALTERS: And grant money, DOD grant
9 money.

10 MR. ONGERTH: So the two agencies, the State
11 Board and the DTSC, decided that we are short of money
12 and here's how we are going to make it up?

13 MS. KATHURIA: Right.

14 MS. WALTERS: Correct.

15 MR. HEHN: I suggest you might want to draft
16 that letter to both of the two major decision makers
17 with copies to the appropriate parties, including
18 people up in Cal-EPA, to make sure that they are aware
19 of the concern.

20 MR. ALDRICH: And even outside, anybody who

1 might be of interest, anybody who might have some
2 input who might oversee those agencies.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, I think we had some
4 discussion. There are some names that we need to get
5 to write the letters to.

6 Shall we reach consensus?

7 MR. BILL LEE: Let me make a question or
8 comment.

9 I think from the city's perspective, we want
10 both agencies to participate. And I think a letter
11 should go to the head of DTSC and the head of the
12 Water Board in Sacramento and carbon copy the two
13 deputy directors.

14 And from the city side, we will let Carol
15 Rigdon know this is an issue. I will write to her or
16 call her and let her know this is an issue of San
17 Francisco. She's chair of the Appropriations
18 Committee, and this is her district right here on
19 Treasure Island. So I think she will have an interest
20 there. We need to lobby Cal-EPA or DTSC or the Water

1 Board.

2 Separately, I will call both these people
3 myself and say that we have a real concern, you know,
4 the city wants to make sure that we get the resources
5 to expedite the development of Hunter's Point, and,
6 also, TI, and we believe strongly that without the two
7 agencies represented, that we won't meet our
8 timetables.

9 At the next meeting, I will let you know
10 what happens.

11 But, separately, I think the RAB itself here
12 has to send a letter because you're a community
13 organization, and then from the city's perspective we
14 will do what we need to do.

15 And I'll assure you that our people up
16 there, you know, will do whatever is necessary to
17 ensure that we get the staffing we need of the
18 regulatory agency.

19 I will report back to you next month.

20 MS. WALTERS: Actually, the timeliness of

1 this is critical. It should be done really within the
2 next day or two.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Maybe you could help us
4 with the appropriate parties to write to.

5 MR. BILL LEE: Yes, we could do that.

6 MS. WALTERS: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That would be good.

8 Have you been introduced, Bill, to the rest
9 of the RAB?

10 MR. BILL LEE: I don't think so.

11 Bill Lee. I'm the city administrator for
12 San Francisco.

13 Years ago, I used to be involved in all the
14 base closures, so I know Jim fairly well. He was at
15 Hunter's Point. So I know a lot of the old issues,
16 background issues.

17 I spent a lot of time in the last couple of
18 months down at Hunter's Point. And the Board and the
19 Mayor has asked me to sort of take a look at why it's
20 taking so long to get these bases ready for reuse.

1 I'm told that's the reason why.

2 I'm visiting here tonight just observing and
3 trying to figure exactly the frame of reference where
4 we are.

5 And so I met with three of the people on the
6 community board at my request about two months ago,
7 and Martha and Gina keep me abreast as to some of the
8 issues.

9 And I have a pretty strong background in the
10 environment from San Francisco. I understand a lot of
11 the issues you're discussing.

12 So I think today's issue is more of a
13 resource issue, and the other role I play is putting
14 other city agencies into this group. If you need
15 someone from the planning department or from Public
16 Works to see what they are doing, then I can bring
17 them here if you have any problems with any city
18 agency.

19 So it's pretty much up to Patricia, you're
20 the Chair, if you have issues with a city agency, let

1 me know or let Martha know.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We appreciate your
3 support.

4 MR. ONGERTH: What is your position in the
5 city administration?

6 MR. BILL LEE: I'm the city administrator.

7 MR. ONGERTH: Thank you.

8 You're Mr. Lee?

9 MR. BILL LEE: Yes. I'm Bill.

10 MR. ONGERTH: Where have I been?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think this is a
12 really good example of being able to bring a topical
13 time urgent issue up to the RAB to have a discussion
14 and to have some results come out of it. So I think
15 this is a real good example of that process.

16 Are there any other comments concerning the
17 agenda for tonight, any other proposed changes?

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Point of order: I don't
19 know that we have, I think we reached consensus, but I
20 would like to reach closure at least formally for the

1 record.

2 Paul and I will craft a letter and cc Bill
3 and Martha.

4 Thank you.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other comments
6 concerning tonight's agenda before we continue?

7 MS. KATHURIA: I don't know if you want to
8 also coordinate with the Hunter's Point RAB.

9 The Water Board is taking the lead and
10 currently proposed. So I don't know if that will
11 strengthen the letter to actually have two RABs write
12 it.

13 MS. CASSA: Every base is affected. Each
14 base around the bay will have one oversight agency.

15 MR. ALDRICH: But from the City of San
16 Francisco point of view, those are the two bases of
17 concern.

18 MS. KATHURIA: And the Presidio, as well.
19 We've taken the lead and the Water Board is.

20 So I don't know if all the RABs want to get

1 together, but that could be something that may be
2 stronger than just one letter.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It might be hard with the
4 time.

5 MS. KATHURIA: That's true, too.

6 MR. BILL LEE: I will inform the Hunter's
7 Point RAB people and have them take care of that in
8 another channel.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Before we proceed
10 further, I would like to introduce Mr. Ryan Brooks,
11 the new community relations director in EFA West. He
12 has been around to the RABs and has had the
13 opportunity to come up to see our RAB tonight.

14 MR. BROOKS: Thanks a lot, Jim.

15 As Jim said, I am the new community
16 relations director over at EFA West. I have worked on
17 most of the sites throughout Northern California, and
18 I'm familiar with many of the issues that are
19 concerning or facing most of the RABs.

20 And, basically, my position here is resource

1 to the RAB members. I will help you with any issues
2 that you need, any concerns, and, hopefully, help to
3 facilitate and get onto reuse.

4 I have worked with PRC prior to this for the
5 past four-and-a-half years, so I have had a lot of
6 experience on most of the RABs and most installations
7 that I know some of the challenges you guys are
8 facing.

9 So, hopefully, I will be a useful resource
10 for everyone. I will be here probably for the next
11 meeting, also.

12 I will give out my phone number today. It's
13 415-244-3109.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we will add Ryan to
15 our standard sign-in sheet so you have his fax and
16 E-mail.

17 MR. BROOKS: Great.

18 Thank you, everyone.

19 MS. WALTERS: Welcome.

20 MR. BROOKS: Thank you.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. If there are no
2 further comments on the agenda, then we will proceed.

3 The next item is discussion and approval of
4 the 15 April minutes, which you should have recently
5 received.

6 But let me interject: We did, as a result
7 of RAB comments at the last month's meeting, make some
8 revisions to the March meeting minutes.

9 However, those revisions were just made and
10 we haven't had a chance to mail those out yet. So I
11 will need to distribute those after this meeting, or
12 in the mail after this meeting. So we won't be able
13 to finalize the March meeting minutes until you have
14 an opportunity to see the changes that were made.

15 There is additional copies of the April
16 meeting minutes on the back table. Is there any
17 comment or discussion regarding the April meeting
18 minutes?

19 John.

20 MR. ALDRICH: Yeah, I have actually quite a

1 few. These I scrutinized a little bit, and I will
2 explain why shortly.

3 But a few things that I think were left out
4 are important things that need to be included.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Just as maybe a process
6 comment: I would like to recommend maybe where there
7 might be a lot of commentary, if you think it's more
8 minor comments that could be discussed off line, but,
9 of course, anything you feel is topical to the other
10 RAB members here.

11 MR. ALDRICH: Well, there is a reason.

12 Basically things do end up in here, such as
13 on page 6: "Mr. Sullivan informed the RAB that they
14 should decide whether to continue with the current
15 schedule," which I assume means the schedule on the
16 agenda to get out of here by 9:30. But it implies
17 that it was talking about the schedule for FOSLs.

18 And so that's something that's pretty minor
19 that I think doesn't need to end up in the minutes.

20 But there are several places where, I think,

1 things are not accurately expressed here in the
2 administrative record, as far as long term retention.

3 For example, on page 3 in the center of the
4 page: "Harlan Van Wye expressed satisfaction that
5 provisions within the FOSL provide for marina
6 operation, but questioned whether dredging occurred
7 during normal maintenance would pose exposure hazards
8 to workers."

9 He was also, I think, more concerned, if I'm
10 remembering properly, of having to pull up pilings and
11 fix piers. That's something I think was a thing that
12 should have been in there.

13 On page 6, down at the bottom, the last
14 paragraph: "Ms. Smith asked why there are high
15 concentrations of silver at Site 12. Mary Rose Cassa,
16 DTSC, said that the site was constructed on fill
17 deposited from the mountains into San Francisco Bay."

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Excuse me, John, could
19 you slow down a little bit?

20 MR. ALDRICH: I'm sorry. I'm just quoting

1 from this article.

2 But, basically, as I recall, too, that other
3 significant events that happened in the time period,
4 Sharon Tobias also made a very important statement
5 that it's natural background from bay sediments being
6 dredged up and placed here on the island, and then as
7 I recall, Dale Smith made the comment -- and I
8 remember clearly, and I remember clearly that she gave
9 it because I was going to give it otherwise -- why is
10 that the only hot spot on the base for silver?

11 And then I made the comment that perhaps
12 it's where they disposed of all the silver waste, the
13 photographic labs and used it as a dump site.

14 Those, to me, are pretty significant
15 comments that down the road maybe somebody may want to
16 recall that that was brought up in a discussion,
17 whether it was followed up and looked into or not.
18 Yet that was left out.

19 There is also the question of the lead
20 discussion on page 7. And I believe it was Richard

1 Hansen, but somebody, as I remember, asked if the soil
2 was being sampled for lead at other buildings, other
3 housing areas.

4 And then Mr. Sullivan stated -- this is my
5 recollection -- stated that buildings were constructed
6 after lead-based paint removal from use.

7 And then I suggested that such sites be
8 investigated for lead if older buildings that were
9 demolished which may have contained lead based paint
10 might have existed there and wasn't tested for in the
11 past. And that's not stated in here. I think that's
12 an important issue to go in here.

13 And the final one is a very minor one, but
14 it is something that was brought up. It was on the
15 end of the review of action items on page 9 at the
16 top: The RAB mailing list has been pared down. Hugo
17 Berston is developing a newspaper advertisement, and
18 he's doing that with Dan McDonald of the RAB.

19 The only reason I bring this up, the
20 subcommittee met after the workshop last week, and we

1 started talking about that this was one of the things
2 that we were concerned about, that comments, things
3 that are made here are being left out of the minutes.

4 I don't expect anybody to take accurate
5 enough minutes to catch every comment of every
6 conversation, but I would suggest that since we have
7 an original verbatim transcript, those be sort of
8 attached as an appendix to the minutes to be referred
9 to. It doesn't really matter if they are poorly
10 edited. People don't have to read it. They can read
11 the minutes. But at least the documentation will
12 follow the minutes.

13 I think that's an important point to make,
14 because, right now when we review this, one thing that
15 stood out is the transcripts, verbatim, are part of
16 the information repository, but the paraphrased
17 minutes refer to the administrative record.

18 As a follow-up, we wanted to request, I
19 guess, the transcript from a set of minutes just to
20 compare. And so, I guess, since I spent so much time

1 on this one, probably just get the transcript from
2 this one. I just want to see what kinds of things do
3 get left out. I don't think it should be up to the
4 individual RAB mechanics' memories to determine what
5 was discussed and what wasn't discussed and have to
6 remember it a month down the line, and then have to
7 bring it up here.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, I guess to add to
9 your comment, if I could, it seems as though some
10 important technical details are being left out of the
11 minutes.

12 If the minutes have the appearance of being
13 written by somebody without a technical background and
14 really don't understand some of the importance of
15 bringing information like silver being observed in
16 site 12, that is an RI issue. It was discussed in
17 that context.

18 To reduce it to a simple statement that
19 removes our ability to comment on technical documents
20 or have interaction among the RAB, I really would

1 concur with John saying that the transcript really
2 needs to be reviewed with the summation so that those
3 technical points can be brought out.

4 Many of the members here rely on verbatim
5 transcripts to provide comments to the Navy and the
6 regulatory agencies, and those are not being reflected
7 in the minutes.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think from what
9 I'm hearing, it sounds like we on the Navy side need
10 to take another look at our meeting minutes and
11 transcript process and see what we can do.

12 Maybe we need to take some additional time
13 between the time that we receive the transcript and
14 the time that the minutes are sent out.

15 MR. ALDRICH: Well, I got these yesterday.
16 This is from a meeting a month ago. If you wait any
17 longer, how are we supposed to remember two meetings
18 back, if we're supposed to be reading the minutes and
19 see if they're accurate.

20 I mean, I agree that it's good that you do

1 that because there's clearly some things that are
2 missing from the minutes that I think should
3 definitely be in here, because they are CERCLA-related
4 issues. I agree that should happen.

5 But I also see no reason, I don't know how
6 many pages these transcripts end up being, us rambling
7 on for three hours, that's it. We get stuff like that
8 all the time.

9 But I think that should be an attachment.
10 We have all these attachments, sign-in sheets, slides
11 from the meetings, which have already been given from
12 the previous meeting. Why not attach that as well?

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: If there is a consensus
14 among the community members, this is actually, this is
15 single sided, so double sided it would be about that
16 thick (indicating).

17 If there is a consensus that you would like
18 to have at least on a trial basis have us send out the
19 transcript?

20 MR. ALDRICH: Well, maybe nothing that

1 extreme. It could be the sense where you have it as
2 an attachment on the official ones that get filed, and
3 then only a few people that want to review that that
4 want to make sure that those details get in, because
5 I'm sure there are many people that won't want to get
6 that extra stuff and won't want to read it anyway.

7 But it could be an optional attachment, if
8 that would be easier for you, maybe it's easier.

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, maybe
10 between now and the interim meeting on the 3rd, we can
11 talk about it on the Navy side, and maybe reach
12 conclusions as to how we want to proceed for June by
13 the 3 June meeting.

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Brad?

15 MR. WONG: If I can just make a suggestion.
16 It sounds like there is a lot of goodwill here on both
17 sides.

18 If John is willing to be the only one from
19 the community members to receive a copy of the
20 unabridged transcript, I'm happy to just keep getting

1 the abridged minutes.

2 But then maybe that would be a good way so
3 that John, since he's chair of that committee, could
4 kind of work with the Navy and whoever over time, and
5 capture outside of these meetings, capture what kind
6 of information is important. It would give him a
7 frame of reference to work that through.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, if we want to make
9 an interim decision based on your suggestion, we will
10 send John a transcript of this meeting, and then we
11 will still have the 3 June meeting just in case we
12 want to expand beyond that.

13 MR. ALDRICH: What I'm proposing is
14 basically to see what they look like to compare with
15 the minutes.

16 I'm saying to start a process of attaching
17 it in the mailings, but certainly attaching it in the
18 permanent record.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, it sounds like,
20 John, not everybody would want to get one, but at the

1 very least, we will provide one to you and we can all
2 kind of think about it between now and the 3rd, and we
3 can make any further adjustments at the 3 June
4 meeting.

5 But at the least, you will get a copy of the
6 transcript from tonight's meeting.

7 MR. ALDRICH: And the last month's meeting
8 you also have available if you could copy that one,
9 too, because that one I read through.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, I think I
11 could give you my copy tonight.

12 MR. ALDRICH: That's good. I appreciate
13 that. Thanks. We will scrutinize it.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Are there any other
15 comments on the April meeting minutes?

16 It sounds like that we may need to defer
17 approval pending taking a look at John's comments of
18 the April minutes.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is this the third month,
20 consecutive month that there have been some

1 significant comments on the minutes that we haven't
2 approved?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think that's correct.
4 I think the February minutes, we didn't approve them
5 in February or in March, and then approved them in
6 April.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is February the first
8 month that we had any contract with preparing the
9 minutes? I'm wondering if somebody could work with
10 that contractor as well?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we can take a
12 look, on the Navy side, we will look at, since our
13 consultants are one team, we will take a look at the
14 process and see what we can do.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: To shore it up.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To take care of any
17 community member concerns.

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We will move ahead to
20 public comment.

1 We set aside five minutes towards the
2 beginning of the meeting, if there are any members of
3 the general public.

4 Although I don't see any. I don't think
5 there is any members of the general public tonight,
6 but if there were, they would be invited to make any
7 comment.

8 Bill and Martha, and maybe this is something
9 that maybe we need to work with the city on, is to
10 maybe help promote the RAB.

11 I think we haven't had much outside
12 community interest in the RAB, so maybe the Navy could
13 partner with the city to see what we could do to maybe
14 more widely disseminate information to get more public
15 interest.

16 MR. LEE: Martha and I will meet with you
17 and look at what the city can do.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Our BRAC cleanup
19 process.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Before we do that, I just

1 want to acknowledge, we are about 45 minutes off
2 schedule and maybe we can take time to review the
3 remaining agenda items to see if we can defer some
4 topics so we can, or race through the topics so that
5 we can get out.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the first item,
7 which I set aside 15 minutes for, is basically to
8 capture any additional comments there might be on Zone
9 1, the Reuse Zone 1 FOSL.

10 So if there isn't a lot of commentary on
11 that, we can proceed into the draft Reuse Zone 2 FOSL,
12 which you will be receiving shortly, and then I have a
13 handout with the latest data on Nimitz House lead in
14 soil, and I could essentially just pass that out as a
15 handout rather than spend as long as ten minutes
16 discussing it. So we may be able to pick up 10 or 15
17 minutes, and maybe even shorten the break from 15
18 minutes to 10.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Is everybody on board with
20 that?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: To tighten the schedule
2 where we don't think we will have as much comment and
3 leave more time for new information like the Reuse
4 Zone 2 FOSL.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do we have a volunteer to
6 be timekeeper? Somebody with a watch, preferably.

7 Okay, thanks, Jim.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. The first item up
9 is to offer an opportunity for any additional comments
10 concerning the draft finding of suitability to lease
11 for Reuse Zone 1. That was the presentation we made
12 at last month's meeting. And so we are looking to
13 close the comment period on that document.

14 So, essentially, I'm opening the floor to
15 any verbal comments, or if you want to make any note
16 cards that we can take away tonight, because after
17 tonight, we will be assembling all of the comments
18 that we have received from both the regulators and the
19 community members to finalize the Reuse Zone 1 FOSL.

20 MR. HEHN: I have a comment. I'm sorry I

1 missed the presentation.

2 It's my recollection that there were a
3 number of UST issues that were present on Zone 1 that
4 have not really been resurrected in our sites as far
5 as looking at the information there. Diesel tanks had
6 an impact on soil and groundwater.

7 Are those particular issues addressed in the
8 FOSL as far as leasing issues on those parcels?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

10 We are using pretty much the standard lease
11 restrictions against excavations that we have in our
12 previous FOSLs, and then, based on the data from these
13 tanks and the air monitoring that we have done from
14 some of the earlier FOSLs, we don't feel that there is
15 any concern over these particular USTs.

16 These USTs in Zone 1 tend to be fairly small
17 tanks as compared to the old fire fighting school.

18 MR. HEHN: Will those come back when we get
19 into the CAP program or removal of the remaining UST
20 issues?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, all of these --
2 yes. All of the USTs are moving through the Water
3 Board's corrective action process.

4 Some of the tanks in Zone 1 the Navy has
5 proposed closure on. Others we're proposing for
6 continued remedial investigation.

7 MR. HEHN: Okay.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Any other comments on
9 Zone 1?

10 Zone 1 is basically the west, southwest side
11 of the island along with a couple of other facilities
12 that the city has been interested in.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I had a point of
14 information.

15 At the last interim meeting, I just wanted
16 to be sure that we get the deadline for our comments
17 clear.

18 There were three items that I think had been
19 determined the RAB could provide comments to the Navy
20 by the 23rd of May, and one of them was the Zone 1

1 FOSL.

2 The other two were the TPA toxicity testing
3 results and additional investigation for Sites 12 and
4 17.

5 So I just wanted to, I think I heard you say
6 the comments were due, or you would like all comments
7 to be rounded up tonight.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

9 The comment date for the Zone 1 FOSL was
10 originally triggered by the date that we issued the
11 document before the last RAB meeting, and we are
12 trying to stick to a 30-day schedule. But it's not
13 quite as hard a schedule.

14 We would like to close out the comment
15 period as soon as we can in order to, because the city
16 has some leasing plans that they would like to put
17 into effect.

18 However, if there is enough concern among
19 the community members, and also if the city has any
20 real objection, we could extend the comment period to

1 the end of this week.

2 In general, we have tried to, I would like
3 to get the comment period a couple of days after the
4 RAB meeting, but in some cases, due to either a
5 regulatory deadline or desires of the city, we have
6 tried to tighten up the schedule more than that.

7 MS. WALTERS: I have no objection.

8 MR. HEHN: I was going to mention that one
9 of the other documents to talk about extended to the
10 end of this week is the toxicity testing results, so
11 there are actually three documents.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe we could try to
13 cover that in the document section, but since we are
14 talking about the Zone 1 FOSL, I think we will extend
15 the community members comment period until this
16 Friday, the 23rd of May.

17 MS. VEDAGIRI: Which documents?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We are strictly talking
19 about the Zone 1 FOSL right now.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I think Jim would like to

1 review with us the schedule for these documents, but I
2 know that two members that were at the interim meeting
3 who generally comment on things are not here tonight.

4 We would like their comments.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Jim, don't we have two other
6 documents that were moved to Friday?

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I will tell you
8 what, John, let's deal with the other, if other
9 documents come up in the discussions, we can talk
10 about the dates then, and then I will pick up, we will
11 pick up the dates for the remaining documents in the
12 meeting section on documents.

13 But I would rather not get too far from the
14 FOSL issue right now, if we can.

15 So the deadline for comments in the Zone 1
16 FOSL will be this Friday, the 23rd.

17 And let me say, as much as possible, we will
18 try to make our comment closure date several days
19 after our RAB meeting, but that may or may not always
20 be the case always. We will try to keep to that.

1 Are there any other comments concerning the
2 Zone 1 FOSL?

3 With that, I think we can move into the next
4 item, which is our new FOSL, that's for Reuse Zone 2.

5 So I would like to turn it over to our
6 project team to make a short presentation.

7 Now, this document, you have not received
8 yet. In fact, we made a decision to, we were going to
9 issue it this week, or within the last week, but now
10 it won't be issued until the beginning of next week,
11 and that was to incorporate some of the comments that
12 we have received on the on Zone 1 FOSLs. We thought
13 that was efficient in terms of everyone's time and try
14 to take advantage of comments we've already received.

15 MS. PIERCE: I think everybody has the
16 handout.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think everybody has a
18 handout.

19 MS. PIERCE: By the way, I'm Nicole Pierce
20 from Uribe & Associates. Lynne Srinivasan from our

1 office discussed Zone 1, which is in the yellow.

2 Tonight I'm going to discuss Zone 2, which
3 is moving around.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Zone 2 is in the green.

5 And, basically, one of the reasons we put
6 together Zone 2 was to kind of fill in the southeast
7 corner of the island.

8 We previously had done FOSLs for buildings
9 182 and 3, and Zone 2 helps to fill in that area as
10 potential expansion for movie studio operations as
11 well as other things. That pretty much FOSLizes the
12 south end of the island along with Zone 1.

13 MR. WONG: Jurassic Island.

14 MS. PIERCE: Like Reuse Zone 1, Reuse Zone 2
15 has been divided up into three reuse zones, including
16 Zone 2-A, one parcel here; Zone 2-B, which is 13
17 parcels right here; and Zone 2-C, which is right up
18 here.

19 I'm not going through the area type
20 definitions. Lynne went over those last week. They

1 are on the last page of your handout. As I go
2 through, I will define the relevant definitions.

3 Reuse Zone 2-A is comprised of one parcel,
4 Parcel T-9, and this parcel is classified as Area Type
5 6. Area Type 6 Parcels are areas of known
6 contamination where response actions have not yet been
7 implemented.

8 The reason this parcel is classified as Area
9 Type 6, it's co-located with IR site 21. The entire
10 parcel is paved, and there will be no direct exposure
11 to soil or groundwater, no contact with the soil
12 because it's paved, and the groundwater, no
13 restrictions on its use.

14 The only potential threat would be from the
15 inhalation of VOCs. So we did a simple risk
16 evaluation, and we determined there would be no health
17 threat from the inhalation of volatile organic
18 compounds.

19 So at this time, we are recommending a lease
20 restriction that there be no invasive underground

1 activities.

2 Reuse Zone 2-B is comprised of 13 parcels.
3 It is classified -- or there are three parcels within
4 Reuse Zone 2-B that are classified as Area Type 1.
5 There has been no release or disposal and these
6 parcels are eligible for unrestricted lease.

7 Four parcels within Reuse Zone 2 are
8 classified as Area Type 2. That's areas where
9 petroleum, only petroleum has been released or
10 disposed of.

11 The reason these parcels are classified as
12 Area Type 2 is due to the presence of underground fuel
13 lines. Fuel lines are scheduled to be removed
14 sometime this year, and in the meantime, we are
15 recommending a lease restriction that there be no
16 invasive underground activities.

17 There is one parcel in Reuse Zone 2-B that
18 is classified as Area Type 6, that's parcel 16, and
19 that's due to the fact that IR site 15 is co-located
20 with this parcel.

1 This parcel is pretty much paved. 90
2 percent of it is paved.

3 There will be no contact with soil or
4 groundwater for the same reasons that the other IR
5 site, the soil is covered with pavement or asphalt and
6 groundwater will not be used.

7 We did evaluate the potential for health
8 threat from inhalation of volatile compounds, and we
9 determined that there would be no potential threat.

10 At this time, we are also recommending a
11 lease restriction here that there be no invasive
12 underground activities.

13 There are five parcels within Reuse Zone 2-B
14 that are classified as Area Type 7. Area Type 7
15 indicates areas that require further investigation.

16 So there are two reasons that this group of
17 parcels are classified as Area Type 7. First of them
18 being that there is potential contamination related to
19 the storm drain lines beneath these parcels. The
20 storm drain lines were cleaned in fiscal year '96, and

1 there has been some sampling done as part of the EBS
2 sampling along those storm drain lines, but the
3 results are not yet available. That report will be
4 coming out soon, I believe, the beginning of June, and
5 after that time, we will begin to incorporate that
6 data into our report.

7 So in the meantime, standard lease
8 restrictions that there be no invasive underground
9 activity in these parcels.

10 Some of the Area Type 7 parcels in Reuse
11 Zone 2-B are classified as Area Type 7 due to
12 potential contaminant migration from adjacent IR
13 sites.

14 Because there is no soil or groundwater
15 exposure, we didn't evaluate the risks associated with
16 direct contact with soil or groundwater, and we
17 determined that there would be no health threat from
18 inhalation of volatile organic compounds.

19 There may be a potential effect from
20 remedial activities construction to the tenants in

1 these parcels.

2 A lease restriction, here, again, no
3 invasive underground activities.

4 Reuse Zone 2-C is one parcel. It's Pier 1,
5 which is Parcel T119. This parcel is classified as
6 Area Type 7, again requiring further investigation and
7 that is due to the potential sediment contamination
8 beneath the pier.

9 These sediments have not been sampled, but
10 because potential exposure to these sediments is
11 minimal, we don't see a problem.

12 We do recommend a lease restriction that
13 there be no dredging and routine maintenance will be
14 allowed.

15 And that's it.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So this is really the
17 smallest of our FOSL zones.

18 Usha?

19 MS. VEDAGIRI: When you say that you
20 didn't -- I didn't catch your name -- when you say

1 that there is no direct soil or groundwater exposure
2 because the site is completely paved --

3 MS. PIERCE: Yes.

4 MS. VEDAGIRI: -- and you're proposing a
5 lease restriction of no invasive underground
6 activities, does that mean that they shouldn't remove
7 the paving? You're assuming that the paving will
8 stay.

9 MS. PIERCE: Yes.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

11 MS. PIERCE: And any activities like that
12 would have to be approved by the Navy.

13 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All of our leases to
14 date have restricted tenants to the existing
15 facilities, and not making any site changes or site
16 improvements to the site. If that occurred, then we
17 would have to reexamine that issue.

18 But for now, most of the interested leasing
19 has been use of the existing facilities essentially as
20 is.

1 MS. VEDAGIRI: I just don't see how you
2 could have new people coming in to use it and assuming
3 the paving will stay the way it is.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, all tenants, all
5 tenant proposed changes to the building, whether it's
6 inside or out, are subject to both the city staff
7 review and the Navy review.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: John?

9 MR. ALDRICH: Question: I assume the
10 sampling for the contamination under the pier is going
11 to come under the offshore sampling plan.

12 Is there a work plan being developed for
13 offshore sampling? I have been asked repeatedly also
14 about when the fuel piers were demolished, and no
15 sampling, I don't think, has ever been done where
16 those piers were located.

17 You were saying they have not been sampled,
18 but is there a plan to sample sediments under Pier 1?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, samples are being
20 taken in the offshore operable unit in the vicinity of

1 Pier 1, as well as other areas within Clipper Cove and
2 other locations around the island where we have any
3 reason to believe that there may have been a release.

4 MR. ALDRICH: Well, is there a work plan for
5 the offshore investigation?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. That's what we are
7 implementing now.

8 We have had the offshore work plan that was
9 finalized some time ago, and we finally, in fact, that
10 was over a year ago it was finalized, and we are just
11 in the field now doing the, well, essentially, it was
12 the second round of sediment sampling.

13 We are just in the field now this week doing
14 part of that sampling.

15 MR. ALDRICH: Did we get that?

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

17 We finalized it a while ago, and then due to
18 the funding constraints, we couldn't fund it until
19 recently.

20 MR. ALDRICH: And that's only offshore

1 sampling?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

3 What we have done now is broken the island
4 into two operable units: The onshore operable unit
5 and offshore operable unit.

6 Before, everything was on one schedule, and
7 now it's separate FSSRA, onshore and offshore.

8 MR. ALDRICH: So there is a plan to do
9 something there.

10 And then for the other Zone 2-B, Parcel Type
11 7, soil sampling results beneath the fuel lines or,
12 I'm sorry, the storm drain lines, are those the ones
13 you're talking about?

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

15 We took samples, this is to examine whether
16 or not any contaminants that may have been in the
17 storm drains, if the storm drains were damaged and we
18 had replaced some of the storm drains due to age and
19 earthquake damage, this was to examine whether
20 contaminants that were inside the storm drain had

1 migrated outside the storm drain.

2 So we took the sampling -- this was not
3 sampling inside the drain because anything that was
4 probably there has since moved on.

5 But this was examining the soils areas
6 outside the immediate vicinity of the line to
7 determine whether anything had migrated outside of the
8 line and contaminated the surrounding parcel.

9 MR. ALDRICH: And was this done with all
10 storm drains around the island?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: What we did, we looked
12 at -- and this was another part of the EBS sampling
13 work plan -- what we did, we looked at a combination
14 of potential upstream sources of contamination,
15 principally our cleanup sites, and where it was known
16 that storm lines had been damaged.

17 So we looked at, we looked at what might be
18 the worst cases, a downstream damaged storm line and
19 an upstream potential source of contamination. We
20 chose what we thought were the most likely spots where

1 contamination could show up.

2 So we sampled in those spots, and what we
3 and regulators agreed to do in the work plan was, if
4 we sample those worst case spots and don't find
5 anything, we will assume, then, that the other areas
6 that haven't been sampled will be less worst case and
7 won't pose problems.

8 MR. ALDRICH: So everything you're looking
9 for --

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Based on what was
11 upstream from that section of pipe.

12 MR. ALDRICH: And parking lots where cars
13 parked and dripped oil, because if you had a large
14 parking area, then you have crank case oil dripping.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Petroleum was really
16 something to sample virtually everywhere anyway, but
17 anything other than petroleum, a pipe, that was
18 sampled for, too, so the results of that will be
19 coming out in the next couple of weeks.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Two hands. Brad and Paul.

1 MR. WONG: Silly question: Do all of these
2 have lease restrictions allowing the Navy to do work
3 like the other ones?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There is, in all of our
5 leases, we are required to have a clause that gives
6 the Navy right of entry to continue investigation and
7 cleanup.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul?

9 MR. HEHN: Two questions: First of all, the
10 map I have that was produced in June of '96 shows a
11 fuel line crossing Sites 15, 16, and 20.

12 I show a fuel line crossing 15, 16 and 20.
13 I don't see in the presentation the fuel line was
14 addressed particularly in the issue of Parcel 15.

15 Was that considered?

16 And, also, aboveground tanks on the map, on
17 Parcels 15, 16, and 12, are those still there, and
18 were those also considered in the reuse or FOSL for
19 the sites?

20 MS. PIERCE: Well, as far as UST, there is

1 one left, 18, and that's still there, but it has
2 secondary containment.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Most of the USTs in the
4 zone are associated with what we call the clean steam
5 plant, and that was a plant that was built in the late
6 '80s to provide special steam to the piers. That
7 facility was built in the late '80s.

8 MR. HEHN: What were they storing?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All of the steam plants
10 have back-up diesel storage, but then because this was
11 a clean steam plant, it used additional chemicals, I
12 believe, some hydrochloric acid.

13 But I can't recall specifically which, but
14 additional chemicals used to treat the water prior to
15 entering the boilers to assure a higher grade of steam
16 to be supplied to the ships, which has a higher
17 requirement.

18 MR. HEHN: Okay. I guess my question is,
19 were these particular issues addressed, and in the
20 reuse, looking at the reuse and the FOSL for these

1 areas?

2 I guess the other question leading to that,
3 what is the anticipated reuse of the sites, and would
4 those particular USTs or fuel lines affect any of
5 those reuses?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think to answer
7 the first part of your question, as part of the site
8 inspection for the EBS FOSL, we would have been
9 looking for any potential signs of release, and, this
10 tank, UST tank area, we would have looked at possible
11 breakage of containment or signs of staining or
12 anything that might have indicated a release, which we
13 didn't find.

14 And, then, secondly, as far as the clean
15 steam plant, it's unclear as to what the future use of
16 that might be.

17 The city is still in the process of
18 assessing whether or not they want to continue to
19 operate any of our boiler plants. So while that site
20 is in the FOSL, we don't know the specific reuse of

1 that.

2 If the city chose not to reuse it, in fact,
3 we discussed this over the last couple of weeks, then
4 we would, what we call, lay up the plant, meaning that
5 we would drain and clean the tanks.

6 MR. HEHN: What I was asking was about the
7 reuse to plan for the sites for the FOSL.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Maybe Martha can add to
9 this.

10 But I think in the zones, in these zoned
11 FOSLs, the intent was to allow or give the city the
12 opportunity to make interim use, early use of these
13 facilities in a similar manner to what they were
14 currently being used for.

15 And the city -- I don't think yet -- it
16 doesn't have a specific reuse or interim reuse
17 proposal for each one of these parcels yet, so it's
18 possible, if someone chose to use the pier and needed
19 to lease the pier and needed that type of steam, then
20 that plant might get used for that purpose.

1 MR. HEHN: I guess what I was getting at,
2 what is the interim reuse for these sites?

3 We don't know, is that it?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right.

5 We are trying to get the FOSLs done to allow
6 the city the flexibility to market and lease the
7 property.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: A question as well:

9 Apparently, there is sampling going on.

10 Do you know the results from that sampling,
11 when that will be available, Pier 1 offshore?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: This is part of the
13 offshore remedial investigation.

14 I think the draft RI report for offshore is
15 due in December.

16 MR. GALANG: That's the plan. The delay,
17 again, remember, we had to come back, so that will
18 probably be delayed.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The schedule, original
20 schedule, we were projecting into December for

1 offshore RI, but we had to spend additional time in
2 Clipper Cove surveying underground utilities.

3 So that will probably delay the schedule
4 maybe a month or so. We are probably looking at
5 January and maybe even February of '98 for the draft
6 offshore RI report.

7 MR. GALANG: Right.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Jim has given us the
9 signal to move on. Thank you.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Again, you haven't
11 received the Reuse Zone 2 document yet, so it will be
12 released this Friday. We should put up a sign-up
13 sheet in the back.

14 Some people pretty much want the documents.
15 We have been sending some to some people
16 automatically, but if you would expressly like a copy
17 of the Zone 2 FOSL, you could leave your name with
18 Hugo and we will make sure you get a copy.

19 But we have been sending out to, usually on
20 the average, six or seven community members copies of

1 the documents.

2 Our next item is a document that we have
3 released in the last couple of weeks, addendum 4 to
4 the remedial investigation report.

5 We provided a brief discussion at previous
6 meetings on the other three addenda, and so we wanted
7 to take the opportunity tonight to make a brief
8 presentation on the addendum 4 which revises the
9 conclusions in the draft RI.

10 I will turn the floor over to Richard.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: While he's coming up,
12 those RAB members that are not planning on providing
13 written comments to Paul and I or Jim directly, please
14 do so on the addendum 4 here tonight so that those can
15 be recorded. They are due Friday, or the 27th, excuse
16 me.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The comments for this
18 aren't due until next week.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes, next Tuesday.

20 MR. KNAPP: I don't know if you will be able

1 to read all of this.

2 What this first line does is try to show all
3 the pieces and how they fit together. We have three
4 addenda that have been essentially used to create the
5 fourth.

6 The first one that came out at the last
7 meeting I spoke about was groundwater modeling, and,
8 number two, the additional investigation of Sites 12
9 and 17.

10 Addendum 3 is the petroleum screening
11 levels. I think originally we were going to produce
12 these three addenda.

13 It was apparent we should try to synthesize
14 all the information in these three to essentially all
15 the revisions that could be made to the conclusions
16 and recommendations in the RI report. So that's why
17 we produced this fourth addenda.

18 What I'm trying to show here is what applies
19 to each site. The very first, I will go through these
20 so you can see.

1 The first one, groundwater modeling, it will
2 apply to sites where we have collected groundwater
3 data. So sites 1, 3, 8, 17, 28, and 29 have no
4 groundwater data, they have no Xs.

5 Site 17 has some groundwater data.
6 Basically, what we tried to do was model the
7 contaminants that were detected in groundwater
8 concentrations, or AWQC.

9 Now, what happened to Site 17? We had
10 groundwater data but none of the chemicals in the
11 groundwater exceed the AWQC, so nothing to take
12 forward into the process.

13 Now, chemicals that did reach the bay,
14 according to the model at the concentrations greater
15 than AWQC, and that change is in addendum 4.

16 Sites 12 and 17, addendum 2, basically
17 applies to sites 12 and 17. And, also, it applies to
18 Site 5. There was some samples there. Essentially
19 that was to look at VOCs traveling from 5 to 17.

20 So those three sites, 12, 17 and 5 I just

1 spoke of, would be included under addendum 2.

2 The petroleum screening levels, addendum
3 number 3 here, apply to any place where we have TPH,
4 total petroleum hydrocarbon, in the soil or
5 groundwater.

6 So we came up with screening levels for both
7 groundwater and soil for TPH, the groundwater
8 threshold level was 14.3 milligrams per liter. And
9 then the screening level for the soil was essentially
10 a bad calculation using the 14.3 number for the
11 groundwater screening level, and then a soil leaching
12 factor. That factor measures the amount of petroleum
13 transferred from soil to groundwater.

14 So if you have that factor and a groundwater
15 level, you could back calculate where the soil level
16 would be. That soil level is 430 kilograms. So that
17 comes into play, essentially, at most of the sites,
18 any sites where we had samples for TPH, be it soil or
19 groundwater.

20 There is a summary table in addendum 4 that

1 I will go through. I don't know how well you will be
2 able to read it, but probably the important thing is
3 if you see circles up there, what I have done is try
4 to indicate where there are changes.

5 Now, there were no changes for the 3
6 addendum for those sites 1, 3, 8, 28, and 29, so I'm
7 just listing the ones where things have changed.

8 And at site 5, because of the modeling and
9 the TPH screening levels, we know there are no
10 groundwater chemicals of concern, or VOCs. So that's
11 new information that is in addendum 4.

12 At Site 7 and 10, it's a similar sort of
13 thing where we have no potential impact, ecoimpacts to
14 the bay, and we are recommending an EE/CA.

15 We have some pesticides and TPH just in
16 surface soils near building 335, if you are familiar
17 with the site. That, we feel, should be a potential
18 removal action. So that's something to be aware of as
19 well.

20 And Site 9, again, no VOCs in groundwater.

1 And a similar sort of thing, we have a small
2 area of lead affected soil in one portion of the site.
3 So we would consider doing a source removal for that.

4 And we have TPH, which is restricted to the
5 former trenches, which, also, we are proposing to do
6 an EE/CA for the petroleum contamination there.

7 Now, Site 11, we did have several VOCs. TPH
8 and groundwater was above the screening levels. The
9 modeling showed copper, lead, silver and zinc, all
10 potentially could reach the bay, so those are the VOCs
11 there.

12 And that is really the only change compared
13 to the original document for that site.

14 Site 12, the modeling shows that silver is
15 above the level for the bay, and TPH levels are above
16 the screening levels in soil and groundwater.

17 One thing that needs to be up here, there
18 has been a change in emphasis for Site 12. Basically,
19 the RI objective was to look at the nature and extent
20 of potential contamination with maybe a wetlands or

1 park type of reuse.

2 Now that we talk residential, et cetera, we
3 are going to be out there conducting more
4 investigation, particularly in areas where there was
5 debris redistributed. So that should be added to this
6 right here (indicating).

7 Site 21, no VOCs in groundwater and we are
8 saying that prepare an EE/CA for a small area of
9 contamination soil that was found fairly shallow in
10 one boring.

11 EE/CA is engineering evaluation cost
12 analysis. It looks at the feasibility of a removal
13 action to reduce the contamination at the site. It's
14 used in small discrete type areas where you could do a
15 removal action and, essentially, get rid of the hot
16 spot in a fairly easy manner.

17 And then you can run the risk on your site
18 once you have accomplished that and look at what your
19 options are.

20 It's kind of a preemptive move, if you will,

1 to try to get something that's well-defined, easy to
2 get to, that you can get out of there.

3 And then, finally, at site 24, the modeling
4 showed it was VOCs. And the other thing is, we will
5 do additional groundwater sampling to characterize
6 potential liquids.

7 So that's a quick summary of the big changes
8 for the sites based on work done in the first three
9 addendum.

10 So let's leave it at that, I guess.

11 MS. SIMONS: Can I make a comment? Just to
12 let you know, we agencies are also reviewing this
13 document now.

14 We meet tomorrow and, most likely, will have
15 comments, if not significant comments, on the
16 conclusions.

17 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Question with regard to
18 Site 24.

19 We met last Tuesday. There were some
20 comments on the work plan that I think would be

1 considered by PRC and the Navy. Nothing was
2 determined at that meeting regarding changes in the
3 scope, but the idea is, it will be considered.

4 Would that also be reflected in your revised
5 conclusions?

6 MR. KNAPP: That would affect actual
7 additional sampling. In other words, we said, in
8 broader terms, I guess, we do need to investigate Site
9 24.

10 The specifics you're talking about are not
11 something that would be reflected in addenda 4 because
12 it's not really a change.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: One comment in particular:
14 Site 24 isn't adjacent to others, is it? It
15 has issues in the relationship between those sites or
16 something, I think should be the idea, and I was
17 wondering, well, that could be a comment I can make.

18 But I wanted the RAB to talk about it.

19 MR. KNAPP: We have looked at data what's
20 available on Sites 17 and 24.

1 The information that we have indicates that
2 there is no real likelihood of commingling petroleum
3 and VOCs in that area.

4 But, again, that's something that will be
5 reflected in the sampling.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Paul?

7 MR. HEHN: I have two questions.

8 When you talk about the soil leaching factor
9 used in the groundwater modeling, how was the
10 groundwater leaching factor determined?

11 MR. KNAPP: My impression, and I'm not an
12 expert on addendum 3, but they took soil collected at
13 the sites and effectively got the concentrations and
14 analyzed there to know the concentrations in the soil.
15 They essentially leached it into the water and knew
16 the water concentration.

17 Several different samples, and I don't know
18 the sort of averaging or range of data, but my
19 impression is that that's the data set they would use
20 to obtain their leaching factor. It had nothing to do

1 with the C soil and the modeling.

2 MR. HEHN: Was that done for all sites as
3 part of the modeling?

4 MR. KNAPP: No. That would have been a lot
5 of effort to do that.

6 MR. HEHN: The second question is, I guess,
7 as I have been re-reviewing these documents, I will
8 hand out copies of comments for folks to review
9 tonight for addendum 1, 2 and 3 at, least.

10 There is a basic premise I see that's kind
11 of faulty in this whole process of the addenda. And
12 that is, assuming all this data is built on the fact
13 that the Phase II-B data is correct, and everything
14 builds upon that basis because you're using that data,
15 and for groundwater modeling, I think there is a lot
16 of controversy about the results of Phase II-B, if
17 that proves to be not good data overall.

18 How does that affect all these other
19 addenda, and going down the road that's leading us to
20 a conclusion where maybe our basic data we started

1 with is not correct?

2 We are reaching conclusions before we went
3 through the rest of the process and got them reviewed
4 and finalized.

5 MR. KNAPP: Well, I would say that's a
6 rhetorical question, frankly.

7 MS. CASSA: Well, I guess the addenda will
8 be incorporated into the draft final RI, so that any
9 unresolved issues will be handed out during the review
10 of the draft final RI before it's finalized.

11 So anything that isn't appropriate from the
12 draft RI, in order to create the draft final, all that
13 thought process went to complete it.

14 MR. HEHN: So when it comes out, we will
15 start all over again.

16 MS. CASSA: Yes. And it will be the
17 complete book.

18 MR. HEHN: And that will include all the
19 addenda.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And as a result of that,

1 we have pretty much resolved the comment period for
2 the draft final to final, which would normally be only
3 30 days is more likely going to be 60 days.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Usha?

5 MS. VEDAGIRI: Procedural question. The eco
6 tox testing thing, are the comments are due tomorrow
7 or pushed back, because it's not on today's agenda,
8 the petroleum screening levels.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: My recollection is that
10 the eco tox comments would be due again this Friday,
11 the 23rd.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

13 MS. VEDAGIRI: So I will put my comments
14 together and send them to you.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

16 MS. VEDAGIRI: Okay.

17 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Basically, what we are
18 driving towards is the release of the draft RI, which
19 we have been trying to hold to a date of 22 July.

20 So the dates for these addenda are all

1 working towards that completion date, 22 of July,
2 which we will probably have to hold pretty firm.

3 MS. KATHURIA: If anyone is interested in
4 seeing the states comments on eco tox results for TPH,
5 let me know and I will fax it to you if you need it,
6 to help with your review.

7 MR. HEHN: Are they submitted to the Navy?

8 MS. KATHURIA: Yes.

9 MR. HEHN: Can those be attached to the next
10 minutes?

11 MS. SIMONS: We have had made comments on
12 all of that addenda, so I'm not sure how, you know,
13 this stays together, I mean, EPA. So I don't know if
14 you want copies of those.

15 MR. GALANG: All regulator comments they
16 give copies to the members of the RAB, especially
17 committee co-chairs, and these are part of the admin
18 record.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we haven't sent
20 copies to every community member, but we have been

1 sending it to essentially those of the technical
2 review.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Jim says it is time
4 for a break.

5 (Short break taken at 8:50 p.m.)

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Our next item, which I
7 agreed to basically just provide, is a handout. It's
8 the results -- and no one has seen these yet,
9 including the regulators -- this is our ongoing
10 efforts at the Nimitz House. We have some samples
11 back a couple of weeks ago, and it was intended to do
12 two things:

13 One was to take additional samples out on
14 the front and back lawn areas, and then, second, to
15 take some confirmatory samples where we had already
16 removed six inches of soil around the building
17 perimeter.

18 The building perimeter is essentially a
19 planter box that is surrounded by asphalt. So it's a
20 confined area of three to six feet or so wide around

1 the house. So we went ahead and removed six inches of
2 soil.

3 However, the confirmatory samples are still
4 showing some high levels. So our next step is to take
5 another six inches out of the planter box around the
6 building and then take another confirmatory sample.

7 The results --

8 MR. ALDRICH: Another six inches down?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Down.

10 It's a defined space because it runs from
11 the building to the asphalt and the asphalt surrounds
12 the building.

13 And then the other action is to take a
14 closer look at the results we have gotten from the
15 front and back lawn, a couple of which are above 400
16 PPM, and to decide how we want to proceed further on
17 there.

18 In general, the results on the lawn are not
19 nearly as high as would be expected from the planter,
20 but they are still averaging in the several hundred

1 PPM, and a couple are going up above 400 PPM.

2 So between now and the next meeting, we will
3 probably have done the excavation, the other six
4 inches of excavation, and we may or may not have the
5 confirmatory, the second round of confirmatory samples
6 done.

7 If we still find high levels after a second
8 six inches, then we might even have to consider other
9 options, like relying more on a barrier rather than
10 continuing to excavate down.

11 But at this point, I don't know what we
12 might find after another six inches. We would hope
13 that we would reach the end of it, but we don't know
14 the original level of the planter box. It could be
15 that it originally was at a lower level and it
16 accumulated lead from paint and then had soil added to
17 it.

18 Yes?

19 MR. ONGERTH: Is the hypothesis on the
20 origin of the lead that it comes from the painting of

1 the Nimitz House?

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, pretty much. I
3 think we are pretty much in agreement that the high
4 levels we are seeing in the planter box, which is in
5 the order of thousands of parts per million, are due
6 to the paint on that structure.

7 The levels we are seeing on the lawn may be
8 less influenced by the house and more influenced by
9 the Bay Bridge.

10 But what we are seeing on the lawn is only a
11 couple of hundred parts per million, in the range of
12 2- to 600 parts per million.

13 Whereas what we are seeing around the house,
14 the original samples were 44,000 parts per million.

15 And then the second round of samples we took
16 before excavating any soil still averaged, I think,
17 around 7- to 8,000 parts per million.

18 MR. ONGERTH: Are there other structures in
19 the area that would likewise have been receiving the
20 same kind of painting attention?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, all of the
2 buildings in that senior officer quarters area are
3 probably going to be maybe somewhat similar, so we
4 were going to use the sampling data from quarters 1,
5 which is the Nimitz House, to base a sampling plan on
6 the other 6 quarters, quarters 2 through 7.

7 Although we took a lot of samples around
8 Nimitz House, but now that we know that we are pretty
9 likely to find high levels, we probably won't take
10 quite as many samples around the other house, or -- we
11 haven't made the decision yet -- or may even presume
12 and go ahead and take six inches out of the planters
13 of the other houses before we even do any significant
14 sampling at all.

15 MR. ONGERTH: Thank you.

16 MR. ALDRICH: What quantity of sand are you
17 talking about? If you collected and made a composite
18 and checked for haz waste disposal level, and then see
19 if there is anything left.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think the six inches

1 we took around the house, I think, filled two small
2 dumpsters, two soil dumpsters. I think they're 10
3 cubic yard dumpsters, something like that. It starts
4 to add up, even six inches. It doesn't take long to
5 start adding up to cubic yards.

6 MS. VEDAGIRI: Just out of curiosity, where
7 does that soil go after, what you dug up?

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, we take a
9 composite sample, and in the process of excavating it
10 and putting it into the bin, it gets fairly well
11 mixed. But then we still go ahead and take a
12 composite sample. You take a sample from a couple of
13 places within the bin and composite it.

14 Most of the time, the lead level is low
15 enough that it goes to a landfill. It may not go to a
16 general landfill, but it would go based on the level
17 of the lead in the soil.

18 But in the six inches, it's not a uniform
19 level of lead, and so by the time you composite it in
20 the bin, that level drops down significantly, maybe

1 down to below 1,000 parts per million.

2 MR. ALDRICH: But you follow the same
3 regulations that everyone else does for hazardous
4 waste?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Oh, yes. We have an EPA
6 and state ID number. We are required to -- I have to
7 actually sign the manifest to certify that this
8 material has been properly identified and that it's
9 going to a proper landfill.

10 I mean, it would be a major violation if we
11 failed to adequately categorize the waste and it ended
12 up in a general landfill.

13 Yes, Brad?

14 MR. WONG: I think it's great to get that
15 lead out.

16 What about the section on the -- getting the
17 lead out, yeah, delayed -- over towards the bridge
18 where I think there were a couple of intersecting
19 sections and it was proposed to put wood chips over
20 the area because of the high lead?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That was kind of the --
2 well, that came out in our original FOSL as a result
3 of the comments made. You know, we have gone out and
4 done some additional testing.

5 And like, for example, Sites 54, sample
6 Sites 54 and 55 are at the corner of the lawn closest
7 to the bridge and actually fall within the line that
8 we define as the IR site, although that line was
9 somewhat arbitrarily drawn. I think I sketched it on
10 a note to Sharon one time, and the next thing I knew
11 it was drawn on the map that way.

12 But at any rate, those -- well, Site 53
13 shows 993 parts per million, so that's a little higher
14 than you would expect on the lawn, except for the fact
15 that it is close to the bridge.

16 MR. WONG: For us laymen, can you just
17 interpret for me what that means? My reaction, then,
18 was just that you thought there might be some concern
19 and it was probably coming from the bridge, so you
20 would put wood chips on it.

1 My comment was, why don't you fence it off?
2 I don't know where it went from there.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And now we are looking
4 at just going ahead and doing like around the, like we
5 did around the -- these are bare areas of soil that
6 have been sampled, so I think at these levels, we
7 haven't made a decision yet. We are probably going to
8 take some soil out, like in that area of the 993 parts
9 per million, we would likely take some soil out of
10 there, too.

11 MR. WONG: Is that high? I don't know.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The HUD guidelines for
13 housing uses a level of 400 parts per million.

14 MR. WONG: Okay.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: There are some other
16 regulatory guidelines, too, but 400 is one target
17 that's used.

18 MR. ONGERTH: That's an upper limit?

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's an upper limit,
20 400 parts per million.

1 So it looks like the average in the soil
2 around this area is somewhere, even the average is
3 somewhere in the couple of hundred parts per million
4 which is done among all the areas that we tested.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Yes. Certainly when you
6 composite it, it will be.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So, anyway, we will
8 proceed in removing the soil in the planter and in
9 assessing the results that we got out on the lawn to
10 decide what actions we take out in the lawn areas.

11 We just got these the last couple of weeks
12 and haven't even had a chance to share it with the
13 regulators. So this is the first time we passed this
14 data out.

15 We are doing this as part of our housing
16 lead-based paint abatement. It's not part of the
17 CERCLA IR program.

18 Okay. Our next item was kind of -- maybe I
19 should turn it over to Pat, but it was to allow time
20 to discuss where we were in the remedial investigation

1 report comment process.

2 We had a workshop last Tuesday night, and, I
3 think, part of tonight's discussion was to determine
4 whether or not we needed to have a workshop next
5 Tuesday night.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's right.

7 I'm not quite sure where to begin, and
8 perhaps you might recall the mailing for the interim
9 meeting which occurred, I think, on the 4th of May, is
10 that right?

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And in that, we had
13 received a draft written response from the Navy to the
14 RAB comments we had submitted in January.

15 And speaking for myself, I prepared a memo
16 outlining my concern about the responses to the RAB
17 comments, and particularly as they related to the
18 immunoassay results and the data validity.

19 Last Tuesday we met with the agency
20 representatives of the RAB, the Navy, and PRC to talk

1 about one issue, and that was the data validity issue,
2 and also to discuss the Site 24 field work plan.

3 And at that meeting, I think the general
4 feeling of the meeting was that it was good to have
5 had this workshop where all parties could describe
6 their concerns and provide responses. So dialogue, I
7 think, really opened up on some of the data validity
8 issues. Although I don't think there was any
9 resolution to those issues that were brought up.

10 But one of the things that came out of the
11 meeting was the possibility of meeting to talk about
12 our Site 12, which we had identified as an issue, and
13 for which the Navy and PRC had prepared a supplemental
14 field work plan.

15 One of the things we would like to do here
16 tonight is decide whether or not we should go ahead
17 with that meeting on Tuesday the 27th and determine
18 other areas of interest to be discussed at the 27th
19 meeting or future meetings.

20 MS. KATHURIA: I thought I had the Site 12

1 work group on June 11th?

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Was that June 11th? I
3 can't remember.

4 I stand corrected.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Tuesday.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Let me double check my
7 notes.

8 MR. HEHN: I think one of the reasons why we
9 looked at the 11th as a Wednesday, too, was that we
10 wanted to give Martha Walters an opportunity to attend
11 that meeting.

12 I talked to her about that today. She would
13 not be available on the 10th. She had something
14 scheduled for the 11th, but she would not do that or
15 attend the meeting on the 11th. And we had the
16 discussion on Site 12, since the city is very
17 interested in that discussion.

18 MR. ALDRICH: Also, wouldn't the BCT have
19 discussed that already? Isn't that why we put it
20 after June because the regulators would have already

1 put in their comments and worked out some of the
2 details?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, also the draft of
4 the work plan, which originally we pegged to issue at
5 the end of this month, or on or about the 28th, the
6 revised date for the draft Site 12 work plan is about
7 the middle of June.

8 But even if there was a meeting on or about
9 the 11th, we would be pretty close to having the draft
10 out, so if there was a desire to have the meeting, we
11 would still be in a position to have some discussion
12 of it similar to the way we were able to discuss the
13 Site 24 work plan about a week before we actually were
14 issued the draft.

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's right. I'm sorry.

16 On the 27th I think what we had, and correct
17 me if I'm wrong, I had in my notes the RI addenda
18 would be discussed on the 27th.

19 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Essentially what we
20 discussed in last Tuesday's meeting were related

1 primarily to data issues.

2 MR. WONG: Yes. I had the 27th as a
3 question mark.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It wasn't firm.

5 MR. WONG: But the 11th was because of
6 Martha Walters.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Any discussion or comments
8 on this?

9 Is there an interest in another workshop on
10 the 27th?

11 MR. WONG: You said the proposed topic there
12 was addendum 4?

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: The RI addenda, which
14 would be on 4.

15 MR. WONG: But this item we just talked
16 about --

17 MR. ALDRICH: No, no. That's the Site 12
18 workshop for additional sampling?

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes. I think the 11th of
20 June was the sampling plan for Site 12.

1 MS. CASSA: The 27th is the addenda.

2 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, would either of
3 these meetings take the place of --

4 MR. WONG: Which addenda, the one we just
5 had a presentation of?

6 MS. KATHURIA: All of them.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: All of them.

8 MR. WONG: Okay.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: There are four addenda:
10 Number one is the groundwater modeling
11 results.

12 Number two is the additional investigation
13 of Sites 12 and 17.

14 Three is the TPH toxicity testing results.

15 And addenda 4 is the revised RI
16 recommendations and conclusions, and I know it's
17 getting late. It's hard to keep track.

18 MR. WONG: And I guess what I'm getting at
19 is that, in the wake of coming off of a holiday, I
20 think Paul brought up the point of how the addenda

1 will be worked into the RI once it starts getting
2 complete, and that, I think, we answered a lot of
3 this.

4 You will have to go back into the addenda if
5 the initial data was not accurate or whatever, the
6 assumptions in the RI were not accurate.

7 So since that's something that's going to
8 take place down the road, I guess, would there not be
9 an opportunity close to that time to review this
10 rather than a day after the holiday?

11 I'm not sure we are talking about the same
12 addenda, but I thought we addressed some of the
13 process there, so we would know when might be a better
14 time.

15 MS. CASSA: Well, maybe I can help explain.

16 Typically there is a report issued. It's
17 issued as a draft. It's reissued as a draft final.
18 And then it's finalized as a final.

19 So the RI report was delivered somewhat
20 incomplete as a draft.

1 These addenda have been prepared and then
2 everything will be put together in the draft final.

3 So if it were one small, regular little
4 document, if you bypass an opportunity to have some
5 meeting discussions about these addenda, then you will
6 be putting it off until the draft final, and that's
7 not typically a time when meeting discussions take
8 place.

9 MR. WONG: Then I think that answers the
10 question.

11 MR. HEHN: Well, I think there are a number
12 of issues that have to be discussed at some point
13 about those addenda.

14 And so, I guess, the question is whether
15 that seems to be more appropriately done in another
16 interim meeting to try to resolve some of those issues
17 earlier on or wait until the draft final comes out.

18 MR. ONGERTH: We've had part of this
19 discussion once before, and my recollection is that
20 there was a general thought that these matters should

1 be discussed at the earliest possible time, not wait
2 until the very end of the process.

3 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

4 MR. ONGERTH: I thought we agreed upon that.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes, I think we did.

6 There will be, I guess, as in the month of
7 May, four consecutive, or at least three consecutive,
8 from here on out, before the next RAB meeting, the
9 27th, the 3rd of June, and then a workshop on the
10 11th, prior to the next RAB meeting, which is on the
11 17th of June.

12 So that's quite a few meetings. I don't
13 know how.

14 If we meet on the 27th, do we want to forego
15 the 3rd, or do we not want to forego the 27th and then
16 meet on the 3rd? I don't know how many people will be
17 gone for that holiday.

18 MR. ALDRICH: Well, basically, I think it
19 depends on the points brought up by Brad and Paul. If
20 we wait until June is that going to be too late to do?

1 Basically, if we had the meeting to go over our
2 comments on the addenda and address the comments on
3 the addenda, if the draft final is going to be out by
4 then, by the time of the meeting, it will be past the
5 point to discuss our input and us getting answers
6 about it, then that's going to mean, from what Mary
7 was just saying, it's like it's not polite to comment
8 on major issues in the draft final.

9 So we have to pick a date based on when the
10 answers we get either satisfy us or we want more
11 answers or further investigation on the comments to
12 the addenda.

13 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And as I understand it,
14 the draft final RI will be issued sometime in July.

15 MR. HEHN: July 22nd.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: July 22nd, and then we
17 would have 60 days to review.

18 MR. ALDRICH: Well, basically, it depends on
19 how much time Jim needs to, and the PRC needs, to put
20 it all together for the draft final.

1 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

2 MR. ALDRICH: If another week doesn't
3 matter, then I would rather wait until June. I'm
4 meeting'd out this month.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

6 MR. ALDRICH: And after the holiday weekend,
7 it would be a nice bonus.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes. I think it's
9 something we can accommodate, so that we can, rather
10 than have the 27th meeting right after the holiday, we
11 could have that workshop on the 3rd.

12 MR. ALDRICH: As long as you can meet, that
13 would be great.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But the comments, well,
15 are we going to be able to, Ernie, are we going to be
16 able to extend the comments for the RI, the addenda 4
17 until another week to coincide with that meeting?

18 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Well, right now, we have
19 two of the addenda having comments due this Friday,
20 and the other two comments due the following Tuesday.

1 I don't know if there is a lot to be gained
2 by extending.

3 MR. HEHN: There might be some value to have
4 those comments available, or at least our comments,
5 written comments available to the Navy and PRC so that
6 they have a chance to review those prior to the
7 meeting and then be prepared to discuss those.

8 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

9 MR. HEHN: And then if there are other
10 comments that come out as a result of the June 3rd
11 meeting, it might be captured as well.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Right.

13 I think we have an obligation to meet those
14 deadlines.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So we would hold the
16 comment dates on the addenda, but then have the
17 meeting, it would be one week after the last comment
18 period for the addenda on the 3rd of June, and no
19 meeting on the 27th.

20 And then there would still likely be a

1 meeting related to the Site 12 work plan on the 11th.

2 MR. ALDRICH: We are still going to get to
3 this, right (indicating)?

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

5 MR. ALDRICH: And we put the dates down?

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

7 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Okay. We beat that one to
8 death, I think.

9 Well, we need to identify, I guess we will,
10 in the next, other business, where those meetings will
11 be.

12 MR. ALDRICH: Well, if you already said June
13 11th, Site 12 workshop, can we do that at PG&E?

14 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Yes, we can do that at
15 PG&E. Same location, Room 2420.

16 MR. ALDRICH: And we have a conference room
17 at a building about a block and a half from BART in
18 Berkeley in my building that I can check into for
19 maybe June 3rd.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That would be great.

1 MR. ALDRICH: And it's an easy commute by
2 public transit. There is plenty of parking. In fact,
3 if you get there right at 6:00, the meters just open
4 up on the whole side at the rush hour.

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All right. So it sounds
6 like we have some options for both the 3rd and the
7 11th. We will work out the details and then send out
8 the location in the meeting announcement. Okay.
9 Great.

10 Move into, quickly move into program
11 updates.

12 Actually, we were discussing, our BCT
13 meeting, RPM BCT meeting this last month was a pretty
14 generalized meeting. We basically went over the
15 schedule, the schedule for the IR sites.

16 We had some discussion of Site 12, and kind
17 of just a general update of where we were. So not
18 anything out of the ordinary. The meeting minutes for
19 that meeting should be out within about two weeks.

20 Anything that anybody wanted to add?

1 I'm sorry. I was going to turn it over to
2 Rachel.

3 MS. SIMONS: Well, I would like to make an
4 announcement. I was hoping it would be earlier in the
5 night.

6 I'm actually going to be leaving the
7 project, and I am leaving EPA as well to go back to
8 school.

9 I will definitely be here for the June
10 meeting, and I'm not sure about July at this point.

11 I just wanted to say -- there is not many
12 people left, I think, at this point -- but I wanted to
13 say that I really enjoyed being on the RAB, and I
14 learned a lot. Although at times it's been
15 challenging, I think it's always been very
16 interesting.

17 So I really, I actually have to say, I
18 really learned a lot. I mean, in a way that, I don't
19 know, sort of opening my mind to different
20 perspectives on things, which I think that if I hadn't

1 had the community, you know, dealing with the
2 community, I wouldn't have gotten. I would just be
3 sitting at my desk reviewing documents.

4 But I did want to make, assure you that
5 definitely somebody will be taking my place.
6 Unfortunately, there may be a month or two gap between
7 when I leave and the new person comes on. I have been
8 trying to say how important it is that somebody takes
9 my place, but along with Gina and Mary Rose, politics
10 are probably going to take the place of that, I mean,
11 govern what happens there.

12 MR. ALDRICH: Is it for certain you will be
13 replaced?

14 MS. SIMONS: Yes.

15 MR. ALDRICH: A major regulator shake-up.

16 We may want to include that that's another
17 reason, at least for some length of time, to keep DTSC
18 on board.

19 MS. SIMONS: Yes. I'm supposed to give you
20 two weeks' notice. I'm giving like three months'

1 notice. I thought that would be enough to organize
2 it.

3 But, yes, I could talk to my supervisor.
4 One thing that I may ask is just to have him come for
5 those two months that I'm not there.

6 CO-CHAIR NELSON: On behalf of the RAB, we
7 would like to express our appreciation for your
8 participation. It's been a big commitment to come
9 here in the evening, I know.

10 MS. SIMONS: It's only been three and a half
11 years.

12 CO-CHAIR NELSON: We wish you the best in
13 your new student . . .

14 MS. SIMONS: A change of pace.

15 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, you'll only be
16 down at Stanford. You won't be that far.

17 MS. SIMONS: Yes.

18 MR. ALDRICH: And partying with Chelsea.

19 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Maybe we could give Rachel
20 a round of applause.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. SIMONS: Thank you.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Under reuse issues, I
4 don't think I have anything new, although I have
5 talked with Larry Floren, who is the mayor's project
6 manager for the Treasure Island conversion.

7 He has agreed to attend one of our future
8 RAB meetings. I think I will encourage him to attend
9 next month's meeting when we discuss the housing FOSL.
10 The housing is a real high interest to the city, and I
11 wanted to give him the opportunity to, so we could
12 hear it directly from the city for them to articulate,
13 you know, why they want to move the housing into reuse
14 as soon as possible, and it would kind of set the
15 stage for both the Zone 3 FOSL and the Zone 4 FOSL.
16 So it's likely he will attend our next meeting.

17 MR. ALDRICH: Just a point of clarification.

18 Is Martha still with the Department of
19 Public Health, or is she now with Larry Floren's, with
20 the project, or is she with the Redevelopment Agency?

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The answer is all of the
2 above. I can't speak for the city organization, but,
3 basically, she kind of has a foot in a couple of
4 different offices.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Okay.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: But one of the feet is
7 in the Department of Health along with Gina.

8 MR. ALDRICH: She has a lot of feet.

9 MS. KATHURIA: Yes. I work part-time for
10 the Water Board and I work part-time for the San
11 Francisco Department of Public Health, so I do what
12 Martha does at Hunter's Point Navy Shipyard.

13 MR. ONGERTH: How long has that been that
14 way?

15 MS. KATHURIA: Since November of last year.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. Under action
17 items, I updated the list that I had passed out in
18 March, and so I will just pass that around. I think
19 probably the most notable items are, the Naval station
20 did award a GIS demonstration project to Mare Island,

1 which is a group of Navy engineers working up at the
2 former shipyard, and it's sort of a partial answer to
3 some of Paul's questions about the USTs. And the
4 sites that we're going to use for the demonstrations
5 are primarily in Zone 1, include the tanks around both
6 Building 1 and Building 227 -- I think I had 201 there
7 and it might be 227. I think it should be 227 instead
8 of 201.

9 But at any rate, the tanks are more on the
10 western side of the island, as well as YBI 270, which
11 is probably our most significant non-IR UST site.

12 So we kind of went from the extreme of
13 Building 1, where the tanks are not that large, to
14 Building 270 in YB Island, where we have a fairly
15 significant plume that we are tracking.

16 So that demonstration project is underway.
17 I had a project meeting with the Mare Island engineers
18 yesterday, and we will probably be in a position to do
19 a demonstration, probably initial demonstration maybe
20 at next month's meeting, and we may, actually, this

1 whole project may not take that long. We may actually
2 have the whole project wrapped up by the July meeting.

3 MR. ALDRICH: So we will be able to click on
4 a site and get all the data on it?

5 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

6 These are sites that have a fairly small
7 amount of data associated with them. That's why we
8 are using it as a demonstration site.

9 And, in part, this is kind of a springboard
10 into data management for the IR sites. We haven't
11 finalized the scope of work for that. It is still
12 within the '97 program. At this point, we will
13 probably award the contract for IR data management in
14 around the July time frame, about the time we have the
15 demonstration project out.

16 Administrative record items, we did provide
17 a draft list of the UST and fuel line documents. So
18 if anyone has any commentary toward that, not
19 necessarily at this meeting, but I did say that we
20 would provide a draft listing of other compliance

1 documents this month, but it's going to have to be
2 next month. We got kind of off schedule because of
3 the base closure.

4 Yes, John?

5 MR. ALDRICH: I have a question about the
6 UST document.

7 Are there any numbers on the document
8 associated with that table?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Right, and that's what
10 the difference is.

11 The information repository system is really
12 based on CERCLA. So where you have a UST site that's
13 not part of the CERCLA site, the documents have no
14 numbering system.

15 MR. ALDRICH: Well, because my impression
16 was that the information repository encapsulated
17 everything else that came with the UST program.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Actually, the
19 information repository is actually geared toward the
20 CERCLA program, but we have included some other

1 documents. I mean, that's something I think we may
2 have to get into a more detailed discussion on, but
3 the information repository can be kind of broad as
4 opposed to the admin record, which is fairly, you
5 know, tightly defined around CERCLA.

6 How broadly we define the information
7 repository hasn't really been determined.

8 But in answer to your question, the short
9 answer is, right now the UST documents do not have
10 document numbers.

11 MR. ALDRICH: They could, though, right?

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: They could, though it
13 would probably be a separate numbering system from the
14 admin record numbers. It would probably have to be a
15 separate numbering.

16 Budget, we are close to being able to
17 provide some information on the '97 budget. There is
18 some potential changes to it, but I don't have
19 management authorization as of today to discuss it
20 because it's still subject to some adjustment.

1 But it's likely that our budget will undergo
2 some adjustment in part due to the South Dakota
3 floods, but it's not going to affect reuse because we
4 have been trying to keep those items, like asbestos
5 abatement, well funded, but it might affect the
6 schedule for some of our further out items, like parts
7 of the feasibility study.

8 But none of that has been finalized yet, so
9 probably by either the interim meeting on the -- well,
10 now, probably almost certainly by the interim meeting
11 on the 11th, we will have more official budget
12 notification after we talk to the regulators. But
13 it's still, at this point, internal to the Navy.

14 BTAG, we don't have any new information on
15 BTAG.

16 MS. VEDAGIRI: What does that mean? I mean,
17 I feel that whole question of the sediment quality
18 values comes up and disappears once every three
19 months.

20 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's a tag.

1 MS. SIMONS: I don't know. I don't know if
2 they are still working. Are they still doing that?

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, I don't know.

4 MR. GALANG: We have a, right now, we have a
5 draft of the guidelines, so to take another, maybe, 30
6 to 60 days before they can put out the draft for the
7 regulators to review.

8 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it's still internal
9 to the Navy, and then it will be released to the
10 regulators in about 60 days.

11 And then we have been working with, Hugo has
12 been working with Dan McDonald on advertising for new
13 membership. We have a draft advertisement out, but
14 maybe we need to kind of finalize that and get it
15 launched.

16 CO-CHAIR NELSON: Do we have a publication
17 schedule?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, I think once we
19 just agree on the advertisement, then we have to
20 contract for the publication.

1 At this point, today, it means that probably
2 we could get published in the Chronicle and Examiner
3 until sometime in June.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: June, okay.

5 MR. ALDRICH: Since we are getting a budget
6 cut, we had talked about combining Hunter's Point and
7 Treasure Island recruiting into one ad. Was that ever
8 followed up on?

9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No.

10 The suggestion was made, but we hadn't
11 finalized our advertisement. But I think, you know,
12 that's a point well-taken.

13 If we are going to go ahead with the
14 advertisement, then we can consult with Hunter's
15 Point.

16 MR. ALDRICH: Have they listed one yet,
17 recently?

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Pardon?

19 MR. ALDRICH: Have they listed one yet,
20 recently?

1 MS. LUPTON: They just had a list of 25 new
2 members come on about a year ago, but there is some
3 attrition, too.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So if there is an
5 opportunity to include them in the advertisement, we
6 can do that, if they want to.

7 And then we had a briefing by DTSC on
8 property transfer issues. We were going to ask the
9 city to discuss reuse issues, and that may happen next
10 month, then, if Larry Floren attends the meeting.

11 And, then, lastly, an ongoing issue is UST
12 decision making process. We need to work with Gina on
13 that.

14 Organizational business?

15 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I don't think there is
16 anything of organizational business that can't be
17 deferred until next month.

18 But I would like to take this opportunity to
19 thank Jim Sullivan and the Navy for inviting the RAB
20 members to the closing ceremony. There are pictures

1 out by the refreshments tonight, and it was really
2 quite an occasion. Many of the RAB members have been
3 a buzz with nothing but compliments. They wanted to
4 relay them to you, Jim, in particular, and to the Navy
5 as a whole.

6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thank you.

7 Upcoming document review. The schedule was
8 attached to the meeting agenda. I think I just want
9 to quickly go through it, because it looks like we may
10 have some minor adjustments.

11 Site 12 and 17 additional investigation.
12 That comment period has already passed.

13 The groundwater monitoring and revised RI
14 recommendations, we had agreed to hold that until the
15 27th of May.

16 TPH tox, we were closing the comments on
17 that tonight, as well as -- now, the draft 1 FOSL, we
18 agreed to extend that until the end of this week,
19 which is the --

20 MS. VEDAGIRI: I thought the TPH tox was

1 this Friday also.

2 MR. ALDRICH: Yes. I thought all of these
3 were Friday.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, the 27th has
5 already past this Friday.

6 But if we already agreed to extend, the TPH
7 tox was the 23rd.

8 MR. ALDRICH: The same with 12 and 17, is my
9 understanding from Paul.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And you think there
11 still may be some incoming comments for Sites 12 and
12 17?

13 MR. ALDRICH: Yes.

14 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Now, this additional
15 investigation is not for the, for Site 12, is not the
16 same as the other, the upcoming Site 12 work plan.

17 MR. ALDRICH: Right. I know. But I have
18 spent a lot of time reviewing it. I didn't bring it
19 up tonight because I thought we had until this Friday.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. If I made that

1 commitment, then it's the 23rd.

2 MR. ALDRICH: Thank you very much.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then the draft Zone
4 2 FOSL, it's, again, we had it pegged as the 17th,
5 which is the RAB night. But if there is enough of a
6 feeling, if you want to add a couple of days to that
7 to make it the Friday of that week, that would be the
8 20th of June.

9 So Zone 2 FOSL would be the 20th of June,
10 the Friday before the RAB meeting month.

11 And then I'm still working with our UST RPM,
12 and we will have to work with Gina on the schedule for
13 some of these UST documents, which are outside of the
14 IR program.

15 So right now, I don't have firm dates. Some
16 of you may have received draft final UST investigation
17 and the draft IR work plan for 270, so I need to send
18 out a notice on the due dates for those. But they are
19 not as tight as the IR site dates.

20 Then flipping to the back page, the Site 24

1 investigation work plan, the availability date on that
2 now is going to be more like the middle of --

3 MR. GALANG: No, Friday.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. I was
5 thinking of Site 12.

6 It was -- it did come out and it is
7 available. We needed to close out the comments on
8 that on the 29th. We are holding that to a shorter
9 period of time, so we can get out into the field
10 earlier.

11 MR. GALANG: To get the money back.

12 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So for Site 24, it's the
13 29th of May, and that went out in the letter to those
14 who received it.

15 MR. GALANG: Yes.

16 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then the Site 12
17 investigation work plan, it will be around mid-June,
18 and that would make the due date around mid-July for
19 Site 12, because we don't have the funding for that
20 yet, the investigation.

1 MR. GALANG: We have to wait for the work
2 plan.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes.

4 But we still will probably allow about 30
5 days for the work plan for that, for Site 12, so that
6 will be mid-July for the Site 12 investigation work
7 plan.

8 And then the draft 3 and 4 FOSLs, those are
9 about the same, about the 30-day schedules.

10 And those two dates, 22 July and 19 August,
11 are not already the Friday of the meeting month, then
12 we can adjust those to that Friday.

13 And the draft Corrective Action Plan, we
14 don't have a firm date for the release of that. It
15 will probably be sometime in July.

16 MR. GALANG: Right. July is the pre-draft,
17 and we will ask ID to review it and then get some
18 comments. So it will be September before it will go
19 out to regulators for review.

20 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: So it won't even be

1 available, the CAP won't even be available until
2 September.

3 MR. GALANG: Correct.

4 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then the draft final
5 RI report is still projected to be available on the
6 22nd of July.

7 Skip over the proposed agenda items for next
8 meeting. It's pretty well set that we will have, of
9 course, we will have the Zone 3 YBI housing FOSL, and
10 we may be adding in some areas of the TI housing into
11 Zone 3. That's still to be determined.

12 And then we wanted to provide a brief,
13 probably a fairly brief presentation on our fuel line
14 removal project, which we had the initial kickoff
15 meeting with the contractor yesterday.

16 So the contractor will probably be in the
17 field in about 30 days, sometime by the middle of
18 June, just around the time of our next meeting.

19 And then we're going to talk about probably
20 EBS data and interim uses, but we will have to

1 finalize the agenda.

2 CO-CHAIR NELSON: June 3.

3 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, now it won't be
4 June 3rd.

5 CO-CHAIR NELSON: I thought we were going to
6 have a June 3rd meeting.

7 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yes, I'm sorry; at the
8 June 3rd meeting.

9 CO-CHAIR NELSON: It's getting late.

10 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. I think, then,
11 July schedule, I think now with the CAP not being
12 until September, we will make some adjustments.

13 Although I think probably just even the
14 Reuse Zone 4, TI housing, Site 12, will probably be a
15 fairly major item for the July meeting.

16 Okay. Next regular meeting will be on the
17 17th of June. There is probably a 50/50 chance it
18 will either be in this building or next door in the
19 bachelor quarters.

20 The July meeting, we are proposing to change

1 to the fourth Tuesday of the month, but we can
2 finalize that at the interim meeting, and even at the
3 next regular meeting because Ernie and I will be out
4 of town during the third week in July for a -- as well
5 as some of the regulators -- for maybe a BRAC Cleanup
6 Team conference in Southern California.

7 And then our next meeting, then, we won't
8 have a workshop, or interim meeting won't be on the
9 27th but on the 3rd of June, so no meeting of any kind
10 on the 27th of May.

11 CO-CHAIR NELSON: That's right, and we'll
12 need to get meeting location information from John.

13 MR. ALDRICH: I'll check that. I will call
14 both of you.

15 MR. GALANG: Jim, another document that's
16 coming out this Friday is the groundwater report.
17 That's just for information.

18 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: That's just an
19 informational report.

20 MR. GALANG: Information only.

1 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And then that will be
2 automatically going out to a couple of the community
3 members.

4 CO-CHAIR NELSON: And something else that
5 has been distributed here. Paul Hehn has taken the
6 time and effort to prepare comments on all of the
7 addenda. Each of you should have a copy.

8 I want to thank Paul for preparing those and
9 getting those in order for us this evening.

10 MR. HEHN: You're welcome.

11 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Well, with that, we will
12 close what may or may not be our last meeting in the
13 Nimitz Center. Thank you very much.

14 (The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.)

15 ---o0o---

16

17

18

19

20

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

Stephen Balloni