

5090
Ser 6225/L8068
4 Dec 1997

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity, West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Encl: (1) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes - 21 October 1997

1. Enclosure (1) is the approved and final Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes and is provided for your file and information
2. Thank you for your guidance and involvement in this project. For further information, please call me at (650) 244-2560.

Originated by:

ERNESTO M. GALANG
By direction of
the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Mr. David Rist)
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Ms. Francesca D'Onofrio)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Mr. David Leland)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (Attn: Mr. James Ricks, Jr.)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (Attn: Ms. Martha Walters)
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Mr. Richard Knapp)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. James Aldrich	Mr. Rick Nedell
Mr. John Allman	Ms. Patricia Nelson (Co-Chair)
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Mr. Richard Hansen	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Paul Hehn (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Mr. Gary Jensen	TI Museum (Ms. Laurie Glass)
Ms. Alice LaPierre	TI Yacht Club (Mr. Harlan Van Wye)
Mr. Clinton Loftman	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Mr. Daniel McDonald	Mr. Brad Wong

5090
Ser 6225/L8068
4 Dec 1997

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS) FOR
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND (NAVSTA TI)

Blind copies to:
622A(JS), 6221(w/o encl) 6225EG, 64
Information Repository (3 copies).
Chron, RF
Writer: E. Galang, 6225EG, X-2560
File: NS Treasure Island

**NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, 21 October 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 21 October 1997 at 7:28 p.m. at the Building 1, 2nd Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) approve the agenda and meeting minutes, 2) discuss the Zone 4 FOSL Draft Response to Comments, 3) discuss the Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Data Summary, 4) discuss the Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, 5) provide general program updates, 6) review action items, 7) attend to organizational business, 8) review the upcoming environmental report schedule, and 9) provide open questions and discussion, and 10) review the proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings.

These minutes summarize topics discussed during the RAB meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A, the attendance list is provided as Attachment B and the meeting handouts are provided as Attachment C.

I. Welcome Remarks

James B. Sullivan, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy Co-chair, welcomed meeting attendees. He noted that this is the first RAB meeting held since the Naval Station Treasure Island officially closed on September 30, 1997. Due to the presence of several guests and prospective new RAB members, Mr. Sullivan initiated a round of introductions of the RAB members, as well as members of the public in the audience. Mr. Michael Gross and Mr. Jim Rodriguez introduced themselves as RAB applicants.

Mary Rose Cassa, Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), announced that she would be transferring to the NAS Alameda BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) as project manager for her agency. She stated it is unknown who will replace her as project manager for TI, but added that she hoped for a smooth transition and that she had enjoyed working with the TI RAB.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

There were no comments on the agenda and so it was approved as written.

Discussion/Approval of Minutes

Mr. Sullivan stated that more Navy time is being spent on reviewing the meeting minutes prior to release of the draft. Dale Smith asked to be referred to as "Ms. Smith" in the August meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan stated he would try to be consistent in the use of "Ms." and "Mr." in the meeting minutes. There being no other comments, the draft August minutes were approved.

Alice LaPierre asked for the identification of the "group" for housing mentioned by Lary Florin on

Page 3 of the September minutes. Mr. Sullivan stated that the identity of the group had not yet been made public, and that he did not know either. Ms. Cassa noted two corrections in the draft September meeting minutes: to replace the word "toxicologist" with "scientist", and a misspelling of the word "ecotoxicological". John Allman requested clarification on the kind of "scientist", which in the interest of time, Mr. Sullivan said could be further discussed outside of the meeting proceedings. The draft September meeting minutes were approved as modified.

II. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public. Ms. Cassa provided an informational sheet on MTBE, and noted that the National Center for Environmental Assessment has an interesting Website at WWW.EPA.GOV/NCEA.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

III. Zone 4 FOSL Draft Response to Comments

Mr. Sullivan distributed a color map to each RAB member showing the entire lead data of Zone 4. Ms. Smith asked why there are no similar maps for Zones 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Sullivan noted that each of the FOSL's contain maps, however, this map was specially prepared to address lead at Zone 4. He noted that the Nimitz Complex FOSL was never finalized, but will likely have a similar map prepared.

Mr. Sullivan also distributed the Navy's draft response to comments from Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, on the draft Site Specific Environmental Baseline Survey and draft FOSL for Reuse Zone 4. Ms. Smith asked if this information will go into the information repository. Mr. Sullivan responded that the EBS and FOSL process are not a part of the Administrative Record because they are not CERCLA-related. The Navy response to comments will be part of the information repository, however, because it is a part of the RAB meeting minutes. Regulatory agency draft response to comments were also distributed.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the Navy draft response to Ms. Nelson's comments (Attachment C). Additional comments can be taken at the next interim meeting. The Navy would then like to finalize the Zone 4 FOSL.

Response to General Comment 1 regarding non-petroleum contaminants observed in IR Site 6 and noting that the site is a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) site: Low levels of non-petroleum contaminants have been detected and the Navy, at the request of the regulators, will continue to monitor for both petroleum and non-petroleum contaminants in IR Site 6. The Navy will note this monitoring and identify Site 6 as a CAP site in the Zone 4 FOSL.

Response to General Comment 2 regarding the data collection process for IR Site 12: As a result of considerable RAB comment, the Navy will be taking additional sampling for IR Site 12 later this month. A grid will be established and data will be provided for the entire site. Data will be gathered for those areas lacking information. The Navy believes that the process is expected to confirm that there are no additional issues on the site. Site 12 housing will not be rented to the City until after the first of the year or later, providing enough time to collect the additional data. The Navy proposes modifying language in the draft FOSL to make occupancy contingent on the results from the additional Site 12 sampling.

Response to General Comment 3 regarding similar concerns for IR Site 20 on data deficiencies and disclosure in the text of the site being dropped from the CERCLA program: The site was moved into the UST Corrective Action Plan Program, although low levels of non-petroleum contaminants have been detected. The Navy will continue to monitor the non-petroleum chemicals in the groundwater. This will be noted in the FOSL.

Response to Specific Comment 1 regarding the process for the Risk Evaluation: The data to date is being driven by the groundwater and by aquatic receptors. The FOSL would contain a prohibition of use of groundwater by humans. If additional data collected from IR Site 12 shows lower concentrations than those collected to date, then the human health risk assessment would not be expected to change. Higher concentrations would require reevaluation of the risk; the data will be available prior to occupancy.

Response to Specific Comment 2 regarding lead concerns: All of the lead data, at the request of the RAB, has been plotted on a map, representing data collected from two programs - the Remedial Investigation, and sampling around the drip lines conducted under HUD guidelines. The Risk Assessment from the FOSL identified two cut-off points: the value for prohibiting gardening is 463 ppm lead and the value for allowing gardening is 216 ppm lead.

Tom Thompson asked if it is historically known what activities lead to levels recorded higher than 463 ppm. Mr. Sullivan noted that these high value areas are limited and dispersed in the site, and may indicate they are anomalies. A paint chip in the sample may be the cause for the one multi-thousand value reported. He added that the area was originally used as a parking lot for the World's Fair, and later part of the site was used for ammunition bunkers, as well as for disposal of debris material that may have contained oils and other contaminants.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy has not reached a decision point on whether or not to restrict gardening. Restriction of gardening is the more conservative approach, and could be removed later when more data is available. It would be more difficult to impose a restriction later if gardening is initially allowed. Brad Wong asked how the gardening issue coincides with the presence of children. Mr. Sullivan replied that children were the driving factor in calculating the safe lead levels of 216 ppm and 463 ppm. It is a backwards calculation from the safe level of lead in blood for a child to the maximum allowable level of lead in the soil. He noted that 400 ppm is the general guidance value used by HUD for housing.

Ms. Smith questioned why the minutes of the RPM/BCT meeting recommend the housing be used only by students or non-procreative occupants. Mr. Sullivan responded that student housing was recommended rather than long-term housing because there are still areas that will require remediation. It will be more difficult to remediate if people occupy the housing long-term. Mr. Sullivan also stated that discussion of non-procreative occupancy predated the generation of the lead level data and the risk assessment in the FOSL. He noted that the lead data was based on the Phase I and Phase II sampling, and the HUD sampling taken in 1996.

Ms. Smith questioned when the lead level data was generated and that she was having problems tracking the dates. Mr. Sullivan replied that the risk assessment was done in July of 1997 for the August 1997 Zone 4 FOSL draft, but that references such as the 1992 Site 12 Preliminary Risk Assessment were also used.

Mr. Sullivan proposed that discussion of the response to comments be included on the next interim meeting agenda. Ms. Nelson suggested discussing how to respond to the Navy responses at the interim meeting, and considering an additional meeting if necessary. Mr. Hehn noted that the RAB would have an additional point to comment on when the new data comes in from IR Site 12 sampling. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the validated data would not be available until late December, but that the preliminary data could be reviewed sooner, with the understanding that the preliminary data will not be considered definitive.

IV. Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Data Summary

Edward Ho, a Tetra Tech project engineer, provided a review of the contents of the draft CAP for petroleum sites to be submitted to the regulatory agencies and the RAB next month. He stated that the document covers seven sites originally part of the CERCLA investigation. No significant concentrations of contaminants, other than petroleum products, were found at these sites. Since CERCLA is not designed to cover petroleum-only sites, they were grouped together and placed into the CAP program in early 1996.

Mr. Ho explained that the CAP contains both of the functions of the Remedial Investigation (RI) and the Feasibility Study (FS). It presents the site background, a summarization of previous investigations, identification of areas of concern, screening and analysis of remedial technologies, and recommendation of remedial alternatives for each site. When approved, the document will enable the Navy to remediate the sites more efficiently and promptly and release the sites for public use.

Mr. Ho noted that the CAP document contains eight sections: 1) an executive summary and introduction, 2) general background, such as geology, ecology, climate, and operations, 3) individual site backgrounds which include physical site characteristics and historic operations, 4) human and ecological risk screening, 5) results of the screening and of previous investigations to define areas of concern, 6) screening of process options and remedial technologies to determine which are most appropriate for more detailed analysis, 7) examination of each of the remedial technologies in greater

detail specific to TI conditions using the criteria of effectiveness, implementability and cost, and 8) presentation of the recommended remedial alternatives for each site. Once the CAP is submitted for review, the RAB will be asked to submit comments which will be included in the final CAP document. Following approval of the final document, the Navy will proceed to detailed engineering design for the sites.

Ms. Nelson asked if the Navy was going to describe the data or give an in-depth summary of the data and what will be included in the report. Mr. Ho responded that the CAP contains much data that is summarized in the appendices. Mr. Sullivan asked the RAB if the data from the CAP would be valuable in evaluating the CERCLA sites. The CAP data has been validated and can be provided to the RAB Technical Subcommittee.

Ms. Smith expressed concern that the data does not always accompany the documents and would like to see it contained as appendices. Usha Vedagiri and Ms. Nelson both agreed that it would be helpful to have the data associated with the sites accompany the document. Ms. Vedagiri asked if the CAP ecological risk screening relies on the ecotoxicity testing for TPH and whether it includes all the comments received on that report. Mr. Ho indicated that the ecological risk screening does rely on the ecotoxicity testing for TPH. He added that the numbers have not officially changed, however, in the event the numbers do change, the document will be revised to reflect the new numbers. Mr. Hehn commented that the validated data information would be valuable if it is tied to the sites, and recommended a map to show where the data was collected. Mr. Sullivan agreed to provide a map that contains the data points. Ms. Nelson noted the consensus to have the CAP data to aid in the review of the draft final RI.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the RAB needs information beyond the data extracted from the lab data sheets and presented in tabular form. Ms. Nelson noted there are a lot of footnotes with the tabularized data, but it is helpful to see the chromatograms and how the data is quantified. Mr. Ho noted that comments from the lab are generally incorporated into the tables. Harlan Van Wye stated that what the RAB would like to see is data presented in a useful form, not so scant that it is meaningless and not so overwhelming that it is difficult to review. Ms. Smith reiterated her concern that the raw data does not accompany the documents.

Mr. Hehn noted that the CAP contains seven sites but recalled nine actual sites removed from CERCLA. Mr. Sullivan clarified that two sites (4/19 and 14/22) were paired because they are co-located, and this will be shown in the map. Ms. Nelson stated that the usefulness of the lab data sheets is to review for calibration errors and to determine the quality of the data, and that she might want to request some for review. Mr. Hehn asked if the laboratory certificates for the analysis are retained, to which Mr. Ho nodded yes. Ms. Smith expressed a concern that the raw data is not accompanying the documents, and that a developer or some other entity may want to see that raw data in the future. Mr. Hehn stated the need to clarify that the CAP only deals with the seven/nine sites and does not involve the USTs or fuel-related removal actions or investigations. Mr. Sullivan added that this CAP represents only those IR sites taken out of the CERCLA program, but that there are other smaller USTs and the fuel lines that will also have

separate CAP documents. Mr. Hehn asked if there would be a compilation of all the CAP site information into one document. Mr. Ho stated there were presently no plans to publish all the CAP information in one volume. Mr. Sullivan noted that the CAP for some sites represented a grouping of USTs or fuel lines that are co-located. Ms. Cassa pointed out that all the CAP data will be included in the Geographic Information System (GIS).

V. Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report Discussion

Ms. Nelson stated that an interim meeting was held last week to discuss the RAB's preliminary findings in review of the draft final RI report. She noted the concern that many of the RAB comments on the draft RI had not been responded to by the Navy, and so many of those comments will also apply to the draft final version. She stated that the RAB has spent much time documenting their concerns and working with the Navy, Tetra Tech EM Inc., and the regulators to resolve issues. She pointed out that there have been some successes, such as the additional testing for IR Site 12. She thanked the Navy and regulatory agencies for considering the RAB's recommendation for this additional testing. Ms. Cassa asked for clarification on whether the RAB found the Navy to be non-responsive to comments because they did not create a response document or because they did not find responses to their comments in the text of the document. Ms. Nelson stated that the RAB had found both instances to be true, citing as an example her request to include data on IR-Site 6 in the report, but which was not provided. Mr. Hehn pointed out an additional success of the RAB regarding the Nimitz House additional sampling, noting that the Navy responded appropriately to that issue.

Mr. Hehn asked the status of the Navy providing a written response to RAB comments on the RI. Mr. Sullivan stated that he has put together one response to a comment from the addenda, and will be working on the rest of the comments. The projected schedule for completion of the Navy's response to comments is mid-November. They will be providing a comment-by-comment response except where similar comments are grouped together for a single response. Mr. Sullivan noted that time is the issue, not funding, to develop the responses. Mr. Hehn stated he would like to see this continue as an on-going process for comments.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it is Navy policy for all sites that community comments are not included as part of the document but are part of the information repository and, if CERCLA related, the Administrative Record. James Aldrich asked if the information repository materials are catalogued chronologically. Mr. Sullivan replied that the documents in the repository are catalogued according to a numbering system. He added that the Administrative Record is established only for CERCLA documents.

Ms. Smith noted that Volume 4 of the RI needs a table of contents for the appendices at the beginning of the document. She also noted that a Technical Memorandum for VOCs at Site 6 had been released in February and should be mentioned in the RI. Richard Knapp, Tetra Tech EM Inc., noted that the memorandum is referenced in Appendix H. Ms. Smith also brought up that DTSC had

commented that Tetra Tech EM Inc. had made a shift in strategies or target goals prior to producing the report. She stated her concern over the process. Ms. Cassa responded that Chein Kao of DTSC wrote the agency comments on the draft document. A meeting was held between the Navy and the regulators in April to discuss the regulatory agency comments and talk through some of the major issues. During the meeting, some of Mr. Kao's comments were resolved because the issues were clarified. On other issues, Mr. Kao would have preferred to go in one direction on a decision, but agreed to go with the consensus. Ms. Cassa added that the discussion helped the regulators to understand and agree to the process, which had already been underway. Ms. Smith stated she would bring documentation regarding her concern to the interim meeting.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

VI. General Updates

FY98 Project Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan reported no change in the schedule since last month, noting the Navy had not issued a firm FY98 Execution Plan. A working document will be issued once the plan is firm; there is currently no FY98 money with which to award work.

October 7, 1997 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan noted that discussion topics included TI closure and leasing issues, the Site 12 work, the RAB meeting agenda and review of action items. Ms. Smith asked if better funding for the State of California Water Department and the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be provided by the Navy. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy would be entering into negotiations with the State over the Defense-State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA). A workshop is scheduled on October 30 for preparation to enter into site-specific negotiations. TI will be the first site to enter into negotiations with the State to work out an equitable arrangement in which the Federal government provides funding to the State as reimbursement for cleanup oversight. Mr. Sullivan added that a generalized DSMOA exists between DoD and the State, but it was not negotiated at the individual base level. Mr. Hehn requested that the concern of the RAB be expressed at the October 30 meeting to have both DTSC add RWQCB representatives as active participants at TI. It was noted that James Ricks, Jr. U.S. EPA, was absent at tonight's meeting due to illness.

Mr. Sullivan stated that Federal guidance is being developed for a Technical Assistance for Public Participation program (TAPP) that will allow RABs to tap into federal funds to assist in evaluation of the cleanup process. A more detailed discussion will be held at the next RAB meeting. He noted that the funding level is up to \$25,000 per year for up to four years or a total of \$100,000.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan stated that Naval Station Treasure Island closed on September 30, 1997. The Navy's Engineering Field Activity, West (EFA, West) assumed administration of the base on October 1, 1997. Lieutenant Commander John Landis is now the officer-in-charge through the Caretaker Site Office; the Caretaker Office now administers over the TI and YBI property. LCDR. Landis works for Kenn Parsons, the base conversion manager, who is a senior civilian. Mr. Parsons is in charge of the Navy's overall process for reuse and cleanup, and LCDR. Landis manages the day-to-day base operations.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the Navy, in turn, has entered into a cooperative agreement with the City of San Francisco. The City will handle the municipal-type functions such as providing fire, police, street maintenance, landscaping, garbage collection, and potable water and sewage treatment service. The Navy is reimbursing the City based on the amount the Navy would have spent if they assumed all responsibility for operating the empty base. This will serve as a transition to when the City assumes full responsibility for operating the base as part of the City. The exact date of the transfer has not been determined; the Navy and the City will enter into a further negotiation on the transfer of the property.

Mr. Van Wye asked how extensive a document is the operating agreement. Mr. Sullivan replied that it is probably between 20 to 40 pages, adding he was not sure whether it is a public document. Larry Florin, the mayor's project manager for TI, and the counterpart to the Navy's Mr. Parsons, would be the contact for obtaining a copy of the agreement. Mr. Van Wye noted that a master lease agreement is currently being reviewed in Washington for approval between the City and the Navy, and asked when this would take place. Mr. Sullivan informed the RAB that the master lease agreement would facilitate subleases, rather than negotiating separate leases. He indicated he did not know the timeframe since he has not been directly involved in this process.

Mr. Aldrich asked if the reuse plan still carries any validity. Mr. Sullivan replied that it does because the reuse plan is at the core of the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). A draft of the EIS/EIR will be released in about 60 days and a public scoping meeting will be held. Mr. Ongerth asked if the RAB will receive copies of the EIS/EIR. Mr. Sullivan commented that there is some question as to where the EIS/EIR fits into the RAB and cleanup process. He noted he is reviewing the cleanup portion of the EIS/EIR, however, the EIS/EIR process is separate from the cleanup.

Mr. Wong noted that the document is public and could be requested by any interested RAB member. Ms. Cassa noted that the distribution lists for the EIS/EIR for several other sites are very large. Mr. Wong suggested that Mr. Sullivan make a request to have RAB members added to the document distribution list. Ms. Nelson pointed out that the RAB has tentatively requested a presentation of the draft EIS/EIR at the December meeting.

Mr. Sullivan also noted that the City is now managing the front gate, and they will be limiting access to protect the property. He will provide the gatekeeper with a list of RAB members.

Mr. Hehn referred to the copy of the August 4, 1997, draft guidance and procedures for early transfer under CERCLA provided by Ms. Cassa and asked if there was an update on the document. Ms. Cassa stated that it was still in draft and had not changed much since February. The timeframe for completion of the final guidance document is unknown.

VII. Review of Action Items

Ms. Nelson stated she would like to resolve the pending approval of the February, March and April meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan responded he had completed review of the February minutes and is about two-thirds through review of the March minutes, and will then address the April minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS:

VIII. RAB Membership Drive

Mr. Sullivan reported that he has received five applications for RAB membership. Several more may come in from museum volunteers that were solicited at the request of Richard Hansen, and from UC Berkeley through the efforts of John Allman. Dan McDonald stated that the Membership Committee, consisting of himself, Clinton Loftman, Tom Thompson and Chris Shirley, plans to meet sometime between November 5 and November 11 to review the applications. They will make their recommendations to the RAB at the November 18 meeting. Mr. McDonald noted that for the previous membership drive, the committee provided a slate of new members, and the RAB voted on whether to accept the slate. Any additional applications should be received by Mr. Sullivan by November 3.

Mr. Aldrich asked if there was an upper limit to the number of applicants on the slate. Mr. McDonald noted that recommendation was made during previous rounds of recruitment to accept a slate that exceeded the recommended total number on the RAB to offset attrition. He stated that the attrition rate is usually about 25 percent upon acceptance and 50 percent within a year, so about eight to twelve new members would be appropriate. Ms. Cassa asked if people not selected last time were contacted. Mr. McDonald stated that past efforts have found many people have moved or do not respond, and is therefore ineffective. He added that experience has shown it is more effective to advertise in the paper, and to let those interested find the RAB rather than the RAB find them. Ms. Nelson thanked Mr. McDonald for his help with membership recruitment.

Ms. Nelson stated that February of next year will mark two years that she has served as community co-chair, and recommended electing a new co-chair at that time. Mr. Hehn announced that he would be unable to fill the role of alternate co-chair and would like to step down, but remain as chair of the Technical Subcommittee. He suggested that two community members might share the co-chair role. Ms. Nelson encouraged RAB members to let her know of

their interest so that elections can be held in February.

Ms. Nelson announced that Mr. Hansen will ask the Treasure Island Development Task Force for time on their November meeting agenda. The RAB Technical Committee would like to make a presentation on the RAB's comments on the draft final RI. Mr. Hansen noted the RAB presentation will likely be first on the agenda. The meeting will be held Wednesday, November 19 at 1:00 p.m. at the Ferry Building. Mr. Allman pointed out that the Technical Committee will review its presentation at the November RAB meeting in preparation for the Task Force meeting the following night.

Mr. Van Wye noted that the Treasure Island Redevelopment Authority approved a request for proposal for marina development, which should be out in about a week. A 90 day response period will follow upon which bids will be accepted and a contract will be negotiated. He added that the marina will be the first test development to occur at TI.

IX. Upcoming Environmental Report Schedule

Mr. Sullivan asked RAB Community members if an extension to December 18, 1997, is needed to comment on the draft final RI. Mr. Hehn indicated that the 30-day extension would be needed to allow time to review the Navy's response to the original comments. Then any additional comments can be added, as well as comments that may follow the RAB's draft final RI presentation. Mr. Allman asked if the Navy's written response to RAB comments will be completed soon. Mr. Sullivan replied that it would be available by the November RAB meeting. Mr. Allman stated that the 30-day extension would be needed to review the Navy responses to the draft RI comments to avoid duplication of effort in making additional comments to the draft final RI.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy's response to comments on the draft Zone 4 FOSL will be made available so the community members can hold discussion at the interim or next regular RAB meeting. The draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) will be available in the next several weeks, and will have a 60-day comment period. The date of release of the draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR is not yet firm, but should be in the next 60 days. The Site 12 Additional Investigation Technical Memorandum will probably be available after the first of the year following data validation in December. The Site 24 technical memorandum is out and will be incorporated into the final RI. Ms. Nelson asked if it would be appropriate for the RAB to comment on the Site 24 technical memorandum. Mr. Sullivan stated that comments could be included with the draft final RI comments.

X. Open Questions/Discussion

Mr. Sullivan noted a suggestion that RAB meetings be moved to Wednesday nights in 1998. Mr. Allman asked for conflicts with other scheduled RAB meetings, and it was noted that the Hunters Point RAB meets on the fourth Wednesday of the month. Mr. Van Wye suggested that members

consider what would work best for them during the next month and hold it for discussion until the November meeting.

Ms. Cassa asked for an explanation of the RAB presentation. Mr. Sullivan stated that community members made a presentation to the body-at-large following the comment period on the draft RI last year.

XI. Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan summarized the following items for inclusion on next month's agenda:

- draft RI report presentation by RABcommunity members
- draft CAP presentation/treatability study
- petroleum issues and adjacent property on YBI
- membership recruitment
- discussion of meeting dates

Mr. Sullivan noted that the next regular meeting date is Tuesday, November 18, 1997. The museum partitions will be removed from the first floor at Building 1 to create a large open space, and this may be the new meeting location. The next meeting will either be on the first or second floor. The December 16, 1997, meeting will still likely be held in Building 1. The next interim meeting is scheduled for November 4 at the PG&E Building, 24th floor. Martha Walters of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency will host the November 3, 1997, BCT meeting.

Ms. Vedagiri strongly encouraged RAB members to send letters regarding funding for TI to elected officials as soon as possible. Mr. Allman requested that notice be provided about interest in changing the meeting night of the RAB in case some members are not able to attend the next meeting. Mr. Sullivan stated he would include a notice in the mailing for the next interim meeting.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the December BCT meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 8. The next Task Force meeting is Wednesday, November 19. Mr. Van Wye asked who would be making the presentation to the Task Force on Wednesday, November 19. Ms. Nelson stated that she and Mr. Hehn planned to make the presentation. Mr. Allman added that the committee is considering splitting up topics between people as one option, but are still working on the details. Ms. Nelson stated that planning meetings would be held on November 4 and 8.

Ms. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 18, 1997, at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2nd floor conference area.

N60028_000796
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

DATED 21 OCTOBER 1997

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000779