

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8103
5 Feb 1998

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 – 18 November 1997
(2) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Final Meeting Minutes – 16 December 1997

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are the approved and final Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes and are 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.

Original signed by:

ERNESTO M. GALANG
By direction of
the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Mr. David Rist)
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)

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

Distribution: (cont)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Mr. Daniel McDonald
Mr. John Andrew	Mr. Brandon McMillan
Mr. James Aldrich	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. John Allman	Mr. Ernest Michelsen
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Ms. Patricia Nelson (Co-Chair)
Mr. Nathan Brennan	Mr. Earl Newbre
Ms. Peggy Chiang	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Mr. Douglas Cormack	Mr. Carlos Penafiel
Ms. Wendy Easley	Mr. James Rodriguez
Mr. Tom Dickerman	Mr. Jack Savage
Ms. Carolyn Froeberg	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Michael Gross	Ms. Margaret Thomas
Mr. Richard Hansen	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Ms. Jeannette Tan Hayden	TI Museum (Ms. Laurie Glass)
Mr. Paul Hehn (Alt Co-Chair)	TI Yacht Club (Mr. Harlan Van Wye)
Mr. Gary Jensen	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Ms. Alice LaPierre	Mr. Richard Vivio
Mr. Clinton Loftman	Mr. Brad Wong

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, 18 November 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 18 November 1997 at 7:15 p.m. at the Building 1, 2nd Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) receive a brief on the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program, 2) discuss the Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, 3) discuss the Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP)/Treatability Study, 4) provide general program updates, 5) review action items, 6) attend to organizational business, 7) review the upcoming environmental report schedule, 8) provide open questions and discussion, and 9) 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. Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, asked for a volunteer to serve as timekeeper. Mary Rose Cassa, DTSC, volunteered to keep time.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sullivan asked for comments on the agenda; there was no discussion.

Discussion/Approval of the draft 18 October 1997 Minutes

Mr. Sullivan noted that he has been sending John Allman a complete set of the transcripts monthly and that anyone else could receive them upon request. Mr. Allman wanted to clarify that his receiving the transcripts does not relieve the other members of the responsibility of reviewing the draft meeting minutes for accuracy. Dale Smith asked why the RAB was not approving the final meeting minutes for August and September. Ms. Nelson stated this would be added to organizational business. The October 18, 1997 meeting minutes were approved as drafted.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Sullivan stated that RAB applicants were invited to attend the meeting tonight, and noted several in the audience. He thanked them for their interest. Mary Rose Cassa introduced her replacement, David Rist, who will attend RAB meetings and serve on the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT).

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

III. Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Brief

Mr. Sullivan introduced Marcelo Pascua of EFA, West, who discussed the TAPP program guidance for RAB community members. Mr. Pascua distributed a blue folder packet containing the presentation slides, the Authorization Act, the Department of Defense's (DoD's) Final Rule, Implementation Guidance, an Application Request Form, and a Draft Scope of Work for the TAPP program.

Mr. Pascua informed RAB members that TAPP is a new DoD program to be implemented in FY98. He stated that the key intent of the program is to provide independent assistance in interpreting scientific and engineering issues for environmental restoration projects. Transfer related environmental compliance, like asbestos and lead paint abatement, is not included in the TAPP program. He clarified that the TAPP is for community members of RABs, noting the requirement that a majority of the community members must concur with the request. Only RAB members representing themselves may vote on whether to seek technical assistance for a particular project. Mr. Pascua stated that the current policy limits TAPP expenditures to an annual maximum of \$25,000, and a lifetime maximum of \$100,000. The money comes out of TI's environmental project funds.

Mr. Pascua described the criteria for receiving TAPP funds, noting that the RAB must demonstrate that the Federal, State, and local agencies do not have the technical expertise necessary to provide the assistance, or that the technical assistance is likely to contribute to the efficiency, effectiveness or timeliness of environmental restoration activities and is likely to contribute to community acceptance of environmental restoration activities. Eligible projects include: 1) interpretation of technical documents, 2) review of proposed restoration technologies, 3) participation in relative risk site evaluations, 4) understanding of health and environmental implications of sites and cleanup strategies, and 5) training, as appropriate. Ineligible projects include: 1) political activity and lobbying, 2) litigation, 3) generation of new primary data, 4) reopening final DoD decisions, 5) epidemiological or health studies, and 6) community outreach.

Mr. Pascua noted the key sections of the TAPP request form such as certification of majority request, which could be documented by meeting minutes; a designated RAB point of contact, generally the community co-chair; the project purpose and description to include timing and scheduling requirements; a statement of eligibility; and the name of proposed and alternate providers and qualifications. The provider must meet minimum qualifications such as having demonstrated knowledge of hazardous and toxic waste issues and/or laws, academic training in a relevant discipline, and the ability to translate technical information into terms understandable to lay persons.

Mr. Pascua stated that completion requirements include dissemination of the information, such as by inclusion in the information repository, and reports by the RAB such as an annual report, a final report and incorporation into an Annual Report to Congress. Mr. Pascua pointed out several examples of potential roadblocks in the TAPP process. These may include that the installation commander does not approve the project; the Navy believes the project could be provided from available resources; the community cannot agree on a scope of work; or the community cannot agree on a preferred provider. He stated that there is an appeals process, and noted that the Navy seeks to make the resolution at the lowest possible level, which would be EFA West.

Mr. Pascua advised the RAB to begin discussion on requirements where TAPP funding might be used. EFA, West can then provide a presentation on the acquisition process for assistance providers. He added that the program point of contact is Jim Sullivan, however, RAB members can also contact Mr. Pascua with any questions.

Martha Walters of the City of San Francisco asked how long the process takes before the money is actually received. Mr. Pascua stated it takes about four to six weeks if the process goes smoothly, noting that it goes more quickly if a provider is identified. Ms. Walters commented that the process seems very cumbersome. Mr. Allman added that if the intent is to help community RAB members understand the process and get technical assistance, then the money should be available to freely spend as the RAB sees fit and not come with strings attached. He noted that the final decision on providing TAPP funds is made by DoD. Mr. Pascua responded that document interpretation provided by the RAB through TAPP would be in an advisory capacity, and that it would be up to the Navy to take action on any recommendations. Mr. Sullivan added that there is some flexibility in the program and the RAB first needs to determine how it would use the TAPP money.

Ms. Smith asked when the funds could be accessed if the FY98 budget is already set. Mr. Sullivan stated that if a TAPP project were approved for 1998, then the RAB would have to make a collective decision to take money for TAPP from another environmental project. Ms. Smith asked if UST issues would be covered under the program and whether money could be used to hire interns to do research as Mr. Allman had suggested. Mr. Pascua replied that asbestos, lead and UST issues not a part of the installation restoration program would not be covered under TAPP money, but that interns could be hired to perform research provided they meet the qualifications stated earlier. Mr. Allman added that he has given the Navy and meeting attendees a list of 42 references on synergistic effects of toxics, and has about seven of the references available, but is not aware of anyone in the CLEAN Program who has photocopied any of them. So he does not think that the Navy resources exist, or at least are not being allocated for this background research

Ms. Nelson suggested that the RAB put together a wish list of projects for TAPP funding and develop a plan to achieve some of these goals. Usha Vedagiri asked what the point is of including a lack of technical expertise by the agencies as part of the criteria when the RAB may disagree or question something that the agencies have approved without questioning the agencies expertise.

Mr. Pascua offered that it is included in the language of the Authorization Act, and that it is the intent of Congress to consider all resources available before requesting funds. Ms. Vedagiri added that she did not think it should be up to the RAB to determine whether the agencies have the technical expertise. Mr. Pascua noted that the resources and expertise may or may not be present, but the RAB could still state a need for independent assistance.

IV. Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report

Ms. Nelson stated that the RAB has been reviewing the draft final RI report since October and that formal comment is not due until the December RAB meeting. The RAB community members have prepared two handouts. She and Paul Hehn have prepared a presentation for the RAB as an update to the initial draft RI report presentation made in January. Usha Vedagiri and Christine Shirley have prepared a presentation on the risk assessment. Ms. Nelson noted that Mr. Sullivan e-mailed the Navy's "draft" draft-responses to RAB comments prepared in January. These responses, along with more recent comments developed by the RAB, will become part of the package submitted formally at the December RAB meeting. She thanked the Navy and the consultants for preparing the responses to RAB comments.

Mr. Hehn stated he would review those items that have changed since the draft RI report was issued, and also look at new areas added to the report from the RI addenda. Mr. Hehn pointed out that the conclusions reached from RAB review of the draft final report are identical to those reached in January for the draft version. The review finds that the RI report is still incomplete and that the Navy should fund and schedule in FY98 the additional field investigation and assessment work proposed by the RAB in early 1997.

Ms. Vedagiri provided comments on the risk assessment portion of the RI. There are two risk assessments in the RI; the human health risk assessment and the ecological risk assessment. She noted as one of her two major concerns the fact that the baseline risk assessment oversteps its role and gets into risk management issues and recommendations instead of looking at the risks under current conditions and no action scenarios. She stated her other main concern to be that several relevant pathways were omitted from the baseline risk assessment. She noted indoor air inhalation pathways and fish consumption by humans as examples. Additional comments included the following:

- *Ten percent screening level against background:* values that exceed the background should not be dropped based only on the frequency of exceedence; these chemicals should be more closely examined as to how toxic they are and how much they exceed background.
- *Lack of comparison of fill material against background level:* Are there naturally occurring chemicals as part of the fill material, not having anything to do with the Navy's activities, with higher than acceptable risks? If so, these should be documented in the baseline risk assessment.

- *Only soil from zero to two foot depths were examined wherever housing exists for risk assessment from direct contact:* it needs to be clearly stated in all the FOSLs and feasibility studies that activities go deeper than two feet and that it is just left there.
- *Groundwater use for gardening and potable water:* the baseline risk assessment should look at these risks and document them. Pathways should not be omitted. It is unknown how enforceable the recommendation is from the Regional Water Board report for de-designation of groundwater at TI as potable water. As far as is known, it is an internal staff report.
- *Fish consumption pathway:* she agrees that there are multiple sources of contaminants in the Bay and hard to attribute to only TI sources, however, the pathway for TI sources alone should not be omitted from consideration. The pathway is very clearly complete. The TI groundwater is very shallow, there are a lot of contaminants in the groundwater, and there are a lot of areas where fish can come in and feed.
- *Typographical error in Table G-2:* residential exposure frequency to adults and children is listed as 100 days per year but should be 350 days per year. If it is not a typo, then she thinks it underestimates the risk.

Ms. Vedagiri's comments on the ecological risk assessment included:

- *Division of sites into one of three categories of risk:* category two sites, where risks are in a gray area, were recommended for risk management, but she feels it is inappropriate to do so without further risk evaluation.
- *Lack of inclusion of plant and soil invertebrates as ecological receptors:* soil invertebrates often are more sensitive to chemicals than birds and mammals and so are not appropriate to exclude. Also, she asked for the basis of statement in the RI that soil invertebrates are flourishing on YBI, and therefore, no evaluation was needed.
- *No Hazard Quotient Table for Site 8*

Mr. Allman noted that the issue has been raised previously that the methodology for ecological risk assessment should include the evaluation of receptor species, bioaccumulation of TPH and metals and analysis of metabolized contaminant species. He noted that the Navy's response to this comment concerned TPHs. According to the Navy, TPHs metabolize at the first level of consumption, and do not occur in higher level species up the food chain. Mr. Allman noted, however, that an accumulation toxicity test is still needed because a compound can metabolize into another form that may not otherwise be detected, yet still pose a threat to species higher on the food chain.

Mr. Allman stated that the Navy chose two organisms for TPH screening levels because their use is considered consistent with other studies at Northern California bases, and provide consistent screening levels. He pointed out, however, that there is a large variation in conditions from the south end to the north end of the Bay and it cannot be assumed that other, more sensitive species would not be affected by certain toxicity levels. He gave the example of high mercury levels in fish in Santa Clara County, explaining that the fish consume metallic mercury, an inorganic compound, but it is metabolized as methyl mercury, an organic compound. He added that methyl mercury is more dangerous to humans than metallic mercury, yet is overlooked when analyzing bioaccumulation in higher level organisms.

Ms. Shirley commented that she felt it inappropriate to screen out Sites 5, 7, 8, 9 and 17 from inclusion in the feasibility study because they were found to fall within the human health risk range of 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} . She recommended including in the feasibility study those sites where risks are higher than 10^{-6} and then make the determination about whether to remediate them. She added that Sites 11 and 12 were put into the feasibility study on the basis of aquatic and terrestrial ecological risks, but should also be included because they pose human health risk above 10^{-6} , as well as ecological risk.

Mr. Hehn briefly reviewed the comparison between recommendations made in January 1997 and the current ones, noting that they remain essentially the same. These recommendations included:

- *Review all existing data to determine what is valid, what can be used, and what needs to be discarded.* This kind of review has apparently not been performed.
- *Determine where the data gaps and poorly characterized sites are located, and what needs to be done to complete the work to arrive at a scientifically valid assessment.* It appears that this review has not been performed, and though additional work has been done on Sites 12 and 17/24, little or no additional work has been done on other sites of concern.
- *Focus results of rework and additional work on taking care of the problems and how the problems impact future reuse of the sites, no matter what the reuses might be.* It appears that such a focus was not fully addressed nor were all reuses considered. In particular, the RAB has noted that information from the personal interviews have not been considered within the Phase II draft final document.
- *Work should be done closely and interactively between the Navy, the regulators and the RAB to make the changes happen.* The Navy, the City of San Francisco, regulatory agency representatives and the RAB have worked more closely since January 1997 to improve the process. Examples include RAB attendance and involvement at the BCT meetings, increased interaction with City staff, and the RAB's involvement in work plans and schedules earlier on in the process.
- *No final or Draft Final report should be completed until supplemental work is completed and*

all parties agree with the results. It was noted that this recommendation was not taken seriously since the RI has progressed to the draft final stage. The RI needs to be completed in an appropriate fashion so that the situation is known at each site to determine appropriate remediation measures, and before the City proceeds with reuse.

Mr. Hehn stated that he reviewed the draft final RI and compared the document to his original comments made in January 1997. He noted that although the draft final is a much better written document than the draft version, many of his original recommendations were not taken to heart. Of his original 102 site specific recommendations, he found that only 25 percent were addressed, 7 percent were partially addressed, and 68 percent were not addressed at all.

Ms. Nelson followed with a review of the site data and site assessment methodology. The issues with regard to site data include historical data utilization and validity and reproducibility. She noted that additional historical data has been provided in the Phase I and Phase II text, however, it has not been interpreted with the rest of the data available. In addition, there was little description of the interim reuses and these should have been addressed at the appropriate IR sites in the remedial investigation.

With regard to data validity and reproducibility, Ms. Nelson reminded the RAB that there was a heavy reliance on the results of the immunoassay data, but there was a 45 percent false negative rate associated with the validity of that data. One success in this area has been the Navy's agreement to conduct additional field work at Site 12 which will provide more data for review. She noted, however, that 28 other IR sites lack data from which to judge the adequacy of the remedial investigation. She added that there is a need for an accurate baseline for the entire base, not just Site 12. Ms. Nelson stated that upon review of the additional Site 12 data and determination of the validity of the original data, it may be recommended to further investigate other IR sites, including the 14 put into other environmental programs or recommended for no further action.

With regard to site assessment methodology, Ms. Nelson highlighted information about geotechnical conditions at TI, specifically addressing settlement activity and transport of contaminants. She also noted that the rationale for removing some CERCLA sites into the CAP program or recommending no further action has not been clearly documented. Ms. Nelson stated that the data she received from the Draft CAP Report about some of the IR sites moved to the CAP did not include text so she is completing an interpretation assessing where communication of contaminants might be occurring across adjacent sites.

Ms. Nelson summarized that the conclusions have not changed much since January 1997, and reminded the RAB that the RI report does not achieve its objectives. With the exception of Site 3, the IR sites are not fully characterized or ready to proceed to a feasibility study. Ms. Nelson noted one new recommendation, for the RAB to build community awareness with the City, agencies, and other stakeholders. Increased funding levels will likely be required to fully address the RAB's recommendations for additional site characterization studies.

Ms. Smith stated a concern regarding the presence of beryllium on both TI and YBI. She noted that its occurrence on TI is said to be from the fill material, but the source is stated as unknown on YBI, causing confusion as to the source and what the cleanup levels should be. Ms. Smith also stated that the plant and animal surveys are cursory and incomplete, which she had said three years ago, and that there should be a three season plant survey. She noted as an example the wrong species of broom plant, *Canariensis* instead of *Monspessulana*. She added that raptors are not addressed adequately, and are either considered numerous enough to not elicit concern or, if subject to protection, have a large enough hunting area that individuals are not of concern. Ms. Smith commented that she did not think the tidal influence studies adequately characterized the extent, direction and shape of the tidal influence. She noted that she also thought Sites 5, 17, and 24 represented a cluster of problems and their interactions should be examined together rather than treated separately. Additionally, she noted that there is no discussion in the RI of dioxin present at Site 12.

Mr. Allman stated that a toxicologist with the U.S. EPA's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) has looked at some of the data for Site 12 from the Zone 4 FOSL and noted several known synergistic and antagonistic combinations. The additional data from Site 12 will also be looked at more closely. ATSDR's epidemiologists may be interested in conducting epidemiological studies of residents on TI as a semi-closed system; he will let the RAB know as this further develops.

A motion was made and seconded among the RAB community members to accept the recommendations as outlined in the presentation. Ms. Nelson noted that adoption of the recommendations means that the RAB is interested in building community awareness beyond the RAB. Mr. Aldrich asked if Ms. Nelson was prepared to make specific requests of the Mayor's TI Task Force as part of the RAB presentation, to initiate community awareness. Ms. Nelson acknowledged that the presentation to the Task Force was a step towards creating larger community awareness, and that a recommendation to the Task Force would be to form a working relationship with the RAB to address community and City needs. Mr. Hehn added that another recommendation would be that the Task Force be proactive in soliciting the funding needed to complete the remediation and investigation process. Mr. Aldrich asked if the Task Force has political influence over funding requests. Ms. Nelson noted that they will become a redevelopment authority on January 1st and may determine their political leverage on the issue by then.

Mr. Allman stated that the RAB can also serve as technical advisors to the Task Force on issues of concern. He noted that the Task Force is new and unaware of the history of the past three years at TI. He also noted that the Task Force has the ability to hold up transfer if sites are not cleaned to the level they want. Ms. Nelson pointed out that the Task Force will be setting up a citizen's advisory group and the link could be formalized if a RAB member was a part of that group. Mr. Hehn stated that environmental issues that might limit the reuse of a particular parcel would be of great interest to the City and to the development authority, and they would likely help bring in the funding to complete the cleanup and allow reuse.

Ms. Cassa commented that the regulatory agencies are generally comfortable with the validity of the data. She noted that it is a matter of interpretation, and that the regulatory agencies are not

demanding significant improvement to the data quality. She also noted that, regarding concerns about synergism and risk assessment, there is a flyer from the U.S. EPA that indicates they will be addressing priority risk assessment issues and may be revising the risk assessment guidance for Superfund. Ms. Shirley noted that there is a stakeholders meeting about these EPA revisions in Atlanta in March, and that there is an opportunity to write letters to this EPA group to express concerns.

OTHER BUSINESS:

V. Organizational Business

RAB Membership Drive

Clinton Loftman provided an update on the RAB membership drive, noting that RAB members were sent copies of the applications. The membership committee, consisting of himself, Chris Shirley, Tom Thompson and Dan McDonald, is recommending that all 17 new applicants be accepted into the RAB. This is based on attrition rates of about 25 percent after the first meeting and 50 percent within one year. Mr. Loftman reviewed the names of the applicants and those present were asked to be recognized. Applicants in attendance included Carolyn Froeberg, Michael Gross, Wendy Easley and Earl Newbre, who briefly introduced themselves. Ms. Nelson welcomed them and noted the need for new member training to include acronyms and areas on the island. She asked them to inform her of their needs so that they receive information to allow them to be fully participating members. Ms. Shirley added that ARC Ecology is willing to spend time and resources working with the Navy to train new RAB members. She also commented on the impressive qualifications of the applicants. Ms. Nelson then initiated a round of introductions of RAB members, Navy personnel, Regulatory Agency representatives and consultants present.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

VI. General Updates

FY98 Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan noted that adjustments were still being made to the FY98 Execution Plan. He submitted information to NAVFAC headquarters in Washington in response to their questions on the budget, and briefed the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Bill Cassidy, at the Pentagon. Mr. Cassidy is one of the Navy's principal parties involved in base closure and reuse. Mr. Sullivan stated his confidence in the budget, noting the support of the RAB members who wrote letters to officials. He indicated that about \$10 million is needed for 1998 to complete the investigative work, do some lead paint and asbestos work, and begin some of the UST remediation. He is expecting to receive about \$10 million, plus or minus a half-a-million. More than \$10 million would not help in FY98, since the \$10 million represents all the work that could possibly be done within FY98. Ms. Shirley asked if there was still a need to write letters. Mr.

Sullivan did not think so at this time, but if a change later occurs in the budget, then it would have to be reevaluated.

November 3, 1997 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan noted the recommendations for Sites 5, 7, 8 and 17 were discussed at the meeting along with the ecological validation study for Sites 11, 28, and 29. Miscellaneous base closure issues, like the Zone 4 FOSL and the City Police Department's interest in putting a helipad at the Northeast corner of the base were included. An update on the Site 12 additional investigation was provided, and a community relations plan addendum and the RAB meeting agenda were also covered.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan stated that there is not much news to report under reuse issues except that several city staff have moved to YBI to serve as caretakers. Three units of housing are now occupied on YBI and none on TI.

VII. Review of Action Items

Response to RAB Comments

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Navy response to RAB comments was distributed earlier in the meeting with a cover letter from Ernie Galang, EFA West.

February, March, and April Meeting Minute Revisions

Mr. Sullivan distributed revised minutes for the February and March meetings, stating he still had to complete the April meeting revisions. He also provided several copies of the complete transcript for those interested in validating the revisions.

Mr. Allman asked for clarification on the Navy draft response to RAB comments provided. Mr. Sullivan explained that the response to comments received last week by Pat Nelson was actually a "draft" draft so that the technical review committee had a document to work with at their meeting last week. He pointed out, however, that only a few minor changes were made to the final copy presented this evening, so there were no significant changes in the technical content.

Mr. Sullivan requested that comments concerning the Navy's response be included with comments for the draft final RI. Mr. Allman asked if the responses would be included in the draft final RI document so that they can be referred to, rather than restating them. Ms. Smith recommended the response to comments be included in an appendix of the draft final RI. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that so far the community comments have not been made a part of the document. Mr. Allman expressed his concern that RAB comments are not included as part of the final document, noting that none of his comments to the document have so far been addressed in the text. Ms. Nelson pointed out that the RAB needs to deal with how their comments are being responded to, and also build a file so that when the ROD comes up there is a compilation of

comments that need to be addressed before the decision is made final.

Ms. Shirley stated that most of the bases include comments from the RAB in the response and summary appendix. Mr. Sullivan responded that he will take the request back to management and get clarification on what has been the policy at other bases. He added that at the RI stage there may be no legal requirement to include community comments as is the case with decision documents. Ms. Shirley noted that response to comments are included in the RI at both Hunters Point and the Presidio. Mr. Allman commented that if the RAB's comments were considered by the consultants and the Navy for updating or changing the RI, then they are part of the decision-making process. At some point they need to be part of the administrative record for information that goes into the CERCLA-based decisions. He added that if the comments were used for revising the document, then the comments should be included, regardless of what other bases are doing. It is important for tracking purposes that the comments accompany the document.

Moving RAB Meetings to Wednesdays in 1998

Ms. Nelson proposed discussing the RABs wish list for the TAPP funds and the proposal to move RAB meetings to Wednesdays in 1998 at the December 2 interim meeting. Mr. Allman suggested that the meeting change be discussed at the next full RAB meeting so that everyone has a chance to participate in the decision.

VIII. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan noted an error on the schedule, stating that comments on the draft and final RI report are due on Friday, December 19 and that comments on the Corrective Action Plan are due on Friday, January 23. The draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR will likely be due in January, the availability of the Site 12 additional technical memorandum has not yet been determined, and the draft final Zone 4 FOSL will be mailed out by Mr. Sullivan.

IX. Proposed Agenda Items

The agenda items for the December RAB meeting will include the CAP, possibly some additional Site 12 investigation data, and the draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR. The draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR may be postponed until January, however, if the document is not released until then.

Mr. Allman noted that the handouts for the CAP presentation at tonight's meeting looked like the CAP presentation from October which was an overview. He requested a more substantive presentation at the December meeting.

Mr. Sullivan summarized that the next RAB meeting will be Tuesday December 16, and the January meeting will be held on January 20. The next community member meeting is December 2 at the PG&E building. The next BCT/RPM meeting is December 8 at DTSC in Berkeley. Mr. Sullivan announced that the Task Force meeting will be tomorrow, November 19, at 1:00 p.m. at

the Ferry Building downtown. Suite 3100. Mr. Sullivan also thanked Mary Rose Cassa for her efforts with the RAB.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 16, 1997, at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2nd floor conference area, NAVSTA TL.

N60028_000826
TREASURE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH C CAN BE FOUND IN THE:

DRAFT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 18 NOVEMBER 1997

IS RECORD NO. N60028_000797

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

Tuesday, 16 December 1997

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 16 December 1997 at 7:25 p.m. at the Building 1, 2nd Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to 1) discuss the Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and Treatability Study, 2) discuss the Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, 3) provide general program updates, 4) review action items, 5) attend to organizational business, 6) review the upcoming environmental report schedule, 7) provide open questions and discussion, and 8) review the proposed agenda items for upcoming RAB meetings and new action items.

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 all meeting attendees. He apologized about the cold conditions in the room, noting that the City is working to repair the heating system. It will hopefully be in operation by the next meeting.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

David Rist, DTSC, asked why the draft final RI report was on the agenda since the topic was discussed at last month's meeting. Pat Nelson, Community Co-chair, stated that comments on the report are due by December 19 and so wanted to provide an opportunity at this meeting to take additional comments or answer questions and to reach closure on the comment period for this document. She noted that very often, RAB members comment at the meeting on the documents rather than in writing, and she wanted to make sure that they are captured in the transcript to be given the same weight as any submitted written comments. There were no other comments regarding the agenda. Ms. Nelson called for a volunteer timekeeper; Usha Vedagiri agreed to keep time.

Discussion/Approval of the November Minutes

Mr. Rist asked to strike the phrase "despite the concerns of the RAB" from the last line of page 8 of the draft November meeting minutes. James Aldrich asked for verification of the statement that there are currently no occupants residing on TI, made on page 10 under Reuse Issues. Mr. Sullivan confirmed the statement as correct noting that all 904 of the housing units on TI are currently vacant but there are three units of housing occupied on YBI. Dale Smith asked to strike the phrase "may have been cited a species of concern" from page 8, line 6, and to replace the words "French broom" with *Monspessulana* and "Portuguese broom" with *Canariensis*. She noted that while the *Monspessulana* is a very great concern, it is not a "species of concern" because that indicates a rare, endangered or uncommon species. The November meeting minutes

were approved with the above noted changes.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Sullivan noted that there were no members of the public present. Ms. Nelson noted Paul Hehn's absence due to surgery and passed around a Christmas card to him for everyone to sign. Mr. Sullivan introduced the new regulatory agency representatives; David Leland, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); David Rist, Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC); and James Ricks, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). He then initiated a round of introductions of all RAB members. New RAB members present included: Carlos Penafiel, James Rodriguez, Wendy Easley, Mike Michelsen, and Brandon McMillan.

Ms. Vedagiri asked Mr. Leland if he would be a permanent representative of RWQCB to the TI RAB. Mr. Leland responded that he would attend RAB meetings as issues arise that relate to the Water Board. Ms. Smith asked Mr. Leland to advise the RAB of what the issues of concern are for the Water Board so that the RAB will have an understanding of why he may not sometimes be in attendance. Mr. Leland agreed to do so.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

III. Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP)/Treatability Study

Mr. Sullivan stated that copies of the draft CAP have been distributed to six RAB community members and that the document can be made available to others if interested. He noted that the comment period for the document closes on January 23, 1998. The CAP concerns the major petroleum sites on TI. He introduced Ed Ho, Tetra Tech EM Inc., to provide a technical update of the report.

Mr. Ho stated that the main issues to discuss would be Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) screening levels, the Treatability Study, and the CAP recommendations. He noted that TPHs consist of motor oil, gasoline and diesel fuel compounds. He added that the Treatability Study involves testing methods of bioremediation, where microorganisms biologically break down the TPH.

TPH Screening Levels

Mr. Ho explained that TPH screening levels were determined through ecotoxicological testing. Purple sea urchins and blue mussels were chosen as the ecological receptors and bioassays were performed on them in accordance with EPA guidelines. Results determined that the threshold value for urchins is 14.3 mg/L of TPH; this is the concentration of TPH in groundwater considered to be acceptable for sea urchins. This value will be used as the screening level for TPH in groundwater at TI.

Mr. Ho pointed out that soil is the other media of concern. In order to arrive at a soil screening

level, a leachate factor was used. Leachate is the water that passes through the soil particles, and may contain contaminants picked up from the soil. The leachate factor is determined by how much TPH the water contains after it passes through the soil. Leachate testing on the TI soils showed that only about three percent of the TPH leaves the soil and enters the groundwater. The soil screening level is derived from the groundwater screening level divided by the leachate factor (14.3/0.033), which in this case equals 430 mg/kg. The 430 mg/kg level is used as a measuring point in examining TI soils and determining whether they pose an ecotoxicological risk to urchins in the Bay.

Ms. Smith asked if the blue mussels are native to the Bay. Mr. Ho indicated he was unsure but is aware they are considered a good species for testing purposes. Ms. Smith asked where the specimens are purchased. Mr. Ho stated they come from a local commercial lab but did not know the specific name of the lab. Ms. Vedagiri asked if the Navy and Tetra Tech EM Inc. intends to address the comments provided by the regulatory agencies on the validity of the toxicity testing results. Mr. Ho stated that they are addressing the comments from the regulatory agencies as they are received. Ms. Vedagiri asked if the threshold values have changed. Mr. Ho responded that as of now, the threshold values remain unchanged because there has been no consensus on rationale for making changes.

Treatability Study

Mr. Ho explained that bioremediation involves technology which incorporates generally indigenous microorganisms and sometimes introduced microorganisms into a media to break down contaminants. The most common and effective application of bioremediation is to treat TPH contamination in an aerobic (oxygen-containing) environment. The CAP sites at TI provide an ideal situation to use this technology because they are TPH-only sites and consist of loose soils that facilitate the movement of nutrients and oxygen. The treatability study was conducted to determine the performance of bioremediation on TI soils. The treatability study included adding fertilizer and a bioremediation agent, X-19, to the microorganisms. Both additives enhance the reproductive capacity of the microorganisms and hasten bioremediation. Results of the study showed observable bioremediation.

Mr. Aldrich asked if oxygen was also added in the tests. Mr. Ho indicated that these tests did not include the addition of oxygen. Mr. Ricks asked if testing was performed on diesel fuel only. Mr. Ho stated that diesel fuel is the most prevalent TPH at TI and was thus chosen for the study. Daniel McDonald noted that the soil testing occurred off-site at a lab and questioned how the technology would compare in field conditions as opposed to lab conditions. Mr. Ho acknowledged that other variables, such as temperature, would be a factor in field conditions. Mr. McDonald asked if rainfall would affect the bioremediation process. Mr. Ho responded that soil will be removed to a separate area for treatment and that it will be treated under covered conditions to prevent rainfall from affecting the process.

Ms. Vedagiri asked if X-19 is added only once in the beginning of the process or if it requires additional doses. Mr. Ho stated that X-19 only needs to be added in the beginning, however, the soil may require periodic tilling to mix and re-oxygenate the soil. Ms. Smith asked what the components

are of X-19 and expressed concern over what its long term effects might be. Mr. Ho noted that it is considered proprietary information by the manufacturer, but it has been determined as safe to use. Ms. Smith expressed concern about vapors escaping from the treatment areas. Mr. Ho stated that the Air Quality Control Board has guidelines for land farming and that activities would be conducted under the Board's guidance and oversight. He pointed out that bioremediation is one option available but has not yet been selected as a treatment technology for TI.

Mr. Aldrich asked how long it would take for hydrocarbon concentrations to biodegrade naturally. Mr. Ho stated that it would vary from site to site, however, it would take longer than preferred to allow the sites to biodegrade naturally. Mr. Aldrich asked if there were sites on TI that were left to biodegrade on their own. Mr. Sullivan replied that the only potential case where this might have occurred is with some small home heating oil tanks. A RWQCB board policy allows for the contents of these tanks to be removed, and the tanks cleaned out and filled with concrete. Small amounts of leakage associated with these tanks could be left to natural attenuation. He pointed out, however, that the CAP sites are more industrial and do not fall under RWQCB policy. The tanks in the CAP sites must be removed, or closed in place and sampled. Underground fuel lines are being handled similarly; on TI most of the lines are being removed and the soil and groundwater tested, and on Yerba Buena Island, most of the lines have been closed in place and the soil tested to determine any leakage.

CAP Recommendations

Mr. Ho noted that three media were considered in looking at the CAP sites - surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater. He explained that the surface soil is less than two feet deep, and excavation is simple, fast and effective. Bioremediation on excavated surface soils is effective and cheap but is also slow, hard to achieve remediation to the non-detect level, and presents possible nuisance and liability issues with large piles of soil left on TI for periods of months. Thermal recycling, where the soil is heated to high temperatures of 700-800 degrees Fahrenheit in a kiln, is a preferred alternative to bioremediation for surface soils. It is a much faster process and removes TPH to non-detect levels, although it is more expensive than bioremediation. The volatilized TPH is typically propelled into a thermal oxidizer, which burns the TPH into water and carbon dioxide.

Wendy Easley asked if the soil is treated on site when using thermal recycling. Mr. Ho stated that it can be treated on-site using a mobile facility or it can be taken to a permanent commercial facility. Ms. Smith pointed out that commercial thermal recycling facilities are often located in poor and minority neighborhoods and that the Navy would be proposing to impact those neighborhoods with thermal recycling. Trucking off-site would also mean trucking the soil through other neighborhoods and on Interstate 80. Mr. Sullivan stated that on-site treatment would be the likely means of treatment. Ms. Smith noted that social impacts should be of greater consideration than cost. Mr. McDonald acknowledged these concerns but stated they are beyond the scope of the RAB. Mr. Ricks suggested that the Navy is obligated to address issues of environmental justice in their decision-making.

Mr. Ho noted that with the second media, subsurface soil more than two feet deep, excavation is

difficult, expensive and risky. Stability of the sidewalls are a concern and require more soil to be removed to maintain the stability of the site, particularly at TI where soils are loose. Also, deeper excavation can be complicated by existing underground utilities and adjacent buildings. In-situ bio-venting is considered the recommended technology for subsurface soil treatment because it is effective, implementable, and less costly. Mr. Ho explained that bio-venting is a variant of bioremediation. It uses a piping network and blowers to supply oxygen to the subsurface and facilitate the bioremediation process in-situ. A treatability study would need to be performed on this technology before a final decision is made on its use at TI.

Considerations of the treatment of groundwater, the third media, include a pump and treat system and in-situ bio-sparging. The pump and treat system is a classic technology that is well proven, feasible but costly and oftentimes a slow treatment process.

The in-situ bio-sparging, another variant of bioremediation that is very similar to bio-venting, involves injecting air below the water table, where it bubbles through the groundwater and supplies oxygen to the microorganisms. Bio-sparging is also a proven technology, that is effective, implementable, and less costly than pump and treat, and therefore, the recommended technology for groundwater treatment.

Ms. Smith asked if the vapors will be captured if the bio-venting and bio-sparging technologies are used, or if they will just be released to the atmosphere. Mr. Ho indicated that they would not likely be captured in most cases due to the low injection rate of air. Ms. Smith questioned what the projected release levels of vapors would be. Mr. Ho stated that they would be almost immeasurably low. Mr. Sullivan added that implementation of either of these two technologies would require involvement of the Regional Air Board, and may even require obtaining a permit and conducting air monitoring.

Ms. Vedagiri stated for the record that she believes the TPH cleanup levels based on the toxicity testing are flawed. She noted that comments from some of the RAB regarding the ecotoxicological testing overlap comments submitted by the regulatory agencies. She added that to date, these comments have not been addressed in a substantive way.

Petroleum Issues on Adjacent Property on Yerba Buena Island

Mr. Sullivan stated that there have been questions regarding what is happening to the Coast Guard base that exists on YBI. He noted that the Navy owns all of TI and most of YBI, except for the Coast Guard property. As an adjacent property owner, they conduct their own environmental investigation and cleanup programs. The Navy maintains on-going dialogue with the Coast Guard. The majority of the Coast Guard property is down-gradient of the Navy property and so has little impact on the Navy's portion. Some work may be conducted jointly in one area, at former UST 270, where the properties meet at the same gradient and where the Coast Guard has also removed a tank.

Ms. Smith asked about the Vessel Traffic Service building on YBI operated by the Coast Guard. Mr.

Sullivan noted that the building is actually on Navy property but will be transferred to the Coast Guard. The Navy has already prepared an Environmental Condition of Property document as part of the transfer process. Ms. Nelson asked for a description of the location of Tank 270 in relation to IR Site 11. Mr. Sullivan stated that they almost border each other, with IR Site 11 just to the east of the former tank. IR Site 11 data is being looked at as part of the investigation of Tank 270. Mr. McDonald asked if the Coast Guard has participated in the cleanup process. Mr. Sullivan indicated that except for the Tank 270 area, there has not been much need for interaction between the Navy and the Coast Guard. Anything attributable to the Navy is being investigated by the Navy even if it extends onto Coast Guard property, which also includes a section of the fuel line.

IV. Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report

Mr. Sullivan stated that this discussion provides an opportunity to take additional comments and answer questions on the draft final RI. The comment period on the document closes on December 19. Ms. Nelson distributed copies of comments from Paul Hehn, Usha Vedagiri, Dale Smith, Chris Shirley and herself on the draft final RI. Ms. Vedagiri stated that she will have additional comments and will fax them to Ms. Nelson and Mr. Sullivan.

Ms. Nelson asked when the new data will be available for Site 12 and how it will be incorporated into the RI. Richard Knapp, Tetra Tech EM Inc., stated that they have so far received about 40 percent of the data for Site 12 from the lab, and may have the rest of the data in by the end of December. Mr. Sullivan agreed to send the whole data set to the Technical Subcommittee when it becomes available. The Technical Memo should be released in late January or early February. Mr. Sullivan stated that the BCT has discussed but not yet decided as to whether to incorporate the Site 12 Technical Memo into the Onshore RI or to complete the RI without the Site 12 data, or possibly even break off Site 12 from the rest of the Onshore RI.

Ms. Nelson asked about the status of the validation studies for Sites 11, 28 and 29. Ernie Galang, EFA West, stated that the comment period for the validation studies work plan has been extended to January 29 at the request of the regulatory agencies. The studies will not likely be completed in time, however, to be incorporated into the final RI or the Technical Memo. Ms. Nelson asked if the Navy would like comments from the RAB on the work plan. Mr. Galang indicated that comments can be submitted by the end of January so the final work plan can be prepared.

Ms. Nelson asked when the final RI is scheduled for release. Mr. Knapp stated that it would be released on about February 18, 1998. Ms. Nelson questioned whether the validation studies would be included as an addenda to the final RI. Mr. Sullivan responded that the validation studies will be issued as addenda if the final RI is released prior to completion of the validation studies. He added that if there are concerns over the sequence of document release, the Navy can take these into consideration. Ms. Nelson asked if an executive summary of the draft final RI had been sent out to new RAB members. Mr. Sullivan indicated that one has not yet been sent.

PROGRAM UPDATES

V. General Updates

Sue Sullivan was thanked for providing snacks for the meeting.

FY98 Project Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan stated that the FY98 budget has firmed at about \$9.5 million however, he has not had a chance to review the final detailed list. He noted that it remains similar to the original draft, and he will provide copies of the final to the RAB. Mr. Galang commented that money has already been saved in negotiations on the first project of the year, and so this savings can be used towards another project. Mr. Sullivan stated that they are working toward a total dollar limit of \$9.5 million, which will fund about as much work as can be reasonably undertaken for the year. He added that this amount is more money than TI has received in the past.

RPM/BCT Meeting on December 8

Mr. Sullivan noted that there were no community members in attendance at the last RPM/BCT meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 6. At the meeting, it was decided to update the BRAC Cleanup Plan, although it is no longer a requirement from Navy headquarters for TI to do so. BCT members felt the document important, however, and so it will be incrementally updated. The next RPM/BCT meeting will be a working session to decide which sections need to be updated.

Additional items of discussion included: the Site 12 additional data schedule and addenda; the Zone 5/Zone 6 FOSLs, which will be discussed at either the January or February RAB meeting (a draft document will not be available until January/February); the incorporation of the Nimitz House Complex FOSL into the Zone 6 FOSL (Zone 6 will entail the remainder of YBI including the housing complex); and the RAB meeting agenda. Final minutes of the RPM/BCT meeting will be available in about one to two weeks.

Clarification was provided on the status of the draft final EBS FOSL for Zone 4; the document will be finalized but occupancy is pending until review of the additional data from Site 12. The Zone 4 FOSL may require amendment depending upon the results of the additional data.

Ms. Nelson pointed out that the Draft RAB meeting agenda did not have the role of the RAB as a January item, but was instead replaced by the draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR. She asked if the role of the RAB would be better handled at the January meeting since new member training is also planned for January. Mr. Sullivan explained that the draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR presentation was changed from January to February in the final agenda because the release date for the document has been pushed back until at least the February/March timeframe. For the benefit of the new RAB members, Ms. Nelson explained that there will be public forums outside of the RAB for addressing the EIS/EIR, however, relevant portions of the document involving environmental cleanup aspects are of interest to the RAB.

Mr. Sullivan noted that at the RPM/BCT meeting it was suggested to include a role of the RAB discussion at an upcoming RAB meeting. It would provide an opportunity to look at RAB guidance documents, which would benefit both current and new RAB members. Ms. Nelson noted both a general need and a specific need; the specific need being how the TI RAB's operating guidelines match up with those suggested in guidance documents issued subsequent to the TI RAB's formation. Mr. McDonald stated that it would be helpful to discuss the role of the RAB and determine whether the role should be changed to reflect the mature phase reached by the RAB since it first began. He suggested the topic would be better addressed in a separate less formal forum, such as an interim meeting. Mr. Sullivan summarized that new RAB members could first receive background information as part of their indoctrination, then the role of the RAB could be further addressed at an interim meeting, most likely in February. Plans for this discussion could be handled at the January interim meeting.

Mr. McDonald asked if another site tour is planned. Mr. Sullivan indicated that an informal two hour tour is planned for Saturday, January 17 at 9:30 am. An additional tour can be planned for later to accommodate those unable to attend on the 17th. Mr. Sullivan informed new RAB members that an information package would be sent to each of them prior to the tour. New members will also receive copies of the RPM/BCT meeting minutes. The next RPM/BCT meeting is scheduled for January 6 at Tetra Tech's downtown San Francisco office.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan notified the group that the Mayor's TI Task Force meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 17 at 1:00 p.m. at the Ferry Building. It is a City meeting scheduled for the third Wednesday of each month. Mr. Aldrich asked if the Mayor's Task Force mailing list has been updated with new RAB member addresses. Mr. Sullivan stated he would get new RAB member information to the City for inclusion on their mailing list.

VI. Review of Action Items

Mr. Sullivan noted that he has not yet updated the action items list yet, but will do so.

Response to RAB Comments

Mr. Sullivan proposed that if RAB members are still in disagreement with the Navy responses to the draft RI, then to include these comments as part of the draft final RI. Ms. Nelson pointed out that the various RAB members approached their comments to the draft final RI differently. She asked if the written responses provided by the Navy will be included in the final RI as an appendix. Mr. Sullivan responded that it has been the Navy's policy not to include community member comments into the RI document, but instead to keep them as a separate record. Ms. Nelson stated that it is the RAB's position that the responses be incorporated into the final RI as an appendix.

February, March and April Meeting Minutes Revisions

Mr. Sullivan noted that he had revised the February and March meeting minutes, but that the April ones are still outstanding. Ms. Nelson stated that John Allman had reviewed the February and March minutes and had no further comment on them. The RAB agreed to approve the February and March minutes as revised and to issue them as final. It was requested that the April meeting minutes be finalized in January.

OTHER BUSINESS:

VII. Organizational Business

New RAB Member Orientation and Training

Ms. Nelson reiterated that new RAB member orientation and training will be held Saturday, January 17 at 9:30 a.m. Members are to meet in the TI Building 1, 2nd floor conference room for about a half hour of discussion. A site tour will follow. All RAB members are invited to attend. Mr. McDonald asked if the January interim meeting will provide an opportunity for additional new member orientation. Ms. Nelson suggested that, beginning with the January meeting, a portion of the upcoming interim meetings be devoted to new member training. Mr. Sullivan stated that the interim meeting notice will encourage new members to attend for additional training. He noted that the interim meetings are optional.

Co-Chair Elections

Ms. Nelson reminded the RAB that she and Paul Hehn will be stepping down as Community Co-chairs and so volunteers are sought to fill these positions. She asked that those interested inform Mr. Sullivan.

Moving RAB Meetings to Wednesdays in 1998

Ms. Nelson stated that there has been a proposal to move RAB meetings from Tuesdays to Wednesdays. She requested the input of the regulatory agency representatives. Mr. Ricks noted that Martha Walters of the City will have a schedule conflict if the meetings are moved to Wednesdays. Other agency representatives in attendance indicated their preference to remain with Tuesday meetings rather than Wednesdays or Thursdays. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the RAB stay with Tuesday since it works best for the majority of the RAB.

It was agreed that the interim meetings be moved to the first Wednesday of the month. The next interim meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8 at Paul Hehn's house. Mr. Sullivan explained that the interim meetings are optional and are held primarily for the community RAB members to discuss issues off the record. The Navy and regulatory agency representatives are only present at the request of the community members.

Ms. Smith asked Ms. Nelson for a brief review of the RAB's presentation before the Mayor's TI Task Force. Ms. Nelson stated that Jim Sullivan and Mary-Rose Cassa also gave presentations

and that the three were complimentary. She noted that the environmental issues presented did not seem to register with the Task Force members and so the RAB may need to decide how to better communicate with them. She suggested that the RAB get a copy of the enabling legislation that will allow the Task Force to become a Development Authority on January 1, 1998; a description of their function may be helpful in determining what their main issues are and how the RAB can best work with them.

Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Grants

Mr. Sullivan stated that there was a lot of discussion at the last interim meeting regarding how to get TAPP grants to undertake various projects. Richard Hansen and Chris Shirley will help the RAB define their priorities in using TAPP money and also help complete a TAPP application.

VIII. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

The following documents are scheduled for release in the next month or so:

- Draft Final RI Report, (available 16 September 1997, comments due 19 December)
- Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP), (available, 18 November 1997, comments due 23 January 1998)
- Draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR, (available January /February 1998)
- Site 12 Additional Investigation Technical Memorandum, (available at the end of January 1998)
- Validation Study (comments will be accepted through the end of January 1998)

IX. Proposed Agenda Items

The following items are proposed for the coming months:

January

- Draft Corrective Action Plan Discussion
- Additional Site 12 Investigation Data
- Role of the RAB

February

- CERCLA Feasibility Study (FS) Overview (possibly deferred to March)
- Zone 5 and Zone 6 FOSLs
- Draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR

X. Closing Remarks

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule:

Next Regular Meetings:

7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 20 January 1997 Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area
7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 17 February 1998 Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area

Next Interim Community Member Meeting:

7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 6 January 1998 Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area

Next BCT/RPM Meeting:

9:30 a.m. Tuesday, 6 January 1998 Tetra Tech EM Inc. 135 Main Street, Suite 1800,
San Francisco

Next Treasure Island Development Task Force Meeting:

1:00 p.m. Wednesday, 17 December 1997 Ferry Building, Suite 3100, San Francisco

Mr. Sullivan distributed draft score cards for the IR sites, which serve as a guideline for progress. He adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 20, 1998, at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2nd floor conference area, NAVSTA TL.

ATTACHMENT A – MEETING AGENDA
ATTACHMENT B – MEETING ATTENDANCE LIST
ATTACHMENT C – MEETING HANDOUTS

THESE ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY NAVFAC
SOUTHWEST RECORDS OFFICE TO LOCATE THE MISSING
ATTACHMENTS. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A
PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED SHOULD THE
MISSING ITEMS BE LOCATED.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

DIANE C. SILVA, COMMAND RECORDS MANAGER, CODE EV33
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, SOUTHWEST
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY (NBSD BLDG. 3519)
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280
E-MAIL: diane.silva@navy.mil