

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8120
6 Mar 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 – 20 January 1998

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 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)

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8120
6 Mar 1998

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

Distribution: (cont)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Mr. Clinton Loftman
Mr. John Andrew	Mr. Daniel McDonald
Mr. James Aldrich	Mr. Brandon McMillan
Mr. John Allman (Alt Co-Chair)	Ms. Karen Mendelow
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Mr. Ernest Michelsen
Mr. Nathan Brennan	Ms. Patricia Nelson
Ms. Peggy Chiang	Mr. Earl Newbre
Mr. Douglas Cormack	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Ms. Wendy Easley (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Carlos Penafiel
Ms. Carolyn Froeberg	Mr. James Rodriguez
Ms. Laurie Glass	Mr. Jack Savage
Mr. Michael Gross	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Richard Hansen (Co-Chair)	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Ms. Jeannette Tan Hayden	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Mr. Paul Hehn	Mr. Richard Vivio
Mr. Gary Jensen	Mr. Harlan Van Wye
Ms. Alice LaPierre	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, 20 January 1998

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 20 January 1998 at 7:07 p.m. at the Building 1, 2nd Floor Conference Room Area, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to: 1) report on the Treasure Island Task Force Activities, 2) discuss the draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP), 3) provide the Zone 5 and 6 FOSL Scope/Schedule, 4) discuss the Department of Defense RAB Guidelines, 5) discuss general updates, 6) attend to organizational business, 7) review the upcoming environmental report review schedule, 8) provide open questions and discussion, and 9) 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 noted this as the first meeting of 1998. He also mentioned the possibility that the next RAB meeting may be held in the first floor area previously occupied by the museum if the partitions are removed in the next few weeks.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sullivan called for comments on the meeting agenda. No comments were voiced, so the agenda was accepted as written.

Discussion/Approval of the 16 December 1997 Minutes

Mr. Sullivan called for comments on last month's meeting minutes. There were none; the minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Sullivan acknowledged visitor Nathan Brennan, a former RAB member, and asked him to consider re-applying for membership on the RAB. He noted that Mr. Brennan is in charge of the sewage treatment plant on TI, and thanked him for attending. Richard Hansen suggested that Mr. Brennan be reinstated as a member of the RAB on an interim provisional basis. Mr. Brennan accepted and agreed to fill out a new membership application.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

III. Report on Treasure Island Task Force Activities

Mr. Sullivan stated that Larry Florin, of the City of San Francisco, was invited to attend the RAB meeting but was unable to do so. Mr. Florin did, however, discuss the status of Task Force activities with Mr. Sullivan, who provided a brief to the RAB.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there has not been a lot of Task Force activity this month. The Task Force has not yet become an authority, however, this is expected to happen next month by vote of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The state law establishing the TI Development Authority became effective on January 1, 1998. The Task Force Meeting scheduled for tomorrow (January 21, 1998) will be informational; they will receive a briefing by a group interested in constructing a theme park on TI. The February meeting should bring more information on the development of the Task Force's Citizen's Advisory Committee. Mr. Florin indicated to Mr. Sullivan that the TI RAB would be asked to provide a representative to that committee.

James Aldrich asked if the Task Force is pushing to put the housing on TI into use. Pat Nelson, Community Co-Chair, stated that there are a lot of groups that have expressed interest in the housing. Martha Walters, of the City of San Francisco, stated that the Task Force is currently in an information gathering phase. Mr. Aldrich asked if the Task Force is setting an agenda for reuse. Ms. Walters responded that the City's reuse plan serves as the basis for reuse, but also noted that things can change rapidly depending on the source of information and political priorities.

Harlan Van Wye noted that, at the October Task Force meeting, the members approved the Request for Proposal for development of the Marina area, with six changes. He added that the responses are due tomorrow and that several groups have expressed interest in the marina. Mr. Hansen asked if minutes of the Task Force meetings have been made available. Ms. Nelson responded that she had requested copies be sent to the RAB, however, none have been received to date. Ms. Walters agreed to check on the status of Task Force minutes distribution. Mr. Hansen expressed concern that the Task Force might say "yes" to all requests to develop and use TI. Ms. Walters stated that one of the roles of the Task Force is to ensure that blanket approval does not happen. She added that TI has to be self-sustaining and generate revenue, but it will take time and occur in increments.

Mr. Van Wye commented that the proposal, as drafted and approved by the Task Force, was open ended in the type of development for the marina. Ms. Walters noted that the Task Force supported the notion that respondents be creative within certain parameters. There are currently 104 boat slips, and the Environmental Impact Report proposes an expansion to 300 slips. Ms. Nelson wrapped up this discussion by stating that the Task Force seems to be coming to grips with the scope of their efforts in the future.

IV. Draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

Mr. Sullivan stated that, as a follow-up to the presentation given last month on the CAP, and the approach of the closeout of the 60-day comment period, time was set aside tonight to address questions and take verbal comments for the record. Ms. Nelson initiated the comment period by distributing a copy of her written comments on the draft CAP. She noted that Paul Hehn was also preparing written comments.

Ms. Nelson stated that she and Mr. Hehn found similar deficiencies in the CAP as to those found in the RI. She explained that in review of the CAP, she was looking for acknowledgment of sites adjacent to IR sites. She focused her review on Site 6, which is adjacent to Site 12. Ms. Nelson noted first that the data contained in the CAP is largely the immunoassay results; no historical data from the Phase I and Phase II-A work were provided to show how these sites were investigated as part of the Phase II-B work.

She noted that the document states that these sites had been determined to be petroleum sites, but that there are other constituents, such as dioxin in Site 6, typically not associated with petroleum wastes. She stated that lab data, other than the immunoassay data and some confirmation results, were not located in the appendix. She noted it as disturbing that other constituents had been found, but that data for these other constituents were absent from the report and appendices.

Ms. Nelson pointed out that the immunoassay data summarized in Appendix B did not distinguish between which was for soil and which was for groundwater, although there had been some false negative or unreporting of TPH constituents in both media. She expressed concern over whether or not there was statistical value to the data represented, and that the sample was small for the areas comprised by the sites.

Ms. Nelson added that she thinks there is more work that needs to be done before the CAP can be considered complete. She noted that data from recent additional work done on Site 24 would have been helpful if included in the CAP. She added that a contour map for Site 6 showing the horizontal distribution of the constituents in groundwater may have overlapped with the northeastern section of Site 12. She suggested that those two sites be put together to plot the location of dioxins in relation to one another since there had been some dioxins observed at Site 12. Ms. Nelson concluded her comments by stating there are some sketchy areas that need to be shored up in the CAP document.

Mr. Sullivan asked Ms. Nelson of others she was aware of that would be submitting comments on the draft CAP. Ms. Nelson indicated that Mr. Hehn and Usha Vedagiri were planning to submit comments. Mr. Sullivan noted that John Allman was presently out of the country and did not know if he would be likely to include comments.

Mr. Hansen asked if it is the Navy's intent to respond to the RAB member comments specifically, or address the overall concern regarding deficiencies. Mr. Sullivan replied that the regulatory

agency comments will be received in the next few days. Then, either as part of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting or as a special meeting, the Navy will go over all of the comments from both the agencies and the community members. The comments will then be addressed in writing, probably at a more specific level. Mr. Sullivan indicated the response to comments to the community members will follow the same format as the responses to regulatory agency comments. Following the response to comment process, the CAP will move from draft to draft final. Ernie Galang, EFA West, noted that there will be no draft final for the CAP, but that it will instead move right to final. Mr. Sullivan corrected himself, adding that there will still be a review period for the RAB on the final CAP document.

Mr. Hansen asked Ms. Nelson if she felt their concerns are being addressed. Ms. Nelson responded that the comments are being addressed, but it is questionable whether to the satisfaction of the commentators. She further commented that whether or not the agencies and redevelopment authority concur with them may or may not be meaningful, and the RAB, as a group, has to determine where they want to go. Mr. Sullivan stated that comments would be accepted through the end of the week, and encouraged new RAB members to take a look at the draft CAP.

V. Zone 5 and 6 FOSL Scope/Schedule

Mr. Sullivan stated that originally a preview of the Zone 5 and 6 FOSLs had been planned, however, it has been postponed to next month's meeting because the draft of the Zone 5 FOSL will not be completed until February. He distributed project schedules for Reuse Zones 5 and 6. He noted that the draft Zone 5 FOSL will be available by the February RAB meeting, and the draft Zone 6 FOSL will be available at the March meeting.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the Finding of Suitability to Lease, or FOSL, determines if a property is leasable for a specific purpose, given the current condition of the property. TI currently has about 10 FOSLs completed. Because the process is labor intensive, the Navy has gone from FOSLs that are small or building-specific to larger zone FOSLs. There have been six small FOSLs and four Zone FOSLs prepared. The Navy is completing signatures on the Zone 4 FOSL, which represents the first FOSL with a contingency regarding occupancy of the property pending review of additional data. The remaining areas of TI and YBI not yet in a FOSL have now been placed in Zone 5 and Zone 6 respectively.

Mr. Sullivan commented that Zone 5 contains a higher percentage of cleanup sites than has occurred in previous FOSLs, and consequently the document is expected to be more detailed and will likely contain more limitations on property usage. With the completion of Zone 5, 100% of the property on TI will have been evaluated for leasing, but that doesn't mean that all the acreage is leasable for any purpose. Zone 6 contains three of the larger IR sites - the landfill (IR 11), the sludge disposal area (IR 8), and the area under the bridge (IR 29). A preview of the Zone 5 FOSL is planned for the February RAB meeting and the Zone 6 FOSL will be previewed at the March meeting.

Mr. Van Wye noted that Building 230 on YBI, the gatehouse, does not appear to be included in Zone 6 on the map, and asked if this might be an error. Mr. Sullivan stated that he would have to compare it to the Zone 3 FOSL to make that determination. Ms. Nelson stated she recalled considering a FOSL for the Nimitz Complex some time ago. Mr. Sullivan responded that a draft FOSL document was put together for that complex, Quarters 1 through 7, plus some miscellaneous buildings. About a year ago, the issue of lead in the soil came up in the RAB which resulted in additional testing. The FOSL was never completed, and the only occupant was an adult caretaker. The soil at the Nimitz House has been removed and retested, but this is the extent of progress to date. Mr. Sullivan explained that this site would be included in Zone 6 to allow for a more comprehensive evaluation, particularly since all of the RI data is now available, as well as fuel line and home heating oil tank information.

Mike Michelsen asked for clarification on Site 27 on the map. Mr. Sullivan responded that Site 27 is a former skeet range submerged offshore. Mr. Hansen requested a brief explanation of FOSLs for the benefit of new RAB members and asked about the time scale of the leases. Mr. Sullivan noted that the leases are generally multi-year, but clauses in the lease allow the Navy continued access for sampling and remediation work. Termination clauses are also included so the Navy has flexibility to complete cleanup. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that FOSLs are an evaluation of property to determine if it can be used for some specific purpose prior to cleanup.

YBI Quarters 5 and 7 Draft Interim FOSL

Mr. Sullivan provided a brief on this interim FOSL, still in progress. He noted that the Technical Subcommittee members would soon be receiving a copy of this document for review. Mr. Sullivan explained that, in addition to the Zone 5 FOSL, the City has requested to lease Quarters 5 and 7 on a shorter term basis. Quarters 5 would be leased to an adult caretaker and Quarters 7 to a family. Regarding Quarters 5, the Navy does not feel there is a risk posed to a short-term adult occupant, however, the soil and the building will still be abated for lead in about 12 months. For Quarters 7, the Navy has begun a lead abatement action in the soil around the building. About 12 inches of soil will be removed and the area retested, then if necessary, more soil will be removed. More difficult to excavate areas will be covered with plastic sheeting, followed by bark and other groundcover. He noted this would be strictly an interim measure until a more detailed excavation can be performed.

Mr. Van Wye asked when the leases would be executed. Mr. Sullivan replied that they would probably be executed the first week in February. A document will go out to the Technical Subcommittee by Friday, addressing occupancy over a 12-month period. The Navy has plans to abate all of the Nimitz House Complex Quarters 1 through 7, as well as the pre-1960 housing on YBI, in FY98. A contract for the abatement work for the Nimitz House Complex will probably be issued in the next three to four months. The Navy's goal is to award the abatement contract for the other housing by the end of FY98. As early as this summer, it is likely that abatement of the Nimitz House Complex will begin, probably in phases. Later in FY98 and into FY99, abatement activities would take place for the rest of the older quarters on YBI.

Mr. Sullivan noted that HUD guidelines cut off abatement requirements for houses built after 1960. All of the houses on TI as well as 60 houses on YBI were built post-1960. He stated that as a requirement in the lease for Quarters 7, the City or occupant would need to take interim measures to control chipped paint and dust both inside and out of the unit. Ms. Nelson asked if the Navy would be responsible for repainting if friable paint is discovered. Mr. Sullivan specified that the agreement would hold the City and its occupant responsible for the housing structure and the Navy responsible for the soil in order for short-term occupancy to occur prior to complete abatement. The City and Navy have already inspected the units and found the paint, both inside and out, to be in good condition. Permanent abatement by the Navy would entail completely removing lead paint from surfaces susceptible to chipping, and placing a special encapsulating paint on other less susceptible areas.

Ms. Nelson asked if this was one of the items for consideration by the Task Force. Ms. Walters indicated that it was not. Mr. Sullivan noted that the City's TI project office has the authority to issue leases of a certain size and duration. All leases have so far required a FOSL, with the exception of several uses of very short duration. For the movie studios, a short-term lease, or license, was executed prior to completion of the FOSL. Mr. Hansen noted that the leasing of Quarters 5 and 7 seem to set a precedent and expressed concern that other groups will press to short-cut the process. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged the concern but noted this as the Navy providing some flexibility to the City since the FOSL process takes about six months from start to finish. He also noted that the occupant would likely be displaced at a later time, whereas the full FOSL process enables the Navy to make a more long-term prediction for leasing a particular property. He pointed out that an evaluation of suitability to lease is still being made, but under an expedited process, to be followed by a more detailed investigation.

Mr. Van Wye commented that Quarters 1 through 7 have been occupied by Navy families since the turn of the century, with no adverse health impacts to them that he is aware of. He noted his support of expediting the process to get property transferred to the City. Mr. Sullivan stated that a lead screening program run by the Navy on children living on the island had not identified any health problems. Mr. Hansen stated he shared Mr. Van Wye's desire to get the property transferred to the City as quickly as possible, and added that if this is a more expeditious way to handle reoccupation on a temporary basis, then it should be used as a means to get all buildings reoccupied quickly.

Mr. Aldrich asked if the FOSL process is always driven by a request from the City. Mr. Sullivan responded that, in general, it is driven by the City because if there is no interest in leasing a property, then the Navy would not FOSL it. However, sometimes the City receives unexpected proposals. This is why the Navy moved from very specific FOSLs to zone FOSLs, so that the entire acreage has been looked at once. Although the City may not have expressed interest in leasing an entire zone, the zone FOSL allows the City the flexibility to respond to potential proposers who may express interest in the future. Mr. Van Wye suggested that all seven of the quarters be FOSLed together rather than do only two of them now. Mr. Sullivan replied that the Quarters 5 and 7 interim FOSL addresses only a short period of occupancy, because the Navy has

to do additional work to the site. The Zone 6 FOSL, which covers these buildings, will offer a more long-term opportunity to lease the site. Mr. Van Wye asked if the City is paying for the expedited process. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy is performing the work at the request of the City, noting it is in the Navy's interest to get some of the quarters occupied.

Karen Mendelow asked how the lead abatement work impacts the budget on a long-term basis. Mr. Sullivan noted that it has always been a part of the budget, since HUD guidelines require federal property owners to abate pre-1960 houses. TI has only recently gotten to the point of designing and preparing to contract for the lead abatement work. Ms. Mendelow asked if lead abatement would impact other projects already planned. Mr. Sullivan stated that it would not since lead abatement has been in the budget for several years.

VI. Department of Defense (DoD) RAB Guidelines

Mr. Sullivan stated that it is an opportune time to take a look at the RAB guidance coming from the DoD and U.S. EPA, since the TI RAB has recently added new members. He pointed out that the RAB still has flexibility in addressing the process and that the information issued by the agencies are intended only as guidelines. Mr. Sullivan called upon Ryan Brooks, Director of Community Relations at EFA West, to review the guidance.

Mr. Brooks began by noting that President Clinton's fast track cleanup plan, initiated in 1993, included community involvement as an important part of the plan. Later in the same year, the DoD took heed and established Restoration Advisory Boards for both closing and non-closing bases. RABs were created to allow for an ongoing dialogue between the community and the Navy. The RAB provides a forum for the community to interact with the Navy, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the U.S. EPA, the California Department of Public Health and other agencies involved with the cleanup process.

Mr. Brooks explained that the RAB consists of a cross-section of the community. Noting the recent membership recruitment for TI, he stated that part of the process to select new members is to ensure that those selected represent a diverse group of the community. He pointed out the uniqueness of TI because there is no immediate surrounding community. Each individual RAB member has the same amount of power and provides advice to the BCT on the cleanup process.

Mr. Brooks stated that the expectation of RAB members is to, most importantly, show up for meetings and secondly, review selected documents. Subcommittees are formed to break down the task of document review, and then report back to the RAB their findings. Suggestions for improvements in the process are encouraged.

Henry Ongerth asked Mr. Sullivan to describe how the RAB functions as a group with relation to taking actions. Mr. Brooks noted that one of the main purposes of the RAB is to represent the diversity of the community. The RAB guidance suggests that RAB members go back and speak

to their communities. Mr. Sullivan added that the RAB process has been put in place to allow the community earlier involvement in decisions, before decisions are finalized. Ideally, when the Navy comes to a decision on what action to take, early community involvement would hopefully lead to a consensus on that action, so that the Navy would not find itself at odds with the desires of the local community.

Mr. Ongerth pointed out that the RAB does not vote as a group to take specific action or decide by majority vote to take a particular position and requested elaboration as to why. Mr. Sullivan responded that there are more formalized committees under the federal government, through the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), that do vote. Mr. Brooks added that the DoD made the decision not to allow RABs to vote because they wanted equal representation by all community members, and believe that all community opinions should be heard. Mr. Brooks pointed out, however, that there are many examples around the Bay Area where RABs have made a big impact, despite not being able to vote. He noted actions at Hunters Point Shipyard, Treasure Island, Alameda and Moffett Field where RABs have impacted decisions made by the Navy.

Ms. Nelson noted that the TI RAB has taken action although not through a voting process. Mr. Sullivan stated that the 1994 DoD guidelines do not preclude the RAB from identifying consensus on issues, but rather ensures that minority opinions are equally heard. So it is still within RAB guidelines for community members to express a group opinion.

PROGRAM UPDATES

VII. General Updates

FY98 Project Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of the FY98 Project Execution Plan, noting that the Plan is similar to the drafts prepared in the late summer and reviewed by community members and the regulators. The Plan totals about \$9.5 million, however, individual line items are presented in ranges so not to affect the procurement process. The funding was received in the last 30 to 45 days so there has not been much time to execute many projects. Mr. Sullivan noted that Reuse Zone 5 and 6 FOSL work has been awarded earlier than originally planned to meet the request of the City. In general, the priority list reflects the items that need to be accomplished in order to keep the cleanup program on schedule towards the completion date of 2002.

Mr. Aldrich asked for clarification on item number 24, to prepare FY98 finding of suitability to transfer for clean parcels. Mr. Sullivan elaborated that there are quite a few parcels that do not have any cleanup actions pending. This project would allow preparation of the necessary documentation so that once the Navy and the City reach a property transfer agreement, that property would be ready to transfer. He noted, however, that the Navy and the City have not yet reached a real estate agreement, but that the agreement might be in place by the end of FY98.

Mr. Ongerth noted both items 5 and 17 refer to lead-based paint abatement for 36 housing units and questioned if this number was a coincidence. Mr. Sullivan stated that item 5 involves the design work and item 17 is the actual abatement. Mr. Hansen noted that all seven units of the housing complex will be abated under the same project. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that the project would be awarded as one contract but that the actual work might be phased to meet the City's needs. He added that the Navy wants to do everything to make the houses long-term leasable and ultimately transferrable, and that the lead-based paint abatement is the major work that needs to be completed to make them transferrable.

Ms. Nelson asked about items 9 and 16 designated as "NC." Mr. Sullivan explained that award for these items was originally planned for FY98, but due to extra money available, were awarded instead at the end of FY97. He noted that the work for these will not begin until FY98. Mr. Galang noted that the combined estimated total for both these items is about \$200,000. He added that a revised project schedule (last issued September 12, 1997) is being updated for the BCT and should be available by the March BCT meeting.

Mr. Sullivan concluded by stating that the list of projects represents the items that the Navy has the potential of completing during the year and that additional funding could not likely be spent. He added that TI is getting through the investigatory stage and entering into the cleanup stage, but to stay on schedule, the Navy must try to complete the investigations in 1998.

January 6, 1998 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated that the main topic of discussion for this meeting was the additional Site 12 work. Currently, the data is being validated and should be available to the technical subcommittee and other interested members about the first week of February. This data will be used to look at the Zone 4 FOSL in order to close out that document. Discussions were also held on the regulatory comments on the draft final RI and the Zone FOSLs. The BCT also had a working session regarding update of the BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP). Chapters 3 and 4, the primary technical chapters, will be updated by the consultants. The BCT will work on the other chapters which address the overall cleanup goals and broader issues. The update will not necessarily be a complete rewrite of the BCP, and will be targeted for issue in March. Mr. Sullivan made excerpts of the BCP available to new RAB members, noting that more will come following the update of the document. Lastly, the RAB meeting agenda was discussed.

City of San Francisco Review of Navy Environmental Reports/Data

Ms. Walters provided a brief review, stating that the City has asked Geomatrix, a highly-regarded geotechnical firm in San Francisco, to perform an independent, third party review of the Navy's projects to date. She noted the City's interest in development of the marina, in the housing area, and Site 12, as well as the RAB's concerns as the impetus for this review. She offered for Geomatrix to present their findings to the RAB, possibly at the March meeting. Mr. Sullivan noted that Geomatrix has done soils and geology studies on Treasure Island previously, and their work is referenced in the reuse plan.

Additional Site 12 Investigation Status/Zone 4 FOSL Revision

Mr. Sullivan stated that field investigation has been completed for Site 12 and the data is currently being validated. Unvalidated data was provided to Geomatrix, but until the data is validated, it is unknown what effect it might have on the Zone 4 FOSL. During the next 30 to 60 days, the Zone 4 FOSL will be evaluated in light of the additional data set; in the meantime occupancy of the housing units is pending the outcome of this review.

Reuse Issues

Mr. Sullivan stated that, other than interest in Quarters 5 and 7, there have been no other reuse issues to address. A discussion of a proposal for a theme park is on the agenda of tomorrow's Task Force meeting, however, there will be no decision making involved.

Mr. Sullivan also brought to the RAB's attention that TI will be developing a Web site to include information such as meeting minutes and agendas. Ryan Brooks will be helping with this effort.

VIII. Review of Action Items

Ms. Walters asked about management of all the data on the Geographic Information System (GIS), noting it as more important than establishing a Web site. Mr. Sullivan responded that the GIS process has proved slower than anticipated, in trying to pull together the database element and the mapping element. It has been included in the FY98 Project Execution Plan, and the Navy is in the process of putting together the scope of work. It will be awarded once the scope of work is completed. Presently, the Navy is updating TI's mapping hardware and software and should probably have the system running in about three months. Mr. Aldrich asked about the software being used. Mr. Sullivan responded that the mapping program is AutoCAD and the basic viewer for the data is ARCVIEW.

Mr. Sullivan next noted the addition of new RAB members, and the first new member training session- a site tour- was held last Saturday. Two long-term RAB members and nine new RAB members attended the tour. It was agreed that a second site tour would be offered on Saturday, February 7, 1998. Mr. Sullivan also suggested that a more detailed classroom-type training session on the technical aspects of the cleanup could be arranged. Following some discussion, it was decided that this training session would be held on Saturday, February 21, 1998, at 9:30 a.m. for about two to three hours. Mr. Sullivan stated he would send out a notice to the membership regarding these two activities. He also suggested putting future training items on the agenda at the next interim meeting. Ms. Nelson encouraged new RAB member attendance at these training opportunities; not attending would diminish their capacity to serve responsibly on the board. Mr. Sullivan stated he recognized that people have other responsibilities, but hoped to work towards getting a majority of the people to attend training events.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he finally completed review of the April 1997 meeting minutes and will be sending out copies to RAB members. Mr. Sullivan also called for reformulation of the

information repository subcommittee so dialogue can be continued on this topic. Mr. Sullivan stated that he has not yet had a chance to research how other bases are handling RAB community member comments on documents, but will report back on this at the February meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS:

IX. Organizational Business

Ms. Nelson asked for feedback from new RAB members on the recent site tour. Mr. Michelsen stated that he found the tour very useful and that it gave him an appreciation of the scope of activities that are being conducted. He added that more detailed discussion on the role of the RAB would be helpful. Mr. Hansen commented that he also found the tour useful and commended the Navy for doing a good job.

Ms. Nelson asked new RAB members to provide phone numbers, fax numbers and E-mail addresses so that the RAB roster can be updated. Mr. Sullivan requested new members also check the mailing list to be sure he has their correct addresses.

Ms. Nelson asked for an update on the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program, noting that January 15th had been set as the target date for the program becoming official. Mr. Galang responded that it has not come out yet but assured the RAB that there are no deadlines involved in submitting an application. It is still appropriate for community members to develop a list of potential projects and evaluate them against the TAPP criteria. Ms. Nelson noted that a wish list was not developed at the last interim meeting, and expressed hope that this could be accomplished at the February interim meeting so not to delay requesting TAPP funding.

Ms. Nelson announced that elections for two co-chair positions will be held. Several people have already expressed interest in the positions, specifically Wendy Easley and Richard Hansen. Nominations will be solicited from the board at the February meeting, and Mr. Sullivan stated he would note the upcoming election in mailings between now and the February meeting.

X. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan noted the following schedule for upcoming documents:

- The draft CAP is available; comments are due by the January 23, 1998.
- The draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR; no specific release date but probably in the March/April timeframe
- The Site 12 Addition Investigation Technical Memo; the data will be available in early February with the Tech Memo to follow in about four to five weeks
- The Work Plan for Sites 11, 28 and 29 Validation Study is available; comments are due about January 30, 1998.

XI. Proposed Agenda Items

February

- Site 12 Additional Data Presentation
- draft Zone 5 FOSL
- BRAC Cleanup Plan update
- TI EIS/EIR process background briefing

March

- Site 12 Technical Memo
- presentation by Geomatrix on IR Site 12
- draft Zone 6 FOSL
- CERCLA Feasibility Study overview (time permitting)

Mr. Sullivan cautioned that the EIS/EIR process is very formalized for public participation and that the RAB needs to approach the topic within the established bounds of the legal framework. Ms. Walters noted that the EIS/EIR is part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and asked why it is of interest to the RAB. Mr. Nelson stated that it is timely to explain the differences between the two public processes, what the implications are, and what trends the Navy sees, considering what's happening with the Hunters Point Shipyard EIS/EIR. It was agreed that this issue would be discussed at the upcoming BCT meeting and information then provided at the interim meeting, scheduled for the following day.

Ms. Nelson requested that a regular report be provided on the Treasure Island Task Force/Redevelopment Authority activities. She expressed concern that issues come up that the City and the Navy should inform each other about, citing as an example a presentation regarding wetland development on the east side of the island also characterized as a remedy for stormwater. Ms. Walters noted this was a proposal only, and that projects proposed before the Task Force/Redevelopment Authority do not necessarily mean they will happen. Ms. Nelson acknowledged this but stated that knowledge of plans and documents during their development will lead to better interim and ultimate uses. Ms. Walters offered to provide a quarterly update regarding long range planning considerations by the Task Force/Redevelopment Authority. She also agreed to look into getting Task Force minutes sent to the RAB.

Mr. Sullivan encouraged RAB members to attend the interim meetings to participate in the RAB agenda building process. He noted that the Navy drafts the agenda in cooperation with the Community Co-Chair to best reflect the needs of the RAB.

XII. Closing Remarks

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule:

Next Regular Meetings:

7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 17 February 1998

Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area

7:00 p.m. Tuesday, 17 March 1998

Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area

Next Interim Community Member Meeting:

7:00 p.m. Wednesday, 4 February 1998

Building 1, 2nd floor Conference Area

Next BCT/RPM Meeting:

9:30 a.m. Tuesday, 3 February 1998

EFAWest, San Bruno

Next Treasure Island Development Task Force Meeting:

1:00 p.m. Wednesday, 21 January 1998

Ferry Building, Suite 3100, San Francisco

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 17, 1998, at 7:00 p.m., at Building 1, 2nd floor conference area, NAVSTA TI.