

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8193
22 May 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 – 21 April 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.

Original signed by

ERNESTO M. GALANG
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER
By direction

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)

Community RAB Members:

Mr. Joseph Alcedo	Mr. Brandon McMillan
Mr. James Aldrich	Ms. Karen Mendelow
Mr. John Allman (Alt Co-Chair)	Mr. Ernest Michelsen
ARC Ecology (Mr. Saul Bloom)	Ms. Patricia Nelson
Mr. Nathan Brennan	Mr. Henry Ongerth
Ms. Peggy Chiang	Mr. Carlos Penafiel
Ms. Carolyn Froeberg	Mr. James Rodriguez
Mr. Michael Gross	Mr. Jack Savage
Mr. Richard Hansen (Co-Chair)	Ms. Dale Smith
Mr. Paul Hehn	Mr. Thomas Thompson
Ms. Alice LaPierre	Ms. Usha Vedagiri
Mr. Clinton Loftman	Mr. Harlan Van Wye
Mr. Daniel McDonald	Mr. Brad Wong

5090
Ser 6225EG/L8193
22 May 1998

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

Blind copies to:
622A, 6225EG, 62B
Information Repository (3 copies)
Chron, RF
Writer: E. Galang, 6225EG, X-2560
File: NS Treasure Island

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

Tuesday, 21 April 1998
Meeting No. 44

The Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on 21 April 1998 at 7:00 p.m. at Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI. The goals of the meeting were to: 1) have discussion/approval of the 17 March 1998 minutes, 2) discuss the draft Zone 6 FOSL, 3) review the new Operable Unit / fast-track of Site 12 housing for leasing, 4) review the EIS process for Treasure Island, 5) receive general updates, 6) review action items, 7) discuss organizational business, 8) review the upcoming environmental report schedule, and 9) provide agenda items and 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

Richard Hansen, Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. He explained that Jim Sullivan, Base Environmental Coordinator and Navy Co-Chair had been temporarily called away to address a plumbing emergency that had developed on Yerba Buena Island (YBI). He will join the meeting as soon as possible.

Discussion/Approval of Agenda

There were no comments on the agenda.

II. Public Comment

There were no comments from the general public. Chris Shirley distributed copies of a San Francisco Weekly article dated February 25, 1998 on Hunters Point Shipyard regarding early land transfer prior to completion of cleanup (sometimes referred to as "dirty transfer"), noting it gives insight on why the Mayor might be interested in pursuing that option. Ms. Shirley stated she also had information about the legislative budgets for the Department of Defense BRAC Cleanup, as well as a copy of U.S. EPA's Institutional Control Reference Manual (60 pages), currently under review.

The EPA document describes what an Institutional Control is and what some of the hurdles are to using them to protect public health. Mr. Hansen noted the importance of the institutional control issue and that one definition would be fencing, which he felt most people in the community would not find a satisfactory solution. Ms. Shirley added that the content is

interesting and she can make copies available to those interested. It was agreed that a 5-page summary report of the manual will be included in the next mailing. She thinks the EPA comment period on the document ends in July.

III. Introduction of New Executive Director, Treasure Island Development Authority Project

Martha Walters, of the City of San Francisco, explained that Annemarie Conroy, the new Executive Director of the TI Development Authority Project, had a last minute conflict with the RAB meeting and would be unable to attend. She sends her apologies and will hopefully be present at the May RAB meeting. Ms. Walters stated that TI Development Authority had a meeting on April 15, that was mainly procedural in content. The Development Authority members discussed and agreed upon a three-phase scenario for the leasing of Site 12 housing. She added that the City is currently in negotiations with the John Stewart Management Company for management of the housing units. A request for proposal for commercial units management will probably be out in the next few months. City employees, including fire and police personnel, and the University Housing Consortium (UCSF, University of San Francisco, San Francisco State and the Academy of Art) have been targeted by the City as the priority personnel to place in TI housing by September.

IV. Discussion/Approval of 17 March 1998 Minutes

There was no discussion regarding the March meeting minutes: they were unanimously accepted as drafted.

BRAC CLEANUP PROCESS:

V. Draft Zone 6 FOSL Discussion and Response to Comments on the Zone 5 FOSL

Rebecca Sugerman of TetraTech EM Inc. stated that comments on the Draft Zone 6 FOSL are due on Friday, April 24, 1998. The draft response to comments on the Draft Zone 5 FOSL will be out by the end of next week. In response to one of Pat Nelson's comments on the Draft Zone 5 FOSL, a preliminary map has been developed titled "ECP (Environmental Condition of Property) Types and Approximate Extent of VOCs and TPH in Groundwater". Several copies of the map were distributed with a request for RAB comments on the map by the end of next week.

Henry Ongerth commented that more copies of the map should have been provided to RAB members for review. (The Navy will provide a copy of the preliminary map to all Community Members.) Ms. Sugerman responded that the map is very preliminary and an initial review was intended for Technical Subcommittee members. A complete copy will be contained in the Zone 5 Site-Specific Environmental Baseline Survey (SEBS).

Once the Navy's draft response to comments are issued on the Zone 5 FOSL, there will be seven days to respond to the draft responses before the final Zone 5 FOSL document is prepared.

Richard Knapp, of TetraTech EM Inc., noted that there may be a misperception that the map indicates contaminant plumes; rather it indicates boundaries within which there have been some detections, but are not necessarily plumes. John Allman expressed concern over the contours running off into the Bay and also pointed out that the map legend refers to the areas as "plume lines". Paul Hehn suggested that the Navy may want to explain in the legend that the lines represent greater than the detection limit.

Karen Mendelow asked the difference between (TPH) Purgeables and (TPH) Extractables. Mr. Knapp stated that Purgeables are lighter petroleum products associated with gasoline, and may include detects of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene or xylene (BTEX), whereas Extractables are heavier fuel compounds such as diesel fuel and motor oil that are nonvolatile.

Ms. Nelson noted that her Zone 5 comments regarding a map were more far-reaching, and had included defining the various FOSL zones, and to map out the plumes from both IR sites and CAP sites. Ms. Sugerman noted that the preliminary map included the CAP sites, but not the reuse zones because it would make the map too difficult to read. Mr. Hehn questioned whether all the CAP sites are included on the map, and stated that he will review the CAP site data. He noted that the map does not appear all inclusive, and doesn't contain the UST sites and fuel lines under investigation. Ms. Sugerman encouraged Mr. Hehn to provide his comments on the map to the Navy. Comments should be submitted to the Navy by May 1, 1998.

VI. New Operable Unit (OU) / Fast-Track of Site 12 Housing for Leasing

Ernie Galang, Navy RPM, informed the RAB that Annamarie Conroy recently met with the EFAWEST Commanding Officer, Captain Hunter, to discuss fast-tracking the lease of Site 12 housing by the City. An April 9, 1998 Navy management meeting followed to discuss how many housing units can be leased to the City immediately. The BCT has decided to place Site 12 into a separate OU, because the final RI for Site 12 has been delayed and would otherwise hold up the leasing of some of the housing units. As a separate OU, the site will be given high priority and put on a separate schedule from the rest of the sites.

Ms. Nelson asked if there is a written agreement between the Navy and the regulatory agencies to create the new OU. Mr. Galang stated that the agreement is contained in the BCT meeting minutes, which will be mailed out to the RAB on April 22. Ms. Walters explained that Site 12 housing has been divided into three phases that indicates when the move-in can occur, in accordance with the cleanup. She added that much is dependent upon the Navy and the Regulatory Agencies reaching agreement on TPH screening and cleanup levels.

Mr Hehn asked how the timing of potential additional investigations or the remediation of Site 12 will be affected by moving ahead on the leasing of the housing. Ms. Walters responded that the phased approach is intended to accommodate further investigations and the remediation of the site. She distributed a map which identifies the three phases for Site 12.

Ms. Nelson requested further discussion on the process to complete the IR and the FOSL for Zone 4 and Site 12. Mr. Sullivan responded that the decision to make Site 12 a separate OU allows the Navy to move the investigation and documents ahead independently of the other IR sites. He noted that TI has been different from most other cleanup sites because all of the onshore sites have been placed in one large OU; it is more common to have multiple OUs on a site the size of TI. The ultimate goal is to speed up the overall completion of Site 12. The Regulators and the City are in agreement that making it a separate OU is the best thing for Site 12.

Mr. Hehn asked how the particular areas were assigned as either Phase 1, 2 or 3. Mr. Sullivan explained that the phases are based primarily on TPH in soil and groundwater, using the Phase I and Phase II data plus the additional data set from the Fall 1997 grid investigation. The analysis shows that there are concentrations of TPH in soil across various areas of the base, but that TPH in groundwater is limited to about three or four distinct areas. He stated that TPH screens out as a human health risk but is a potential health risk to the Bay. Although the soil might be impacting the groundwater, the groundwater provides the pathway to the Bay.

Mr. Sullivan further explained that a tidal influence zone of about 200 to 250 feet has been established, although the zone of mixing might be less than the tidal influence. The Navy is looking closely at the groundwater data and making inferences as to the potential impact on the Bay. Some wells are showing higher concentrations of TPH down gradient, between the well and the Bay, and in some cases, the concentrations are very small. They are applying the Lawrence Livermore study in looking at potential plumes in the groundwater and determining whether they are moving towards the Bay. They are also looking at the data over time to see if TPH is decreasing.

Mr. Allman noted that the Livermore study doesn't apply to brackish water, where bioattenuation may not readily occur. If the concentration appear to be decreasing, then it has to be determined whether it is due to bioattenuation or to the contaminants moving to different areas. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that inferences can be made as to the potential movement because there are a number of groundwater sampling points on this site to provide data. In many cases where there are higher concentrations, the groundwater samples around these sites are at lower concentrations.

Ms. Shirley asked how it is determined whether TPH is just dispersing or if it is actually breaking down. Mr. Hehn noted that there are certain parameters that can be tested for, such as nitrates, phosphates, orthophosphates and iron sulfates. Mr. Knapp confirmed that these products are the results of microorganisms feeding on the TPH. Mr. Allman asked if these products are being looked for in the groundwater data. Mr. Galang stated that this will be included in next month's groundwater monitoring. Two quarterly sets of data will be taken before the results can

be determined. The presence of dissolved oxygen and oxidated iron will be reviewed. Usha Vedagiri pointed out that this analysis only establishes that the conditions for bioattenuation exist, but is not the same as actually tracking degradation products to show that bioattenuation is actually occurring. The monitoring will show whether conditions support bioremediation. Mr. Knapp noted that the natural sequence of breakdown products from biological activity would be examined.

Mr. Allman asked if the Navy will take more aggressive remediation measures at Site 12 if it is determined that bioattenuation is not occurring. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that about one third of the 904 housing units are not within the boundary of Site 12 and so are not under CERCLA. Phase 1 is composed of those housing units outside of Site 12, plus those areas within Site 12 that are not expected to require remedial action, because of the absence of TPH concentrations in the groundwater and low levels of TPH in the soil. Phase 2 contains areas where there are no significant groundwater concentrations but have higher soil concentrations, in addition to areas in closer contact to the Bay. Phase 2 might require some remedial action, such as soil removal. Phase 3 comprises the remaining areas which have higher concentrations of TPH in the groundwater. Phase 3 might require source removal of soil and groundwater treatment, which would take longer than source removal of soil only from the Phase 2 area.

Ms. Nelson asked if the data set included the Geomatrix data when developing the three phases. Mr Sullivan responded that the Geomatrix data focused on areas in which they felt there were data gaps, and primarily involved testing for pesticides and dioxins. The pesticide data came out nondetect, or extremely low, and so confirmed that pesticides are not an issue at the site. Samples for dioxin were also taken, and the Navy is currently reviewing the data. The dioxin levels appear higher than background, so a risk assessment has been performed. It appears that dioxin will screen out in the health risk assessment because it falls in the 10^4 to 10^6 risk range. A memo to the regulatory agencies is being prepared and more discussion will follow.

Ms. Vedagiri asked if risk calculations are being performed if contaminants occur at depths below two feet. Mr. Knapp replied that the resulting risk is being looked at considering all samples except for the Geomatrix data. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Geomatrix data set is being evaluated but it hasn't been decided whether it will be incorporated into the complete data set. Ms. Nelson noted that, in a March meeting with Regulators and the City, April 21 was identified as the date that the Geomatrix data and technical memo of the entire data set for Site 12 would be available. She asked if this is available and whether a technical memo would be distributed that would update the information in the Zone 4 FOSL and the IR Site 12. She added that she supports the approach the Navy is taking in leasing the Site 12 housing, but believes the data supporting these decisions need to be documented in either a technical memo or the Zone 4 FOSL, particularly for the management company that will manage the leasing. Ms. Nelson also requested to review the complete data set, including the Geomatrix data. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy is discussing internally a document that validates the steps being taken. The BCT feels it best to move forward in issuing a remedial investigation report for the Site 12 OU, rather than produce an interim technical memo. He noted it would be prudent to update the Zone 4 FOSL as a decision document for the leasing.

Mr. Hehn asked if the basis of decisions for drawing the boundaries of the three phases unofficially include the Geomatrix dioxin data, as well as the data collected from the additional Site 12 investigation. Both Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Walters indicated that it had. Mr. Hehn asked when the information will be available for the general public to review in the form of a report. Ms. Nelson stated it would be in everyone's best interest to have an updated FOSL prepared and distributed no later than May 15. She asked if any information would be available by the next interim meeting on May 6. Mr Sullivan stated that the Navy will be meeting with the regulators next week to work out the final details of the Navy's proposal, and a report could likely be produced as a follow-up. Mr. Hehn stated that the community members need to be provided with the data in some manner to understand more clearly the Navy's decisions on dividing up Site 12. He added that all the data should be included, not just that for TPH. Mr. Sullivan stated he agreed that the burden is on the Navy to show that other potential contaminants of concern are not an issue. Mr. Hehn stated he understood the City's need to proceed quickly, adding that is why the RAB is pushing to review the data as soon as possible.

Mr. Allman stated his concern that the review of the data may be biased and cause oversights because the Navy is making a commitment to the City to fast-track the property. Ms. Walters responded that the Navy has been sharing all of the data with the John Stewart Management Company in great detail. Mr. Allman stated that it's not just a matter of looking at the raw data. He added that Site 12 is still not adequately characterized and expressed concern that the phases have been delineated based on TPH and groundwater data, but that there may be other chemicals of concern occurring there as well. He pointed out on the map a groundwater plume associated with Site 20, that has been included in the Phase 1 area. Mr. Sullivan responded that the housing lease map was oversimplified and didn't show a boundary around Site 20, which is not actually a part of the housing area.

Ms. Nelson stated that she believes the RAB understands the basis of the decision, but requested a document which details all the data that has lead to the Navy's decision. Mr. Allman asked for clarification on whether near surface samples with high concentrations were assumed to be the result of a recent release or spill, and characterized as contaminated soil. Mr Sullivan replied that this is still to being evaluated. The Lawrence Livermore report can be applied, and in some cases, the near surface hits are very isolated, with nondetect or significantly lower levels found immediately below the spot. Mr. Hansen asked if these situations might lead to removal of the top six inches of soil. Mr. Sullivan stated that it might be removed that way, or a spot removal might be conducted. Small, isolated areas would be expected to screen out for human health risk and would not likely impact the Bay. Each spot would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Hansen asked about institutional controls regarding the consumption of home-grown produce as people move into each phase of the housing. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy doesn't believe home-grown produce will be an issue at the site. Harlan Van Wye asked if it is known whether there has been a history of home-grown produce in the housing areas while TI was an active base. Mr. Sullivan stated it is inevitable that some people gardened, and so the Navy evaluated the concern, but reached the conclusion that it was not an issue.

Ms. Nelson asked when a document could be produced by the Navy containing all the available data for Site 12 . Mr. Sullivan replied that the Navy must first develop milestones with the City and the regulators to expedite the work. The data may need to be provided to the RAB in phases rather than in a single document.

VII. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Process

Mr. Sullivan explained that the EIS process is part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It is required for the disposal of the property and looks at proposed land uses. The NEPA process has a public participation component similar to the CERCLA process. NEPA public participation focuses on the government's decision to transfer the property for civilian reuse. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that NEPA and CERCLA are two separate processes.

Mr. Sullivan stated that NEPA takes into account every issue that could potentially effect the surrounding environment in the broadest sense, including air, water, noise, transportation and socioeconomic issues. The Navy is developing a component to the EIS called "hazardous materials", which involves the cleanup and other related environmental issues. This component is a small part of the overall document and the reuse issue under consideration. The document will likely be issued in draft form in the next 60 days. A public hearing will be held within 30-60 days from the release of the document; a public scoping meeting started the process about one and one-half years ago. The document will be finalized based on comments received during the written comment period.

Mr. Ongerth asked what agency is the lead. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Navy is the lead preparer of the document since it is taking the action of transferring the base for civilian reuse. The Navy is also partnering with the City because the City is required to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under California's equivalent of NEPA . Mr. Sullivan noted that the EIS process is closely regulated by the EPA. He added that the NEPA process is parallel to the CERCLA process, and any member of the community can participate, though it is not focused on the cleanup.

Ms. Nelson asked how interested RAB members can receive their own copy of the EIS. Mr. Sullivan stated he thought RAB members are already on a general EIS mailing list. Ms. Walters stated that the RAB is on the City's Planning Department mailing list. Mr. Sullivan agreed to follow up on whether the RAB is on the EIS mailing list. Ms. Walters offered to make several copies of the EIS document available to the RAB once it is issued. Ms. Nelson expressed particular interest in reviewing the hazardous materials component and the land use issues in the document. Mr. Sullivan noted that the RAB will likely start receiving information on the EIS in the next two months. He added that the Navy is required to evaluate NEPA to determine that none of the current reuse activities are having a significant impact; most of the reuse to date has been very similar to the Navy's past uses.

PROGRAM UPDATES:

VIII. General Updates

Announcements

Mr. Sullivan announced that Caltrans is producing and distributing a newsletter on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, called the *East Span News*. He provided copies and noted that Caltrans also has information posted on their website. He added that decisions Caltrans makes regarding the bridge may also effect Navy activities on YBI, particularly remediation of Sites 8 and 11 and UST 27.

FY98 Project Execution Plan

Mr. Sullivan stated that TI is fully funded for the year and for the first time will not be affected by a lack of funding. There is some question as to whether all planned activities for the year will be executed until the Navy resolves TPH screening levels with the regulatory agencies. Some remedial action work may be deferred until outstanding issues on fuel lines and USTs are addressed.

6 April 98 RPM/BCT Meeting

Mr. Sullivan noted that the BCT met at the DTSC offices on April 6, 1998. The majority of the meeting was devoted to development of petroleum screening levels and creating a separate OU for Site 12. Additional topics included leasing and transfer issues; the EBS sampling and analysis summary report, specifically metals concentrations and MTBE screening levels; update on status of petroleum investigations other than CAP sites; and preparation for this RAB meeting.

Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring

Mr. Sullivan stated that quarterly groundwater monitoring for non-IR sites has just begun this week. Two consultants now monitor groundwater; TetraTech continues to monitor in the IR sites, and AGS Consultants will monitor the other UST sites. The groundwater sampling for both will be conducted simultaneously in the same quarter this time. The January monitoring report for the IR sites will be out in several weeks.

TPH Issues for Soil and Groundwater

Mr Sullivan stated that consultations are continuing with the regulators. A solution is being sought for Site 12, but may not be applied to other sites. He noted that it is a Bay Area wide Navy issue. It is possible this information will be ready for presentation at the May RAB meeting. It is hoped that the Navy and the regulatory agencies can reach a conclusion by the end of this year. Mr. Hehn asked if this will delay the CAP and the final RI report. Mr. Sullivan responded that it will effect the non-Site 12 RI reports. He added that the next TPH meeting is scheduled for April 27, 1998 for the project managers.

IX. Action Items

Mr. Sullivan reported that he had good news regarding how the Navy would address community members comments for the documents and for the information repository and Administration Record. Legal counsel and public affairs guidance allows the Navy some latitude in determining what is most appropriate for each individual RAB. The Navy can therefore incorporate RAB member comments into the documents, just as is done with agency comments. The Zone 5 FOSL will be the first opportunity to apply this decision, and the Navy will continue to do so in subsequent documents. Mr. Sullivan added that he would consider extending this approach retroactively to earlier documents.

Ms. Nelson suggested comments on the draft and draft final RI can be incorporated together into the final RI. Mr. Sullivan stated that each set of comments will need to be identified as to what they are responding to since the draft and draft final represent different phases of the document. Mr Hansen expressed appreciation to the Navy for taking the RAB's comments seriously and to allow them to receive equal status with the regulatory agency comments.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the February and March 1997 meetings minutes have been updated. In lieu of updating the April 1997 minutes, he stated he has chosen to include a copy of the April transcripts, which will be placed in the Administrative Record. Mr. Allman asked if the meeting transcripts are always included in the Administrative Record. Mr Galang indicated that they are not, but are included in the Information Repository. Mr. Sullivan noted this as an action item to explore further. He stated it may be a good time to get the repository subcommittee back in action and to identify and address concerns. Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of the updated February and March 1997 meeting minutes, and also copies of the April 1997 meeting transcript.

Mr. Sullivan stated that an action item list will be included at the end of the meeting minutes beginning with the draft April 1998 minutes, so action items can be tracked.

OTHER BUSINESS:

X. Organizational Business

RAB Training Program for 1998

Mr. Hansen pointed out that attendance by RAB members has dropped off, noting only about 13 members in attendance this evening. Mr. Sullivan stated that letters went out to 12 members who have not attended recently to determine their interest in remaining on the RAB. Mr. Galang noted that only a few members responded back. Mr. Sullivan suggested that a determination be made at the next interim meeting as to who should be dropped from the RAB. Ms. Nelson commented that the RAB should drop all those who are no longer committed to attending the meetings. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the Navy should go ahead with RAB training plans, which may attract back those members who have not been attending. Nathan Brennan suggested targeting July 11 1998 as a day to hold RAB training since the City is hosting a planning tour of TI that same day.

Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Program

Mr. Allman stated that he has put together a statement of work for the TAPP application; copies were distributed for RAB member review. The statement of work, titled *Potential for Movement of and Exposure to Hazardous Contaminants in Soil and Groundwater as a Result of Seismic Events at Treasure Island*, describes the reason for concern and recommends a proposed provider. Essentially, the request is to conduct a study to predict the effect and extent of contaminant movement in the soil and groundwater at Treasure Island should an earthquake event occur. Frank Rollo, Sr. of Treadwell and Rollo, has been identified as the first choice provider for the project because of his previous work at TI, however the RAB can suggest others.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the statement of work provides sufficient detail to identify what the RAB is looking for. The next step will be for the Navy to evaluate the proposal and then for the Commanding Officer to sign off on the project. Mr. Hansen stated that the RAB should vote on acceptance of the proposed project. Mr. Allman pointed out that the RAB had voted on the general concept several meetings ago, but needs the RAB's support to submit the application to the Navy. Mr. Hansen asked for the general consensus of the RAB.

Mr. Ongerth commented that the proposal should be discussed more before going forward. He expressed concern that the impact outlined in the proposal may be out of proportion if a major earthquake strikes the area. Mr. Allman stated that the scenario poses a significant enough concern to bear looking into.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the TAPP program is similar to the Superfund Technical Assistance Grant program, and provides the RAB with an independent evaluation of the cleanup program. The TAPP is limited to \$25,000 per year or \$100,000 for the lifetime of the project. Mr. Allman noted that his proposal would be in the range of \$2,500.00.

Mr. Hansen asked whether Mr. Rollo could discuss the possible project at the suggested July 11 RAB training session. Mr. Hehn asked if Mr. Rollo had been contacted about his interest in the potential project. Mr. Allman responded that he had spoken with him initially, noting his interest in the project. The work would require some research by Mr. Rollo to see if similar studies have been performed. Mr. Allman stated that although Mr. Rollo may not be able to provide a lot of specifics, it's worthwhile to have him look into it. As a result of Mr. Rollo's study, he is proposing a 30-minute presentation to the RAB, and a summary of findings to be placed in the Administration Record.

Mr. Allman stated that Mr. Rollo had initially expressed interest in addressing the RAB at no charge, but would accept payment if there is money available. Mr. Allman stated his desire that the RAB indicate the dollar amount of the contract, noting his intention that this be a small scale project for several thousand dollars. Mr. Hehn suggested Mr. Allman first discuss with Mr. Rollo what would be an appropriate price for the work, then present this information to the Navy's contract office.

Mr. Allman pointed out that Mr. Rollo does geotechnical work, and that the contract may need to be set up to include a subcontractor to address risk assessment aspects of the project. Mr. Hehn suggested setting parameters by getting a bid in advance based on the scope of work. Mr. Allman stated that it was his impression that the Navy seeks the bids on the project. Mr. Sullivan suggested that he and Mr. Allman work with the contract office on the scope of work and report back on the status at the next interim meeting.

Jack Savage mentioned the definite dimensions of sand boils noted in the statement of work. He asked how definite Mr. Rollo could be of the dimensions of a sand boil. Mr. Allman stated that these are ballpark dimensions. He clarified that sand boils would occur within 500 feet from the center. He added that if it is determined that sand boils could occur anywhere within a certain perimeter, and the area gets flipped over due to seismic activity, then contaminants which are now deep below the surface could end up on the surface. Risk assessments are based on contaminants on the soil surface or their likelihood of coming in contact with people. More aggressive cleanup measures may need to be taken in areas where contaminants are presently subsurface, but are likely to emerge to the surface in a sand boil during a seismic event. He added that the study may show that the area is so small as not to be a concern. The point is, however, that the question has not been properly addressed and would be worthwhile to investigate.

Mr. Allman stated that he wanted the approval of the RAB on the final version of the proposal before it gets contracted out. Mr. Sullivan pointed out the option for a RAB member to participate in more detail in the contracting process. The Navy would not make an award without the RAB representative knowing the final price. Mr. Allman pointed out the advantage in hiring Treadwell and Rollo for this project since they have performed other work on and are familiar with TI. It would not likely take them as long to do the work as it might some other firm, and would possibly cost less, as well.

Ms. Nelson recommended that a budget be established by a phone call to Treadwell and Rollo before the proposal is formally finalized. She also requested that the results be stated in such a way that a comparative statement can be made whether or not an earthquake would be more of a problem than if environmental or chemical exposures resulted. Ms. Nelson stated she could support the scope of work with these stipulations. Mr. Brennan noted the devastating effect of an 8.0 magnitude earthquake, supporting Mr. Ongerth's concern. He added though, that the project would be a good learning experience for the TAPP process as long as a dollar limit is put on it. Mike Michelsen voiced his agreement with proceeding with the proposal.

Mr. Allman stated that the obligation of the RAB is determining the fate of the contaminants, not what will happen with the island in a catastrophic earthquake. David Rist, DTSC, asked if the types of contamination and their distribution on TI had been considered before putting the proposal together. Mr. Allman responded that the extent of sampling on TI is a concern, and a lot of information is not known. Mr. Rist stated that it would be prudent to take a look at the distribution of contamination to determine if the proposed study is really a viable concern.

Mr. Hansen called for a vote of those in favor of the RAB asking Jim Sullivan to convey the proposal to the procurement office, and that the cost of the project not exceed \$2,500. A majority of the Community RAB members voted in favor of the proposal. Mr. Sullivan stated that the next step will be for the commanding officer at EFA, West to review the proposal. EFA, West may direct questions back to the RAB regarding the proposal. Ms. Nelson explained that she had opposed the vote as stated because it did not specify that the evaluation would be compared to catastrophic events, as she had requested.

XI. Upcoming Environmental Report Review Schedule

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the following schedule of environmental reports:

- Draft Reuse Plan EIS/EIR. (Availability date to be determined)
- IR Site Groundwater Monitoring Report (Available 4 May 1998)
- Draft Offshore Remedial Investigation Report (Available 29 May 1998)
- Final CAP, Final Onshore RI and FS (Dependent on resolution of TPH Cleanup Levels)
- Draft Zone 6 FOSL (Available, Comments due 24 April 98)

XII. Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan reviewed agenda items proposed for up-coming RAB meetings:

May

- CERCLA Feasibility Study (FS) Workshop
- TPH Issues for Soil and Groundwater
- Draft Offshore Remedial Investigation Report Preview

June

- Draft Offshore Remedial Investigation Report Preview

XIII. Closing Remarks

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule:

Next Regular Meetings:

- 7:00 p.m. **Tuesday, 19 May 1998** Casa de la Vista,
Treasure Island
- 7:00 p.m. **Tuesday, 16 June 1998** Casa de la Vista,
Treasure Island

Next Interim Community Member Meeting:

6:30 p.m. **Wednesday, 6 May 1998** Pacific Gas &
Electric. Room 2420

Next BCT/RPM Meeting:

9:30 a.m. **Monday, 4 May 1998** Location TBD

Next Treasure Island Development Authority Meeting:

1:00 p.m. **Wednesday, 20 May 1998** Ferry
Building, San Francisco

Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 19, 1998, at 7:00 p.m., at the Casa de la Vista, NAVSTA TI.

ACTION ITEMS

4/21/98

1. Determine whether meeting transcripts and minutes are included in the Administrative Record.
2. Determine whether the RAB is on the EIS mailing list.