

**Final
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
18 April 2006
Meeting Number 123**

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Alice Pilram Nathan Brennan Dale Smith

Regulatory Agency, City and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

James Sullivan (Navy) Alan Friedman (Water Board)
David Rist (DTSC)

Other Agency, Navy Staff and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Marcie Rash Victor Early Scott Anderson
Tommie Jean Damrel La Rae Landers Marc McDonald
Pete Bourgeois

RAB Support from ITSI:

Steve Edde Joni Jorgensen-Risk
Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter

Public Guests

Sophia Wann D.W. Hughes Kellen Williams

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 18 April 2006 meeting at 7:06 P.M. at the Casa de la Vista (Building 271).

Mr. Sullivan welcomed those in attendance, and stated that the meeting materials were mailed out about a week and half ago and pointed out that there were extra copies of the meeting materials available at the back of the room. There were no changes or comments on the agenda so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan stated that there were two public comment periods included on the agenda to afford members of the public the opportunity to comment on the Navy's environmental program at Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI). He added that the public is also welcome to comment during the course of the meeting.

Dale Smith acknowledged that the meeting was taking place on the 100th anniversary of the 1906 earthquake that occurred at 5:18 on the morning of 18 April 1906.

There were no other comments or announcements so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

Site 12 Update (Remedial Investigation and EE/CA)

Mr. Sullivan stated that James Whitcomb, the Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), was unable to attend the meeting, and introduced Victor Early, the Tetra Tech (TtEMI) Project Manager (PM), to provide the update on Site 12.

Mr. Early, who has been working on the project since 2000, started with an update on the soil gas investigation that began in December 2005. The Navy installed soil gas probes in four buildings in Halyburton Court and also collected soil samples beneath the building slabs. Soil gas samples were analyzed for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The field crew was unable to collect soil gas samples at Buildings 1104 or 1106 due to the flooding of the probes by the rising water table because of the recent heavy rains. The field crew will have to wait until the water table decreases and exposes the probe in the vadose zone before they can resample. The Navy considered all sampling results collected to date as low in concentration. The Navy will review the sampling results with the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) and the RAB when all the data become available.

Regarding the Remedial Investigation (RI) report, Mr. Early explained that the site has been divided into 19 exposure units and a calculation of the human health risks will be performed separately for each exposure unit. These calculations will be presented in a paper in July before the RI report is completed. He added, that depending on the results of the calculated risks of the common areas, the Navy may want to verify that those risks are the same as the risks in the backyards. The Navy will likely go back to the site to sample the backyards for risk verification or conduct remediation if necessary.

Mr. Early stated that the draft RI report is scheduled to be distributed for review in December 2006, with the final report slated for distribution in April 2007.

The original Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) completed in 2002, covered the solid waste disposal areas (SWDAs) and backyards throughout Site 12. However, the planned removal action will only include the SWDAs. The remaining areas will be addressed in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process. The SWDAs are the fenced areas around the perimeter of the site with the majority of the areas unoccupied. The occupied areas are restricted to a few buildings.

Sophia Wann asked what buildings were occupied. Mr. Sullivan identified the occupied buildings as 1211, 1213, 1235, 1237 and 1325. Indicating to the overhead slide, Dale Smith asked if the pink hatched areas in the map were occupied. Mr. Early explained that the pink hatched areas were excavated in prior removal actions, and they would not be addressed under the planned removal action. He emphasized that the SWDAs are located along the shoreline.

Mr. Early added that, under the EE/CA, the Navy will be developing costs to remediate the area of Bigelow Court which had been identified a few years back as having debris and lead in the soil. Mr. Sullivan said that the Navy intends to include any work at Bigelow Court with the work at Halyburton Court. Mr. Early added that the only other area that the planned removal action would address is Building 1319, where methane has been detected due to debris disposed in that area. The Navy expects to excavate the area. The contaminants of concern that are being addressed in the removal action are lead, PCBs, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxin, and methane.

Mr. Early summarized the alternatives that are being reviewed for the EE/CA that included the required no action; excavation to two feet below grade in unpaved areas; excavation to two feet below grade in all areas, including roads (not to include buildings); deeper excavation to mean highest-high water level (two to four feet) in all areas with the exception of buildings; and capping. Mr. Early also pointed out that for the excavation alternatives, they will be looking at digging beneath the utility lines to a depth of about six inches as a protective measure for future utility workers.

David Rist, DTSC, asked if the Navy would be addressing utilities under roads. Mr. Early responded that the alternatives that include roads would address the utilities under them. Mr. Rist confirmed that for the alternatives that include hardscape, the hardscape would be removed to two feet and asked if the Navy was considering excavations down to four feet. Mr. Early replied that yes, the Navy is considering excavations down to four feet.

The draft EE/CA will be issued in late May 2006. Following that, there will be a 30-day agency and RAB review period, with a public information session planned within this cycle of review. The final EE/CA report is scheduled for distribution in August 2006, with a 30-day public comment period. The Navy may conduct a second public information session during this review cycle as well. All comments on the final EE/CA will be addressed in an action memorandum. The purpose of the action memorandum is to document the final decision on the selection of the removal action alternative. The draft action memorandum will be distributed in October for a 30-day review period, and the final action memorandum is expected to be delivered in January 2007.

The issuance of the final action memorandum will trigger the fieldwork planning process that includes work plan development and permitting. The fieldwork is estimated to extend into July of 2007. Mr. Early wrapped up his presentation and opened the floor to questions.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy would be doing any additional sampling to determine if the high water table had any influence on the soil gas data. Mr. Early responded that they probably would not, but depending on the results, they may need to consider one additional sampling round. Up to this point, the sampling results have been fairly low and far below the levels that would create a risk concern beneath the slab. Ms. Smith asked how the Navy can rationalize the fact that even though the levels are low now, they have been high in the past. Mr. Early responded that those high levels were detected inside the buildings, not from beneath the slabs, and they could not be certain of the source location. He further explained that there were two or three housing units that yielded high levels, and they would still return to these units to sample the indoor air to be sure that its not coming from beneath the slab. He suggested that dust could have been the cause of those high levels. Before they sample again, they will clean the units and then sample to see if dust could be the source. Ms. Smith asked if any analysis has ever been done to assess any impact on the bay from the PCBs at Halyburton Court. Mr. Early replied that groundwater samples were collected in the highest PCB concentration areas in 2001 and analyzed for PCBs. They did not find anything dissolved in the groundwater at that time.

Mr. Brennan asked for clarification with regard to utility lines that are not beneath the roads, such as laterals coming into the buildings. Mr. Early responded that, in the case of laterals, they will dig six inches below.

Field Activities Update (FOSET and Building 1 PCB Sampling, Site 12 Soil Gas, Well Demolition, Building 233 Asbestos/Radiological and Building 293 Demolition/ACM)

Mr. Sullivan introduced Mr. Pete Bourgeois, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (Shaw E&I), and Scott Anderson from the Navy to present the field updates.

Mr. Bourgeois stated that they started the radiological survey work at Building 233 by performing indoor sampling and background level sampling at adjacent Building 7. There was a spill in 1950 at Building 233 that the Navy did cleanup. They are assessing if the cleanup performed in 1950 meets today's more stringent standards. The asbestos tile floor will be removed to expose the original flooring prior to conducting radiological scans on the floor and walls to determine if residual levels remain in that building.

Mr. Bourgeois continued his field activities update moving to monitoring well destruction at Sites D1B, 6, 25 and one well at Building 1. He then described the steps involved in well destruction. The wells were destroyed by first saw cutting the concrete surface around the well casing, at least 2 inches larger than the well casing, so that when they overdrill, they are actually getting clean soil around it. Following the removal of the surface features, the hollow stem auger drill rig is set up over the well, and with a cable they pull the well casing material out. With the concrete seal and filter pack removed, they fill the cavity with Portland cement to about a foot minus grade. What remains of the feature is then filled to the surface with the appropriate media; soil, asphalt, sod, or concrete.

Mr. Bourgeois, pointing to a photo of the drill rig in the handout, provided details of safety cage around the augers. The last set of pictures showed a limited access rig that allow for drill rig access in areas of limited/restricted space, such as at Building 1. Mr. Bourgeois asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Rist asked if records of all well locations are being maintained and provided to the City. Mr. Bourgeois replied that project closure reports will include copies of well destruction reports, and as always, the figures included in the reports identify the locations of the wells. Mr. Rist asked what the procedure was for the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Program. Mr. Bourgeois responded that the procedures are the same. Under the CERCLA Program, they have only removed wells at Site 11. Those wells were removed for Caltrans prior to them conducting bridge construction activities. Mr. Rist suggested that those records could be compiled for the redevelopment agency so that they have a record of where those wells were located before they start any construction activities. Mr. Bourgeois agreed and added that some of those abandoned well locations are 12 inches in diameter filled with cement grout which is a significant piece of concrete. The Navy has been compiling well installation and destruction data into a table that also includes Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates.

Mr. Anderson started with a review of the PCB sampling. The PCB sampling was initially performed in 2004 around the vault pads, existing outside pads, and former transformer pads. The Navy has sampled all the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) areas, and is preparing to sample the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) areas of all remaining transformers.

Before moving on to the sampling results, Mr. Anderson thanked everyone who participated in assisting the Navy to finalize the two FOSTs for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

The initial round of PCB sampling identified some elevated levels in a few buildings. There were some concerns with Building 1 due to possible human

health risks because the transformer vault was located in the basement of the building with staff working in the offices above it. The Navy completed indoor air sampling within the vaults on 18 April to assess any possible impacts to the staff, and the results will be evaluated and presented at the next BCT meeting. Mr. Anderson displayed some photographs taken at Building 1 and some sampling equipment. The sampling of the remaining PCB transformer areas in the FOSET areas will be completed in mid-May. There were no questions on the PCB sampling activities.

La Rae Landers, Navy Lead RPM, provided an update on Building 293. There had been a fire in the building that damaged asbestos pipe lagging in the building. Due to the fire damage, a portion of the building had to be demolished. The portion that remains will get new siding and weatherproofing.

Site 8, 28 and 29 Draft Remedial Investigation Update

Mr. Sullivan announced that Mr. Anderson would be filling in for Mr. Whitcomb to provide the update on Sites 8, 28 and 29 draft RI update. Mr. Anderson stated that a draft RI report was submitted to everyone in March 2006 and a meeting was held with Caltrans on 5 April. Caltrans provided a summary of bridge construction activities that have taken place thus far and their future work forecast to bridge completion in 2013-2015 (originally planned for 2009). During the meeting with Caltrans, it was discovered that some areas addressed in the RI report as showing some potential risks were either removed or disturbed by the new bridge construction activities. As a result, the Navy had to take a step back and review the path forward for the RI report with DTSC. Some of the areas might be able to proceed to no further action. The Navy and DTSC have agreed to place the RI on hold; the Navy will reevaluate the new information from Caltrans and recalculate the risks based on that new information. A revised draft RI will be reissued for review.

Marc McDonald asked if Caltrans was aware of the Navy data. Mr. Anderson responded that sampling data was provided to them by the Navy. Caltrans is required to sample soils, in addition to what the Navy has done, when constructing footings and excavating. Caltrans provided data in the early stages for the south-southeast detours, and these data were included in the draft RI report. Mr. Anderson confirmed that Caltrans knew what they had and what the soil conditions were where they dug. Mr. McDonald asked if the soils have been properly disposed of by Caltrans and not distributed throughout the site. Mr. Anderson confirmed that was correct. To ensure worker safety, Caltrans reviewed Navy sampling data as well as their own.

Mr. Anderson stated that there is an area where the bridge will be connected back into the island that is considered a lead "hot spot". Caltrans will be

excavating those soils prior to attaching the new bridge to the existing tunnel. The Navy intends to reevaluate that area as well as others in relation to current and future bridge construction activities. The Navy certainly would have preferred having this data available before releasing the RI report, and for that reason they have elected to hold off and revise the existing RI report.

Mr. Anderson reviewed some figures of the bridge construction activities and opened the floor to questions. Ms. Smith asked why the Navy does not separate the western onramps since they are not impacted by the Caltrans project. Mr. Sullivan asked Ms. Smith if she was asking if there was going to be Caltrans work on the western San Francisco side. She confirmed and suggested that it seemed that they could separate that from the eastern side and move forward with the RI report for the western onramp. Mr. Anderson responded that the Navy does not see a major delay in the RI approach with the path they have chosen; suggesting a possible 6-month delay. Nathan Brennan added that the City is trying to give the ramps back to the State. A discussion ensued about the east and west on/offramps and Mr. Anderson concluded the discussion stating that they are looking at no action for the eastern and western portion of Site 29, Site 8, and Site 28 along the water. Mostly what will be reevaluated will be the Site 29 area underneath the new bridge and the south-southeast footprint.

Ms. Smith asked about an area where disposed batteries were found. Mr. Anderson said that "the battery site" was found when Caltrans was replacing a waterline. Mr. Anderson confirmed that an excavation was subsequently conducted to remove the batteries and the completion of that work was pending some unfinished step-outs because Caltrans mobilized to the area. Caltrans has cleared that area of stockpiled soil and materials and the Navy hopes to return in a few weeks to complete their investigation of the battery site.

Sites 9 and 10 Proposed Plan Update

Mr. Anderson reminded everyone that the RI report was finalized for Sites 9 and 10, and the normal step to take in the CERCLA process would be a Feasibility Study (FS) followed by the Proposed Plan. Because the recommendations made in the RI report were no further action for both sites, the FS will be skipped and the Proposed Plan will then take its place. The findings of the RI will be included in the Proposed Plan along with the preferred remedial alternative. The publication of the Proposed Plan will be announced in the local newspaper and the document will be placed in the repositories for public access. The public will have a 30-day period to provide comments and concerns; comments can be written or oral. A public meeting will be held to present the Proposed Plan and a transcript of that meeting will be made available. Once all comments are received, the Navy will prepare a responsiveness summary of the comments which are then placed in the Record of Decision (ROD) document.

Site 9 was previously used as a painting shop and had a vehicle hydraulic lift in it. The main chemicals of concern were lead and some petroleum. Site 10 was a bus painting shop, and a small maintenance area. PAHs and chlordane (pesticide) were detected in Site 10. Mr. Anderson reported that the excavation performed in the adjacent Site 14/22 (under the Petroleum Program) uncovered burnt debris that was traced in the northern direction up to Site 10 boundary. Under CERCLA the Navy performed a trench investigation. The final dioxin trenching investigation report was issued in March 2006. The results of that investigation will be documented in the ROD.

According to Mr. Anderson, based on the sampling data there is no human health and/or ecological risks from soil or groundwater at both Sites 9 and 10. The Navy is pursuing closure for both sites, with no further action, in a no-action ROD.

The Proposed Plan is scheduled for distribution in July; however, they may have it ready for the June BCT meeting. Ms. Smith asked if the Proposed Plan would be distributed to the current mailing list. Mr. Anderson confirmed that the Proposed Plan will be distributed to the mailing list and added that the notification will be posted in the San Francisco Chronicle.

Update of Community Relations Plan

Ms. Landers provided the update on the updating of the 2002 Community Relations Plan (CRP) by informing those in attendance that the CRP describes the community and the outreach activities that the Navy does. It identifies the level of community interest which is gauged by interviewing members of the community. They will not be conducting any interviews for this update. The CRP also outlines the planned public participation activities in accordance with the regulatory requirements. In their review of the previous CRP, the Navy realized that there are many new points of contact that need to be updated. In addition, they will be updating the Current Site Descriptions to include four sites that have been added over the years. Other updates will be made to the past community involvement efforts, Section 3, and incorporating all of the major milestones (RI reports, ROD on Site 13, Site Closure on Site 7) into the updated CRP. The RAB meeting information will be updated as will the site map.

Ms. Smith asked if notification will be sent to Site 12 residents of the upcoming activities at the site. Ms. Landers said that they would be notified, and Mr. Sullivan added that fact sheets will be mailed to everyone on the mailing list. The mailing list includes every resident on TI and YBI, plus an additional 300 interested parties. Ms. Smith asked how often the mailing list was updated. Mr. Sullivan responded that they actually mail to "Resident," so that it will go to each residence. Individual names are identified only when those individual's

have contacted the Navy directly to be placed on the mailing list. Mr. Landers added that, once a mailing is completed the mailing list records are updated with new addresses, usually quarterly.

Ms. Landers stated that the updated CRP will be sent out electronically for review; highlighting those sections that have been updated. The final version will be updated to incorporate comments as appropriate.

Upcoming Documents and Field Schedule

Documents

Mr. Sullivan introduced Marcie Rash from TtEMI to provide an update on Documents and Field Schedule. Ms. Rash reported the draft Environmental Closeout Strategy 2006 Update was delivered, and the agency review comments are due by 15 May; the draft Proposed Plan for Sites 9 and 10 is scheduled for distribution on 23 May, but as pointed out earlier, efforts will be made to expedite that; the Site 31 RI report is estimated to be finalized on 29 May; the fact sheet for the Site 30 FS alternatives should be distributed 18 April with hopes that it can be finalized by the end of May; the Site 12 draft EE/CA will be distributed on 26 May; the fact sheet for Site 12 History will be distributed on 4 May with comments due on 18 May; the fact sheet for Site 31 FS alternatives will be distributed 24 May, with comments due on 7 June; the draft CRP will be distributed 10 May, with comments due on 9 June; and the final Sampling Plan for the PCB sampling equipment within the FOSET areas will be distributed 21 May.

Ms. Landers added that the reason that the Navy is doing the fact sheets for Sites 30 and 31 was mainly because of the school playground (Site 31) and daycare center (Site 30). The Navy is doing additional community outreach because of the current use of these two sites.

Field Schedule

Ms. Rash reported the upcoming field activities for the next two months are as follows; PCB sampling in the FOSET Areas begins 9 May (corrected to end of May); soil gas sampling in Building 1 will be completed by 19 April; ongoing Asbestos and Radiological Assessment /Removal at Building 233 should be completed in mid-May; ongoing Lead-Based Paint Abatement at Quarters 2 through 7, 240, 83, and 61 should be completed by 14 May; ongoing Asbestos Abatement at Building 293 should be completed by 12 May; and Lead-Based Paint Reevaluation at the 105 housing units on YBI should be starting in early May.

Ms. Smith asked for clarification on the reevaluation of the 105 YBI housing units. Ms. Landers responded that all units will be reevaluated and explained under Housing and Urban Development (HUD), when reduction measures are

undertaken to leave lead-based paint in place (encapsulating paint has been used on these units), a two-year reevaluation schedule is required. Ms. Landers added that they are trying to meet both the HUD requirement for every two years and also the Department of Defense (DoD) requirement for reevaluation before transfer.

Ms. Rash asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Brennan asked Mr. Anderson if he would be performing PCB sampling in both the FOST and FOSET areas. Mr. Anderson confirmed that they will be doing some stepout sampling of previously sampled locations in the FOST areas as well as conducting sampling at the FOSET areas. Ms. Landers added that once the preliminary results of initial sampling in FOSET areas are evaluated, they will address all the FOST and FOSET detects at once under one remediation project. Ms. Rash added that those results will be reported in the PCB Summary Report (item 31).

February 2006 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor for discussion of the draft February meeting minutes. Ms. Smith requested to replace the "u" of microgram symbol with "μ" symbol on page 2, third paragraph under "Field Activities Update". She also stated that the discussion about the wells and the aerobic state was confusing. Mr. Anderson stated that the discussion in the minutes is correct, and Ms. Smith volunteered to strike her previous comment. Ms. Smith questioned the term "monograms per kilogram" on Page 8 of 12 (last paragraph). Mr. Friedman stated that should be corrected to "nanogram". Mr. Sullivan asked if there was a motion to accept the minutes with the changes as noted. Mr. Brennan moved to accept and the motion carried.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. Sullivan turned the discussion over to Ms. Pilram. Ms. Pilram stated that there would be a Master Plan Sustainability Workshop on Thursday evening at 5:30 at Pier One.

BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Mr. Sullivan turned the discussion to Mr. Rist to present recent BCT activities. Mr. Rist stated that they had had two BCT meetings since the last RAB meeting. The 7 March meeting included updates from the Navy on budget issues and discussions on RI reports and scheduling future work to balance the workload. In addition, the team discussed the updates to the CRP and the RAB meeting, documents, field activities and future items.

An additional meeting held later that same day involved discussions on the process of evaluating risk in each of the different exposure units on Site 12.

The 4 April meeting included a review of Sites 28 and 29 and the Caltrans' activities, an update on Site 12 regarding Halyburton Court activities including exposure assessment at each of the units, the PCB sampling at Building 1, update of the CRP, then documents and future items for future meetings. There were a few other meetings held to discuss the Site 12 EE/CA, and the meeting with Caltrans.

The next BCT meeting is scheduled for 2 May at 10:00 A.M at the TtEMI offices in San Francisco.

Other Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor to any public comments or announcements; there were no public comments. Ms. Sullivan added that attendees were more than welcome to stay after the meeting to talk with project personnel. He turned the floor over to Mr. Brennan.

Mr. Brennan expanded on Ms. Pilrams earlier announcement regarding the workshop; he added that the developer for Treasure Island is putting on the Master Plan Sustainability Workshop at Pier 1 that following Thursday. The reception will start at 5:30 P.M. and the workshop will run from 6:00 to 8:30 P.M. Mr. Brennan said that they will have maps posted and discussions about the different components of the development intended to be more sustainable (than originally proposed).

According to Mr. Brennan, the developer is trying to follow Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards for buildings. Mr. Brennan explained that LEED standard is related to energy and water conservation, and designed around citing the building to take advantage of southern exposure.

According to Mr. Brennan, there would be regular Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB) meetings on the first Tuesday of the month.

The developer and Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) are currently working to finish the development plan by June and present it to the Board of Supervisors.

Both Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Brennan suggested that, since the CAB meetings are subject to change, schedules for those meetings should be checked on the Web site. Mr. Sullivan added that the TIDA Web site contains a wealth of information including links and documents that can be downloaded.

Future Meeting Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan stated that there were a number of agenda items identified for the June meeting. Further discussions of the agenda items would take place during the BCT meetings and RAB conference calls in May and June. He has been corresponding with Jack Sylvan from the City and has tentatively scheduled the base reuse plan update for the June RAB meeting. The Site 31 former south storage yard FS alternatives has also been scheduled for discussions. The draft EE/CA has been scheduled for distribution in June, and that too will be presented during the June meeting. The last agenda item was a site tour. The consensus appears to be a site visit in June prior to the RAB meeting. Mr. Sullivan proposed a meeting time before the June RAB meeting at 6:00 P.M. or 6:15 P.M. Ms. Pilram preferred to meet at 6:00 P.M. Mr. Sullivan will plan to pick participants up in the Navy 12-passenger van at the Casa de la Vista at 6:00 P.M., returning them before the meeting starts at 7:00 P.M.

Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated the next RAB meetings are scheduled for 20 June and 15 August. He reminded those in attendance that call-in numbers for both the May and June conference calls are posted on the revised agenda provided at the back of the room. He then thanked everyone for coming and brought the meeting to a close. Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

April 2006 RAB Meeting Handouts

- Site 12 Remedial Investigation and Removal Action Update, April 18, 2006, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- CTO-105 Well Destruction, Petroleum Program, Sites D-1B, 6, 25, and Building 1, Treasure Island, Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, April 2006
- Sites 8, 28, and 29 Remedial Investigation Update, April 18, 2006, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Sites 9 and 10 Proposed Plan Update, April 18, 2006, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Community Relations Plan 2006 Update, Naval Station Treasure Island, La Rae Landers, Navy Lead RPM, April 18, 2006 RAB Meeting
- Document Tracking Sheet
- Navy Field Schedule