Final
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
21 June 2005
Meeting Number 118

Community RAB Members in attendance:

John Gee	Nathan Brennan	Dale Smith
Alice Pilram	Douglas Ryan	

Regulatory Agency, City and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

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

Other Agency, Navy Staff and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Marcie Rash	Phil Burke	Dan Leigh
Tommie Jean Damrel	Pete Bourgeois	Dennis Kelly
La Rae Landers	Shirley Ng	Kevin Hoch

RAB Support from ITSI:

Joni Jorgensen-Risk	Steve Edde
Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter	

Public Guests

D. W. Hughes	Bruce Ricci	Ramona Sagapolutele

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 21 June 2005 meeting at 7:00 P.M. at the Casa de la Vista (Building 271).

Mr. Sullivan welcomed those in attendance and thanked those who participated in the Site 24 field trip. He stated that they would be happy to conduct similar activities in the future, and urged people to consider the possibility, either in association with a RAB meeting or on another night or weekend. He also pointed out there were extra copies of the meeting agenda 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). There were no comments or announcements so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

Field Activities Update

Mr. Sullivan introduced Pete Bourgeois, Shaw Environment and Infrastructure (Shaw), to provide the field activities update.

Mr. Bourgeois stated that in recent months most of the field activities were related to Site 24, including setting up injection and extraction wells like the ones observed during the field trip. He then asked Dan Leigh to give a brief update on the status of the Site 24 bioremediation.

Mr. Leigh stated the bioremediation pilot test at Site 24 was being conducted for the plume originating under Building 99. He showed a slide that included a graphic of the plume being treated, and stated the plume was about 900 feet long.

Mr. Leigh showed a graphic that illustrated the location of the previous treatability study at the Building 99 source area, and the downstream plume area currently being treated. He explained that they are trying to treat the portions of the plume with concentrations in excess of 100 parts per billion (ppb) total chlorinated ethene. He explained that to treat the plume they have three recirculation loops where they inject the substrate, recirculate the fluid for about three months, and then turn off the system and monitor the biodegradation of the organics. He emphasized that they have three recirculation loops to prevent contaminated water from moving toward the bay. Before beginning the project, 105 bio-barrier wells were installed so that if the plume did expand, it would expand into a treated area.

The system consists of 26 four-inch diameter extraction wells that are pumped with a submersible pump at a rate of about four to five gallons per minute. The system also has 17 four-inch diameter injection wells installed both shallow and deep up to a depth of about 30 feet bgs. He showed pictures of extraction and injection wells pointing out the control valves, flow meters, and piping. The system is designed to automatically shut down if there are any leaks in the lines, and he suggested that leaks were unlikely as the system contains 4,000 feet of high strength welded high density polyethylene (HDPE). The piping is not glued together, and the welds are actually stronger than the pipe itself.

Referring to a figure in a hand out showing the locations of the extraction and injection wells, he demonstrated that water flows from the extraction wells to the treatment system located in Building 96. When the water reaches the treatment

system it is injected with lactate and hydrogen. The treated water is then pumped to the injection wells where it is injected back into the ground.

Mr. Leigh explained that spill prevention was incorporated into the design of the system, and the system includes numerous flow switches that will turn off the system if pressure or flow drops. He then showed pictures of the pump and the screen used to control the flow. The flow control is computerized, and if there is something wrong it will alert the Shaw staff by telephone so that the problem can be appropriately addressed.

Mr. Leigh summarized by stating that the current system was an expanded version of the treatment that was proven in the pilot test at Building 99. The current system had been running for about 2 weeks. He then asked if there were any questions. There were none, so he handed the meeting back to Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that Site 24 had been the focus of the field efforts for the previous two months and noted that there was also a pilot test that was being planned for the Site 21 Vessel Waste Oil Recovery Area near Pier 12.

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Draft Findings of Suitability to Transfer

Mr. Sullivan noted that since the time the base was closed, the mission has been to get the base prepared for transfer. As part of that process, a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) document is prepared. The Navy is now preparing to submit the draft FOST documents for both Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Mr. Sullivan then introduced Dennis Kelly, Tetra Tech EMI (TtEMI), to give a presentation on the draft FOST.

Mr. Kelly noted that there was a handout to go along with the presentation, and then began with a history of the draft FOST. In 2003 work began on a Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey (SEBS) and a FOST. The purpose of an SEBS is to review the environmental condition of a property and based on the review classify the base as either transferable or not. Based on the results of the TI SEBS, a FOST document was prepared that ultimately becomes the Navy's formal determination that the property is suitable for transfer.

The Draft SEBS classified the property into seven categories, called Environmental Conditions of Property (ECP). Of the seven categories, four (ECP 1–4) are suitable for transfer and three (ECP 5–7) are not suitable. Those identified as suitable either had no environmental issues identified, or identified environmental issues have been appropriately addressed. Those identified as not suitable require additional environmental action.

When the Draft Final SEBS was completed in June 2003, a draft FOST was prepared for portions of TI. This was followed by meetings with the city and

regulatory agencies, and a presentation at the September 2003 RAB meeting. This process revealed questions about current site conditions, particularly in relation to the buildings and environmental issues. So, in 2004 all un-leased buildings were re-inspected to confirm the initial findings, such as the condition of asbestos containing materials, and also to evaluate if there were any new environmental conditions. Possible environmental concerns included polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), lead-based paint, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and radiation.

Mr. Kelly stated that PCB sampling was completed at some of the sites on TI and five sites will be remediated concurrently with transfer or during site redevelopment. He noted that lead-based paint abatement has been ongoing at Yerba Buena Island (YBI) since 2003, and that process is nearing completion. Additional PAH samples were collected and one area was identified as an area of concern based on this sampling. The area, located near the skeet range, has been removed from the FOST property footprint. In addition, a Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) is being completed during 2005 for all of TI. Mr. Kelly noted that any parcels with potential radiological concerns ('radiation impacted') are not shown as transferable in the FOST.

Mr. Sullivan interjected to clarify the meaning of 'radiation impacted' as used by federal agencies. He stated that 'radiation impacted' does not indicate that radiological contamination is actually present; it simply indicates that radiological activities occurred at that location. In this context 'radiation impacted' means that additional evaluation is needed to determine the presence or absence of radiological contamination.

Dale Smith stated that she understood that the assessment was only for radium, it did not include cobalt or strontium. Mr. Sullivan replied that there are specific criteria used to complete the HRA, including identifying radioactive materials that might be used as part of the Navy operations, and that those issues will be addressed in the HRA, which is scheduled for submittal in the fall.

Mr. Kelly then showed a graphic that presented the areas that have been transferred, that are recommended for transfer, and those that are still under investigation. He noted that the areas recommended for transfer on TI are similar to those proposed in 2003, with the exception of the area removed due to PAHs associated with Site 27 and the areas that were removed based on the HRA. Mr. Kelly concluded with a review of the timeline.

Mr. Sullivan added some information on the issue of early transfer. At the beginning of the BRAC program, a FOST was the only process by which to transfer suitable properties. Later, there was a recognition that some communities may want to transfer properties earlier and integrate cleanup and

redevelopment. Therefore, the Department of Defense (DoD), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and state regulatory agencies worked together to create the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) process. Once the Navy and the city agree to a schedule for early transfer, the Navy will begin preparing a FOSET document. The FOSET will supplement the FOST and address the remaining portions of the base. So, the entire base property would be addressed with a combination of FOST and FOSET. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Navy is currently focusing on the FOST, although the SEBS will be used to support both the FOST and the FOSET. Mr. Sullivan then asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Site 30 Daycare Center Draft Remedial Investigation Report

Mr. Sullivan introduced La Rae Landers, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), who would provide the introduction for the presentation. Ms. Landers said the Remedial Investigation (RI) report was issued 23 May with comments originally due 24 June; however, the review period has been extended to 8 July. Ms. Landers introduced Kevin Hoch, TtEMI, to provide the next presentation.

Mr. Hoch introduced himself and briefly reviewed the purpose of the RI process and showed slides of the site location. He said that prior to use as a daycare center in 1985, the site was undeveloped. The daycare center closed in 1997 along with the base. Following base closure, the TI Homeless Development Initiative wanted the daycare center reopened, and that required an Environmental Baseline Survey be completed as part of determining the suitability to lease the property. During the review process, an old drawing showed an "old trash dump" along the utility line corridor at 11th Street. The site was investigated in 2002 and a time critical removal action (TCRA) was undertaken shortly thereafter to remove some debris and contaminated soil. The daycare center was reopened in 2003.

Mr. Hoch said five soil investigations were conducted between May and September 2002. Groundwater sampling, near Sites 30 and 31, was also conducted in support of the investigation. He said that there were only five chemicals in the soil that were detected at concentrations exceeding the screening criteria or ambient level; Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethene (DDT), lead, arsenic, vanadium, and dioxin. No chemicals were detected in the groundwater at levels exceeding the groundwater screening criteria. Thus the TCRA was conducted and removed contaminated soil and associated debris in areas not covered by street asphalt or concrete.

The TCRA excavation extended into the daycare center property where there were two dioxin detections. However, they were so close to the building that the

excavation could not proceed any further, so the area was covered with a 6-inch concrete pad and a layer of asphalt.

The RI reviewed the ecological risk associated with chemicals at the site, but because the area is largely covered by asphalt, concrete, and buildings, there is no viable habitat for "terrestrial receptors." Mr. Hoch reminded those in attendance that no chemicals detected in the groundwater exceeded the Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) screening criteria. And considering the distance from the bay, which is well over 1,200 feet, it was determined that there is no risk to aquatic receptors from chemicals detected at the site.

The RI process then considered human health risk assessment. Mr. Hoch explained that the risk assessment was conducted to establish the potential lifetime cancer risks and adverse non-cancer health risks associated with site-related activities. The methods used were consistent with EPA and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines and Navy policies. The risk assessment was based on the five soil investigations and one groundwater investigation, and included an evaluation of the current use as a daycare center (both from the scenario of daycare children and daycare staff), and future hypothetical reuse scenarios (such as residential).

Mr. Hoch explained that two methods of identifying the chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) were used for Site 30, and both methods were given equal weight throughout the process. The first method follows Navy guidance and is an EPA-based method that includes ambient, essential-nutrient, and risk-based screens. The second method is preferred by DTSC and does not include the risk-based criteria screen.

The risk assessment also includes an exposure assessment for likely exposed human receptors and the exposure pathway to the soil. The soils were considered for dermal contact, ingestion, and inhalation (particulate and chemical vapors). Because groundwater at the site is approximately 5 to 6 feet bgs, groundwater dermal contact and inhalation of COPC vapors was also considered. The risk characterization step then combines all of the previous steps and estimates the potential cancer risk and non-cancer adverse health effect for most chemicals. He added that the unique toxicological effects of lead required the use of the DTSC Lead Spread model to estimate blood-lead levels and compares that to a threshold level. Mr. Hoch further explained the risk drivers and rationale.

Mr. Hoch concluded his presentation, stating that the final result of the risk assessment is that Site 30 is considered fully characterized and does not pose an unacceptable risk under the current land use conditions. Although it is not planned for the land use to change at Site 30, consideration for further evaluation

of dioxins under the concrete pad and possibly under the Daycare Building 502 should be considered if the land use were to change. A Feasibility Study (FS) will then be conducted to evaluate remedial alternatives to ensure protection of human health in the event that the building is demolished. Mr. Hoch opened the floor to questions.

Ms. Smith asked about the source of the vanadium detected in the soil samples. Mr. Hoch replied that it he did not know, but could get back to her on it. Ms. Smith asked for additional clarification on why the soil risk considered did not go any deeper than 7 feet bgs. Ms. Landers answered that it is because groundwater is encountered at about 5-6 feet below the ground surface (bgs) and normally soil sampling stops at saturated soil. Mr. Hoch added that the groundwater fluctuates in that area and could be as deep as 7 feet.

Ms. Smith asked about the use of the total risk holistic approach for all chemicals encountered as opposed to using the specific chemicals of concern in the document; for example, benzo(a)pyrene was the one used, though it is not considered a chemical of concern at TI. Ms. Landers explained that the total risk values are based on benzo(a)pyrene. However, because benzo(a)pyrene is not a chemical of concern at the site, the Navy had to consider benzo(a)pyrene equivalents. Ms. Smith asked if the section in the document regarding total risk was relevant. Ms. Landers explained that total risk is something that the EPA likes to see in considering the whole site versus the site-related risk. If the risk is largely driven by the site-related risk, then you may look at different FS alternatives and be more aggressive with the cleanup. If the total risk and site-related risk are similar, then you might look at other alternatives. This particular process can aid in the selection of FS alternatives in both the approach and the selection.

Mr. D.W. Hughes asked for an explanation of the minimum threshold criteria and how it compares with the San Francisco Public Health Department and the generally-accepted medical criteria. He elaborated, asking if the San Francisco Public Health Department or any city or state agency has established soil or groundwater levels more stringent than those currently being used by the Navy at TI. Mr. Hoch replied that the Navy is using EPA preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). Mr. Hoch added that drinking water criteria do not apply in this case because the groundwater is not a drinking water source; instead most of the groundwater criteria is based on the eco-receptors in the Bay and that criteria comes from the State Water Board.

David Rist, DTSC, stated that to the best of his knowledge, the city does not have any requirements that are considered more stringent than the Navy is currently using at TI and added that what is being done at TI does meet state and federal requirements.

Mr. Hughes asked that if the city develops the island, will it have to come back and meet more stringent criteria than what is established now? Mr. Rist replied no; that when the state leaves the site, it certifies that the process is finished. There should not be an future liability for the city. He added that the city is involved in the process as well and has a representative, and that no one at the city Health Department has expressed any concerns. Mr. Rist also stated that the city is involved at the Navy facility at Hunters Point, and that there is nothing more being done at Hunters Point than is being done at TI.

Mr. Sullivan also added that the city participates and reviews the Navy's documents at the same time that they are being reviewed by state and federal agencies, and is very aware of the cleanup process. Mr. Rist assured Mr. Hughes that he has a valid concern and that the cleanup process includes provisions for discoveries of contamination after the base has been turned over from the Navy to the city.

Mr. Brennan noted that the military does not have to clean up the property beyond the current use, and that if the city decides to redevelop the property differently, they may have to face extra cleanup. Mr. Hughes stated that that a major portion of the development plan, as presented last month, is residential, and that even the commercial portion will initially be hotels and restaurants. Mr. Brennan added that the exposure rate for hotel guests is not the same as for a residential exposure. He added that the development does take into account areas like Site 24, which have been left open, and the developer is very aware of the cleanup.

Mr. Sullivan then moved on to the next topic.

Navy BRAC 2005 Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that he wanted to update those in attendance on BRAC 2005 and changes to the Navy's San Diego BRAC office. On 13 May the Secretary of Defense forwarded the recommended base closure list to the BRAC Commission for review. The BRAC Commission will review those recommendations, visit the proposed base closure sites, hold public hearings, and solicit community and local government input. Based on this review the BRAC Commission will make it's own recommendations in a report that will be forwarded to the President by 8 September 2005.

The President has until 23 September to accept or reject the BRAC Commission's proposal in its entirety; per BRAC legislation, additions, deletions, and substitutions are not allowed. If the President rejects the proposal, it can go back to the BRAC Commission for another review process. If he accepts the proposal, it is forwarded to Congress. Congress has 45 days to reject the recommendations

in their entirety or the proposal becomes binding; Congress does not have to vote to accept the proposal. Once the proposal becomes binding, the DoD implements the base realignment and closure plan.

Mr. Sullivan described the difference between realignment and closure. Realigned bases may expand or contract, either with more people and equipment or fewer, but the realigned bases remain active. Closure, however, means complete closure of the base, such as was the case for TI and many of the other bases in the Bay Area.

He went on to explain that originally the Navy's BRAC program was implemented by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC), which has the responsibility for building and maintaining all of the Navy and Marine Corps facilities. At the beginning, the TI BRAC project was managed by the Western Division of NAVFAC in San Bruno, which later became Engineering Field Activity West (EFAWEST). In 1999, a decision was made to consolidate the Navy's BRAC Operations for California bases in San Diego under the Southwest Division of NAVFAC. In 2005, in order to further streamline the organization, a decision was made to separate the BRAC program from NAVFAC. The Navy Program Management Office, or Navy BRAC PMO, now implements the BRAC program for the entire Department of the Navy, which includes both the Navy and the Marines. The Navy BRAC PMO is headquartered in San Diego, under which are BRAC PMO-West in San Diego, BRAC PMO-Southeast in Charleston, BRAC PMO-Northeast in Philadelphia, and BRAC support staff in Washington D.C. He noted that the other services, the Army and Air Force, have slightly different BRAC organizations tailored to their specific service.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the BRAC 2005 list only includes a few bases in California, including the Naval Support Activity in Corona, and the inland portion of the Naval Weapons Station Concord (NWSC) in the East Bay. The Corona base will be closed completely and its operations will be moved to Point Mugu Naval Air Station. The inland portion of NWSC, the area predominantly used by the Navy, will be closed, while the tidal area of the base, used primarily by the Army, will remain active.

Two reserve centers in the Los Angeles area will be closed and their reserve units will be relocated to other centers in the L.A. area, and various realignments will occur at Camp Pendleton, Miramar, Barstow, China Lake, Coronado, Point Loma, Ventura County, San Diego, and Fallbrook. However, these are only the recommendations that are currently under review by the BRAC Commission.

Mr. Sullivan provided a hand out that listed bases in California with on-going BRAC work being managed by Navy PMO West and key web pages. The list did not include already transferred bases or the proposed BRAC 2005 bases.

Ms. Smith asked if Hunters Point was a TI Annex. Mr. Sullivan explained that it had been in the past, but was transferred from the Naval Station to EFAWEST in 1995. Mr. Sullivan also gave the new Navy web address for TI. The old web address still exists, but will no longer be updated. Mr. Sullivan also noted that the **www.navy.mil** website has lots of valuable information, including a link to the main Department of Defense BRAC website.

He added that the BRAC office in San Diego is undergoing some changes, including some organizational changes, and added that personnel working on TI will likely remain on the project. Mr. Sullivan will have additional information on the reorganization at the next RAB meeting. Also, the BRAC office will be moving to a new building in San Diego in August and September 2005.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any questions. There were none, and the meeting continued to the next agenda item.

Yerba Buena Island Site Status and Boundaries

Mr. Sullivan noted that there was a handout regarding the four Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) sites on YBI: Site 28, the on- and off-ramps for the Bay Bridge; Site 29, east Bay Bridge right-of-way; Site 8, sludge disposal area; and Site 11, the old YBI landfill.

Mr. Sullivan also stated that there are other projects in addition to the CERCLA sites. There is a site investigation in progress at the Battery Site, which is located in the flats below Quarters 1, although the Navy has temporarily lost access to the site due to Caltrans construction. There is a section of petroleum pipe, YF3, that will need to be addressed at some point in the future. The Navy has also been doing some other petroleum work in the area between the former Naval Station and the Coast Guard Station.

Mr. Sullivan then referred to a figure that illustrated the site boundaries. He commented that it is not evident from the figure that YBI was initially only owned by the Navy and the Coast Guard. The bridge and the tunnel was originally constructed as an easement on Navy property. However, during the new Bay Bridge construction the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), working with Caltrans, determined that Caltrans should own some of this property. FHWA has a process by which they can transfer federal property to a state transportation agency, and in 2002 transferred that property to the California Department of Transportation. Part of that transfer included a portion of Site 28.

The Navy is discussing modifying the property boundaries to address two issues: (1) the majority of Site 29 is now located on Caltrans property and (2) the issues of overlapping site boundaries between sites. Under the Navy proposal

the portion of Site 28 that that is now on Caltrans property would be transferred to Site 29. Then, the portions of Site 29 that overlap onto Sites 8 and 11 will be cut out of Site 29 and be represented on Sites 8 and 11 only. Mr. Sullivan stated that this would make the preparation of the RI more efficient and make the ultimate transfer of the Navy property to the city more efficient. He emphasized that all the site data will still be evaluated; it would just no longer overlap. He added that DTSC had expressed some concerns about the analysis of the data set with the new boundaries in order not to miss any spatial relationships because of the way that the boundaries split the data. The Navy agreed to address that concern.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy would be responsible for addressing the Site 29 contamination that is located on Caltrans property. Mr. Sullivan responded that was an important question because Sites 29, 11, and 8 are all now within Caltrans property. He continued to explain that the Navy intends to complete the remedial investigation and then work with Caltrans to get the site closed. The draft RI report is scheduled for submittal in October 2005, and should be finalized in Spring of 2006. He added that the Navy is focusing on completing the remedial investigation of the CERCLA sites, and then determining how to appropriately address the battery site.

Mr. Edde asked a question related to a "notch" in the proposed Site 29 boundary on the San Francisco side of the tunnel. Mr. Sullivan replied that the "notch" was related to how the property was actually deeded, likely because of the location of an off-ramp in this area.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any questions or comments related to the proposed boundary changes. There were no questions.

Treasure Island RAB Operating Procedures

Mr. Sullivan stated that the review of the RAB Operating Procedures was more complicated than initially though, and requested that the issue be deferred. The RAB Operating Procedures were established in 1994 or 1995, with revisions in 1996, but have not been reviewed in the last nine years. Mr. Sullivan stated he is reviewing other RAB operating procedures at other BRAC bases and looking at the proposed Department of Defense RAB rule. He is planning on proposing some changes to the RAB Operating Procedures, that he will prepare in "strike-out" and submit to the RAB for comment.

Ms. Smith pointed out that the sections on meeting and document review need revision. Mr. Sullivan responded that the revisions will make the RAB Operating Procedures consistent with the proposed RAB rule.

Upcoming Documents and Field Schedule

Documents

Reading from the Document Tracking Sheet, Marcie Rash, TtEMI, stated that:

- A Technical Memorandum on the Previous Investigation Activities within the Lake of the Nations Footprint will be finalized on 5 July.
- The Revised Site 27 Feasibility study is scheduled to be finalized on 15 August.
- The Supplemental EBS is scheduled to be finalized on 18 July.
- Comments on the Draft Site 12 Risk Assessment/RI Scoping Work Plan are due 23 June and the document will be finalized by 15 August.
- The Treasure Island Newsletter will be finalized on 29 July.
- The Halyburton Court SAP Addendum will be finalized on 22 July.
- The Treasure Island Draft FOST will be completed 6 July, with comments due on 5 August.
- The Draft Site 30 RI report is currently being reviewed, comments are due 8 July.
- The Draft Site 33 Groundwater Investigation SAP Addendum is complete and comments are due 1 July. The Addendum should be finalized by the end of July.
- The Draft YBI Draft FOST is scheduled for submittal on 22 July.
- The Draft Site 31 Remedial Investigation will be submitted 26 July.
- The PCB Summary Report is scheduled to be finalized on 15 July, although the date might get extended.
- The Asbestos Abatement and Radioactive Survey Project Plan will be finalized on 30 June.
- The Quarters 1 through 7 Field Activity Report will be finalized on 23 June.
- The Draft Historical Radiological Assessment will be completed 11 July, with comments due 10 August.

Field Schedule

Ms. Rash stated that the Asbestos Abatement and Radiological Assessment of Building 233 is scheduled to begin on 1 July. Mr. Bourgeois replied before the full scale assessment can begin, the Navy will be providing a demonstration for the State Department of Health Services (DHS). The demonstration will likely be completed in the second or third week of July. Upon completion of the demonstration, the work plans will be finalized, and the full scale assessment of the building will begin near the end of July or beginning of August. Ms. Rash asked if there were any questions. There were none.

December 2004 and April 2005 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Smith was concerned that there was no notification to bring the December meeting minutes and any associated notes to the meeting. Therefore, Mr. Ryan recommended delaying the approval of the December minutes. A decision was made to defer the discussion of the December meeting minutes, but to continue the discussion of the April meeting minutes.

For the 19 April 2005 minutes, Mr. Brennan was concerned that the meeting minutes stated that Scott Anderson said hydrogen bubbles were used to help disperse the compound, but he had learned during the site visit that it was actually to enhance the reactions. Ms. Smith stated that if the minutes accurately reflected what Mr. Anderson said, then they should stand. Mr. Sullivan stated that he would have the transcripts checked and if Mr. Anderson had incorrectly stated that the hydrogen bubbles were used for dispersion instead of to enhance the reaction that a parenthetical statement with a correction could be added to the April meeting minutes.

Ms. Smith had a question regarding the sentence on page 3, paragraph 3 relating to the treatment methods used at Site 21 and Site 24. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the sentence should be rewritten so that it is clear that injection technology will be used at both Sites 21 and 24, but recirculation will only be done at Site 24.

Ms. Smith then requested, and Mr. Sullivan agreed, that on Page 4, top paragraph "Halyburton soil gas sampling" should be changed to read "Halyburton Court soil gas sampling."

Mr. Brennan made a motion to accept the minutes with those corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gee. The meeting minutes, with corrections, were approved. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk then reminded Mr. Sullivan that he had yet to approve the February meeting minutes.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any co-chair announcements. There were none.

BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that the most recent BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting was two weeks ago where they discussed changes to the BRAC program and contracting issues. They had intended to discuss the Site 27 Skeet Range proposed plan process and the remedial action plan, but that discussion was deferred until the Site 27 FS was completed. There was also discussion related to Site 27, and based on comments received, the Navy is going to review the depth sounding information and sedimentation data in the years since the skeet range

closed in order to evaluate the amount of sediment being deposited in Clipper Cove.

Mr. Sullivan also stated that the SEBS was discussed. A meeting was scheduled to further discuss the draft response to comments that the Navy had prepared. The SEBS is being updated based on these discussions. Mr. Sullivan noted that the SEBS should be finalized in the middle of July.

There was a discussion regarding Site 24, similar to the RAB meeting presentation. There was also a discussion of Site 7, which the Navy is proposing to remove from the program. Ms. Smith asked for further information about Site 7. Mr. Sullivan replied that Site 7 was the former pesticide storage area at Building 62. Several investigations have been conducted at the site and there were no chemicals detected at concentrations of concern. However, closure of the site was delayed pending completion of work at surrounding sites. This work has been completed, and the Navy is drafting a letter requesting closure of Site 7. Mr. Sullivan also noted that the RAB will get a copy of the letter and have an opportunity for comment.

Finally, Mr. Sullivan noted that typical administrative issues were discussed including documents, the meeting agenda, action items, and planning the next BCT meeting, to be held on 12 and 13 July in San Diego.

Other Public Comment and Announcements

Mr. Sullivan turned the floor over to Mr. Brennan for an update on the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB). Mr. Brennan said the CAB June meeting had been cancelled, and also noted that the TI Development Authority (TIDA) Board, the CAB and the Mayor's office had a community workshop, open to the public, to discuss the planning process. He reported about 50 or 60 people attended the meeting, and suggested that anyone interested in learning more about the results of that meeting or the upcoming July CAB meeting check the website http://www.sfgov.org/treasureisland for additional information.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any other questions or comments. Mr. Hughes stated that he had asked about Site 12 back at the December meeting regarding standing water during the winter; he had understood that work was complete at the site, but he had now observed work occurring in the area in the last 30 days paving residential units on the backside of Bayside Drive. He wondered whether anything had changed, and if new data had been identified that had caused any problem.

Mr. Sullivan explained that lead, PCBs, or PAHs had been previously identified that extended past the environmental fence line and into fourteen leased backyards. So, starting in the year 2000, as an interim measure, the Navy worked

with the city to install both sod covers and concrete pavers in these fourteen yards. Since then Shaw, under contract to the Navy, has been maintaining the lawns and inspecting the pavers on a weekly basis. As part of that on-going maintenance some of the sod covers have been converted to concrete pavers, including four yards in the past month. This maintenance will continue until a permanent cleanup action is completed in the housing area.

Mr. Sullivan added that additional trenching throughout the housing area was completed in 2003 to make sure that all of the areas within housing had been sampled. As a result of that 2003 trenching, the Navy did not identify any new areas of concern within the occupied housing area. The city and the Villages management have also put out what they refer to as the "House Rules". It asks residents not to dig in their backyards or otherwise disturb the soil. The Navy feels, in consultation with the BCT, that it is an adequate measure to take until there is a permanent cleanup action in the housing area.

Mr. Hughes then asked who was responsible for fencing and maintaining the security of the structures enclosed by the fencing. He noted that the fence is in a poor state of repair along the perimeter path, and cited problems with squatters and graffiti.

Mr. Sullivan replied that the question of maintenance responsibility was not clear; that there had been conversations back and forth between the Navy and the city, and that there may be some differences of opinion on responsibility. The Navy is maintaining the fencing it installed as part of the environmental program; however, the perimeter path fencing was not installed under the environmental program. The perimeter path fencing was part of the original Naval Station fencing. Mr. Bourgeois stated that Shaw had been inspecting and maintaining the both the temporary fencing and the new permanent fencing that replaced the temporary. In the last three or four weeks they noted an increase in the number of problems. They have been working with the Police Department, documenting damage with photographs, and passing the information on to the Navy.

Mr. Hughes then asked who was responsible for cutting the grass along the wooden fence and the structures, and noted that it has been used by kids and squatters. Mr. Sullivan replied that the question of responsibility was still unanswered, but that he would make sure it was cut. Mr. Hughes was concerned that he had been requesting that the grass get cut for four months. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the Navy had not cut the grass in the last four months.

Mr. Hughes then reiterated his concern related to unauthorized people having access to the buildings. He noted that the graffiti is increasing and doors and windows are being broken, and that the placement of plywood on the inside of

the windows had allowed the windows to be broken. Mr. Bourgeois replied that the Department of Public Works (DPW) typically responds and does the maintenance. Mr. Hughes expressed frustration that no one had clear responsibility for these issues while threats from fire, squatters, and children seemed to be increasing. Mr. Sullivan stated that he understood Mr. Hughes' concerns, and that the Navy will attempt to address issues related to the brush and the fence.

Future Meeting Agenda Items

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any agenda items anyone would like to see included at the next RAB. He noted that it could be discussed at the scheduled conference calls on the first Wednesday of July and August. Mr. Ryan stated that he liked the field trip, but was not sure if that would be useful for the next meeting. Mr. Sullivan agreed that he was not sure if there was anything of interest that would be going on in August, but that they could possibly conduct a van tour of the base. That possibility will be discussed further at the scheduled conference calls.

Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated the next BCT meeting will be 16 August. There is a conference call scheduled for 6 July, and another is scheduled for 3 August. Mr. Sullivan noted that the next BCT meeting will be held in July, and that the new Navy web address is on the agenda. Mr. Sullivan then thanked everyone for coming and brought the meeting to a close. Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.

June 2005 RAB Meeting Handouts

- Design and Operation of an In Situ Anaerobic Bioremediation System at Site 24 Naval Station Treasure Island, Treasure Island RAB Meeting, June 21, 2005
- Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Draft Findings of Suitability to Transfer (FOST), Naval Station Treasure Island, RAB Meeting, June 21, 2005
- Treasure Island Draft Remedial Investigation Report, Site 30-Daycare Center, June 21, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Navy BRAC 2005 Update, Naval Station Treasure Island RAB Meeting, June 21, 2005
- Installation Restoration Site Status and Boundaries, Yerba Buena Island Sites 8, 28, and 29, Naval Station Treasure Island, RAB Meeting, June 21, 2005
- Document Tracking Sheet
- Navy Field Schedule