

**FINAL
MEETING MINUTES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
16 August 2005
Meeting Number 119**

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 | Richard Perry | Scott Anderson |
| Tommie Jean Damrel | Pete Bourgeois | Dennis Kelly |
| La Rae Landers | Gary Foote | Kevin Hoch |
| Marc McDonald | Todd Bernhardt | |

RAB Support from ITSI:

Joni Jorgensen-Risk
Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter

Public Guests

| | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|
| D. W. Hughes | Anthony Fo | Joey Vazhappally |
| Lawrence McDonald | | |

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 16 August 2005 meeting at 7:04 P.M. at the Casa de la Vista (Building 271).

Mr. Sullivan welcomed those in attendance, and pointed out there were extra copies of the meeting agenda available at the back of the room. He noted that RAB meetings were held every second month, with the last meeting held in June, and the next meeting would be in October. 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), and also for any announcements.

D.W. Hughes thanked the Navy for promptly responding to the community's concerns regarding fencing repair and weed control, and that it was noted by the residents. He also pointed out that there is a resident's association forming on the island, with a number of meetings held already, and this is something that had been discussed. He added that a lot of people used these areas for walking.

Mr. Sullivan thanked Mr. Hughes for the feedback. He then introduced a new agency team member, Mr. Richard Perry. Mr. Perry is a public participation specialist with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

There were no other comments or announcements so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item. He added that there would be another opportunity for public comment or announcements towards the end of the meeting, but that if anyone had any comments or questions during the course of the meeting, that they should feel free to bring them up for discussion.

Field Activities Update

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

Mr. Bourgeois stated that the Navy had conducted extensive vegetation control within the fenced areas. Slides accompanied the discussion of the vegetation control activities. He noted that they had used some large equipment, including a tractor-mower, hedge-hogs and chainsaws. Shaw also collected trash that had accumulated in the Halyburton Court and Westside Drive areas.

Mr. Bourgeois then discussed the Site 24 bioremediation system. The first loop and five wells in each of the second and third loops have been turned off. He noted that they would continue to monitor the progress of the bioremediation, and present the results of the monitoring at future RAB meetings.

Mr. Bourgeois then noted that field work is scheduled to begin at Site 21, located near the sailing school. The Navy will be installing both fencing and one-inch injection wells in the area. The field activity will continue for about two or three weeks and the system will sit in place for several months. Dale Smith asked if the Site 21 activities would interfere with the sailing school's fall programs. Scott Anderson replied that the school would be able to conduct their fall programs. Mr. Bourgeois added that his crew would be out at the site on Thursday to help the school move their boats and to be there for questions and answers on the project.

Ms. Smith then stated that she felt some of the vegetation removal in the Site 12 area seemed excessive, and wanted to know if the extensive removal was primarily for the purpose of improving visibility. Mr. Bourgeois concurred that it was to improve visibility for the police department as well as a fire control measure. Ms. Smith noted that none of the vegetation was native.

Marc McDonald (Treasure Island Development Authority [TIDA]) commented that there is a movie production operation located in Hangar 3, and asked if anyone had contacted them regarding upcoming activities. Mr. Bourgeois responded that he was not aware of the movie production operation, and he did not think that they would be impacted by the fencing. Mr. McDonald requested discussing this further with the Navy and indicated that he would provide them with a phone number for the movie production operation.

Mr. Sullivan also noted that work would begin soon at Building 233. Mr. Bourgeois agreed and noted that the team, the Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO) and the State Department of Health Services (DHS) were discussing approaches on doing the radiological survey in the building. The Navy plans to get out and do at least a demonstration survey for DHS and the agencies within the next month. The Navy would then revise the draft work plan and send it out for comment.

Mr. Sullivan stated that investigative work would begin in the Halyburton Court area as part of the soil gas survey study. In addition, Mr. Anderson noted that the Navy would be installing four groundwater monitoring wells in the Site 33 Waterline Replacement area as part of the Remedial Investigation (RI).

Mr. Hughes asked who was responsible for maintaining the overhead street lighting in the Halyburton Court area; it is the only lighting for some of the residents in the vicinity. Mr. McDonald introduced himself as the Director of Facilities for TI and provided a response to Mr. Hughes' question stating that the design of the lighting is such that they are attached to the housing; the panels are located on the buildings. The City is working on rerouting the electricity so that the outside lighting can be turned on without turning on the electricity in the vacant buildings. Mr. McDonald said that he would convey this information to the John Stewart Company and others.

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

Mr. Sullivan noted that the draft TI Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) was issued for comment 11 July. Public notice was provided and copies of the notice were sent to those on the mailing list, which included all the residents on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (YBI). He noted that the public

comment period had officially closed, but he offered to take additional comments at this meeting. He also noted that the YBI draft FOST had also been issued, and the public comment period is still open. The FOST documents are environmental documents that do not result in the transfer of property; it determines whether the property is environmentally suitable for transfer. Property transfers result from completion of real estate agreements, and these negotiations are on going between the Navy and the City of San Francisco. He went on to note that there currently is no schedule for property transfer, but as soon as there is one, that information will be communicated to the RAB. Mr. Sullivan then introduced Dennis Kelly, Tetra Tech (TtEMI), to provide an overview of the FOST and address questions and comments.

Mr. Kelly began by noting that the FOST documents do not cover all of TI and YBI, they only cover those portions of property that are suitable for transfer. The Navy will execute the Final FOST for TI on 27 September. The YBI FOST comment period will end on 8 September and the FOST will be finalized by 30 September. The Navy has received comments from all of the regulatory agencies, the City, Dale Smith, Douglas Ryan, Nathan Brennan and Mr. Kalman. Mr. Kelly then asked if there were any questions or comments.

Ms. Smith requested that her comments be read into the record. Her first comment was that it was difficult to search through the list of reviewed documents within the FOST; there was no seemingly rational order. She stated that it would be better if the list was sorted by date and then, within the date, by some other order, possibly document title. She specifically noted that she could not, without difficulty, find the reference for radiological. She went on to note that there was an incomplete sentence on Page 32 that should be struck, and that the salient points had been made in the previous sentence. Her final comment was that she was concerned the documents did not clearly address corrosives, and she identified the parcel T-15 area as an example. In the tables, parcel T-15 is identified as a location of a corrosive hazard, but parcel T-15 is not identified on the figures or in the text. She stated that if there was a concern that was noted in the table, it should at least briefly be mentioned in the text. Mr. Kelly stated that he would address all the comments in a response that will be included in the final document.

Mr. Hughes asked if the FOST stated that the Navy accepts liability for situations that arise after the transfer of the island, including damages from exposure to toxic materials. Mr. Kelly replied that the FOST states that all remedial actions have been completed for known releases, and that if at some future date Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) contamination was identified and found to be a result of previous Navy activities, the Navy would be responsible for addressing that contamination. Mr. Kelly also clarified that the Navy will not be responsible for

the activities of others that occur on the property after the transfer has been completed.

Mr. Kelly asked if there were any other questions or comments; there were none. Mr. Anderson thanked everyone for their input. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that the public comment period for YBI is still open. He explained that if the Navy and the City agree to an early transfer, then a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) would be completed. There is also the possibility that other properties might undergo the FOST process in the future

Site 27 Skeet Range Update

Mr. Sullivan introduced La Rae Landers, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), to give a presentation on the status of the Clipper Cove Skeet Range (Site 27) Feasibility Study (FS). Ms. Landers stated that they are currently working on resolving comments on the revised draft Site 27 FS. She also noted that the onshore portion of Site 27 had been removed from the FOST footprint. One of the outstanding issues is evaluating whether or not the depositional environment of the cove will ensure that the cove is protected from lead shot buried in the sediment. Ms. Lander's presentation focused on the sediment evaluation point paper prepared by the Navy to address this question.

Data from three different cove soundings were evaluated; 1985, 1989, and 2002. The 1989 sounding had been done to support an Army Corps of Engineers permit for maintenance dredging of channel in the cove. The 2002 sounding had been conducted by TIDA for development of the marina. The data were compiled and transects were evaluated throughout the cove. Ms. Landers noted that there were some difficulties correlating the data between the various years due to different intervals of depth measurement and that some of the data were hand drawn. Within the cove there is greater than one and a half inches of sediment deposition a year, resulting in over two feet of deposition since the skeet range closed in 1989. Because of the difficulty in evaluating the conditions within 150 feet of the shore, a new hydrographic survey is planned for September. The survey is being designed so that the new data can be easily correlated with the 2002 survey.

Ms. Landers stated that they are also evaluating monitoring techniques to monitor the conditions of the institutional controls once they are instituted at the site. The issue will be addressed in the final FS which is scheduled for submittal in November. The Proposed Plan would then follow the FS. She then asked if there were any questions.

John Gee asked Ms. Landers to explain the purpose of calculating the depositional rate. Ms. Landers responded that the primary receptors in the area

are diving ducks. Diving ducks can insert their head in up to one foot of sediment, therefore it is important to maintain at least one foot of sediment above the lead shot deposits. She reminded those in attendance that, based on the data, two feet of sediment have been deposited in the cove since the skeet range was closed.

Douglas Ryan asked about the history of dredging in the area. Mr. Sullivan responded that there had been very little dredging in the area, and there was no record found of any dredging in the cove since the island was created in 1937. The Navy initiated a permit to dredge in 1989, that was signed by The Army Corps of Engineers in 1992, but because of the impending base closure, the dredging was never completed.

Ms. Landers added that the cove was originally 50 feet deep, but is currently between 16 and 18 feet deep. Mr. Ryan wondered if that meant that the cove would eventually need dredging. Mr. Sullivan replied that at some point it may, although the sedimentation rate is now slower than it once was, and that a sandbar had been forming at the mouth of the cove.

Mr. Hughes asked what the closest sampling was that the Navy took to the shore. He stated that, typically on a skeet range, at least 50 percent of the rounds are going laterally or diagonally because of the way the clay birds are launched and the way a shooter normally follows the birds, and that he would say 50 percent of the shot would probably be within 150 feet. Ms. Landers replied that when the sampling was conducted in 1996, they did find some lead shot that was fairly close to the shore. Also, they did conclude in the RI that the cove did not have a complete exposure pathway, and that is what lead to the questions about the depositional rate and whether there is enough sediment on top of the lead shot to protect the duck receptor.

Mr. Sullivan added that there is a seawall along the shore that is constructed as a pyramid of rocks, which extends away from the shore before the sediment begins so they had to go out a little before getting off of the rocks and into the sediment.

Site 31 Draft Remedial Investigation

Mr. Sullivan introduced Kevin Hoch and Todd Bernhardt from TtEMI. Mr. Hoch stated that the Site 31 Draft RI was scheduled for submittal on 29 August. An RI serves as a mechanism for collecting data to characterize site conditions, determine the nature of the waste, and then assess risk to human health and the environment. Mr. Hoch then gave a presentation on the Site 31 RI document. Site 31 is the schoolyard for the elementary school. The parcel had been undeveloped before the school was built in the late 1960s. In the early 1970s the southern portion of the site was used as a storage yard during the construction of

the Navy housing. In the late 1970s the area was paved over to create the schoolyard.

Mr. Hoch continued by explaining that the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) identified a storage yard on the site, and an adjoining trash dump beneath the 11th Street utility right-of-way. Based on these results, there were four phases of investigation at Site 31. The first phase, in February and April of 2002, consisted of collecting soil samples with a Geoprobe® to a depth of four feet, along with exploration trenching in the former trash dump area. As a result, a Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) was conducted to remove lead and debris in the trash dump area. Additional soil sampling was completed in 2003 after the TCRA. Fourthly, temporary groundwater monitoring wells were installed and groundwater samples were collected.

The soil sample results indicated several compounds above residential preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), including pesticides such as Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethene (DDT) and Aroclor 1260 (a polychlorinated biphenyl [PCB]); some polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); bis (2-chloroethyl) ether; and some metals such as cadmium, copper, lead, and iron; as well as dioxin associated with the debris. He noted that no groundwater sample results exceeded applicable screening criteria. In addition, there are no chemicals of potential ecological concern at Site 31.

Mr. Hoch continued to explain as part of the TCRA, 540 cubic yards of soil were removed from Site 31 on the north side of 11th Street from depths of 2 to 6 feet. He then turned the presentation to Todd Bernhardt to discuss the human health risk assessment for Site 31.

Mr. Bernhardt began by stating that the methods to evaluate human health risk at Site 31 were similar to the methods used for Site 30. The risk assessment evaluated both the current site use as an elementary school, and hypothetical future site use with exposure scenarios for construction workers involved in site redevelopment, recreational visitors, and residential. Similar to Site 30, two methods, identified as Method 1 and Method 2, were used to evaluate risk. The first method follows Navy guidance and is an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-based method that includes a frequency of detection screen, a risk-based criteria screen, and a screen of groundwater concentrations versus EPA vapor intrusion numbers. The second method is preferred by DTSC and does not include these screens.

Mr. Bernhardt then explained the evaluation of exposure pathways. They evaluated surface soil (0-2 feet below ground surface [bgs]) and combined surface and subsurface soil. Although most of the area is currently paved, the evaluation included the hypothetical scenario of removing the pavement and

disturbing the underlying soil. They also evaluated potential groundwater exposure. Groundwater is not used as a drinking water source on the island, thus the only potential groundwater exposure pathways would be groundwater vapor migrating indoors or dermal contact during construction. He added that there are no existing buildings on Site 31, and all of the school buildings are north of the site.

Mr. Bernhardt continued explaining that after the chemicals of potential concern were identified, and the exposure assessment and toxicity assessment was completed, then it was possible to calculate cancer and non-cancer health risks. Mr. Bernhardt stated that there was no unacceptable risk level for the contaminants of potential concern, except under the hypothetical future resident scenario.

Once the health risks were calculated, it was possible to evaluate which chemicals were significant risk drivers. Once the risk drivers were identified, then there was a review to determine if the compounds driving the risk were concentrated in localized areas. Mr. Bernhardt explained that the four debris areas identified during the RI were the primary risk drivers. Therefore, the risk drivers are very localized, as opposed to being heterogeneous across the site. If these localized hot spots were removed, and the risk was re-calculated, there would also be no unacceptable risk for the hypothetical residential future use scenario.

Mr. Bernhardt then summarized, noting that there is no unacceptable risk related to the current use of the property, but there is a potential unacceptable risk related to the hypothetical residential redevelopment scenario. Therefore, an FS is recommended for Site 31. Mr. Bernhardt asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Brennan stated there was a possibility Site 31 could be redeveloped for residential use, and if that were the case, it would need to be evaluated. Mr. Bernhardt replied that the city is planning on continuing the current use of the site, but that the Navy is evaluating residential use for all the sites moving forward in the CERCLA process.

Mr. Hughes asked about the immediate risks for exposure if the ground cover immediately adjacent to the elementary schoolyard is not maintained and allowed to revert to bare soil. Mr. Bernhardt replied that the soil had been removed and replaced with clean backfill on the southern end of Site 31. Mr. Sullivan also replied that this risk assessment focused on Site 31 as defined by the site boundaries, and that risks related to other sites are addressed in other site-specific evaluations, including Sites 30 and 12. Mr. McDonald asked if workers doing landscaping had been considered. Ms. Landers explained that

type of exposure is included as part of the construction worker exposure scenario.

Ms. Smith wanted to know if it would be necessary to remove the debris areas if there was a future use other than as a paved area. Mr. Bernhardt replied that issues would be evaluated as part of the FS. Ms. Smith also asked if the effect of wind blowing loose soil had been taken into consideration, and Mr. Bernhardt said that it had.

Mr. Rist expressed concern that the 11th Street area contamination had not been evaluated. Mr. Bernhardt clarified that the entire site had been considered, and localized areas of contamination had been evaluated as if they were unpaved. The Navy accounted for the elevated concentrations of lead and other compounds underneath 11th Street.

Mr. Rist then asked if 11th Street had been evaluated separately for the construction and utility worker scenario. Ms. Landers replied that while they did not look at 11th Street as a separate risk, they did evaluate hot spot removal at specific locations along 11th Street. Mr. Rist added that the team would get into those comments in the RI. Mr. Sullivan added that there have been ongoing discussions between the Navy and the regulatory agencies as to how to appropriately address the 11th Street contamination beneath pavement.

Ms. Smith said that there is no indication in the history as to why there is such an elevated level of lead in this area. Mr. Sullivan replied that based on the information from the Waterline Replacement Project in 11th Street, there apparently was debris disposed here at some time in the past. The trenching identified debris, burnt ash and associated chemicals such as lead. Mr. Rist added that there was lead detected in other debris areas.

Finally, Mr. Sullivan noted that the comment period for the draft report is scheduled to end at about the same time as the October RAB meeting, and that the draft would be available in late August or early September.

Upcoming Documents and Field Schedule

Documents

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

- The Site 12 Risk Assessment RI Scoping Work Plan is scheduled to be finalized on 9 September.
- The Halyburton Court Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) Addendum is scheduled to be finalized on 19 August.

- The TI FOST is scheduled to be finalized on 27 September.
- The Site 30 RI report will be completed in September or October.
- The TI Environmental Close-Out Strategy and Schedules is scheduled to be finalized on 29 August.
- The YBI draft FOST comments are due 8 September, and the document is scheduled to be finalized on 20 September.
- The Site 31 Draft RI Report will be issued 29 August.
- The Site 12 Groundwater Optimization Technical Memorandum comments are due on 9 September.
- The Building 233 Asbestos Abatement Project Plans are scheduled to be finalized on 2 September.
- The Draft Historical Radiological Assessment (HRA) is scheduled to be issued on 22 August, with comments due on 22 September.

Field Activities

Ms. Rash stated the Site 33 groundwater investigation was in progress. She also noted that the Site 12 soil gas sampling and Site 21 Pilot Study were scheduled to begin the week of 22 August. The well installation at Site 24 C Zone is scheduled to begin 6 September. Finally she stated that the groundwater monitoring at petroleum site D1B, 25, and 180 is scheduled to take place from 18 to 24 August. Ms. Rash asked if there were any questions. There were none.

December 2004 and June 2005 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sullivan began the discussion with the December meeting minutes. Mr. Gee had questions about the appropriate use of apostrophes with abbreviations and noted some inconsistencies in the minutes. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the correct apostrophe usage would be researched and appropriate changes would be made so that the document would be consistent. Ms. Smith noted that there was a change between the first draft meeting minutes she had received and the current version of the draft meeting minutes, and was concerned about changes that were being made while the documents were under review. Mr. Sullivan said in the future he would make sure that he did not send the minutes to the RAB for review until he received the corrected draft from Joni Jorgensen-Risk. Mr. Brennan requested that on Page 6 the first full paragraph be clarified so that it is clear that 10 percent of the samples were analyzed for dioxin. Ms. Smith then

made a motion to accept the December Minutes with these corrections. Mr. Brennan seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

Mr. Sullivan then opened the floor to discussion about the June meeting minutes. Mr. Gee noted that on Page 13 Mr. Smith needs to be changed to Ms. Smith. Mr. Gee then made a motion to accept the minutes as noted. Ms. Pilram seconded the motion and was subsequently passed by the RAB.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. Sullivan turned the discussion over to Alice Pilram. Ms. Pilram stated that, after caucus, the community members were pleased to accept Walter Stortroen as a RAB member. Mr. Sullivan invited any interested guests at the meeting to consider submitting a RAB membership application.

BRAC Cleanup Team Update

Mr. Sullivan stated that there had been two BCT meetings since the last RAB meeting. At the July meeting in San Diego, they reviewed the new Navy organization, as was discussed at the July RAB meeting. Mr. Sullivan stated that the TI team was formerly associated with the Alameda team, but is now associated with the Hunters Point and Oak Knoll Naval Hospital team. The result of the reorganization is that there may be some changes to the non-environmental personnel involved in the project, but the environmental people involved on the TI project will remain essentially unchanged. He also noted that he would invite some of the new Navy team members to future RAB meetings.

Mr. Sullivan also stated that the July meeting had a general briefing on BRAC 2005. He stated the list of BRAC sites is changing, and the commission is scheduled to make recommendations at the end of August, with a report going to the President on 8 September.

In addition, comments on the environmental close-out strategy and schedule were finalized, and the close-out strategy document would be available upon request. Mr. Sullivan also agreed to send a compact disk (CD) of the document to the technical subcommittee.

Also discussed at the July BCT meeting was the DTSC "Envirostore" database, the Water Board's "Geotracker" database, and the development of the draft HRA that will be issued within a few weeks. Mr. Sullivan noted that the HRA was not a CERCLA document, and there was some discussion regarding whether it should be submitted to the RAB for review, and ultimately it was decided that the RAB would be given the document.

There was also a discussion of the schedule, of the draft Site 30 RI, of the Work Plan for the Site 12 RI, Site 27, and the draft Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). Mr. Sullivan explained that a draft ERA had been prepared for the base when the entire base was a single RI site. Now that the base has been divided into several RI sites, there was a discussion as to how to include the ecological issues in each of the individual RI reports.

Mr. Sullivan then discussed the August BCT meeting. Issues discussed at the August BCT meeting included the ERA, Site 12, and community relations' issues. Mr. Sullivan stated that the BCT discussed issuing pre- and post- remedial investigation fact sheets for Site 12. Finally, the BCT prepared for the August RAB meeting.

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 most recent CAB meeting was held 2 August. The CAB meetings are held on the first Tuesday of every month, except for the September CAB meeting, which will be held 13 September. Mr. Brennan noted the TIDA website had been updated. Mr. Brennan discussed the design principles for the new development, including discussion about building skyscrapers on TI to increase the possible housing density and open space, since the Tidelands Trust can be lifted off only about 80 acres on Treasure Island to trade for 80 acres that would go into the trust on YBI. The buildings could be up to 300 to 450 feet in height and could be as tall as the Bay Bridge towers. Other areas would be a more normal 60 to 85 feet in height. Ms. Smith asked how many people would that represent, and Mr. Brennan replied that it would be about 4,500 to 6,000. Mr. Brennan also noted that the next meeting would likely include a discussion of transportation planning issues.

Mr. Sullivan commented that there was a lot of good information on the TIDA website, and thanked TIDA for including Navy documents on its site. Mr. Sullivan then asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none.

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 also be discussed at the scheduled RAB conference calls. Ms. Smith asked about proposed changes to the RAB operating principles. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the changes need to be made, and that the issue will be made an agenda item. Mr. Brennan requested a discussion of the Halyburton Court air testing. Mr. Sullivan agreed to add an agenda item for a discussion of the history behind the sampling and a discussion

of the field activities. The next agenda would also include a line item for comments on the Site 31 RI report and other documents with open comment periods.

Closing Remarks/End of Meeting

Mr. Sullivan stated the next RAB meetings would be in October and December. There is a conference call scheduled for 7 September, and another is scheduled for 5 October. The next BCT meeting will be held 8 September in San Francisco. He then thanked everyone for coming and brought the meeting to a close. Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

August 2005 RAB Meeting Handouts

- Naval Station Treasure Island, Vegetation Control in Known Debris Areas of Site 12, August 16, 2005
- Schedule for Finalization of FOSTs
- Clipper Cove Skeet Range, IR Site 27, Revised Draft Feasibility Study, Naval Station Treasure Island, August 16, 2005
- Draft Remedial Investigation Report, Installation Restoration Site 31, Former South Storage Yard, August 16, 2005, NAVSTA Treasure Island RAB Meeting
- Document Tracking Sheet
- Navy Field Schedule