

**Final  
MEETING MINUTES  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND  
20 June 2006  
Meeting Number 124**

**Community RAB Members in attendance:**

John Gee                                  Nathan Brennan                                  Dale Smith

**Regulatory Agency, City and Navy RAB Members in attendance:**

James Sullivan (Navy)                  David Rist (DTSC)                                  Jack Sylvan

**Other Agency, Navy Staff and Consultant Representatives in attendance:**

Marcie Rash                                  Victor Early                                  Tommie Jean Damrel  
Stan Ali    La Rae Landers                                  Marc McDonald  
Pete Bourgeois                                  Jim Whitcomb                                  Kevin Hoch  
Deanna Rhoades

**RAB Support from ITSI:**

Joni Jorgensen-Risk                                  Valerie Jensen, Court Reporter

**Public Guests**

R. Hairston                                  D.W. Hughes                                  Loraine Lee

**Welcome Remarks and Introductions**

James Sullivan (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the 20 June 2006 meeting at 7:12 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 available at the back of the room. Mr. Sullivan thanked those who participated in the site tour of Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) sites, and suggested that, if there was interest, the Navy could schedule another site tour prior to the August RAB meeting. 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 TI and YBI. He added that the public is also welcome to comment during the course of the meeting. There were no

comments or announcements so Mr. Sullivan moved directly to the next agenda item.

### **Field Activities Update (Building 233 Asbestos/Radiological Survey)**

Mr. Sullivan introduced Pete Bourgeois, from Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (Shaw E&I) to provide the update on Building 233. Mr. Bourgeois stated that the Navy had recently completed a radiological survey and some related asbestos abatement at Building 233. He explained that the Historic Radiological Assessment (HRA), completed in February 2006, recommended five sites for further investigation, of which none had known contamination. Building 233, however, was recommended for a characterization survey because of a known spill that took place in January 1950 when a radium source was broken during calibration exercises at the Radiological Safety Training School housed in the building at the time. The Navy completed an extensive cleaning effort in May 1950 and the building was reopened for unrestricted use. Mr. Bourgeois stated that the building had been unoccupied since 1995. The purpose of the characterization survey is to ensure that the cleanup effort conducted by the Navy in 1950 meets with today's more stringent standards.

The survey plans were reviewed and approved by the Navy's Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO), California Department of Health Services, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region IX. The plans were finalized in March 2006 and the team was mobilized to the field on 18 April. The survey was completed 17 May. They are currently in the process of preparing the final report (due August 2006) and await analytical results for samples collected inside the building.

A gamma survey was conducted on the inner walls, ceilings, and certain rooms and hallway areas. Based on the gamma survey results, a few locations were selected for direct read measurements and smear samples. Mr. Bourgeois showed some photographs while explaining the process of collecting direct read measurements and smear samples for alpha and beta-gamma on painted surfaces, walls, and ceilings. Paint was removed from sample locations using a non-toxic stripper. Once the paint was removed, direct read measurements for alpha, and beta and gamma radiation were collected on the exposed surface (wallboard). Smear samples were collected in the bathroom drains and pipes to characterize the potential residual contamination from personnel washing up after the 1950 spill.

Mr. Bourgeois said that during screening activities they came across a "bridge marker" used by soldiers to mark bridges at night, or placed on their helmets or belts as a light source. The marker was comprised of radium 226 mixed with

zinc paint to produce light. Finding this marker verified that the instruments used, and the procedures followed, were correct and helped to validate the study.

Mr. Bourgeois displayed photographs of the operations that included the fence that surrounded the building to protect the public; the radon sampling instrument; gamma screening; asbestos containment using a negative pressure pump to keep the dust down; screening of asbestos material removed from the rooms; screening of personnel following decontamination; and the sample grid created on the wall during the survey depicting where samples were collected. Additional photographs showed where wallboard was actually cut away for sampling purposes and bags taped to the wall with paint chips inside. Some of those bags were selected for submittal to the laboratory and others remained on the wall. The final photograph showed the "bridge marker" and the location where it was found stuck behind a pipe. The pipe had to be removed as well as some flooring to get to the marker. The survey showed the pipe and the flooring were clean.

Project statistics were reviewed:

*First Floor included a total of 24 rooms and covered 9,075 square feet (ft<sup>2</sup>):*

1. 12 rooms, three hallway areas and the main entrance covering 4,853 ft<sup>2</sup>;
2. 4 wall and 2 ceiling locations each in 11 rooms;
3. 8 wall and 3 ceiling locations in room 121 (spill area);
4. 11 wall locations each in 3 hallway areas;
5. 2 ceiling locations in central hallway, 1 in main entrance;
6. 32 floor locations in 4 rooms after asbestos removal; and
7. 5 drain smears in the bathroom.

*Second Floor included a total of 11 rooms (201/202/203 considered as one) and covered 8,250 ft<sup>2</sup>:*

1. 9 rooms and 2 hallway areas covering 5,682 ft<sup>2</sup>;
2. 4 wall and 2 ceiling locations each in 9 rooms;
3. 11 wall locations each in 2 hallway areas;
4. 2 ceiling locations in central hallway;
5. 10 floor locations in 1 room after asbestos removal; and
6. 4 drain smears in the bathroom.

*The north stairwell covered 207 ft<sup>2</sup> with 3 ceiling locations and approximately 1,780 ft<sup>2</sup> of flooring was removed from Building 233 (10% of the building total). A total of 30 paint samples and 30 wallboard samples, and 2 biased (1 concrete and 1 baseboard) samples were submitted for laboratory analysis. There were a total of 236 locations measured by direct read/smear methods and 32 locations were selected for confirmation analysis (13.5% of total locations).*

Mr. Bourgeois explained that the total flooring removed was actually more than the 1,780 ft<sup>2</sup> because some of the flooring included three or four layers. The reason for the two biased samples was due to higher than background readings at those locations. Mr. Bourgeois asked if there were any questions, of which there were none.

### **Base Reuse Plan Update**

Mr. Sullivan introduced Mr. Jack Sylvan, from the Mayor's Office of Base Reuse and Development, to provide the update on the Base Reuse Plan. Mr. Sylvan explained that he was the project manager in the Mayor's Office and is working on the long term development on behalf of the TI Development Authority (TIDA), who has the legal responsibility and standing to actually facilitate the redevelopment.

Mr. Sylvan started with a review of some of the constraints inherent in dealing with the island that include transportation (one access point on and off the island); geologic conditions (some seismic improvements are required and some areas of the island are better suited for building development); the Job Corps property (great opportunity for the city's work force development, but it is 40 acres in the middle of the island that the City has no jurisdiction over); and environmental remediation (this is a cost issue more than it is determining where land uses can go).

The City uses several contractors to assist in the oversight of ongoing cleanup operations and to help the design team understand the environmental implications of future land uses. Mr. Sylvan added that the information that comes out of the RAB and BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) process is instrumental to their understanding future uses. He illustrated Site 24 as a good example, and that although the Navy is making good progress at Site 24, the City considers it prudent to simply avoid development of the site at this point.

Mr. Sylvan suggested that it is important to understand that the City has a partner in this planning process, and it was determined very early in the process (due to site complexities) to pull in a private development partner who would fund all of the planning, engineering, legal fees, and also bring their expertise to the table for understanding what the infrastructure needs are, and what the actual market is, in terms of economics.

For example, under the initial reuse plan (a requirement of the BRAC process) the City proposed a theme park on the island; however, when the request for proposal (RFP) was issued to development firms, the theme park idea did not find a following. The City has a private partner to assist in the economic development of the property that is actually paying a lot of the upfront costs

associated with the planning process. Mr. Sylvan added that those costs are extensive and happen over a long period of time with any major urban development.

The planning partner, Treasure Island Community Development (TICD), includes three partnering firms, several architecture firms, and an array of engineers, lawyers, and landscape architects. Together the partners are preparing the plans for TI. Those plans go through review with the Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB), the TIDA Board, the Board of Supervisors, and several public workshops in an effort to reach a broader audience.

There is another complexity associated with the island and that is the Tidelands Trust (Trust), which applies to all property that is either waterways or was once waterways (fill material). Because TI is fill, when the property transfers from the federal government to TIDA, the Trust will apply. The Trust is a state law that limits residential, office, and industrial uses, and is intended to keep land use in maritime and public-oriented use. Open space, hotels, and restaurants are considered public-oriented uses; residential and industrial are not. The Trust constrains the number of acres where they can put uses that are not allowable (under the Trust). The Trust does include an exchange mechanism whereby areas of TI that the state legislature deems are no longer needed for Trust purposes can be removed from that designation. This allows for residential development.

TIDA is currently looking at about 5,500 housing units that include two-story rowhouses and up to 40 stories and above towers; all will be built primarily on TI and in the areas of existing housing on YBI. They are calling the heart and gateway to the island the "Urban Core" that will include the most dense concentration of housing on the island. Another proposal that is being considered is cutting a ferry key into TI and have the ferries arrive 500 feet into the interior of the island, right at the heart of the commercial and retail center.

Another component of the TI economic development is commercial use that will include 300 to 500 hotel rooms (consisting of two hotels on TI and one on YBI).

Open space is the third planning component, and because of the Trust, is also a place where some of the constraints overlap. One concern is that too much open space could overwhelm a new community and could actually detract from the island. The planners are focusing on having different areas with different programming that will include more passive natural landscape. They have proposed regional-serving ballfields that could be self-supporting with tournaments. There will also be storm water treatment wetlands treating all storm water generated on the island and linked to a new waste water treatment facility.

Another proposal on the table is environmentally sensitive and sustainable development. This includes solar energy generation and clean and green building materials. They also need to see that there is enough critical mass on the island to support a grocery store and dry cleaner so that residents will not need to drive off the island for goods and services.

There is also a plan to expand the marina from the existing 100 slips to 400. Historic Building 1, standing at the entryway to the island, will probably house some community space functions. Historic Buildings 2 and 3, subject to the Trust, are limited as to the type of uses they can house and those uses need to generate enough revenue to pay for the seismic improvements necessary for these buildings.

Mr. Sylvan stressed that this is an evolving process that is visionary at the core right now. The planning process is getting them closer to understanding where uses will go, but at the end of the day, when they actually start the development effort it will actually be shaped around site conditions (infrastructure and environmental).

They are hoping to have a preliminary thumbs-up on their development plans from the policy makers and elected officials sometime in late summer or early fall 2006. This is not considered an approval for the project, but rather an affirmation that they are moving in the right direction. Following that, redevelopment plans will be created, and a project-specific Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be developed. Assuming that the City does acquire the property from the Navy, they are looking at starting construction in 2009. That construction will be the new backbone infrastructure bringing the island up to city standards, and by 2011 new buildings will be visible. Depending on the market, development could take seven to eight years, but if the market is slow, it could take 10 to 12 years.

One last item presented by Mr. Sylvan was housing in the current Site 12. The future land is not proposed for residential, and is in fact slated for a marsh/open space area. The planners are proposing that the existing housing be deconstructed as the final phase of development (eight to 10 years out). The reasons for that are twofold: the revenue generated from that housing will assist in financing the infrastructure, and they have made a commitment that people living on TI are given first opportunity to move into new units.

Mr. Sylvan opened the floor to questions. Dale Smith, pointing to the development map, asked what the whitish area was in Site 12. Mr. Sylvan replied that was the school and because it is important to the mayor that development attract families, the school will be necessary. Nathan Brennan asked if the school was Tidelands Trust compliant. Mr. Sylvan replied that it

was not, and is one of the areas they are removing (exchanging) from the Trust. They are doing that to ensure a school on the island. Ms. Smith asked who the entities were that made up the consortium. Mr. Sylvan responded that Lennar Homes, one of the largest home builders in the country, has partnered with Wilson, Meany, and Sullivan (primary commercial expertise), and Kenwood Investments on the planned redevelopment of TI. Ms. Smith asked if Lennar would be doing any of the remediation. Mr. Sylvan replied that is an unknown at this time, depending on when and how the property is transferred to the City. David Rist (Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC]) asked if additional fill material will be brought in to enhance existing features. Mr. Sylvan replied that the landscape architects are talking about creating some topography and thought it possible (from planned dredging operations) that fill would be placed on the northern end of the island.

Mr. Sullivan thanked Mr. Sylvan for participating in the TI RAB meeting and providing the quality presentation updating the RAB meeting attendees on the reuse planning process. He added that there were a few copies of the reuse plan available as a RAB resource. Mr. Sylvan said that all of the plans that are presented publicly are posted to the TIDA Web site.

### **Site 12 Update and Draft EE/CA**

Mr. Sullivan announced that the Draft Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), revised from the 2002 published version, was distributed to the RAB Technical Subcommittee about a week ago. Following the review process, the document will be finalized and distributed for public comment. Mr. Sullivan turned the floor over to Victor Early, TtEMI, to provide the briefing on the Site 12 EE/CA.

Mr. Early said that the chemicals associated with the solid waste disposal areas in Site 12, located at the northern end of the island (mostly along the coastline), are primarily in the soil. The areas have been fenced off and isolated from the public, and for that reason, there is no immediate threat to the public or the residents. The Navy has selected to conduct a Non-Time Critical Removal Action to remediate the soil. The Navy will be focusing their removal actions at four areas that include Areas A and B, where they have also found an area of methane and soil gas that they believe is associated with solid waste disposal. Mr. Early indicated that the solid waste disposal areas were between seven and eight acres in total; Site 12 overall includes about 93 acres.

Ms. Smith asked if the Navy would be reviewing the dioxin boundary area during this action. Mr. Early replied that the dioxin area would be reviewed under the Remedial Investigation (RI) reporting process.

The solid waste disposal areas contain construction debris, steel, glass, and ceramics. The Navy has found lead, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dioxins, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the soil within these areas. Marc McDonald asked what PAHs were. Mr. Early explained they are contaminants associated with diesel fuel and are considered a heavy fuel component.

Since the last EE/CA (published for Site 12 in 2002), the Navy has conducted a large-scale investigation of the entire site. This investigation allowed the Navy to focus on the areas with the highest levels of contamination. The Navy's objective for the proposed removal action is to remove the risk for both current and future residents, and any construction worker that might be working in the area in the future. Mr. Early stated that cleanup levels were developed to guide the excavation and said that, if during excavation activities, they see any obvious signs of gross solid waste, the solid waste will also be removed (regardless of the chemical concentration).

Alternative 1 would excavate to two feet below ground surface (bgs) and would not include excavation under hardscape (roads, driveways, buildings). If utilities are located in the area of excavation, they will excavate beneath the utilities to a depth of six inches below the utility to a maximum depth of mean higher high water elevation. He added that, if the utility is deeper than two feet but shallower than the mean higher high water level, they will still excavate six inches beneath the utility line. Alternative 2 includes excavating to the same depth; however, they would also excavate the hardscape areas. Alternative 3 increases the depth of excavation to the mean higher high water elevation, which ranges from two to four feet at the site. Alternative 4 would include the same depth designation of mean higher high water and also include the hardscape areas. The last alternative they looked at just removes the top soil and caps the non-hardscape areas with concrete.

The Navy has not yet selected an alternative and is looking for input from the public and the regulatory agencies. The Navy is scheduled to publish the final EE/CA on 12 September, with the 30-day public review period to be completed on 7 October. Following that, the Navy will issue a draft action memorandum that will present the proposed alternative. The final action memorandum and the work plan are scheduled for delivery the first of the year 2007.

Mr. Early added that there will be some dust control measures put in place during the removal action that will include keeping soils wet and monitoring to protect the health and safety of the public as well as the workers. A traffic control plan will be developed for the trucks that will be hauling the soil. There is the potential for utility outages and the Navy will do all that they can to plan and mitigate for those issues. The Navy will also be conducting radiological

screening of the areas that are excavated to make certain there are no issues with potential disposal of radiological materials.

Mr. Early opened the floor to questions. D.W. Hughes asked if there were any exposure risks associated with contaminants and the high groundwater level on the island. He noted that at certain times of the year standing water can be seen at the northern area of the island. Mr. Early responded that the contaminants that have been identified are relatively insoluble, making them more likely to stick to the soil and not dissolve in the groundwater. The groundwater just does not mobilize those types of contaminants. Jim Whitcomb, Remedial Project Manager (RPM), added that the solid waste disposal areas are fenced off, and those fenced areas are where the excavation will be; the public does not have access to the solid waste disposal areas. Mr. Rist added that Mr. Hughes' concern was about the exposure potential and said they have been monitoring the wells that are located in the solid waste disposal areas for the last seven or eight years, and are not identifying any major contamination. Contaminants are not likely to move upward and certainly any exposure to the public would be incidental and would not be considered a threat.

Ms. Smith added that it is stated in the EE/CA (page 2-14) that there is a concern for dermal contact with anyone working in the groundwater. Mr. Rist suggested that was a reference for workers in an excavation who could be in contact with groundwater. Ms. Smith also said that it is not clear in the EE/CA that methane is a concern. Mr. Early stated that the issue would be clarified in the document, and asked Ms. Smith to include that item in her comments. Ms. Smith requested that the document be clarified to address dust as an exposure pathway, the potential for contaminants at Site 12 migrating to the bay, and to also provide the direction of groundwater flow. She added that there was no mention of the monitoring wells in the area.

The discussion regarding risk continued and Ms. Smith asked if it would not be prudent to select Alternative 1 or 5, doing the least amount of remediation and spending the least amount of federal dollars at a site slated for marsh land under the current redevelopment plan. Mr. Rist responded that DTSC is charged with determining the best remedy to make sure that residents of Site 12 are protected. He added that the redevelopment plan is only a plan right now, and what is projected in the future may or may not happen.

Ms. Smith had one final comment regarding Bigelow Court and the former airstrip located there. Mr. Sullivan said that all indications are that the airstrip was built at the beginning of World War II and used very little. The Navy, through the RI process, has identified the primary contaminants of concern at Bigelow Court, and they are all considered relative to debris disposal, not aviation operations.

Mr. Sullivan wrapped up the discussion by reminding those present that the EE/CA addresses a removal action slated for 2007 on a portion of Site 12. There is also the RI report that will lead to the selection of a sitewide remedy in order to close out the entire Site 12.

Mr. Hughes asked if any surface water had been sampled through the RI process. Mr. Hughes was primarily concerned with the area that gets pretty saturated in wet weather conditions. Mr. Early was not sure if they had collected surface water data in that area and added that, based on the data from the groundwater monitoring, they would not expect to see anything in the surface water.

### **Site 31 Former South Storage Yard Feasibility Study Alternatives**

Mr. Sullivan introduced La Rae Landers, the Navy's lead RPM, to introduce the presentation. Ms. Landers said the Navy has a new RPM who could not be present, so she was filling in for Lara Urizar.

The Navy is preparing to finalize the Site 31 RI report on the Former South Storage Yard; currently the elementary school play yard and a portion of the parking lot across the street. In addressing the review comments on the RI, they are taking a look at the 11<sup>th</sup> Street area and added the extra Debris Area E to the figure which was included as a handout. Ms. Landers turned the floor over to Deanna Rhoades, Project Manager for Sultech.

Ms. Rhoades began with the current use of the site; it is entirely covered with asphalt and is the play yard for the elementary school. The site was evaluated as its current use (as provided in the 1996 reuse plan); there is no risk under the current use. The Navy also reviewed the risk for the commercial/industrial worker, recreational visitor, and resident, and found that there is risk in the risk management range. They also evaluated naphthalene concentrations in Debris Areas C and D for the residential receptor and they are evaluating a cleanup value for those areas.

Ms. Rhoades stated that the Navy evaluated various technologies and process options and a few technologies were retained as General Response Actions for the site including both engineering and institutional controls, as well as excavation and off-site disposal. The engineering and institutional controls would include maintaining the existing hardscape as an effective exposure prevention barrier. Excavation and off-site disposal is often considered cost effective and is, of course, a permanent solution.

The Navy has combined the General Response Actions into a variety of alternatives for further evaluation in the Feasibility Study (FS) report. Alternative 1, is the no-action alternative required under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Alternative 2 is the engineering and institutional control alternative which consists of engineering controls (maintaining the existing hardscape as an effective exposure prevention barrier) and provides institutional controls to assure that the engineering controls are monitored, maintained, and reported on. Alternative 3 includes excavation to four feet and off-site disposal of soil from Debris Area E in combination with the engineering and institutional controls described in Alternative 2 for the remaining debris areas. Alternative 4 includes excavation to four feet and off-site disposal of soil from Debris Areas C and D and uses the engineering and institutional controls described in Alternative 2 for the remaining debris areas. Alternative 5 is required under Department of Defense (DoD) policy for unrestricted use (without institutional controls) and includes excavation to six feet and off-site disposal of soil from Debris Areas A, B, C, D, and E.

These alternatives will be evaluated in the FS that will include a detailed cost analysis. Costs for Alternatives 3 and 4 will include excavation to four feet bgs, and to a depth of six feet bgs for unrestricted use (Alternative 5). The Navy will be starting their review of the document 3 July, and then it will go to the Navy's legal department for review on 14 August. Ms. Rhoades said that they hope to get the Draft FS to the BCT and RAB before the scheduled 9 October date so that a briefing could take place at the October RAB meeting, otherwise there would be a presentation in December. They are hoping to have the Response to Comments (RTCs) for the December BCT Meeting, allowing them to finish 14 February with the final FS. Ms. Rhoades asked if there were any questions, of which there were none.

## **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 following schedule of document submittals:

1. Environmental Closeout Strategy and Schedule will be coming out final 30 July;
2. Draft Proposed Plan for Sites 9 and 10 is scheduled for distribution 30 June, with a 30-day review period;
3. Site 31 RI report will be finalized 15 July;
4. Site 30 FS will be coming out draft 12 July, with comments due 11 August;
5. Draft Site 12 EE/CA comments are due 12 July;
6. Draft Site 12 EE/CA fact sheet is expected out 27 July with comments due 10 August;
7. Draft Site 12 white paper (considered a precursor to the RI report) will be issued draft 4 August;

8. Draft Site 12 history fact sheet will be coming out the end of June; comments due in July; finalized in August and submitted prior to the Draft RI;
9. Draft Site 32 RI Report scheduled for distribution 14 July; comments due 13 August;
10. Tier 1 Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment for TI Sites 6, 12, 24, 30, 31, 32, and 33 will be coming out draft 27 July;
11. Site 31 FS alternatives fact sheet due out 15 August, and comments are due 2 weeks later;
12. Fall newsletter hoping for a draft submittal 4 August; and
13. 2006 update to the Community Relations Plan (CRP) is expected to be finalized 21 July.

### Field Schedule

Ms. Rash reported the upcoming field activities for the next two months are as follows: PCB sampling shows a finish date of 14 June; Site 12 Groundwater Semi-Annual Sampling and the first quarter sampling of the Petroleum Sites 6 and 25 will be finishing up on 23 June.

### **April 2006 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor for discussion of the draft April meeting minutes. Ms. Smith requested a change to the text on Page 5 of 12, second paragraph, from "Mr. Bourgeois indicating to a photo" to "pointing to a photo". There were no other comments and the April 2006 minutes were approved with the change to the text.

### **Co-Chair Announcements**

Mr. Sullivan stated that Alice Pilram, RAB Co-Chair, was unable to attend the meeting, but suggested an item for consideration was the utility of having a RAB conference call every month. Ms. Smith suggested that it did not make sense to her to have the conference call in the month between RAB meetings. All RAB members present agreed to having the conference call the same month of the RAB meeting (in preparation for the meeting). On the topic of new membership, Mr. Sullivan reported that they had passed out some RAB applications at other public forums, but they had not received any back yet.

### **BRAC Cleanup Team Update**

Mr. Sullivan turned the discussion to Mr. Rist to present recent BCT activities. Mr. Rist stated that one item that came up during the two BCT meetings involved the RI for Sites 8, 20, and 29; the Navy was working to finalize the RI when the decision was made by the group to hold off on the RI until the Navy

has had an opportunity to further evaluate the YBI sites associated with the CalTrans construction.

### **Other Public Comment and Announcements**

Nathan Brennan stated that there was no Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB) meeting in June; all were canceled. The next meeting should be some time after 4 July and suggested that anyone interested should log onto the TIDA Web site for meeting information. Mr. Brennan stated that they now have plans for the infrastructure and transportation; they still have to work on the housing and financing plans. The plans have been posted to the Web site, and anyone interested is welcome to browse the Web site.

### **Future Meeting Agenda Items**

Mr. Sullivan opened the floor for future agenda items. Mr. Brennan asked if the Navy could provide an update on Site 6 that would include a discussion about the monitoring wells. Mr. Sullivan suggested they could provide some information that addresses the path forward for the groundwater program and well deconstruction. Further discussions of the agenda items would take place during the 2 August conference call.

### **Closing Remarks/End of Meeting**

Mr. Sullivan stated the next RAB meeting is scheduled for 15 August. He said that he would be pleased to do any kind of site tours in the future and thought that once the field work starts on Site 12 and other locations, they could conduct a visit out there. He then thanked everyone for coming and brought the meeting to a close. Mr. Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

### **June 2006 RAB Meeting Handouts**

- CTO-134 Asbestos Abatement Investigation and Radiological Assessment of Residual Radioactivity in Building 233, Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, June 2006
- Revised Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Solid Waste Disposal Areas, Site 12, Old Bunker Storage Area, June 20, 2006, NAVSTA Treasure Island, RAB Meeting
- Installation Restoration Site 31 Former South Storage Yard, Feasibility Study Technical Scoping Presentation, Naval Station Treasure Island, Deanna Rhoades, P.E., SulTech, Lara Urizar, P.G., Navy RPM, June 20, 2006
- Figure 4-3, SVOCs in Soil, Remedial Investigation, Site 31, Naval Station Treasure Island, California
- Document Tracking Sheet
- Navy Field Schedule