

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES  
Held April 27, 2000**

**Welcome and Introductions:**

The April 2000 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Myrna Hayes, Community Co-chair and representative of Save San Pablo Baylands. Twelve (12) RAB members, sixteen (16) guests and community members, one (1) RAB support and one (1) community relations staff from Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI), and one (1) recorder were present. The following RAB members were in attendance:

- Ms. Myrna Hayes
- Mr. Jerry Dunaway
- Ms. Diana Krevsky
- Mr. Ken Barden
- Mr. Jerry Karr
- Mr. John Cerini
- Ms. Bonnie Arthur
- Mr. Ken Kloc
- Mr. Adam Chavez
- Mr. Ken Browne
- Mr. Chip Gribble
- Mr. Al Iliff

Recorder: Kathy Langstaff

(The RAB and community members introduced themselves.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I want to announce that this is the sixth anniversary of the Mare Island RAB and acknowledge the diligent effort of so many volunteer members, some of you who are still on the RAB from that time period. Congratulations! Jerry, do you want to do the minutes?

**Administrative Business:**

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Myrna. The first item on the agenda is the meeting minutes from last meeting, and we want to discuss any comments to the minutes or accept them as final. Does anyone on the board have comments to the minutes? Then we are going to make those final, and we'll distribute the final minutes in the meeting next month.

**Reports:**

***Community Co-chair***

Ms. Myrna Hayes - The reason I'm taking my co-chair's report first is that Jerry has a relatively extended one where he's going to describe some of the new rules of the game with Southwest Div. First, I want to pass a few copies of some brochures around that GPI has created for Alameda and the Point Molate RABs. If you haven't picked them up, I'll pass

them around. They're thinking that might be something we would like to have them create for us. Your input is valued on whether that's something you'd like to have worked on.

Diana was very generous in creating this wonderful news bulletin on John Randell's retirement, and she just had a single copy with her last time, so I've photocopied a number of those. And then I had this other idea that we might want to sign or make some note to John on a nice copy here, and also onto the back, and we could mail that to him. Diana - this was a labor of love on her part, but I think you wouldn't mind if we --

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Well, I already gave him one.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - You already gave him one on behalf of the RAB, but he probably wouldn't mind getting another one that's not folded. You can sign it if you'd like.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I don't know how many of you get this *BRAC Talk*. If you don't, I received it in the mail, and I'll pass it around. It's put out by the Navy at Point Hueneme, and an interesting thing on the back is the website listing for Southwest Division Restoration Advisory Boards, and Mare Island's listed under a non-Navy site and a couple of different web sites for it. So you might want to jot down some of those addresses.

And this is a copy of a document that I got last year, and I found a duplicate of it in cleaning house. And it'll be in the RAB library, but anybody who wants to take it tonight is welcome to. It's the environmental restoration program for the Navy for fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and it might be useful to you.

And I also attended -- somebody else -- Chip did -- who else? -- a DTSC UXO workshop on April 6th, and these are the handouts that were the basis for the slide presentations that were given. The workshop was conducted by the director of DTSC, Edmund Lowry, and his staff, and it brought experts together from all over the country to give presentations on unexploded ordnance, particularly related to land-use controls and specifically also to residential developments on unexploded former UXO property. You're welcome to go through this packet, and if there's something you'd like to take, we can make a copy for you.

### *Navy Co-chair*

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, Myrna. Just a note on one of the documents going around, that telephone-book-looking document is actually our report to Congress for all the bases in DON. It gives a quick summary for all the bases with the Navy and Marine Corps, and it provides a good overview. Why don't I jump into my co-chair report for the Navy.

This is my second time as Navy co-chair and my first time formally presenting knowledge to the RAB, so I'm looking for your input on the level of detail that I'm providing. If you feel there are things that are too detailed or not detailed enough, you can comment after

the presentation, send me an E-mail, or call me on the phone. This is my information, if you don't have it already: my telephone number, fax machine and E-mail address. Go to the next slide.

I'm going to provide an overview of four general areas, and as you are aware, we transitioned this BRAC program from what was called an Engineering Field Activity West, down to the Engineering Field Division Southwest. And so we have a new ballpark we're playing in, and I'm giving an overview of the organization we are developing for this BRAC program.

I'm going to present a BCT oral report, basic cleanup team, BRAC cleanup team overview, and I'll describe that later. And then a program status talking about what we're doing now, some tentative plans or ideas in the works for the future, and then, of course, a few items of discussion for RAB support. I have some handouts, and I don't have enough for the entire audience, but for the RAB themselves, you can pass those around. For the extras, you can move those down into the audience and pass those extra copies out as they are available.

This first slide shows our environmental team that we've organized from the transition down in Southwest Division. In the center, you see myself and several other members. Basically, we have the lead team here, essentially myself and Sarah Ann Moore, the lead RPM. The center group of folks are kind of our bosses, if you will. We have one vacancy on the real estate side of the program, and that's why there's no name there.

And then we have our staff of half a dozen or so RPMs who will be managing the actual remediation projects for the base. To our left we have a staff of two who help us out here in the field and are actually on the base. They're called the caretaker site office staff (CSO), and they help oversee the agreements with the City, tenants on the base, overseeing compliance, and supporting the local reuse agency.

To the right we have the ROICC support staff. ROICC stands for residence officer in charge of construction, and people may understand it better as contract representatives. They're the folks who are also out here near the base and help oversee the remediation work from the field. And they haven't been involved in a great deal of the past work, but we want to get them more involved as we get more into remediation work.

*Organizational overview.* We took that group of people, met with the regulatory agencies, and in spirit, we didn't sign this in blood, but we stated a program goal. Our goal is to facilitate property transfer at Mare Island by completing environmental restoration in a manner that provides protection for human health and the environment. A pretty simple goal, and all the agencies and the Navy are working in a general manner under that goal.

Some of our objectives for meeting that goal include ensuring efficient operations and

chains of communication to successfully achieve the program goal; adhering to all legal requirements and immediately correct any noncompliant conditions; promoting community support and input for remedial decision-making; and achieving cost and schedule savings in every aspect of the program.

I mentioned the BCT in the past, and I know a lot of RAB members are aware of that acronym for the BRAC cleanup team, which is composed of the Navy with, at this point, the federal EPA to the left, and then state EPA to the right. I list this chart to help show how we interrelate with both the LRA and the RAB and then how our work eventually funnels to the program goal. And essentially we're trying to do our work at the BCT level, take our work and solicit the input from both LRA and the RAB, and then eventually get down to that goal of property transfer.

The CMT is common to all BRAC bases, and it's the conversion management team. And there's been some discussion and controversy with what has been the ECMT, specifically among the RAB members. And what we've done in the last ECMT I'll describe later, but what I'm trying to describe in this slide is the CMT role and basically how we as a BCT, as the RAB, support the CMT. And, basically, it requires the Navy as well as the regulators to coordinate and provide input for three general areas: schedule coordination; property-description coordination; and special consideration, such as land-use controls, other types of restrictions, or any other special piece of interest related to that property transfer.

We are reserving the remedial decision-making process for the BCT and for the RAB. It is something that I believe the RAB has felt has been taken away from them and performed at the ECMT, and we're trying to correct that by getting our work done at the BCT level in coordination with the RAB and the LRA, instead of excluding the RAB.

So I'm moving into my BCT report in order to describe what the BCT has done over the last month or so. One of the things that we've attended as the BCT is the ECMT meeting held on April 5th, and from what I saw there -- that was my first time at the ECMT meeting -- is that the issue resolution performed or discussed was for a couple of parcel transfers currently in the works. We discussed very specific things, such as special coordination, property-description coordination, and special considerations. I did not see a lot of discussion on remedial decision-making, but that may have been some perception of reality in the past.

We converted the ECMT to the CMT. Seeing that we are now working together as a BCT, we didn't see a need for the ECMT, and the City is taking the lead on running the CMT with Navy support and participation. The next one is scheduled for May 10th. The BCT met that same day in the afternoon, and we did a program review and some very rudimentary business planning. We discussed how regular meetings will be held, correspondence procedures, and updating the FFSRA, the federal facilities site remediation agreement, schedule.

To elaborate on the regular meeting, we discussed RPM meetings, and we are going to target a monthly frequency for those meetings. In those meetings we will review work -- IR work or installation restoration work. We'll discuss planned future actions that would involve the remedial decision-making process. We'll discuss issues and elevate project-specific conflicts. These meetings will be open to RAB and LRA members, and formal minutes will be taken.

BCT meetings will be a venue for us to review program schedules and milestones, address basewide issues, and resolve conflicts. These meetings will be limited to BCT members, and the frequency will be determined as needed. Formal minutes will generally not be taken. However, we did take minutes on the April 5th meeting, and those will be distributed once they are finalized. We further held four conference calls or teleconferences on the 11th, 17th, 19th, and 26th of this month to generally resolve issues relating to the two property transfers within two investigation areas: A1 and E.

In Area A1 one of the issues that surfaced during the last 30 days or so was one UST site at Building 655, and we basically saw that some of the prior work may have missed some of the locations that were more appropriate for the suspect UST. So the Navy has contracted for additional work out there starting next week. Another issue that was discussed and attempted to be resolved is the red stain technical memorandum. Red stain is basically a condition of soil observed out in some wetlands areas of the base, and we don't see it as an environmental issue, or a contamination issue, and we're working with the state and EPA to resolve that.

In Area E we have an issue with pesticides detected out on the golf course at levels that were elevated compared to the rest of the base, and we understand this is most probably due to the use and operation of the golf course. We are agreeing that we have a disagreement between the Navy and regulatory agencies. The Navy doesn't feel that it's a CERCLA or Super Fund release, and therefore we have not taken an action under that legislation. We understand the State and the EPA feel that some type of action is necessary for responding to this, but the Navy policy is that we do not address pesticide application as a hazardous waste release. And our resolution is, where the State is proposing to take action through state processes, that we have taken care of the matter due to the economic development conveyance which defines the land use after transfer, and that is as a golf course.

And so we don't expect it to be a residential site, and we feel that that EDC agreement takes care of that. The State does have an action that they want to pursue, and they'll do that on their own. We have some neighboring sites that require safety arcs to span over the golf course area, the Area E that is part of the upcoming transfer, and our legal staff has concurred that we don't need a land-use restriction there. It's merely an access restriction that can be written into the Finding of Suitable Transfer document, the FOST.

Additionally, the BCT performed some other items. We did a site walk, DTSC only, with the Navy and other parties. We did a site walk of the Area E western boundary to ensure that we excluded the western magazine buildings from that transfer. The western magazine buildings are part of the western magazine area, and we don't want any of that transferred until we finish our work at the western magazine area.

We also have tentatively planned for an RPM meeting. We had to switch some dates, so right now it's May 24th. I haven't got confirmation from the agencies yet, so that's just a tentative date. During that meeting, we will provide or hear status briefs from regulatory agencies, as well as provide status briefs from the various Navy RPMs.

*Program status and review:* I'm going to cover two general areas: current actions, things that are happening at the base; and future activities. And for current actions, right now we have the FOST, or the finding of suitability for transfer, for Parcel 10 within Investigation Area E, the golf course area. We also have the other FOST. That's for Parcel 15, Investigation Area A1, an area deemed for mixed-use industrial, light industrial.

The ordnance program is the one area where we have some activity in the field. Ongoing investigation and clearance include the ordnance production and manufacturing area, the south shore area, and dredge berms adjacent to the Marine Corps small arms range.

Some ongoing work in the offshore ordnance arena includes a couple of work documents in place right now for proposed investigation/clearance work around the fleet reserve piers, as well as berths 2 and 3. The DON is currently evaluating that work with regard to Navy policy. And we have a few activities planned in May with various parties from D.C. coming out, as well as various parties in NAVFAC, and how we'll address this proposed work.

*Future activities* are really tentative. They're ideas that are in the works, nothing set in stone here, but I wanted to report to the RAB what things that may surface. Investigation areas were discussed as being cumbersome to discuss land transfer, to discuss cleanup, because now we have investigation areas overlapping reuse areas, and then on top of all that we now have the transferable parcels, and there is some discussion of trying to convert the investigation areas to parcels so that we don't have multiple nomenclature for the same piece of land.

Near-term schedule for remedial documents includes, in May, a couple of draft documents. One is the draft FOST for A1, part of the upcoming transfer. We also have the draft UST excavation report, and it's actually a couple of reports, one for 243/231, and also for 637. And there may be a couple of IR sites that are not part of CERCLA because they're petroleum only, and so those have been segregated from these UST reports. In any case, there are some documents coming out regarding petroleum excavation work recently performed.

In July we have a draft C1 RI report. That's a remedial investigation. And C1 includes IR, installation restoration, Site 15. We also have a draft area C2 remedial investigation report, and a draft UST site assessment report, actually a couple of reports covering various UST sites. In September we plan for the draft C2 remedial investigation report to be issued.

Additional future activities include preliminary discussion on early transfer of the dredge ponds to the local reuse agency, and that is a Weston business venture that would eventually take use of that land. The LRA is discussing this with the Navy, and you'll hear more about this in the future. Whether it goes or it doesn't go, I'll report it to you.

Also, there is tentative early transfer discussion for several other economic development conveyance parcels to the LRA, and those are for use by the developers Lennar and Legacy, again, preliminary, and I'll report to you what progress is made, if any.

*The ordnance program* is something where we need to do a better job of integrating that work into a CERCLA or CERCLA-like process and complete closure documentation, and to be a bit on the Navy's side, is to ensure that we protect ourselves and the future land users from ordnance-related issues and that we have good documentation of all the fine work that's been done for ordnance clearance and ordnance investigation.

*RAB support.* I know there are several things that, in view of some RAB members, have been slowed down or delayed because of this transition, and we want to get things rolling again for RAB support, as well as all the other things I've discussed in the program. The RAB library and trailer improvements, we have recently completed the GIS updates, and that was performed within the last two weeks. There are some new operating instructions for the GIS data, and the instructions are on the computer. They pop up first, so it'll be a short learning curve for the RAB members to use that GIS system.

*Library indexing and trailer improvements.* We have some ideas that have gone into conceptual contracts and scoping to do some improvements there, and I'd like to hear from the RAB members on what is most important to them. And a RAB tour, that was a request from the last RAB meeting. I'm interested in knowing who the planned attendees are. I know we have new members, and that seemed to be the focus of the request, but I'm sure it's been some time since there's been a tour for the entire RAB, and I'm assuming that it's not just for new members, but for the entire RAB. Some tentative dates, I'm interested in hearing those.

I've just got a couple more slides. Maybe we can talk about some of these items after I'm done. Actually, just one more slide. The community relations plan update. We have a contract in place and some recommended improvements. DTSC has summarized those for us, and we want to take some action on those as we can fit into our contract and into our

current budget for the year. Again, what is important to the RAB and which outreach programs they want to pursue, those will help drive and develop the actual implementation of these improvements.

*EDC memorandum of agreement.* That was a request last month for a presentation of that, and I hope the City's on board. We can do a presentation next month on that at the RAB meeting, and so far that has been inked in.

And again, this is a new experience for me. I'm trying to find ways to better provide avenue for information translation and exchange. So I'm hoping that E-mail is a good venue; and it's an easy way to disseminate information to multiple parties. If we can do that, I simply need E-mail addresses. If others don't have E-mail, then U.S. mail would be appropriate. So my information's on the first slide. The easiest way to get to me is my E-mail address. Make sure it's accurate, and simply E-mail me. And I will maintain a list and a distribution list for the RAB specifically. Questions from the audience?

- Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Getting back to some of the questions I had for the RAB -- the tour. What are we looking at as far as the scope of the audience? Any idea?
- A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - I think everybody's interested, members of the RAB, because it's always a learning experience, no matter how much we know.
- Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Do we have an estimated number? I believe there are about 20 members?
- A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, Jerry, depending on what vehicles the Navy has available -- in the past we've had a big, old clunky bus that the Navy took us around in, and I don't know if you have anything in stock or available anymore like that. Otherwise, we would need to either use vans, which means you need to have somebody knowledgeable in each vehicle, or you would need to rent a motor coach for a minimum time.

I agree with Diana that all the RAB members would be interested, but depending on the vehicle you end up with, if we have extra room, it'd be really nice to ask other folks who are interested from the public to fill up the bus if you end up going that route.

- Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - That's part of my question or query, are we extending it to beyond the RAB? What's an estimated number of participants you guys feel? Again, I'm new to the team, so I don't know exactly what the level of interest might be. If we're looking specifically at the RAB and the RAB is the audience that really wants to get the tour, maybe we should start with the RAB, since it's been a while, and focus on that.
- A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I think it also depends on the time of day. I mean, if we have an evening, it's a little difficult for some people to get here. And we used to do tours at 4:30, 5 o'clock in the afternoon, but some of the regular RAB members work far away now. Then you're looking at a weekend, which isn't good for some people too. So . . .
- C. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Well, to accommodate others, if we did a couple of tours that fit people's

preferred schedules, we could do one during the week, another during the weekend, and maybe that would help split up the masses, and make it a more manageable group.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - I would say that a smaller version of a tour first for more orientation purposes, and then think about doing a larger, public tour as a community outreach activity.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Diana. Thanks, Myrna. How about a schedule? Is this a good time of the year to do it? Maybe within the May-June time frame?

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - The days are longer.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - June?

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - June's for Diana. She'll be off work.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Okay. Well, you know, there's some RAB members who aren't in attendance tonight. If some of you bring this up with them and then E-mail me, I can get an E-mail list together and propose some dates through E-mail and see what we can do. The RAB library and trailer, what's missing there? What is the RAB in need of?

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - A Xerox machine. They took that away.

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - We don't know why, but it was a surprise, so we had to borrow some other federal agency's copier. And Chip has mentioned the lack of a telephone, not so we can call D.C. and other places, but so you have some way to call for emergency purposes. Because we do meet in the evening, and it's a forsaken part of the base.

And the only other thing is, there's a leak in the toilet. So there's a lot of wasted water, and that might be contributing to the large amount of moisture that gets in there during the wintertime. The other thing that might be contributing to that would be gutter failure or something like that. So it's pretty bad in there in the winter with mold . . .

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - And it's only been this winter? This past winter?

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - No, it's always --

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Oh. So it's always been like that. Okay. I know there's some ideas from the Navy that the RAB trailer wasn't suitable anymore, but if we could make improvements, we'll see what needs to be done. Are there any other comments to anything I reported? Any questions? I know I discussed things about the State and an agreement of disagreement that we have with them. I know Chip will discuss what they're doing. I'm not going to steal any thunder from him, but if you have questions feel free to ask. Diana?

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Just one small question about the RPM meeting. Are you going to notify the RAB as to what time of the day --

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - When it's finalized? Yes, I'm hoping to -- again, and I'll do my best to E-mail it to the entire RAB membership.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - You have noon down as a tentative time.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes. And that would allow us the entire afternoon to go through that. Questions? Chip?

Mr. Chip Gribble - You said that the Navy's interested in trying to replace the investigation area scheme with a new parcel subdivision scheme, and I was talking to the surveyor who's doing the work for the Navy and the City out there today, and you mentioned that also, and it's apparent that this plan that's already in the works, that the City is having the surveyor working with the Navy, already drafting these new boundary lines.

And the point here is that the State is not involved in that, and what's been quite obvious to me, as we've been working through these remedial action plans for Investigation Area E and also for the north end of A1, is that for us to not be involved early on in that drawing of those narrow lines as opposed to fat lines that we've been working with for the last five years, that that's problematic, and it seems that if the City and the Navy want this to work to maximum benefit, the State should be very much involved in the placement of those lines on a map.

Otherwise, we're going to have further conflicts when it comes time to use those, such as in property transfers, decision-making time. So I'm suggesting to the Navy and the City, or whoever's involved in that line-drawing exercise, that somebody give us a call and consider having a review component to that effort.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Chip. I'm not aware that we've pursued this actually, and I believe maybe the City --

Mr. Chip Gribble - Ron Howard, from the Navy, is involved, I understand.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I know he's on the real estate side, and they are surveying, but I believe he's not doing it in any relation to the investigation areas. It's just something that has to be done for the eventual transfer of those parcels outlined in the transferable parcel map. What we're trying to do is take the investigation areas and marry those with those parcels, and we haven't taken any steps to that effect other than general discussion.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Okay. There is an effort under way to define those lines in a very specific way, and it makes sense to have those drawn with consideration of environmental concerns.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I understand. And as you know, even at the time of transfer, I don't think those are fixed in stone until the transfer occurs, such as our experience with the golf course, the western perimeter, we fine-tuned it at the time of transfer to match the conditions or the events at the time that allow the transfer. Western magazine area wasn't complete in its environmental investigations and possible cleanup, so we excluded those buildings. At the same time, we knew we wanted to transfer the golf course, and so there are opportunities for fine-tuning those lines.

Mr. John Cerini - Chip is correct, there is an activity going on along those lines, but I'll pass the concern on to the city engineer and see if we can get him in touch with him.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - All right. Thanks, John. Myrna.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - To follow up on that, I know you have been working on the details of the lines for transfer on Area E and the golf course and the western magazine, and I've been involved in that process as well from the State Lands Commission angle, as a public citizen, and what I'm hearing from Chip is that, the sooner the State gets involved in that, the sooner you can know which environmental issues might affect that line, and that it's smarter to do it sooner than later.

And while you're saying, "Yeah, well, we're doing the details right now," I think that's an issue that could have been resolved, for example, in Area E years ago, and wouldn't have to be scrambling right now to get those issues resolved, as you're in the process of doing right now when you're up against the deadline of trying to do a RAP and a public meeting for that and the transfer document itself. So from the public angle, I would encourage you to work with the State and make sure that, from an environmental perspective, those lines make sense, as well as for the development perspective.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Myrna. And to further comment, the golf course transfer, we have involved the State, I believe as early as possible. I'm not exactly sure if it was the earliest, but Chip has been out with State Lands Commission, with the developer, to hear both sides of the story from the developer, as well as from State Lands, as well as the City's perspective, and we are defining that at this point to make sure we only transfer what is suitable for transfer. And I hope Chip agrees that we are doing our best, but this one kind of got rushed at the end.

Mr. Jerry Karr - Jerry, a couple of comments on the format of your chair's report. I appreciate having your contact information on the front, and I think it's a good, concise overview of what you're about. As soon as I brush up on my acronyms and alphabets, I'll be able to cruise along with you a little better. But I think the idea of electronic information transfer is good. Many of us are on line, and to be able to get that information from you, I think that's good that you're considering it. So thank you.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you. Any questions from the audience? I think we're at the end of the first hour. And to further comment on what Myrna started out tonight with is that this is the sixth-year anniversary. We have cake in the back. Hope you all will stay and enjoy some of the cake. Thank you.

(There was a break from 7:56 p.m. to 8:16 p.m.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - We are going to try to go very quickly through these focus group reports. We

have 15 minutes allocated. Sometimes we take longer than that, but let's try to get done by 8:35 to give Chip a fair amount of time to give his presentation and for some questions, and try to get out of here in a timely manner. So let's just go down the line of the focus groups. The community focus group, Diana.

### **Community**

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Not much to report. We didn't meet, but I would like to vote for a brochure done for Mare Island similar to this. I don't know how you go about requesting it, but --

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, let's have a show of hands in support of Diana's recommendation that we request a similar flyer for Mare Island. And I think the community -- unanimous. The community outreach focus group might be a good place for you to work with us to make sure that it has what we'd like to see in there.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Has the Mare Island team done one of these in the past?

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - No.

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Not a color, glossy version.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I think the best we've done is our newsletters. The Navy hasn't done a publication, except for a one-page flyer that we sent out with the membership application, the RAB-member application, that was just some general information.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Okay. I'll see what we can do and report to the RAB at the next meeting or when it does make progress.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Jerry, one other item concerning community outreach that you and I had talked about, was that down the road, since I noticed in that *BRAC Talk* that Southwest Div does have web pages for their various RABs, that that's something we hope you'll be able to bring on line too, and I didn't remember you putting it in your presentation today.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes, I guess I did not cover that. We have a public affairs officer who diligently prepares and maintains web sites for all our bases that have RABs, and, yes, that is in the works. We already started that this week, as a matter of fact. So once we get something developed, we'll get a web site address out and make improvements as time goes on.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - It might be possible for us to contribute the information that's in our past newsletters for you to add to that web site.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Those would be great additions. We could scan them in, and they'd be links.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Or Diana can provide it in electronic form.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Perfect. If it's already in electronic form, that makes it that much easier.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Thank you, Diana and Jerry. The natural resources focus group, Mr. Karr.

### *Natural Resources*

Mr. Jerry Karr - One of the things Audubon is doing -- our plan is to implement the wetlands habitat goals project, which is for the whole of San Francisco Bay. This document was prepared by -- Bonnie paid for the whole thing herself actually. The EPA Regional Water Quality Control Board, Cal Fish and Game, numerous agencies funded this report that was published last year, and I'll just gloss over it because it's a huge project that Audubon, as a national organization, is putting the same nationwide emphasis that they have on their campaign to save the everglades in Florida. So for us, as a group, it's huge. I know you can't see it here, but here's a wonderful picture of Mare Island and the tidal wetlands out on the San Pablo Baylands, also some things down around the southern tip and the rest of Napa marshes.

The goal of this project and Audubon's function is community education and the education of our legislators as to why funding is required to purchase these various projects that are involved in here. There are numerous property owners within the Napa River drainage that we need to come up with funds to acquire those lands, and it mentions the dredge ponds on Mare Island and Cullinan Ranch, components of the Fish and Wildlife Service. So they have a stronger presence on Mare Island, we certainly are going to be involved in trying to acquire as many funds as possible to make all the wonderful plans we have come to fruition.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Speaking of bringing funds to Mare Island and to the Fish & Wildlife Service -- I don't know if I've ever publicly announced that the Department of Interior's budget for FY2001, which is being considered by Congress right now, through 2003, has earmarked in it \$2.3 million for the restoration or rehabilitation of Building 505 to the San Pablo Wildlife Discovery Center. So thank you for your seven years of work with me, Jerry, and others to make that happen.

And we'll probably be asking you sometime for a letter of support to your congressperson. But that is the only environmental education visitor center in the national DOI budget for that five-year period, and we're ranked second in the western region. So we're very proud. The next focus group, technical focus group. Ken? It looks like you have something to share.

### *Technical*

Mr. Ken Kloc - We had no meetings, but we do have two projects in the works. The first one is that we've asked Mary Masters of the TOSC group whether TOSC would be willing to review the area C1 remedial investigation, and she agreed to do that. So that will be sent to her as soon as it is published. And we should expect both written comments and a presentation for us when she's done.

And the second project we have is our TAPP application No. 2, and I passed out a copy of the latest copy of this draft. Actually, Myrna and Jerry, I don't think you got a copy, so luckily, I have just two left. This TAPP application is to request funds from the Navy for the RAB to hire independent consultants to do an independent technical review of the remedial investigation and feasibility study for the landfill.

And if you look in the TAPP application, I've also asked our proposed contractors to take a look at other supporting documents so they can get a more global understanding of the landfill and provide us with better technical comments and recommendations.

At this point, whenever we get a draft TAPP application in the meeting, we have to vote on it. The community members have to vote on it to see whether or not they support this so that it can continue on to the Navy so that they can see whether or not they'd like to fund it. So I would like to make a motion that we approve TAPP application No. 2.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Is there a second to that motion?

A. Mr. Jerry Karr - Second.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Jerry. Discussion.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Just to understand the process, do you involve the RAB members in any manner of scoping of this application? Are they aware of it? Have they reviewed --

A. Mr. Ken Kloc - I brought this idea up about five months ago with both the technical group and in the RAB meetings, and I have asked for suggestions and made my own suggestions as to what I thought would be a good chunk of work to have independent reviewers do for us --

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I'm sure we took a vote on that.

C. Mr. Ken Kloc - We took a straw poll at that point. And the way the process works is that normally a subgroup of the community members will get together and suggest a TAPP project, and then the rest of the community members vote on whether or not they agree.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Just a question. The first TAPP application, when was that and what documents, so I can do some research myself?

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I'm not quite sure when we made the application. It's probably about 25 years ago, but it was implemented this fall with the purchase of a computer by the Navy and a printer and the installation of Arc View GIS software on that computer for use at the library.

And then the second component of the TAPP application was the -- and that -- the money ended up not coming out of the TAPP grant for that. That was purchased by the Navy from some other mechanism, and it's your computer. But the TAPP grant, the first one, went to employ a contractor who gave us an eight-hour training at EFA West in San Bruno, an all-day Saturday training and then two-hour follow-up trainings here at the

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I'm not quite sure when we made the application. It's probably about 25 years ago, but it was implemented this fall with the purchase of a computer by the Navy and a printer and the installation of Arc View GIS software on that computer for use at the library.

And then the second component of the TAPP application was the -- and that -- the money ended up not coming out of the TAPP grant for that. That was purchased by the Navy from some other mechanism, and it's your computer. But the TAPP grant, the first one, went to employ a contractor who gave us an eight-hour training at EFA West in San Bruno, an all-day Saturday training and then two-hour follow-up trainings here at the library. And we just completed those the beginning of March, the end of February?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - And that was a very controversial TAPP application because we were asking for software and for training, and the reason for that TAPP application was that we had learned that the regulators and the Navy and the City were using Arc View and the database that Tetra Tech has created, and is managing to make cleanup decisions, and we felt that if we had that data and could learn how to use it, then we could also bring feedback and recommendations to you more effectively if we had access to that database. So that was our rationale for asking for that equipment.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Sounds logical. Thanks, Myrna.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - As Ken said, the next official step for us, as the community members of the RAB, is to approve this TAPP application. And so if there's any other discussion, otherwise, I think we can take a vote. No other discussion? Okay. Vote to support Ken's motion to submit this as our second TAPP application. An unanimous vote of the community members present. So you want to take care of actually making that application, or by handing it to Jerry? Is that what we needed to do?

Mr. Ken Kloc - Actually, what we have to do now is that I'll work with you, because remember, in the first one, you had to sign it because you're the community co-chair.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - All right. So we'll do whatever we need to do to get this in for you. Thanks again, Ken, for your hard work and for the various folks who worked with him through E-mail and through meetings to put together this request. The next focus group report would be the transition and reuse. Cynthia is not here this evening. Is there anyone else who would like to -- it looks like Adam's grabbing that microphone.

#### *Transition and Reuse*

Mr. Chavez - Yes. Cynthia had to work tonight, so we had a fast meeting between John and me. There's not much to discuss. The EDC, as Jerry has mentioned, has been scheduled for

next month, and John's mentioned that also. The cooperative agreement by John is a floating schedule, so whenever we want to. We're still in the preliminary stages of developing our long-term goals for the committee. Your input is always welcome on that.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Following up on your request from the last meeting, to not only have a presentation on the EDC and the cooperative agreement, I've also preliminarily talked with Bill Moore from Lennar, and we have him lined up for June or July, sometime in that time frame, to give us an update on activities or plans that Lennar has as they relate to reuse. And certainly reuse is the driver for the cleanup, besides human health and environmental health. So it will be good for new RAB members who didn't hear a presentation given by Lennar about a year ago, and then we'll try to get the other developers on through the summer. Okay. John, the City report.

### *City Report*

Mr. John Cerini - We're continuing to do the evaluation of the water system on Mare Island with the Department of Health services, and the only other item will be that Craig Whittam will present the EDC information to the RAB.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Bonnie and Chip, regulators' report, and then why don't you just segue, Chip, right into your presentation.

### *Regulatory Agency*

Ms. Bonnie Arthur - Myrna's giving me moral support tonight. I have a difficult announcement to make, that I won't be working on the project after May of this year; and now I get to go into wonderful budget information with you guys as to why. You've gone through this with the State, and now it's EPA's turn. For the last year and a half, our projections from the Navy have shown us decreasing our oversight role for Navy bases. For better or for worse, EPA's oversight funding comes directly from the Air Force, Navy, or Army. A lot of people see problems with that, and I'm sure there are arguments to be made on either side.

Over the years, these budgets are projected, and the last year and a half the Navy came forward with some projections of a significant cut for this year, starting in October, and then zeroing us out for the year from October. And they're still in discussions. There have been numerous meetings back with our headquarters and DoD headquarters. Air Force is beating up on the Navy and saying, "What are you guys doing?" and so on and so forth.

But the end shot is that we're having to direct our resources to NPL bases, the national priority list bases. We're legally mandated to work on those. Mare Island is our highest priority non-NPL base in the region, and so we were trying to get funding from our own sources to work on these. But since we're legally mandated to work on the NPL bases, that's where we have to put our priority for funding right now. And so, I'll be redirected to Air Force bases now, so that'll be an interesting change of pace from the Navy for me.

But in terms of budgeting, other than the fact that, when we first heard this a year and a half ago, we did some planning for it and looked at what we could do with rearranging people and keeping people on Mare Island. We have not just myself. We have a large technical support team. I have people from our Portland office doing UXO, technical support, laboratories working on some of the mixed-waste issues that are kind of tricky, as with the IR2. I talked to you about that before. We'll be stepping away from all of those June 1st, at least the way that it's scheduled now.

We're still hoping to try to get additional funding so maybe in the future we'll be able to come back. We're just not sure at this point. But I have really enjoyed working with all of you, and this is the hard part. My husband said, "Well, maybe I'll come tonight and give you support in the audience." I said, "I think that would be a lot worse." But you guys have been great to work with, and you've seen me get more and more gray hair.

I have to tell you a funny story. My three-year-old says to me, "Mama, your hair is all gray," and I said, "Well, no, there's some brown in there." It just shows me what she's going to be like as a teenager if she's saying those things now. I better go get a dye job. But --

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Then she'll say your roots are showing.

Ms. Bonnie Arthur - Yes. All of you who have raised daughters out there. But I think you guys have done a great job, and I really respect all the time and energy that you spend here at the RAB, and Chip's crying, too, see? We just went through this with John Randell and we all were trying to keep our composure, and we had a tough time with that too. But you guys all have day jobs you work at and you still come and give so much of yourself to the RAB, so I wanted to thank you, and to keep with that and show you that we really appreciate it. And you guys need to keep coming, and you need to keep reviewing reports and give your input. So -- before I completely collapse . . . (clapping)

But we'll be working on the project through May, be finishing comments. And if you have any questions about our pulling away from the sites -- we haven't done this very often, so we've had some internal meetings for the last couple weeks on how we're going to do this, exactly what priorities we're going to have over the next month. Give me a call if you have any questions, or we could go ahead and answer your questions tonight.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - In the interest of time, I'm going to keep us pushing on. And the only thing I will say is that this is very disturbing news to me. I just learned about it a very short time ago today. And there is something that we as community members can do, and I would urge you to get together with me and formulate a letter to our congressman, to our federal senators, to the EPA administrators, and to the Navy.

It's a bad faith move on the Navy's part, just as with the DSMOA grant funding to

California. It's the wrong time to take away that important federal regulatory role on this base, just when we're getting rolling. It's not a service to the community. It shows a lack of support of what Americans have proven even in tough political times about how much they care about the environment, the water they drink and air they breathe, and it sends the wrong message.

So anybody who wants to work with me on that, E-mail me. Chip, it's a kind of a hard act to follow, but we've been looking forward to your presentation.

### **Overview of Mare Island Naval Shipyard Cleanup Program**

Mr. Chip Gribble - We've had a lot of really fine people work on this project, people from EPA. We appreciate it. Thank you. Before I get started on the presentation here, I want to give a brief update on the two remedial action plans we've been preparing. I said at the last month's RAB meeting that we were hoping to make this night the public meeting night for those two remedial action plans. Obviously, that isn't happening tonight. Our schedule has slipped by some weeks, and at this point it looks like next week we will be initiating a public comment period. That's tentatively set for next Wednesday, May 3rd; and if we start on May 3rd, we'd probably be running into June -- about 30 days from that for the public-comment period.

This would be for two remedial action plans, one for Investigation Area E, which is the hill, and the other for Investigation Area A1, clean parcels. So that's the public comment period that we've got tentatively set. And the public meeting that would go along with those would be held at the next month's RAB meeting date, which I believe is May 25th. So we'd start at 7 o'clock with the public meeting, have the public meeting on the RAPs, two remedial action plans, and then move right into the RAB meeting. This is a kind of a Mare Island primer for people who haven't had an orientation.

Mr. Chip Gribble - For those who haven't had an orientation of the project before or for those of you who had an orientation a long time ago and want a refresher, hopefully this will help you. Unfortunately, we're missing a lot of our new community members, but we still have several others who probably haven't heard this presentation before. Next slide.

This is a slide of Mare Island today, and this is a picture of Mare Island seven years ago when we started on this project. I think some of you might appreciate that. We've made so much progress. Can you tell the difference? We have made a lot of progress in not-so-visible ways. The goals of the presentation are to describe the project history and the development.

The second one is -- this is a difficult subject to communicate and for people to understand. It's complicated, unfortunately, and I'll try to do my best to make it understandable to everybody. The second goal then is to make all of this easier to

understand, to do a little bit of the project history, touch on some of the environmental concerns and responses, and then get into a reuse organization scheme.

This is a translation from our world in the remedial investigation or environmental restoration to the reuse and, again, the property transfer. The environmental project at Mare Island goes back to about 1983 with some early studies by the Navy that were mandated for military programs and EPA-mandated studies. Prior to 1993, when the base was listed as a BRAC closure site, the environmental program consisted of about 24 IR sites. And once the base was listed, interestingly, the Navy and all of the agencies got very involved and engaged, and that had a lot to do with funding levels going way up, and at that point, that's when I came onto the project actually.

The initial goal was to try to expand the environmental program to address all the environmental issues so we could get property ready for transfer, we could have the project properly funded to have all the projections in place so everything could move smoothly. So prior to 1993, we had 24 original IR sites. We called those the Group 1 sites, and then we set about trying to identify everything else. We went through a second round of site identification called Group 2. We identified unexploded ordnance (UXO) as an issue, and we set up a program which fit very well with the Navy's in-house capabilities to deal with that issue.

We established a UST program, underground storage tank program, to deal with hydrocarbon issues and underground storage tanks. We established a radiological program to deal with all radiological issues. We established a PCB program which was a takeoff from the Navy's base closure effort to basically sweep the island clean of all their belongings. In other words, sweep the floor, close the windows, lock the doors, make sure the roofs are not leaking and the doors were keyed properly, and by the way, do we have anything, grease stains or anything like that we need to pay attention to? And they were sampling in lots of different places that we would never have thought of, but because of their background and what they had been finding in their housekeeping or house-closure efforts, were sampling for, we connected with them and established a PCB program to look at transformer sites and electrical switching stations and the like.

And then there are miscellaneous others, including the lead in the soil and lead-based paint concerns. The issue of pesticide and the golf course is one that didn't fit into any of those. And then we finally went through one more round of site identification, which we called the Group 2 through 3 site identification, and some of the longer-term RAB members probably remember that. They were involved in that when everybody had to have an opportunity to suggest or submit their idea of sites or concerns that we should set about trying to address.

So initially a lot of things were organized into programs in terms of a study organization. Currently our sites are still organized by program, but also geographically. We have a

geographical organization to try to facilitate addressing all the issues. In the intervening years from 1993 to the present, there has been a lot of work accomplished. In the Group 1 sites there have been several sites where the Navy has conducted removal actions, some of them relatively minor, some quite extensive.

For example -- by the way, you have maps of the Group 1 sites. The first map in your stapled packet shows a number of different overlays. If you look at the key down at the bottom, in red are the Group 1 sites. One site that the Navy did extensive removal action on is site IR8 at the far northern side of the island. That's a lead oxide site from lead batteries that were broken up and the wastage was spread out on the surface. There was an extensive soil removal program conducted there. We haven't gotten to the point where we think the work is all done. That may be the case, but we haven't reviewed the documents to get to that decision point yet.

Moving a little south of there, IR 17 is a former paint-manufacturing facility, and it's, give or take a year, 1998 or 1999 when the Navy did a removal action out there to demolish the remaining structural foundation elements to that site. Also did a soil removal, and there were pipelines and additional USTs in the area that were removed in that effort. We think that site is probably far from completely remediated, but these removal actions are incremental in getting us to that end point, and this one was significant. Those are two that come to mind of significant removal actions in Group 1.

There have been a number of others -- Group 2 and 3, we don't have any removal actions there, other than most of these or many of the Group 2 or 3 sites are collocated with many of the original Group 1 sites. For example, the paint manufacturing site, IR 17, adjacent to that and overlapping that is a Group 2 and 3 site called Building 503 area. It's really an extension of the same problem, all related to the former paint manufacturing area. Those are still in the study phase. And by and large the worst sites on Mare Island, most of them are Group 1 sites, and that's probably why we focused on those for removal actions.

The unexploded ordnance program, which many of you are much more familiar with here, the Navy has been dealing with this unexploded ordnance issue for as long as I can remember, from stuff washing up on the beach and issues like that that they've been dealing with a lot longer than this program. When we launched this UXO program, effectively we made it part of our CERCLA cleanup program. We identified basewide all the issues where we had unexploded ordnance concerns, known and unknown possibilities, and set out to do a lot of surveying through those areas. That surveying began with surface sweeps and geophysical surveys to identify subsurface anomalies. Most of the unexploded ordnance sites on the uplands part of Mare Island, as opposed to offshore, have already been surveyed and the unexploded ordnance has been removed.

So we're getting near completion on that whole phase of the unexploded ordnance

program. The Navy here at Mare Island has approached that issue of removing all ordnance that they were able to detect. The State of California's view on that is that's the way we want to see that issue addressed, all unexploded ordnance or subsurface anomalies that can be identified, should be removed.

Beyond that, there is a residual concern from unexploded ordnance that possibly wasn't identified in the surveys. There's some probability of stuff still remaining undetected, and we think an appropriate way to address that residual concern would be through land-use control, such as restrictions to limit or control future activity and subsurface disturbance.

The underground storage tank program in 1993 originally consisted of about 18 different sites. And they were listed on a few scraps of paper, and it was quite an embarrassment, I'm sure to the Navy, as well as the regulatory agencies, that we didn't collectively have a better listing of the sites in that category. After a lot of effort, we developed a database with the Navy that was expanded to about 160 sites. Something like half of those are suspect sites that probably are not real underground storage tank sites, but there is some record or evidence to suggest there may have been something there.

To date, all known USTs have been pulled from Mare Island, but we still have issues regarding contamination in many of them, and again the issue of whether or not there was a UST present in many other sites. So we actually feel very good about the database that we developed. Now the effort has got to resolve the questions that are reflected in that database.

*The radiological issues.* Mare Island is a former nuclear shipyard where they built and serviced nuclear submarines. That history left a lot of questions and concerns with the regulatory community, as well as the local community, about possible radiological contamination. And the Navy took that issue particularly seriously, and that certainly was backed up with a lot of money to deal with it too.

As of October 1997, all radiological issues at Mare Island were resolved, the conclusion being that there was no radiological contamination remaining at Mare Island above background or above the screening levels of a  $10^{-6}$  risk, and in certain cases. Subsequent to that, all the agencies that we could find signed off on that: DTSC, the water board, Department of Health Services, the federal EPA, as well as the participating Navy agencies.

Subsequent to that, one radiological issue has resurfaced, which is coincident with the unexploded ordnance issue in some of the dredge ponds. And what the unexploded ordnance team found, because they had on staff former shipyard radiological control people familiar with those kind of issues, at certain outfalls in the dredge ponds, were a limited number of radioactive devices, little buttons, deck markers, toggle switches that have radium on them as, for the most part, luminescent capabilities. We are hopeful that,

with the unexploded ordnance team, that would be Weston's effort to remove the unexploded ordnance at the outfalls in the dredge ponds, we can finish off that issue as well. That's in progress.

The PCB program consists of over 100 sites where the Navy sampled for PCB contamination. The Navy was evaluating PCB contamination, possible PCB contamination, at electrical switching stations, transformers, anything where they may have had a PCB usage. At several of those they have found contamination and significant contamination concentrations, but for the most part, we found that the extent of those contamination spots is quite limited, and in many cases, they're indoors, meaning they have not been released to the environment. We have finished that review with a limited number of investigations on the island, but we're far from complete in reviewing the work with that program.

We also have the lead-based paint issue. We've been approaching that since we have a disagreement with the Navy or the military on whether or not our authorities cover that issue. DoD maintains that that is an issue that isn't subject to CERCLA. The EPA and the DTSC have made it clear that we believe this is a CERCLA issue. We've been doing that on our own since we don't have agreement with the Navy on how to proceed. We've been doing that piecemeal in areas coming up for property transfer or close to closing out all the issues.

In some cases, some of the developers have even participated in that, and note, Roosevelt Terrace, which is the off-base housing area, the developer for that is DaSilva Group. They've made an arrangement, with our oversight, to remove all the elevated lead concentrations in the soil around those buildings and survey them and provide documentation data and a report that supports that conclusion, which we agreed with. And that project was completed two years ago. So where we can, we're working with the developers or the City in some creative ways. So in your handout there, you've got a number of maps. The first one shows a lot of these environmental sites.

And we're running overtime. Can I take another five minutes? I'll try to race through this reorganization scheme. Originally the plan was to address these environmental sites with a remedial action plan, or the federal term is a ROD (Record of Decision), site by site. And we concluded that would not be an efficient way to get this work done, so we decided to subdivide the island geographically into investigation areas. Sometimes you'll hear the word operable units, and we stayed away from that term and created our own term, called "investigation areas." The whole project is supposed to be based on that scheme where we package remedial investigation reports, Record of Decisions, all of our documents on an investigation-area-wide basis. One of the maps you have shows that breakdown. Now, the complication there -- can you go back to the slide that shows the reuse organization plan -

Initially the City was trying to develop a reuse plan for the island, which they were successful at. They subdivided the island into reuse zones. They were titled Zones 1 through 15, and this is defined in the City's reuse plan. Our investigation area scheme was based on that, and we tried to mimic that to the extent possible. Obviously, environmental contamination doesn't respect artificially or arbitrarily drawn lines, and so our investigation area subdivision isn't identical to the City's reuse zone subdivision, but it's a close interpretation of it.

Subsequently, the Navy decided that they wanted to classify the island on an environmental basis, and they subdivided the island into 126 CERFA classification parcels. Each parcel had its own environmental classification based on its history, the known and unknown environmental issues, and that's another overlay you'll find in some of the documents. You'll find a discussion on CERFA classification parcels.

Another overlay to that -- which comes even at a later date -- was the City's and the Navy's transfer plans. They developed another subdivision of the island based on which acreage was going to which future landowner. These subdivisions were called transfer parcels, and they're called Roman numeral I through XXI. So, again, these are not identical to the other subdivisions, but they are close.

As Jerry and I were talking at the beginning of the meeting, it sounds like the City and the Navy are trying to not define another set of boundaries, but rather take these crudely drawn boundaries and get very specific with a very sharp pencil as to where these boundaries should be drawn for purposes of legal descriptions and specific purposes of property transfer.

The point I was trying to make to Jerry earlier is to work together to sharpen that pencil and come to an agreement on where those lines should specifically be drawn.

You want to race through the other pictures with the remediation there? This is some of the PCB program cleanup work. What they would do is scabble the floors. This is when they had contamination on concrete pads or within buildings. They would scabble the floor with a device, which basically stripped off the veneer from the latenance of the thin top surface of the concrete until they removed the contaminated layers of concrete. Is there another one on the reuse map which I just discussed? Any questions? Thank you.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Thank you.

Q. Mr. Ken Barden - How many dredge ponds have these toggle switches and et cetera that they found?

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Ken, there are two that I know of . . . Larry Maggini in the back, who is with the Navy unexploded ordnance program, is telling me there are three ponds. They are quite confident -- perhaps we'll get to the point where we agree with them; we haven't

expressed an opinion yet since we haven't received reports on these, but their view is that these devices came from dredging in specific areas on the Mare Island waterfront.

So, if you can reason that these devices were disposed of in the Mare Island straits at specific locations or at limited locations as opposed to the entire waterfront, then you can identify where that sediment, those locations, were pumped to. There's specific dredge lines that go out to the dredge ponds from specific points offshore rather than a random association of offshore to dredge ponds. I believe they will be asserting at some point that the issue is limited to some number of dredge ponds and the question only needs to be addressed for those particular ponds. Any other questions?

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Could you say what CERFA is again?

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - CERFA. This is where I'm going to really feel bad when Bonnie leaves. Bonnie, what's CERFA?

Ms. Arthur - We went through this last time.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Well --

Ms. Arthur - Environmental --

Mr. Chip Gribble - Comprehensive environmental? No. Community --

Ms. Arthur - -- Environmental --

Mr. Chip Gribble - Community environmental something.

Ms. Arthur - Community Environmental Reuse, and I don't know what the F is.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Reuse Facilitation. Something like that. We embarrassingly don't know, but perhaps that's an indication that it's an acronym to us that --

Ms. Diana Krevsky - I don't feel so bad now.

Mr. Chip Gribble - That's okay. I've been embarrassed before. It won't be the last time I'm sure.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Any other questions? If not, I'd just like to conclude the meeting. Oh, John.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - What's CERFA, John?

A. Mr. John Cerini - I won't be embarrassed and try to answer it. I did have something that I didn't mention, and we didn't have a community-comment period where Bill Moore was going to mention it. There is some serious consideration and a plan has been given to the City from Lennar to demolish some residential units in Farragut Village, so I wanted to

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - At this point, we'd like to open it up for public comment and give the RAB a chance to address those comments.

Audience member - There was a question here about the housing, so maybe Bill can do a brief on what the project details --

Mr. Bill Moore - Yes, I'll just give a brief announcement. It has to do with some of the housing units in the Farragut Village area. It's former enlisted men's housing in Reuse Area 6 in Farragut Village. We're proposing to do an abatement and demolition in 83 of the units, two nonresidential. All residential except two nonresidential structures, which are older structures. There are no historic buildings there. It's not an IR site. It's something we'll be working closely on with Chip Gribble -- and before tonight, I was going to say with Bonnie, too -- on every step of the way. The application will go in from the City to the Navy, and it's being put together now, and we just wanted to let you know it was coming. We'll give you a full report later, and I'm sure John will be including this in the City report from time to time. Thanks.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - We have the RAB newsletter that went out last month for John Randell's retirement. If you want to sign this, we have it up front. If there are no other comments --

Mr. Ken Browne - I have one here.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Oh, one more?

Mr. Ken Browne - There's a hike being lead by Kathy Hoffman of the Bay Ridge Trail organization Saturday at 9:00 a.m., six-mile hike leaving from the building at the end of the Tennessee Street bridge, right on the left, up to the top of Mare Island Hill. So if anybody's interested, on Saturday morning.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Any other comments, public or RAB members? If not, I'd like to end on the note that I appreciate the work this RAB has done. I know it's been six long years. There are quite a few issues here at this base, and it's not an easy program to manage. With the missing EPA here in the future, I know that's going to be a big loss for the six years of work that have been done thus far. We have some serious issues that we recognize here at the Navy that we need to address, and we want the RAB to provide as much input and participation in order to remedy the situations.

Okay, to finally close, if anyone is interested in taking remnants of the cake, there's some remnants to be had. And with that, I'll close the meeting.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.)