

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, May 31, 2001

I. Welcome and Introductions:

Myrna Hayes called the May 2001 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) to order at at 7:02PM. Twelve (12) RAB members; seventeen (18) guests and community members; seven (7) RAB support and, regulatory agency members; and community relations staff from Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc (GPI), ; including Ms Kathy Langstaff, Court Reporter.

At the time of introductions, the following were present:

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Co-Chair)
- Diana Krevsky
- Jerry Karr
- John Cerini
- Paula Tygielski
- Jerry Dunaway (Co-Chair)
- Patricia Schader
- Jim O'Loughlin
- Adam Chavez
- Mr Kenn Browne

Regulatory Agency & Navy Representatives in Attendance:

- Mr Henry Chui
- Lee H. Saunders
- Gary Riley
- Patricia Ryan
- Mr Chip Gribble
- Larry Douchshand
- Joseph Bean, Master Sargeant (Travis AFB)
- Emily Roth
- Carolyn d'Almeida
- David Oppenheim

Community Members and Guests in attendance:

- Mr Glenn Anderson
- Mr Kevin Jackson
- Joyce Scharf
- Carla Duncan
- Carolyn Hunter
- Lily Heyen
- Brenda McConathy
- Bill Moore
- Prashan T. Khanna
- Mike Jory
- Terry Roagoshi
- B.D. Kan
- Alan Stancombe
- Dick Posey
- Matthias Gasni
- David Lindquist
- Joanne Schively

RAP Support from GPI:

- Ms Kathy Langstaff

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 PM (1902 hours)

Ms. Hayes - Good evening. My name is Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair for the Restoration Advisory Board. Luckily that's not my only role in life, so I don't have to say that every time I introduce myself, this long title.

I want to welcome folks here this evening to our special meeting that the Navy has worked with us to put together specifically about concerns around the ordnance-removal program, and I also want to note for the record that this is the seventh year, as of this meeting, that I've been the community co-chair. And I usually offer at least a yearly chance for the RAB members to take my place, but so far, no one has been that foolish.

So I'm going to turn the mike -- what we normally do is have the RAB members introduce themselves and where they're from, if they have an organization they're affiliated with, and I think we'll maybe not ask everyone in the audience to introduce themselves this time. Usually we give you that choice, but in the -- to save some time, just introduce ourselves.

As indicated, meeting attendees introduced themselves.

Mr. Dunaway - Well, thank you, RAB members and audience members for attending tonight. We have a -- a special agenda, and I want to go over the agenda for the meeting first.

We're going to focus this meeting specifically on the ordnance-cleanup program at Mare Island, and we're gonna basically have about a one- hour presentation. During that presentation RAB members will be able to ask questions and get clarification if needed. We will leave questions from the audience members until after the presentation.

After the question and answers, we're going to open the floor to a public-comment period for any topic related to Mare Island. We'll then briefly take care of some administrative business for the Restoration Advisory Board, and then we're going to essentially hopefully have about 30 minutes at the end of the meeting for an open house for anyone to talk to any of the folks that we have here tonight especially for this ordnance presentation. And that will hopefully allow us to conclude at about 9:00 p.m. tonight.

II. PRESENTATION: Ordnance Cleanup Program Overview

Mr Jerry Dunaway, Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command - Going into the presentation, there is a handout for some of those who came in later.

RAB members have a packet in front of you with the presentation outline in that packet, along with other material.

For the audience members, we have the presentation brief in a handout at the back of the room on that table, along with some other information. And I'll get started with the presentation.

The agenda for the presentation will be to discuss the purpose of the ordnance-cleanup program, and this -- this presentation, a description of the ordnance sites on Mare Island, issues raised in the recent articles published by the Times Herald newspaper. And those issues include training, safety arts, the cleanup process, and the safety audit that the Navy

conducted last year. We'll then go into a current-site-security discussion and then discuss future ordnance-cleanup plans.

Well, the purpose of this presentation is to provide information first and foremost. The Navy has a comprehensive multi-step ordnance clean-up program at Mare Island, yet the articles -- the recent articles did not fully inform the readers of this program. Unfortunately this incomplete information left a couple general impressions about the program that really are inaccurate.

First, from reading the articles, it would appear that ordnance is scattered all across Mare Island. That is not true. The ordnance areas are confined to limited areas on Mare Island. Much of the developed industrial areas of Mare Island are shipyard, industrial facilities. They do not have any history of ordnance on them. That is why we call it a shipyard.

Secondly, the articles also implied that the Navy is done with the ordnance cleanup and that we're ready to transfer these ordnance sites to other parties. That is not the case at all. We have lots of work left to do with the ordnance-cleanup program, as well as with a number of other cleanup programs for these sites. Although some of our folks that were cited in the articles, the former workers, think that their work may have completed all of the cleanup work, we actually in fact have much more work to be done, and obviously done by other folks, as part of our validation process.

Tonight we want to provide you with a better description of where we are with our cleanup program and exactly what areas of Mare Island have remaining ordnance work. Public education is another element of -- of this presentation, and we want to start tonight by hopefully educating not only RAB members but the very concerned or interested audience in this program.

And you have available to you at the back of the table, the table in the back, a couple of fact sheets. One of 'em is a black-and-white fact sheet. It's a general fact sheet about ordnance cleanup in general conducted by the Navy. Another one is a color fact sheet specifically on the current status of the Mare Island ordnance-cleanup program.

And thirdly, there's a small tri-fold information pamphlet about unexploded ordnance, what to do, what not to do, where those are provided to you to take home with you and to learn about the program.

And we want this information -- we want this information to be accurate and correct so that you have an accurate knowledge of the program and that you share this knowledge with other community members, members of your family, so that you know that the dangers imposed by UXO are real, they are potentially there at Mare Island, and that you share this information, again, with other folks that you know.

The ordnance clean-up process and the general outline of it is laid out really in three basic steps. There's not a whole lot of options we have for ordnance. The clearance step is

obviously very critical, and I know that's what the articles focused on, was the clearance work that has been done over the past years at Mare Island.

Well, following that we also have basically a step where we evaluate the work and develop land-use controls, and we'll talk more about those. And lastly, it is public education. That is a very critical part to ordnance cleanup compared to other types of cleanup operations. Lastly, public input is a critical component to the Navy's cleanup decisions. The Navy maintains a public-information repository right here at the J.F.K. Library, and we include all of our work plans and reports about our cleanup work, not just ordnance, but a myriad of cleanup programs conducted at Mare Island.

More directly and more -- more regularly, we get our public input through this Restoration Advisory Board. The Navy established this Restoration Advisory Board in April of '94 for the purpose of improving public input and participation in the cleanup process. The RAB is composed primarily of community members from Vallejo, as well as surrounding communities.

In addition, we have members or representatives from regulatory agencies, the City of Vallejo, and other governmental agencies. We actually need a few good members on the RAB, so if you are interested in the cleanup program or have concerns about the cleanup program, we invite you to -- to apply for membership with the RAB. We have applications I believe at the back at the table or at the front table. And even if you can't join the RAB, these meetings are open to the public. We also hold focus group meetings during the month as needed. The public is welcome to participate in that process too.

With that, I'm going to turn the rest of the presentation over to Patricia McFadden to go into more detail about the ordnance program.

Patricia McFadden, Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Ms. McFadden - Hello. My name's Patricia McFadden. I'm the ordnance project manager for Mare Island. I've been doing the ordnance project for about a year and a half. I'm far from an expert, but I'm familiar with the work that's been done here. And I will defer any questions that you have on the real technical stuff to some of our experts from our Navy shop and some of our experts from Weston that are here, but let me move ahead.

First and foremost we wanted to state very clearly that the Navy stands by the effectiveness of the past cleanup. That's not to say it's perfect, because there are limitations in the technology. There is no technology that is 100 percent, and we have to work with that. Also, a key factor is that the ordnance field is an ever-evolving field, and we try and learn from the past and look to the future and maximize what we can use there, and we really are applying all these improvements throughout the cleanup program.

Secondly, as Jerry said, the ordnance program is -- is still in process. It is an ongoing cleanup process, an ongoing evaluation process, and an ongoing decision process, where we work with the regulators, the RAB, and the public to make those decisions, and we're

committed to that aspect of the cleanup. We don't do this in a vacuum. We work very closely with the RAB and very closely with the regulatory agencies to get to the decisions of what the next steps are.

So you will ask, what are the sources of ordnance? Where did this ordnance come from at Mare Island? Mare Island was a shipyard, but it also had an ordnance-production-manufacturing area, and in this area, as the first bullet describes, there was manufacture, maintenance, refurbishment, quality testing, and basically the movement, storage, and loading of munitions on Mare Island. The high point of those -- of that era was the 1950s to the 1970s -- I'm sorry, 1850s to the 1970s. Thank you.

I guarantee that I'm not perfect either, so that's just evidence. Also, because there was ordnance present at the base and in a large variety of the production area, excess and outdated ordnance would sometimes be buried or thrown in the water, not that that was the approved practice, but it was a common practice in the early years.

Now there are very strict rules about the handling of all ordnance and munitions, so that's changed, but this is a base that has a long history. Also, because there were lots of ships along the strait, we had ordnance that was dropped or thrown off ships, accidentally or purposefully, and that material that was dredged from the strait went into the dredge ponds, and that's this yellow area you see here. And there's some maps in your handouts, as well as more in the presentation of the ordinance activities.

I just wanted to make a couple things clear. Mare Island was never an artillery range. There was no bomb dropped on Mare Island. This is important because on ranges the type of ordnance that you would find has a higher hazard factor than the stuff that we're finding at Mare Island because of the -- the fact that it's been fused, fired, and for some reason has malfunctioned. I go to some definitions later. There were small arms ranges. These are pistol ranges, rifle ranges. They used small arms. I did bring a few props here.

Well, I didn't, but I'm connected to -- these are -- this is the range of small arms. It's defined as less than 50 caliber. This is a 50 caliber, and it goes down -- that's the largest small arm, and the smallest is this size, which is from an M-16, correct? So -- and the key thing is that these are the same as what's commercially available. So I'll speak to that a little -- a little later.

The most common ordnance that we find at Mare Island are the unfired 20mm rounds and/or the pieces of them, projectile parts or the casings. This is an example of that, and this is basically the next step up from the 50 caliber. And then we also find the larger version of that, which is a 40mm, which looks like this when it's together. And these will be on the back table for those who want to get a closer look during the open house portion.

We also find various complements of the ordnance because of the production area, and then the important part that does have some significance is that 94 percent of what we

have when we're counting by item falls into this small arms category. So that's -- that's just important to know because it's -- we're finding all the large stuff and the small stuff.

Definitions. Ordnance and explosives is the broad category that we use. What it is, is basically any munitions, delivery system, or ordnance item that contains explosives, propellants, or chemical agents. That's the very broad category. Within that is a category that we termed UXO. We use it a little more broadly than the definition, but it's basically an item that has been fused, fired, and for some reason it has malfunctioned in the field; and that's important because it does put it into a little different category in terms of handling it. We also then have the small arms, and I've talked a little bit about that. And what that is is -- is, you know, hand-held, shoulder-held weapons fired at target ranges, and it's the same as is commercially available for sport shooting and hunting.

So this is an outline of the areas that we have at Mare Island. What we do is we -- early on in the base history, we assessed the whole base and looked for areas that could potentially have it, have any kind of ordnance contamination; and if you can look to this map right here, I'll walk through these sites.

Ordnance-production-manufacturing area is one of our high priority sites in terms of what we need to look for and be careful of, and that's in this area here. It's at the south end of the island. Going around the south tip, we have the south shore. This was a support area for the production area. There's a Pier 35 for loading and off-loading from ships, also some storage, and then we go over to the dredge ponds. That's this series of ponds here. Basically they received dredge material from the strait, and because of the historical uses and ships in the channel, there was some ordnance picked up there and concentrated in the outfalls there.

IR Site 5 is the former detonation range. That's located right here, this orange square. That's part of -- that's within the IR site program. We have our current open detonation range is a small corner of this one dredge pond separated out. It's not highlighted on here.

The western magazine area is this pink area, and that was -- those magazines were basically for storage. There was no operations there except for the movement and storage of munitions. Some other onshore sites, small area not related to the production end of the island, is the DRMO scrap yard. And it was a scrap yard for the recycling of metal, of any other useful materials on the base, and that is located -- a little triangle right there.

The historic landfill area is this large green area. And there are two small areas in there where in the histories of sampling and trenching we did find a couple of items, and so we're gonna close that out as part of the landfill.

We have the upland magazine area. That's this light green area. A portion of it is already transferred and turned into nine holes of a golf course some of you might be familiar with. That area was fully investigated and cleared for transfer. And then the second half of that portion is going to become a part of a regional park. Marine Corps firing range is

this red area. This is a small arms range, had a rifle range, which is the long portion, and several pistol ranges, again, just small arms there. And then we had a few other historic small arms ranges that were a part of the investigations in the past, some indoors.

We do have four areas that we identified offshore. They were areas that were either up here, where we had historical ship storage, fleet reserve, and a Berth 2, and then two areas down here because of the proximity to the land-based sites. That's the shoreline along the production area and the shoreline along the south shore.

Ms. Krevsky - Patricia?

Ms. McFadden - Sure.

Ms. Krevsky - Can you -- can you explain why there's no areas of concern along --

Ms. McFadden - Yes, thank you, Diana.

The reason this strip here was not identified as an area of concern is because, throughout the base history, this area was dredged on a regular maintenance basis, so -- because even up till '94 or '95 I believe was the last stretch of operation, so material -- any material there would have already been moved, you know, moved over to the dredge ponds because of the constant dredging that occurred. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Krevsky - Yes, thanks.

Ms. McFadden - This is just a map for you to look at.

Okay. Now I'm gonna go through some of the issues in the article, not in great detail, but hopefully enough to give you some additional information; and then we can hopefully answer any questions at the -- for the RAB members or, at the end, for the public.

What I'm gonna do is, I broke them down into some key issues: the UXO personnel qualifications; the safety arcs, particularly for the 16-inch projectiles that were found; the ordnance-cleanup process in general and how we approach things and the process we followed; and then the Navy's safety audit. And here's the breakdown of what I'm gonna talk to next, the four categories that I talk to: UXO worker, UXO specialist, a UXO supervisor, and then a project manager.

UXO worker. I put on this the Department of Labor equivalent because there's several different categories that are followed. The Army Corps will have a different terminology. Department of Labor is trying to standardize that terminology. And this is kind of the terminology we had typically used on the base, so I'm sticking to that, giving you the equivalent. This is a person who's trained on equipment at the site and on the site's specific conditions. They assist the UXO specialist, they conduct visual and instrument searches of the area, and they do not handle ordnance. They work directly with a UXO specialist, who I'll describe after this.

And as stated in the article, a lot of these people were former shipyard workers. When this organization was set up under the Navy, we looked for qualified people within our own ranks, and we found a lot of them. These were -- these shipyard workers had a working knowledge of the base, working knowledge of the activities that happened on the base, and that's really invaluable to us as our crew gets smaller and smaller. They were retrained to perform these specific tasks from various backgrounds. The training just in part included hazardous materials training, explosive safety training on -- on a -- a broad basis. Daily site-specific safety briefs go on at every project every day, and equipment-specific training had to do with -- sometimes it was the manufacturer, sometimes other people who were experienced on the equipment, depending on the -- how difficult the technology was. And there was also a lot of on-the-job training, a lot of shared information, a lot of the, you know, knowledge of working on the base.

The UXO specialists. These are the people; the terminology in DOD is Technician Level 2 and 3. We've kind of talked to them together. These are people that have successfully completed the naval explosive-ordnance-disposal school. This is a school that's used for all the military that -- for people that handle explosives. The Navy just runs the school that -- this is the program where basically these people were certified to work in this field to identify, inspect, transport ordnance, and to do the handling as needed. The difference between the Tech 2 and Tech 3 is the Tech 3 can perform everything the Tech 2 can, but in addition can also supervise and perform some disposal of ordnance.

So again, these were when -- when SSPORTS was setting up -- that's the Navy organization that gathered some shipyard workers -- we looked at first through our ranks, and we found at least a few people that met the qualifications of UXO specialist. And we brought them on board to help us with the base, but then again that was limited, so we also went outside the shipyard and recruited from outside as well.

UXO supervisor, pretty similar in the Department of Labor. This basically is the same experience as a UXO specialist, but with added years of experience. And this -- this person would perform some of the additional planning, coordination, and supervision of the UXQ activities, and at Mare Island what we did was selected the most experienced UXO specialists for this position.

Project manager is -- I'm describing it here because it is the same as what you would think on non-ordnance sites. This is a person who handles the coordination of the schedule, the budget, the resources for a team to make sure that a project goes smoothly and within budget.

They'd also manage the contract specifications, administrative responsibilities, develop reports and documentation for the customer. And these, again, were -- we looked -- we looked to our ranks, to the experience that we had at the base. We had very experienced professional people to draw into this, and their experience and their knowledge of the base was invaluable and is still. And these people do not handle the ordnance, and they do not direct the ordnance-safety program. So that's -- I wanted to just make that clear.

In the field the UXO specialist directs the field operations in terms of ordnance safety and ordnance handling.

The second issue I'm gonna talk to is the safety arc. That's the term we use. The technical term is an explosive-safety-quantity distance. The article called it a few things, but we term -- we use the term safety arc because of the way it's defined. What it is is it's -- it's an arc or a radius that's established as an exclusion area where only the appropriate personnel can enter during ordnance operations. These are terms placed only when ordnance is being handled, investigated, or moved.

The arc is determined by the type of ordnance, the amount of explosive material in it, you know, the condition of the ordnance, the condition of the site, and it is based on the furthest hazard distance, meaning what is the distance that there's a potential for any kind of hazard to someone, and that's -- that's how it's -- that's the definition. The safety arcs are in place to protect the workers and the public, and the safety arcs are based on well-developed standards from DOD, as well as the Navy working together to develop those.

Mare Island uses what we call a default safety arc of 1,250, which is -- was established to be more than enough to cover the ordnance we expected to find here during the remediation. It applies to the storage, handling, assembly, disassembly, recovery of ordnance up to 30,000 pounds net explosive weight. And the arc is also important in the sense, I wanted to make the point here, is that when there is a breach of that arc, when somebody who is not approved for that arc goes in that area, then work is stopped.

An example of this is when we have to deal with things like the strait here, and this arc goes into the strait, and of course you have water traffic there. So what would happen is, the ferries don't move that fast, so we can see them coming. The arcs, they would see them. They would stop, ferry would pass, and work would -- work would resume. I mean oftentimes you can -- you know, the rules say that you can't have people traverse through the arc, but we did that as a precaution to make sure that everyone was safe.

Now, the question of the 16-inch projectiles came up, was the arc safe for the 16-inch. Yes, it was. The 16-inch projectiles could be safely assessed by the UXO specialists within the safety of the 1,250-foot arc. Each 16-inch round that -- or projectile that was found carries a maximum of 50 pounds of ordnance or explosives, and that's well within the limit of the 1,250.

The article stated something -- I can't recall exactly, but something in the realm of 2,300 or 2,500 arc. We calculated 2,500-foot arc when you intentionally detonate a 16-inch projectile, so that's where that number probably came from. We don't know for sure, but that's kind of what we estimated that came from.

This is an example of the safety arcs that are potentially in place when we do future ordnance work at the base, and those would be coordinated with the city, with any uses

that are impacted, with the RAB as they become aware that we are doing that work. This is just to demonstrate that. Doesn't show up too well here. Sorry about that.

Ms. Hayes - Patricia, I just wanted to note, if you could go -- go back to that, I think folks might remember that the golf course was actually impacted by one of your safety arcs. Its operation for a period of time had to be shut down. And the City of Vallejo was upset enough, as were the -- were the golf course owners, that they actually considered a lawsuit against the Navy to try to -- to prevent them from stopping the op -- the golf course operations.

So, you know, my -- in my own memory, I know that the Navy takes those arcs real -- real seriously and that it does have impacts at times to people who happen to have a business or an activity within those areas.

Ms. McFadden - Thank you, Myrna. Yeah, also to picture that, basically the -- this pink area is what she's referring to. When work was done on this edge of the pink area, it had to impact that golf course. So we did find a workable solution I recall.

Some better information on the 16-inch round, 16-inch projectiles. This is what it looks like when we found it at Mare Island. This is what it looked like probably, possibly even before it went into the ground at Mare Island. This picture was found in one of the buildings that was demolished. A time capsule was found, and this picture was in it. The time capsule was dated around 1938. I couldn't remember if it was '38 or '39. And so that's -- that's what it would look like new, and this is what it looked like comin' out of the ground.

Let me talk to you about the next slide while the picture's up just to make it more interesting. I'll leave this up while we go to the next slide, but what we found at Mare Island was five 16-inch armor-piercing projectiles. They were -- four of them were certified inert at -- by the UXO specialists, and they could do this because they could tell they were not fused and not fired.

The fuse-they could tell visually, and the not fired they could tell because there's a rotating band that would be scored if it had been fired. And those ones were determined to be inert, and they were safe to move. They're basically scrap metal, but we do handle ordnance-related scrap metal differently, so we actually kept those in storage until we can handle that.

There was one that could not be certified inert. Basically it could be certified that it wasn't fused or fired based on a visual inspection, but the cavity within the 16-inch round or projectile could not be certified empty because this one plug was welded in. Now, the fact that it's welded in is kind of an indication that it's probably inert because you wouldn't weld on something -- welding is a hot activity -- on an explosive item that might react to that hot activity.

That's my layman's understanding of it. So we -- we did -- we did safely move that to the magazine, where it's stored. It is within a safety arc, and we're workin' with DTSC to find a way to certify that inert within a regulatory process. I just basically talked through this slide, but I thought you might have interest in that.

Ms. Krevsky - I'm just wondering if you could mention the size, the weight, and actually when they were found.

Ms. Hayes - And what they were found -- why they would've been there.

Ms. McFadden - Larry, do you have a month on when they were found?

Mr. Douchand - March 6th, 7th, and 8th.

Ms. McFadden - March of 2000. And they were found basically right along the -- in the ordnance- production area along -- basically, it was a historic sea wall. It was a nicely constructed stone sea wall that had since been then filled outward. The construction of these are -- you can tell the size from that picture.

They're basically over 2,100 pounds of steel, and they're basically solid steel, solid walls. There's about a four-inch cavity that goes up through the middle, about halfway up the -- up the length, and that's where the explosives would be put. Now, the fuse would be at the base, in the middle of a base plate. And the right people are nodding, so I haven't told you any lies.

Okay. I'm just gonna go through real broadly the steps of the cleanup process just so people understand that -- why we're not ready for transfer yet, as Jerry stressed, and just how we do this -- how we go about this process. I'm gonna not talk to these specifically 'cause I go into them in detail on the next slides.

Site identification. We looked base wide. We assessed maps. We interviewed people. We looked at records. We looked at the sites themselves and their uses and determined which ones had a potential for ordnance contamination, and that's what this map shows here. Then we go into a site-investigation phase.

For ordnance, this is typically because the ordnance items, if they can't be visually seen, that means they're below the ground surface, and almost all ordnance items have some kind of metal part to them, which can be likely detected from the surface. I say likely because the detectors are not 100 percent efficient. They are affected by the type of ordnance, the size of the ordnance and the depth that it is, and even the orientation that it is in the ground.

So that leads to the effectiveness of the detectors. We say typically, the detectors, 70 to 90 percent. And it's for this reason that we're not -- we don't consider ourselves done yet, because we have to go back. We have to evaluate the past work. We have to assess the

future land use, in addition to what was done and what's -- you know, how we can ensure the safety of future users.

Okay. This is just an example I wanted to show you of, you know, what happens when we go on survey. We do it methodically. We go out and we set up a grid. These grids are surveyed in, and each -- each grid is individually surveyed based on the site-specific decisions that are made with the regulators and the public. And then basically we -- we get -- we find magnetic objects under the ground by the detectors, and we mark them on maps.

These red dots indicate all the areas where we found some indication of a metal object below the surface, and we excavated every one of these. Not a fun job, though some people might disagree.

These pink areas, which are a little hard to see, are where we found ordnance, and these are consistent with the outfalls, which were the focus of the investigation because that's where most of the debris settled out. And the berms were also a secondary focus because of the way the ponds were operated. I'm not gonna go into that much detail with all the sites, but I just wanted you to know about the systematic approach we took.

The next step is -- as I discussed, is we go out and we excavate to see what those metal objects that we're detecting from the surface are. And, you know, the teams are supervised by DOD-trained UXO specialists, and the surveys are done by the UXO workers typically. In -- in our case the site investigation was actually done by an EOD unit, but the follow-up removal investigation was done by the UXO workers. Any live ordnance is safely moved and treated by controlled detonation typically on the base.

The next phase is quality assurance. This is also where we basically assess the adequacy of the past work, of the field efforts. This is a Navy responsibility to validate the work that's been done. Contractors typically are responsible for the quality control. The Navy has to come in and do an independent quality assurance, and we're in that process for most of our sites. And then we also have to, within that process, evaluate if there's a need for additional work or if there's gonna be a need for some site controls for long-term management.

And then site closeout is when we're getting ready to transfer. We summarize all the working documents. We work with regulators to establish the appropriate controls, and with the city and with the public. And those go through the public-review cycle, and those are the decision documents before we transfer.

Now you get to the fun part, some pictures to show you what it was we actually did. This is the upland magazine. This was a reservoir, called the ordnance reservoir because it was in the ordnance area. It really was a fire-protection reservoir.

There also is a blue heron rookery there, so we had to work around that in terms of the dates that we did this. But we drained a million gallons of water out of this so that we

could go in with detectors, survey the area, remove all the objects that were found, and -- and we were able to clear this area because, of all the items that were found, there was no live ordnance or ordnance with any explosives in it. We did find a bicycle and a cigarette machine, so -- and various other items.

And this is a big X. I'm a little worried about that. For some reason this picture isn't showing up, but it was a picture of the Geometrics G8 -- 858, which is one of our detectors, and I apologize for that. I think it's just my slow computer, and I'm hoping the rest of them will show up. This was a picture of a guy walking the site. It wasn't a very exciting picture, but -- there, good, the rest of them are there.

This is the excavation that happens after the detection. This is the dozer. Those are some of the workers that are there. The workers support the UXO specialists. There are probably more watching the area being excavated to ensure that there's no items found and supervising the team that's out there.

This is an outfall. This is the dredge ponds. This is what comes from the strait, underneath Mare Island, and shoots out into the dredge ponds. And this is just an example of what one is because we always talk about the outfalls, basically a pipe comin' out of the berm, and the dredge material shoots right out of here. And this is where we found the large amount of metal debris would settle out, within several feet of that outfall.

It would settle out so much it would sometimes create these huge masses that would just turn into cement, with all the metal debris, rust, and clay that was in the material. And these had lots of nice names from the workers, or we just called them outfall masses. And as you can see, these created a challenge for us. We had to carefully break them up because, as you can see here, this is a 40mm casing that's coming out of the mass, and that had to be carefully extracted to be certified inert or live and handled accordingly.

This is the former detonation range before and after mediation. We removed a lot of soil contamination as well as ordnance and a lot of metal debris as well.

This is just a summary of some of the ordnance findings to date. A couple of key things. This is the small arms number. This is the total number. That's where that 94 percent comes out of. We did find almost 12,000 of other miscellaneous explosive-filled items. The numbers are -- this is for those -- it's about 220,000 total explosive-filled items found.

About 208, 207 were small arms, in this category here. Almost 12,000 was other items. This includes other live cartridges, parts, fuses, different components. And then scrap metal was almost four million pounds. Say it with me. No, just kidding. That's about -- that's over 1,900 ton. I mean we pulled out anything that we found, and of course a lot of it, which is good. We didn't want a lot of it to be ordnance, but we did remove a lot of scrap in looking for the ordnance.

And the other key factors here -- I just wanted to make a note of this -- all this work was done, about 90 percent of it, by the Navy's SSPORTS organization, which was privatized to Weston. 320,000 hours of fieldwork have gone by without a UXO accident or injury, and that's -- I think we're very proud of that, and that -- that says more than I think any picture that I can put up here.

Mr. Schonholtz - Patricia?

Ms. McFadden - Yes.

Mr. Schonholtz - One more quick question. One more quick question on that last slide. Do you have a break -- of that 11,882, as I recall from some of our previous briefings, a great majority of that was, although bigger than small, it was the 20mm and 40mm, not the larger explosives. Do you have that breakdown handy?

Ms. McFadden - I do not. It was exactly -- I do not have the exact number, but you are correct. The vast majority was 20 and 40mm. Do you have --

Ms. Hayes - Could you pick those up again?

Ms. McFadden - Sure. This is the 20, and the 40 is this and this. I'll just leave it standing there.

Larry, do you have any ballpark figure on that? We did find some other larger items, but by far it was the 20 and 40.

Mr. Douchand - Most of the items that we found that were larger were from the production area, and there were somewhere around -- it would be in the hundreds, the larger items.

Ms. McFadden - That would not fall in the 20, 40 mil.

Mr. Schonholtz - And the reason I asked that question was, statistics can be extremely misleading. If you look at that and you say you found almost 12,000 pieces of larger than small arms, well, that's true, but most of that was -- the great majority of that was on the small size of the explosives, the ordnance category.

Mr. Douchand - It also included flares, smoke, you know, different pyrotechnics of that nature also, so --

Ms. McFadden - Yeah, lots of components and other propellants that we measured as well. Thank you for that.

How am I doing on time?

This is just a table on the status of the ordnance sites. I'm not gonna go through it. Basically it's to show you that, for the large majority of the sites, we're in the field-validation mode.

The initial removal's been done. We need to go back, validate it, assess how well it's been done, what else we might need to do, and prepare for, you know, close-out documentation. And there are some sites where we're still in the site-investigation phase. We just haven't done that intense -- that intrusive work yet.

I just wanted to -- as a transition to our next subject, which is the NOSSA safety audit or Navy safety audit, I just wanted to talk a little bit about the transition from -- from the Navy to SSPORTS to Weston. April '96, as you are all very familiar with, is when the base closed. It was during that time when the environmental detachment called SSPORTS -- that stands for Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Portsmouth, so the acronym doesn't real match what they did, but they were an environmental detachment -- they were recruited and retrained shipyard workers recruited to conduct post- closure cleanup. And we did a lot of that in those years; from -- actually before '96, but up until September '99 is the date that was established.

We had no control over it except by the powers that be, that the Navy privatized the SSPORTS personnel into Roy F. Weston. And my sub note here is just so that, when you think of the ordnance program, just recall that 90 percent of it, at least of my ballpark figure, was done under the Navy organization, and Weston's taken on the remainder of that with some of the key personnel continuing some of that work.

January '00 there was -- this was in the -- fairly early in the transition that Weston had transitioned the SSPORTS employees, and they were hearing some concerns from the employees. So they had -- they set up a three-way safety stand down. The CEO of the company came out from Back East, lots of other high people in the company, listened to the employees and made some changes based on the concerns that were raised. And I've highlighted those changes that were made at that meeting.

And this is something that our Navy safety office also looked at when they came out to audit three months later, and they saw that these changes really helped address all the issues that -- that they were hearing. There was established positions that changed kind of who people reported to from a supervisor and administrative level.

There was a senior UXO supervisor. This, again, was the most experienced person with the EOD training. There was a safety officer, UXO safety officer. Again, this is one of the military-trained personnel. Established the policy of -- of that -- while it was in place during the fieldwork, it was establishing the policy that ensured that the UXO specialist had control over the field efforts.

There's also some details about how the fieldwork was done, improved communication, getting everybody cell phones and radios, and also increasing some separation distance between the field teams, just an added safety factor. And then there was also a decrease

in the worker-to-supervisor ratio. That helps in the level of kind of attention that a supervisor is able to provide to the team, level of oversight, and that was an improvement

At this time I'm going to introduce Captain David Oppenheim. He is from our Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity, and they were the ones that performed the safety audit that's referred to in the articles. And I'll let him speak directly.

Captain David Oppenheim - Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity

Captain Oppenheim - Thank you. First of all, I want to answer a couple questions. First, why me and why NOSSA? I'll explain a little bit about what NOSSA is and why NOSSA, but first of all, I'd like to introduce myself. I'm a reserve officer, and in civilian life I'm an attorney. I do contract work for construction companies, so this was kind of down my -- my field of expertise.

In the Navy I'm a special operations officer. I deal with ordnance. I do -- I'm a chief inspector for the explosive safety inspections, so I deal with this on a constant basis, and I work for NOSSA.

What is NOSSA? NOSSA stands for the Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity. For a lot of you that were in here, it's the old NAC, Naval Ordnance Center. It is located in Indian Head, Maryland, and it is responsible -- it's the Navy's arm for ordnance safety and -- and security.

We go out, we do the inspections, the explosive safety inspections, on facilities. We also work with and for the DDESB, which stands for Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board, which is the DOD or -- or national organization that's responsible for all of the explosive safety items and -- and has a control for everything that's done in the Army, everything that's done in the Air Force, everything that's done with any ordnance, and of course the Navy.

Like I said, the -- NOSSA provides an oversight and guidance for all of the ordnance for the Navy. It also manages the safety policy and review boards for -- for the Navy.

In -- as you know, a lot of you here know, an audit was requested because of a January letter, January 2000 letter, from the union to the Department of Defense, and it went to the DDESB, making various allegations of impropriety when it comes to safety. DDESB turned it over to CNO, Chief of Naval Operation, and of course Chief of Naval Operation turned it down to NOSSA.

At the time it was Captain Jim Evans. Jim Evans, he took myself and two people from his internal organization -- that's called the OESA, and Mr. Ripazanski (phonetic) is here from OESA who can address any questions that you have on that level -- and we came out here and conducted a 38-day audit in March.

We interviewed 36 of the Weston employees. I think we missed about three or four employees that happened to be on Johnson Island at the time. I'm sure they'd rather have

been interviewed. The -- we -- we reviewed their current contracts. We talked about safety issues. We inquired about what their training was, what -- what they felt was -- was happening and what was wrong. We tried to address those issues at the time. A lot of the issues that they had at the time had already been addressed by Weston and were taken care of, and the people that were interviewed agreed that a lot of those had been taken care of.

In July of 2000, NOSSA, again, Captain Jim Evans at the time, sent a letter to the Chief of Naval Operations explaining what he felt to be the major concerns were at the time, and he made -- made recommendations to improve the program. Now, again, maybe it was a lot of the issues had been addressed by Weston.

The directive, the letter that came down from CNO, was much broader than just go out, look at -- at Mare Island. There were other issues that had to be addressed. The concerns that I had, perhaps both because of my military background, but even more so my -- my legal background, was, if this was happening here, what is happening with the other contracts? And so a lot of the issues were Navy wide, and because we were doing so many BRACs, were there other problems and were there issues that had to be addressed with NAVFAC? So when you look at the letter, it's got a -- a number of issues in it, not just the issues - the safety issues, though those were addressed as well.

And as this slide indicates, we did try and -- and talk about standardizing the contract language for all of the work that was being done regarding explosive- safety issues, and, again, not just at naval facilities but DOD-wide. So this was a DDESB problem that we kind of threw back at them and said, okay, if we're having this problem, you're probably having a problem elsewhere.

We talked about incorporating the standard skills in the UXO community, making sure that those were adhered to, developing standards within the contract language, and we do have those.

I'm working also on a board with -- and if I use acronyms and numbers, forgive me, that's just the way I was brought up -- but it was a 4145.26M right now that we're working on with the DOD contractors. Anybody who works with the Department of Defense, any contractor that is handling ordnance, has to adhere to these standards.

The Navy has its own publications called the "OP 5," operation procedures, "Operation Public 5," where we have -- it's a very thick book that talks about all the procedural requirements in the Navy for handling explosive ordnance.

There -- there are other such publications for -- for all the various Department of Defense sub -- the Air Force, Army, etc. And then, again, the -- the next step is to continue to conduct explosive safety inspections on the base-closing -- closing areas, and coordinating the -- that work out in the field, which is still an ongoing process.

A couple of the other recommendations was to have a government oversight for civilian contractors -- we're doing that right now -- and making sure that all of the Navy and, like I said, Department of Defense contractors are meeting their requirements.

We also review the contractors' occupational safety and -- and health program, and we're kind of increasing our field of work there as well, making sure that -- that the -- when it comes to explosive-safety issues, that all of the issues are dealt with appropriately, and evaluating the ordnance training to improve the -- the Navy oversight. And that's ordnance training for, not the Navy personnel, but of course the contractor personnel.

It's -- it's important to understand -- and then I'll turn this back over to -- to Jerry, but I've brought this up earlier in talking to you people -- it's important to understand what exactly we're dealing with here and trying to get our hands around it. We're not going to tell you and the Navy's not going to tell you, ever, here -- here's a 100 percent-safe site. It's not gonna work that way. It can't.

Okay. Nothing we do works that way. Nothing. The water you drink is not thoroughly pure. The homes that we live in are not thoroughly clean. We try the very most and our hardest to make sure that the product that we are going to turn over is as safe as it possibly can be, and we just call it ORM, operational risk management.

We've got an operation here, we're trying to reduce the risk, but we can't ever get it down to zero. Okay. So we do certain things to try and -- and make it manageable, and I think we're going a long way towards that.

There will always -- if you want to have a completely risk-free, ordnance-free Mare Island, probably the best thing to do, in my suggestion, is sink it and rebuild it with clean dirt. That's the only way you're gonna get it. If you get it down far enough, it would probably be at least a little bit safer, and that's the issue. There's always gonna be something down there, but we're trying to get it where, for the site specific, wherever we go, for that site it's appropriate.

So if you're going to have, for example, a golf course with a lot of sand, where the ordnance is going to continue to settle, we're probably not gonna drill down or sift the -- the dirt down to 20, 30 feet. It's just, if you had all the time, all the money, and all the manpower, that probably could be done over four or five lifetimes, but people don't want that. They want it now or within a reasonably reliable future.

So we're not going to go down 20 feet and sift all of the dirt on all of the island. It's not going to happen. You don't want it to happen. So given these restraints, the program that I saw when I was out here in March I think indicated that we have a -- a good procedure working and we'll be able to turn over a safe environment.

Now, as in anything else, when something comes up, we've also got in place all of the appropriate steps so that if something -- if somebody goes over to Mare Island and they're told, "Hey, there's a metal object out there," don't pick it up and throw it around. Call

somebody. There'll be people there. So that's part of the program. That's part of the safety program.

So I don't go on, Jerry?

Mr. Dunaway - Okay. Thank you, Captain.

Ms. Hayes - If I could just say one thing, Captain, I'm the person who asked these guys to invite you out because I -- I knew that there was a team who came out, and I'm very appreciative on it. I hope the folks here this evening will take advantage of, not only your expertise, but also your specific knowledge of this as you've outlined of the work that you did here last year. It's sort -- it's really comforting and educational at the same time. So I really appreciate the effort you've made to come back out.

Captain Oppenheim - It's my pleasure.

(applause)

Mr. Dunaway - I just have a few more slides to go through, and we'll get through some other items and then go to the open house. And, again, I welcome the others to talk to you, any of the specialists that we have here tonight.

Regarding the reduction of risk during the cleanup process, our key component to reducing risk is to keep people away from these areas while they're being cleaned up, and our current site-security measures rely on fences, signs, and such to keep those people out.

We have barriers to prevent vehicle access to the pond roads, locked gates to prevent vehicles and pedestrians from getting into areas, and signs warning of potential hazards. We have access for only approved activities, and generally we try to make sure those are escorted activities.

We have a couple pictures of some of our site-control gates. Some of you may be familiar with these. This is to the ordnance-production area, and it's a pretty strong gate there. This is to the Marine Corps firing range, and that -- that gate, again, to keep people out. And I would certainly encourage folks, you don't need to go back there. We brought all the goodies here to the meeting. You can look at them during the break, but there's nothing back there that's of any interest.

Ms. McFadden - Don't go there. That was the picture -- that's the slide from the CNO. This was the slide that had an example -- there we go. There's some of it at least.

Mr. Dunaway - Yes.

Ms. McFadden - It had an example of a sign too.

Mr. Dunaway - Yeah.

Ms. Hayes - It takes a real long time.

Mr. Dunaway - Basically, you see a sign that says "don't enter," just don't enter. I -- I would say that probably the biggest hazard is you might fall into a hole that's dug up and an open excavation, more so than running into a piece of ordnance. It is an area that's work in progress, and we don't need people there.

I'm going to talk real briefly about the future ordnance-cleanup plans in respect to a lot of discussion about property being transferred right now, and a lot of that discussion has to do with early transfer, as the RAB members are keenly aware.

We have essentially shifted efforts from working on the ordnance-clearance work toward the south end of the island and really for the last year tried to put together efforts and packages and documents for early transfer. The big one that we've made the most progress is for the Lennar early transfer, and that's generally for the -- the greater shipyard area in this -- this part of the base. It does not contain any of the ordnance areas, and the Navy continues to retain ordnance responsibility for that early transfer.

There was a time early on in the negotiations where we were going to include the small arms range and that DRMO yard here, the scrap yard, but there was a complicated set of arrangements. It really didn't have much to do with the fact that ordnance was there or not there. The Navy was gonna take care of the ordnance. It was just simply some complications that we decided not to put those in, and that's probably a smart move.

There's another early transfer that's in discussion, and that is for dredge ponds. And Weston, the same Weston organization, wants to operate dredge ponds as a commercial venture. That is an ordnance site, and they basically have in that agreement proposed costs to the Navy that we will pay for, for them to complete the remaining ordnance work there, which we do not believe is very much work, but we do need to finish some things there.

The Navy will continue to be involved with it as the mediator or middle -- middle organization between the contractor's work and NOSSA and DDESB because NOSSA and DDESB do not work directly with contractors or private organizations.

For cleanup work that the Navy needs to complete, we're shifting our priorities to those areas that are directly adjacent to these areas that we want to transfer or that will be transferred as the early transfer, and that would be a small arms range and the DRMO yard. Those areas would be the first on our list, and that's generally what's in our funding budget. And, of course, what Patricia went over was the work remaining at the other ordnance areas. The validation work will be ongoing, but, again, our priority is not there 100 percent.

Long-term ordnance management, again, a key point to make is that, after we do clearance, we do have some residual risk potential for things to be found in the future. Well, we're on the base right now. We're probably gonna be on the base for several more years. The Navy is going to be the first responder for that. And if a response is needed after the Navy eventually leaves the island, we have arrangements in place for other military organizations around the area that have EOD response units to provide that support.

And we actually have Master Sergeant Joe Bean from Travis EOD unit, and I'd like to invite him up to just describe his organization, what their capabilities are, and how they're willing to support Mare Island. It's important to note that UXO and ordnance in general is a DOD responsibility. It's not specific to the Navy or any other service.

Mare Island Support from Travis EOD Unit - Master Sergeant Joe Bean

Master Sergeant Bean - Good evening. As he stated, my name is --

Ms. Hayes - You have to use the microphone.

Master Sergeant Bean - My name is Master Sergeant Joseph Bean. I'm a flight chief at the Explosive Ordnance Disposal unit stationed at Travis Air Force Base just up above in Fairfield. As the captain said, no matter what we do anywhere to locate bits of metal and ordnance, we're never gonna find anything, or never gonna find everything.

We're the people that you're gonna call when finally everybody packs up and leaves, and if something's found, we're going to be the people to come down and take care of that suspect piece of metal that's pulled up out of the ground.

Along with our Army counterparts stationed at Moffett Field in the South Bay Area, we've been trained to respond throughout the Northern California area and mitigate hazards posed by the suspect munitions, explosive items that are found in communities. Specifically, at Travis, we have a 14-man unit.

We maintain three personnel on a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week standby posture to respond to any -- any call throughout the Northern California area. As I've said, we respond routinely throughout the area and will continue to do so in the future.

Mr. Dunaway - And the final note about ordnance, and maybe if it's more than just one item that's found that's beyond the Travis EOD unit's capabilities, the Navy is always gonna be responsible and will always come back to take care of additional site work, investigation, larger removals than just one item. And we're responsible for that in perpetuity, forever.

With that, I want to just put out there phone numbers for points of contact. My number locally is 562-3104 there on the base. I am out of San Diego, however, but a voice mail is provided, and I check that on a daily basis. And I really appreciate questions, or if

anybody needs more information about this program or if people have complaints or want to say something about the past work that's been done and they want to remain anonymous, they can call me. It's hard to decide, with some of these allegations, when it comes through the media, what regulatory procedures to go through.

Patricia McFadden can also be contacted if there's technical questions on the program or you want additional information; and then finally the Navy caretaker site office, we have a group full-time on the base. That phone number is provided in case there are immediate needs. And, again, we are available for responding to these type of activities.

If there's no questions, no more questions from the RAB members --

Mr. Karr - I have a --

Questions and Answers

Ms. Hayes - Yeah, so -- I stole the microphone from Jerry for a minute here. I'll give you a disclaimer. I had a concussion a few months ago, and I'm still not recovered fully, and Jerry has a bad head cold, so the two of us are gonna try, crippled, to facilitate the next portion of the meeting. So if I kinda get foggy here, I'm gonna hand the microphone to him.

So just the terms of -- we'll start out with facilitating or answering questions and taking comments from the RAB, and then we'll follow that up with fielding any questions that our guests this evening have. And if you want to direct it to a particular person, you can tell us that, and Wally has a microphone which he'll bring to you, not because we want you to practice using a microphone, but because whoever designed this room gets an F for being able to -- to be heard. And we do have a person who does take court-reported-type minutes, and so we -- we want to give you the best chance of having her hear you and having the rest of the people here hear you.

Jerry, you have a question.

Mr. Karr - Yes. I guess for Patricia, a point of clarification. Talking about these 16-inch projectiles, I'm confused. It mentions a 2,500 foot arc applies to the intentional detonation, but yet a smaller arc for an accidental detonation. Perhaps you could clarify that.

Ms. McFadden - Yeah. I -- I asked that same question of our safety guys back at NOSSA, and I said, well, you say intentional detonation; what about an accidental one? And the response was, is that unintentional detonations are very rare, and they couch that with the fact that these DOD specialists or the UXO specialists are specially trained to be able to assess and handle these rounds.

Now, a couple factors about Mare Island also come into play: the fact that this wasn't a range; that these items, to date we haven't found any that were both fused and fired that would fall into that category. But essentially they are trained to assess an item safely, and so that that's why that arc was sufficient.

Now, the 2,500-foot arc also accounts for the fact that it's on the surface, with no barriers, that there's actually a charge added to it. And, again, it's that extreme -- you know, the extreme distance that there's a potential for even a slight damage-to-the-skin hazard. So that was my understanding of why the 1,250-foot arc is adequate, because you do have only the specially trained people handling the item and trained to assess it safely.

Mr. Karr - Thank you.

Ms. Hayes - I might also note that these -- from my understanding, these were 12 foot down in the ground?

Ms. McFadden - Yes, they were.

Ms. Hayes - Okay. Next question, Patricia?

Ms. Schader - You mention that the Mare Island straits have been dredged so no -- nothing else would be done. How far up were they dredged? How far north?

Ms. McFadden - Basically, you could tell by this map that the extent is -- is delineated by the extent of those -- those blue areas. These were all the dry docks. So the ships would come in and out, and those were all the areas that needed to routinely be deepened because of the sedimentation that happens in the channel.

So basically between that one and that one. And these are identified because there's no docks -- there's no dry docks there. But these were just where ships were stored, so those areas were specifically identified as potential because they had storage for a period of time during World War II and post World War II.

Ms. Schader - The area where the ships were stored, is there a chance that there's anything out there?

Ms. McFadden - That's why we highlighted them as areas of concern, because we are gonna look into seeing what might be out there and assessing what we might need to do. Those are in the site-investigation phase, the offshore areas.

Ms. Schader - Okay.

Ms. McFadden - So we haven't yet assessed what might be there. We know there's metal objects there, but that's not that surprising from ships. You know, forks, trays, chisels, and such could easily be there as well. So we have to still assess that.

Ms. Schader - Thank you.

Ms. Hayes - Those -- the last ships that were there, could be the whole ship could be down there. That's right outside my living room window, and they were used as target ships. Kind of beat up.

Another question or comments from RAB members? Paula.

Ms. Tygielski - I guess I'm one of the -- the original people in the RAB, so I've been watching this process for more than eight years now, and I do want to say that the -- the UXO presentations have always been the most complete and most interesting presentations that we get, and I've always been impressed with the credibility of the people who gave the presentations.

I do want to say, though, that the newspaper articles have -- have damaged that, and I do think that the Navy and Weston and -- now you're forced into a position of jumping through some hoops to reestablish the credibility, because not everybody has been watching you for eight years. You know, a lot of people, the first they've heard of this has been those newspaper articles. A lot of my neighbors and acquaintances have come to me because they know I'm on the RAB, and literally people are afraid of the island, and you need to repair that with people that haven't watched the process for eight years. You do need to jump through some hoops. I think it's very important that a serious investigation of the charges in the newspaper article be done. This went away.

Ms. Hayes - No, you're still with us.

Ms. Tygielski - Okay. I think it's very -- I think the Navy needs to do a serious investigation of the charges and needs to do it very promptly. That's gonna be critical.

Ms. McFadden - I share your concerns. When I read that article, I -- I took them almost very personally, even though I've only been on the project for a year and a half. And we took them very seriously, and we are -- we are already in the process. Part of the presentation you see here is because we've looked into this already, from the very first article. And this has gone all the way back to our headquarters in D.C. They're interested in it. They're asking us -- we're gonna report to them tomorrow morning and let 'em know how it went, the fact sheet, all that information.

And so the Navy does share your concern, and we realize that it's a challenge for us to regain that credibility and regain -- and go through a lot of hoops or just different actions that we'll need to get the information out to the public. We appreciate the support of the RAB, but we do need to also broaden into that -- that wider public as well. So I hope that answers your question.

Ms. Tygielski - Yes, thank you. I think one thing the Navy could do to reestablish some credibility -- most of the work so far has been done onshore I think with the -- the frame of mind, that, it's offshore and underwater, it's not dangerous. On the other hand, things that are offshore and underwater sometimes wash up with the tide. And I think maybe it would be a -- a good idea to start dredge work in those lavender areas around the -- the

island to -- you know, so that they all look clean like that part in the middle. I think that would be a very useful thing to do.

Ms. McFadden - I agree, and we are in the process of doing the site investigation. We can't go right out there and dredge because we have to go through the process. And we'll go out, and we'll assess the site and assess where -- if and where the ordnance is and assess the different remedies.

In some of these cases, because of the sedimentation, dredging may actually make the condition worse. We can pull off five feet of sediment that's there, and we may be exposing more than we're actually removing.

So that's what we need to make sure, that we're assessing it, working with the regulators, and we're apt to make the right cleanup decisions. We are -- that is on our scope of planned actions, and we agree that it's something that will -- is our future project and will help us to regain that credibility.

Mr. Dunaway - Paula, one more note. I know I mentioned this within the last eight months or so. The Navy is developing a Navy-specific offshore ordnance- cleanup policy, and in that policy is a risk-based cleanup-decision-making process and cleanup process in general. And so that's in the draft stage, and I don't think we'll be implementing that until it's final. I don't know what the target date is for that, but it's certainly in the process. It's quite a highlighted item given all the attention to UXO.

Ms. Hayes - I might just add, Jerry, on that note, that I believe this RAB, as -- as I imagine other RABs across the country, could be very helpful in helping the Navy, you know, create that policy. So I would hope that you would look to us as members of the public in that role.

Ms. Hayes (continues)- Diana?

Oh, and I wanted to mention a follow-up on what Paula said, and I -- I think that the RAB, because I've heard stories -- not only have I fielded dozens of phone calls from these -- prompted by these newspaper articles, but each one of the RAB members has told me folks have left little notes on their door, knocked on their door, made phone calls to them.

And that's rewarding to me to know that our RAB members, community members, are serving in the role that -- that the Navy and the US/EPA intended when they created -- helped us create this organization several years ago, and that is the two-way communication. We are recognized as representatives in our own communities who -- who do have some, you know, information about the cleanup at Mare Island.

So I would encourage you to utilize us as -- and maybe sit down with us in a technical focus group or -- or in another focus group meeting and brainstorm with you on other

ways that you can help kind of improve your -- your standing with the community, and -- and do community outreach.

Diana?

Ms. Krevsky - The -- is this on? If I just can take this time to vent a little bit. I first of all thank you for the presentation tonight, and a lot of what I'm gonna say is to just bring out a few -- some of the same points. And I'm speaking mainly as a resident of Vallejo, but also as a RAB member who's been attending meetings since 1994.

And I guess I was disturbed by the articles published by the Times Herald, particularly -- I don't know if everyone's familiar with it by now, but this "Dangerous Legacy" headline. And I think it's true, I think it is, unexploded ordnance is a dangerous legacy, but for all military bases all over the world, not just Mare Island; but another legacy that could be considered dangerous is our local newspaper and the lack of responsible journalism in this recent coverage of ordnance cleanup.

What angers me is that many people of Vallejo have businesses on Mare Island were alarmed unnecessarily. The reporters sensationalized situations that are not life-threatening, or at least not any more dangerous than a year before or when the base closed or even 100 years ago. Cannonballs have been known to be dug up on Mare Island. The credibility -- as Paula mentioned, credibility of the excellent environmental cleanup work done so far, has been diminished in the eyes of the public.

The most misleading slant to the articles is the false impression that the ordnance-removal work is completely finished. Tonight's meeting has shown otherwise. The UXO-removal program is an ongoing process.

Although the news articles were damaging to public perception of the environmental cleanup, my own view of the work done since 1994 is unchanged. The workers and managers demonstrated competence and trustworthiness and consistently responded to our community-safety and ordnance-removal issues.

Human error is always a possibility. As you've heard tonight, ordnance-removal techniques have not reached -- have not yet reached the hundred percent, ideal level of clean. This -- this would mean digging up every inch of Mare Island and digging down more than ten feet.

This situation is very complex. The people deserve accurate information and valid sources. The RAB is a valuable public forum for concerns regarding the cleanup, a place where accurate information can be gotten.

Everyone is welcome to make their voice heard here at our meetings and to contact us directly -- or to contact us directly. The Times Herald reporters are also invited to attend -- attend our meetings on a regular basis, to cover the cleanup as it happens, not a year and a half later. Thank you.

(applause)

Mr. Dunaway - Thank you, Diana.

Questions? Rob.

Mr. Schonholtz_- Yes. This is also as much a comment as it is a question. I -- I will echo some of the thoughts with a little different spin than have been expressed by some of my fellow RAB members. I do believe that the Times Herald has done this community a severe disservice by some very second-rate journalism here, and I hope they take some time to try to make things right.

That said, some of the other things that I would like to get on the record here, and especially express to members of the -- other members of the community who are here in attendance tonight, is that this is a -- a completely volunteer organization with the exception of the representatives of the various agencies; and I want to make sure especially that people here understand that this cleanup process generates literally probably an inch of paper per week I receive on average. That's a conservative estimate. I receive on average one or two notices a week of documents that are available for me to review if I want to, and of course no one on this board is able to do that level of review. It's not our job as RAB members to provide oversight for what the Navy does. Instead it's our job, as the RAB, to provide a communication between the Navy and the community.

And I also will confirm some of the comments that have been made here earlier. Over the years that I've served on this board, the briefings that have been provided by the UXO team here at Mare Island have without a doubt been the most comprehensive, the most candid, the most thorough briefings that we have received, and I also would underscore I believe these have been some of the most responsive members of the -- more so by a fair shot than some of the other cleanup folks associated with the Navy. When there have been concerns about noise and so forth, those are people who have reacted and taken care of those problems.

So I certainly will say, I think we've been taken care of well. I'm actually quite happy that John Randell refused to let himself be drug into some disgruntled employee business that got here in the newspaper. But that said, I also will very much echo what Paula has said, is that we need to at this point turn to people whose job it actually is to oversee this.

I very much appreciate having Captain Oppenheim here on behalf of the Navy, but in addition to that, we really do need to have the third parties. It would be nice if the city saw fit to do that, but our city doesn't really do that. But particularly I will find myself looking very much to DTSC and EPA because that is their job, to actually provide oversight, as opposed to the community liaison that this group provides.

And I think, Chip, you tell me you will make comments later?

Mr. Gribble - Yes.

Mr. Schonholtz - So I'll be very interested to hear what Chip has to say, and we encourage people to stick around and listen to them.

Ms. Schader - First I'd like to say to everybody here that all the RAB board members are available to talk to at any -- at any time, and we're open. And I would also like to say that I wish that the newspaper would have contacted us before that article ran. You know, maybe you could've talked to us and heard what we had to say.

Also, I'd like to find out, where has the newspaper been? I haven't seen them at any meeting. Is there anybody here today? I believe there may be somebody here today. But you're welcome to attend meetings. They're once a month, and we hope to see you at the next meeting.

And I'd also like to thank the Navy, and Weston especially, for all the information and all the questions and the answers. I had plenty of questions. Everybody gave me answers: e-mails, telephones, Fed Ex, everything. And so I didn't have a problem getting any information I had, and I'd like to say thank you.

Ms. Hayes - Can you tell us that little story you told me about class?

Ms. Schader - Which one? I've had a meeting with my biology instructor who saw the nice article in the paper and really wanted to know what was going on, and he wanted to sit down and talk to me and find out what I had gotten myself into, for starters.

But the first day that the article ran in the paper -- I work full-time, and I go to school full-time. I come home at 10 o'clock, and there's a yellow sticky note on my front door, right there at the keyhole, for me to call one of my neighbors. She had a very big concern, you know, what's going on, what happened.

And the next morning, on my way out, there was someone else saying, "Well, what happened?" You know, "What's going on?" and, "I thought Mare Island was, you know, being cleaned up, and I thought it was safe." I was really upset because, you know, this is 10 o'clock at night, so I'm running in and trying to read a newspaper and figure out, what did happen? What happened? You know, that's it. A little bit of frustration.

Ms. Tygielski - One more thing I'd like to point out. The pictures that ran in the paper are of ordnance that was dug up and taken care of. There's literally -- they took the RAB members on a couple of tours? There's literally mounds of ordnance that they showed us that they cleaned up.

Mr. Karr - Myrna, as -- as a long-time president of Napa Solano Audubon Society, and I consider myself an environmental activist, I really wished I would've known that John

Randell was a raging, tree-hugging environmentalist, 'cause I'd have worked on him a lot more to help me write letters.

So I appreciate the Times Herald for pointing that out to me.

(applause)

Ms. Hayes - I don't think anybody can touch that line, Jerry, as always. I know, Chip, this sounds like a testimonial here, so -- I think it's your turn.

Mr. Gribble - This is interesting, because my vision has changed and I can't figure out which pair of glasses to wear. So I'd like to look at people, but I -- I can't see anything.

My name is Chip Gribble, and I work for the State of California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control, usually referred to DTSC for short. DTSC is the lead regulatory agency overseeing the environmental cleanup at Mare Island. Other regulatory agencies' activity involved are the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

I'm the project manager assigned to the Mare Island cleanup, and I've worked on Mare Island since 1993. Henry Chui is the second project manager with DTSC assigned to Mare Island.

Henry, would you please stand so we can acknowledge you? Thank you.

We also have two project managers from the Water Board: Mike Rochette, who's not here tonight, and Gary Riley.

Gary, would you please stand so people can see who you are? Thank you.

We also have two project managers from the United States EPA: Emily Roth -- Emily, would you please stand? -- and Carolyn d'Almeida, who is in the back. Thank you.

Altogether we have three agencies and six project managers actively working to ensure that the Mare Island cleanup is done properly and thoroughly in the best interest of protection of public health and the environment and this community. I'm not going to stand here today and tell you that everything is just fine, thanks, and that you don't have to bother with this stuff and that government will do the right thing without your paying attention.

I'm sure that many of you can list without any effort several sites not in Vallejo where these three regulatory agencies have performed substantially unsatisfactorily. I would not argue the point. I do want to say, however, that the six of us are very committed to doing the very best that we can for Mare Island.

For those of you that are not very familiar with us regulators and want to evaluate that for yourselves, and even for those of you who do know us and have spent considerable effort, personal effort to participate as a member of the public, I strongly suggest that you watch what we do and not just listen to what we say.

In this environmental-cleanup business, the perception of good work is just as important as actual good work itself, and it is very important and valuable that, when all the environmental problems have been cleaned up, that the community is confident that the cleanup was done properly and thoroughly.

One of the important purposes of this Restoration Advisory Board is, not to BS people about how great the cleanup is going, but to honestly earn the perception that it is being done well; and, sure, we should all be careful and vigilant that that perception is honestly earned.

What is relevant here today are two things: the question, is the cleanup being done properly and thoroughly, and No. 2, the fact this community has now been deprived of the opportunity to have confidence in the cleanup. As far as the question is concerned for the community, for this community, this community is entitled to answers and not just more opinions from regulatory agencies. As far as the community's ability to have confidence in the cleanup, effort should be taken to restore that to the extent possible and after -- and after the basis for such confidence has been reestablished.

While we are all caught up in the question as to whether the cleanup is or is not being done properly and thoroughly, I am compelled to say this, that this is the first site that I know of where the Navy and DOD have said, "We submit to CERCLA with respect to unexploded ordnance; tell us what you want us to do." This is the first site that I know of where the Navy and DOD have said, "We will remove all UXO detected regardless of depth."

I want to thank all of you for coming here tonight and, by doing so, demonstrating your interest in this community and the cleanup. I also want to especially thank the RAB members for their substantial commitment and effort to insure that this community gets a good cleanup. And I also want to thank the people who have worked on the cleanup, that have put their work into this -- that have put their work into this extra effort to make this cleanup the best.

There have been many more than a few people that have taken this cleanup seriously, as though this were their own backyard.

And if you would like to talk to me further regarding the Mare Island cleanup, you can reach me by phone. I'll give you my phone number: 510/540-3773. That's in Berkeley.

That's the end of my prepared statement. I have a few other things, comments I'd like to make in response to some of the other things I heard tonight. I apologize if I'm taking too much time. I know we're -- we're running short.

Site control. One of our concerns with -- with the project as a whole, and the Navy's performance, is site control. That's a major concern of ours. We have been on and off fairly uncomfortable about that. It is a very complicated situation because the use of Mare Island, as you all know, is constantly changing; and we are trying to work with the Navy to improve that. We are not satisfied at this point, and we think improvements need to be made on a -- on a continuous basis.

The other point I'd like to make is, the uplands magazine area, where the Navy said that you can never be sure that you're 100 percent free of ordnance, and in an apparent contradiction of that, although it's not a -- not a real contradiction, we have dispensed with the -- with the upland magazine area up there as far as an ordnance concern goes. That's based on the history and the efforts that the Navy has gone to, to demonstrate that we do not have an ongoing concern with residual UXO that we have yet to identify.

This is an -- is an unusual case and an exception. Other than that, for all the other sites -- probably for all the other sites on Mare Island where we have UXO -- UXO concern, once the Navy has been -- has completed the removal of whatever ordnance they can detect, we will probably still have a residual concern and will want to deal with that through site controls, permanent institutional site controls.

One more comment regarding the offshore areas. And the good things that I have already said about the Navy, that in -- in deference to that, or an exception to that, are the offshore areas. We have yet gotten with the Navy to commit to continuing that same effort, to extend that same effort to the offshore areas.

We are concerned that the Navy is -- is apparently reluctant to do that, and we -- we will be pushing the Navy to make the same commitment for the offshore areas that the Navy has done on the uplands areas, all the areas that are on the island.

We think that waiting for the ordnance to be buried through additional siltation is not an acceptable way to deal with it, or other statistical approaches or risk-based approaches or other approaches that are anything different than removal of all ordnance that can be detected. That is an ongoing concern of ours and a possibly major point of difference between the regulatory agencies and the Navy.

And I'm also left wondering that, if we get through this evaluation of all the allegations and find that there is no substance to them, I'm curious as to what the newspaper might -- might do with that story. And as one RAB member told me before the meeting here, that they were thinking of a headline that might be "NEVER MIND" in three-inch letters. Thank you.

Mr. Dunaway - Thanks, Chip.

John, you had a question?

Mr. Cerini - I just wanted to make one comment, and that is that the city has not received any direct information that causes us to believe that the Navy has done anything but a quality job in the cleanup areas in the UXO area, and we also have asked the Navy to provide us the results of their investigation because we also want to insure that the citizens of Vallejo are kept informed.

Mr. Dunaway - Thank you, John.
Emily?

Ms. Roth - Again, my name's Emily Roth. I'm from the US/EPA, and I should clarify that this site is not a federal Superfund site and we are not the lead agency. The state, DTSC, is the lead agency, and Chip is the lead agency project manager.

As Chip says, we are involved, and for both Carolyn and me it's practically a full-time job. We do very little else besides Mare Island. We -- we do not review every report produced by Mare Island. As all of you acknowledge and -- and know, that's very many -- there are very many reports.

I guess I feel like I do need to clarify exactly what our oversight role is. Not being lead agency, we do as much as we can to focus on the areas that we think are important, and we tend to review well the closure reports, for example, as the Navy gives us closure reports from one area to the next. And we are in the position to bring in expertise from time to time, and have done so with both RAD and we're in the position to bring in expertise on UXO as well, that we can access.

We don't provide a lot of field oversight. Having read the articles myself in the paper, I don't want there to be an illusion that the agencies are out there doing absolutely -- watching exactly everything that is being done and reviewing every QAQC report that's ever produced, because that's not the case; but we are given resources of the U.S. government on the environment these days and in the past. We do the best we can. So I guess that's my statement.

Mr. Dunaway - Thank you, Emily.

Are there any more questions from RAB members? If not, I'd like to open it to the floor for any comments or questions from the audience. If you have any, raise your hand. Wally will provide a microphone.

Mr. Stancombe - Good evening. My name's Al Stancombe. I'm a candidate for the Vallejo city council that came down tonight because I, too, was deluged with lots of e-mails and lots of phone calls, on my birthday weekend in Palm Springs, on the article that occurred on May 18th. I'm pretty appalled at the reporting here, and I agree with Diane here and this gentleman here about this.

I'm going to go away to my meetings of all my groups and basically tell them that we have a terrible Times Herald and they've -- they've caused a dilemma for the community. It's just really unfair. So I'm very comfortable with telling people that everything I've

heard here tonight, and all the reports, of letting them know that everything is okay.
Thank you.

Mr. Dunaway - Any additional questions or comments?

Ms. Shively - Thank you. Don't worry, I'm not gonna run over you. I'll save that for the Times Herald. I do want to congratulate all the RAB members for the years of dedicated service, and I hope you all saw in the newspaper my support for -- oh, excuse me, I'm Joanne Shively, Vallejo city council.

I felt that it was important for the public to be aware of the confidence that many of us are placing in this group and have for a number of years. I think it's a situation where, as bad as the newspaper really wanted everyone to believe, that there would've been a lot of Mare Island employees and military personnel blown up over there long before Mare Island closed. It's a shipyard with a history of 140 years, and there was a tremendous amount of ordnance handled over there during World War II and in the subsequent conflicts.

I want to encourage the Navy personnel to seek the advice and help of this group. Many of you were not on board when we did the Mare Island reuse plan here quite a few years ago. There was a committee of about 50 people from, not only Vallejo, but surrounding communities, and we produced a plan that has become the model for base reuse. So I think we have a lot of very good people here that can really assist you, and I strongly encourage you to utilize that.

In addition to the safety questions that have been raised by this newspaper article and -- I think someone said earlier it's a major disservice to the community, and we have a representative here tonight from one of the developers on Mare Island, and I'm sure he feels it's a major disservice to what is the economic development that we're trying to accomplish on Mare Island and the recovery of this community from a blow that was very difficult for us to -- to handle.

I-- I also feel that you need to do something to reestablish credibility with the community. You can see there aren't many community members here tonight. They're gonna get their information from the newspaper, which is where they got their concerns; and I truly think that you need to do what you can to address those concerns in a speedy, thorough, concise manner, and regain that credibility, although you did nothing to lose that. Someone took care of that for you.

I was very pleased to see that the Navy and DOD have previously addressed concerns, because that was one of the allegations in the newspaper, that concerns had been elevated and never addressed. Apparently that was also incorrect.

The safety-arc question, according to the newspaper, half of Vallejo should've been evacuated, and you expressed tonight that 1,250 feet or in some cases 2,500 feet was adequate.

Also, I think you explained quite clearly the training, because one of the allegations was also that some of the supervisors, the UXO supervisors, were not adequately trained and were supervising people with greater training than they had, which sort of looks like the pyramid upside down.

Anyway, thank you all for coming tonight. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak, and once again, my congratulations and gratitude to this group of dedicated citizens.

(applause)

Ms. Hayes - On behalf of the RAB, I want to thank Mrs. Shively for being here. Council members have one of those thankless volunteer jobs like we do, and they read or could read reams and reams of paper like we try to and -- and as they do.

So I know you have a very busy schedule, and we don't see council members and mayors here much more often than we see the newspaper representatives, but when -- when you -- you are here, it -- it does make a difference. And you are also one of the folks who goes back and has the ability to communicate, as we do, to the community about issues concerning cleanup, and we would welcome being invited to the council, which is televised, to give some type of briefing, abbreviated briefing maybe, where many more people could -- could see some of this basic -- some of the information. I feel -- Councilwoman Shively.

Ms. Shively - Tell me when you want to do it.

Ms. Hayes - Well, you tell us when there's a slot. All right? We'll get together and work with you on that.

In defense of the Vallejo Times Herald, I'm gonna go on record saying that I have worked with the newspaper for 13 years, and starting out with ferry service when it was scheduled to be abandoned, then when the community found out how valuable it was during the Loma Prieta earthquake.

That's where I began my relationship with the Vallejo Times Herald. And I've been highly critical of this particular series of articles because, unfortunately, I don't think that the investigative reporting got to some of the very basic issues that just didn't get covered in these articles and did plant fear in this community that I truly don't feel is valid.

If I thought that all of this was going to be launched at my house tomorrow morning, I'd probably know who instigated that. I'm gonna still live the two blocks from Mare Island that I live, and the least of my worries is whether these guys are gonna blow me up, and that's partly because we've developed a relationship, individual people we have gotten to know, and I think you heard that from the RAB.

Some people would say that we're spoon fed, that we've been brainwashed by the Navy, but I think you heard enough differences of opinion and -- and thoughts very passionately described tonight that you could be convinced that we aren't -- we have some of our faculties, except for me. Auto accidents do those things to you.

But I just want to remind all of us that it's individuals we get to know and trust. And I've had the privilege, as many other RABs have, to get to know workers and individuals in the cleanup process, and that's where our confidence comes from.

And I also want to say that, the Vallejo Times Herald I have a personal working relationship with, and unfortunately they don't pay their staff well. They come and go very quickly. They go on to really wonderful jobs other places. This is a stopping-off place on the way to really bigger and better things.

So I appreciate the fact that, while we're in a media sinkhole -- we don't get covered by San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, unless we've done something very bad, like steal a child or blow -- blow up a county building -- so we really do depend on the Times Herald and the reporters who are there, and, you know, this was one of their -- the editors called and talked to me for an hour and a half, to his credit, about some of our concerns.

I saw some changes in the writing style the very next day. And I would hope that you don't end your writing career, but you go on to do a better job and maybe you stay out of investigative reporting. But this is a good place to start. Don't go there.

Anyway, let's take a few more questions. Yes.

Ms. Heyen - Thank you. My name is Lily Heyen and this might come as a surprise to some of you, but there is another news source for Vallejo. I'm a reporter for Vallejonews.com. It's an on-line newspaper that covers just Vallejo. So you may want to check it out.

The question I have is, Paula, you mentioned that you felt that there should be an investigation of the allegations that were put forward in the articles, and the people from the Navy agreed, and I wondered if there was a timeline by which you would present some kind of a written response to the specific allegations.

Mr. Dunaway - I know that the audit we did last year addressed some of those questions, and to further investigate the allegations in the news articles, most -- most of that would be some repeat work. But we are gonna look at those allegations closely. I'll have to work with my management to see what kind of steps we can take to address that, but I couldn't tell you a timeline when we'd finish that.

Ms Heyen- Will you have a written response?

Mr. Dunaway - We generally would have to provide something in writing if we do this investigation, but, again, I can't confidently state when and how that will get done.

Ms. McFadden - Again, I reiterate what Jerry says about how we haven't established a investigation which would result in a report, but I think, taking some advice from Paula, we'll probably utilize this as an opportunity to put some information out in the public that will respond and inform, maybe not directly to the article, but to the issues and concerns that were raised. And I don't have a time, but I know we're gonna be talking about it a lot in the next week -- week or so and hopefully having something out in the near future.

Mr. Dunaway - Certainly this presentation here is to start rebuilding that trust, that credibility. So we're starting our process. We'll have to evaluate what next steps we'll have to take.

Additional questions from the audience? Adam?

Mr. Chavez - Okay. I just -- I just wanted to go along with my colleagues and say, you know, that maybe this was --

Ms. Hayes - It's not on.

Mr. Chavez - Am I on now?

Ms. Hayes - Yeah.

Mr. Chavez - Okay. To follow up with my colleagues' statements about the newspaper reporting, however -- it was sensational, however, on the other hand, I've got to say that I haven't seen this many people at a RAB meeting since I've been here, and so if nothing else, maybe that is good. Maybe we need sensationalism to get people of Vallejo out here to listen to us.

We are here for a purpose, and we -- I hate to use the word ignore, but if we don't have the town supporting us, the Navy doesn't listen to us, the developers don't listen to us. So in other words, I'd like to thank the Times Herald or whatever, because at least we got heard. And unless there's a early transfer or some other program, we basically come here, sit through it, and talk to ourselves. So I wanted to just put that in.

Mr. Dunaway - Basically a comment, Adam.

III. Public Comments

If there are no additional questions -- I know we're running behind time -- our next step was a public-comment period. If there are no comments to be made about anything about the Mare Island program, I want to really quickly go through the administrative business for the RAB.

IV. Administrative Business - April minutes to be finalized.

Each of you should have a packet in front of you, and what you received in the mail also. You received the March meeting minutes and -- no, they should've been the April meeting minutes. Sorry, a typo on the agenda. The April meeting minutes are in your packet. If you have comments to those, please provide those. Otherwise, we'll finalize those in the next meeting.

Rescheduling August RAB Meeting to 8/23 to avoid Labor Day Weekend Conflicts

A reminder. August RAB meeting date is rescheduled to the 23rd to avoid the Labor Day weekend; and the original priority topic for this meeting was the reissuance of the finding of site suitability for early transfer, the Lennar early transfer, as people are calling it. Again, no ordinance areas. It's the area with no color right here.

Lennar FOSET focus group meeting

We did issue that document on May 17th for additional 30-day public-comment period. Because we weren't able to discuss it tonight, I'm offering to do a RAB focus group meeting sometime before the end of that comment period. The comment period ends on June 18th.

And I propose some dates -- I've included my typical co-chair report, and I propose some dates in there for the second -- I believe the second and third week of -- of June, before that date. So please discuss among yourselves and -- and e-mail. Let me know what dates are good for you all.

With that, I think we're gonna break. Okay.

Ms. Hayes - Something not on the agenda is the co-chairs' reports because we dispensed with the reports, but there's two things that I want to say. Actually, three things.

We have prepared -- I'm talking to myself here -- we have prepared, as RAB community members, a letter to the editor for the Times Herald and the other papers that the stories were run in, and I want to just make sure that all the community members of the RAB got a chance to take a look at that and make sure you're comfortable with it, and if you are, to sign a copy that Diana has.

We try to do things in a democratic fashion here, unlike maybe the way the City of Vallejo has the image of -- of having historically done things, so we're not gonna include a community member's name on this letter if you don't feel comfortable with the letter.

Also, besides that date that Jerry mentioned or those dates for a focus group meeting about the finding of suitability for early transfer document, Weston -- Pat Kelly of Weston has -- they're very close to publishing their environmental assessment on their reuse proposal for the dredge ponds. They would like to meet with us, any member of the public, but the RAB members hopefully on June 12th, Wednesday. I think the 12th. It might be the 13th.

Ms. Tygielski - 13th is Wednesday.

Ms. Hayes - 13th is Wednesday. Wednesday the 13th. They're coming before counsel they expect on the 12th, and they'd like to meet with us to go over some of those -- their answers to those hard questions that Rob posed a lot of.

And then very last thing that I want to do is give each one of the members of the RAB a mug that I drug back in a bag on the carry-on from Jerry and my conference we went to in Denver that was hosted by the Chief of Naval Operations environmental-cleanup program. I scooped on these and thought that it was only fair that you at least get something for all your hard work over the years. So grab one, each one of the RAB members.

Mr. Chavez - Is that a bribe?

V. Open House

Mr. Dunaway - For the end of our meeting, I know we're past 9 o'clock, but if I could ask some of our special guests that helped us with the presentation to stick around a few minutes in case there are any questions from the community members, and we will have refreshments in the back also. So with that, we'll close the formal portion of the meeting, and thank you all for attending.

Ms. Hayes - And we appreciate your donations to the refreshment kitty. The Navy doesn't pay for that.

Adjourned (9:06 PM)

All meeting attendees introduced themselves.