

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY JANUARY 29, 2004**

Mr. Jerry Dunaway, RAB co-chair called the January 2004 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) to order at 7:10 PM (1910 hours) with Five (5) RAB members; Eleven (11) Regulatory Agency & Navy Representatives; Eight (8) Community members and guests; and community relations' staff from CDM, Inc., including Doris M. Bailey, Court Reporter, in attendance.

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Co-Chair)
- Michael R. Coffey
- Jerry Karr
- Diana Krevsky
- Paula Tygielski

Regulatory Agency & Navy Representatives in attendance:

- Jerry Dunaway (Co-chair)
- Gary Riley
- Jeff Morris
- Diane Fowler
- Carolyn d'Almeida
- Cris Jespersen
- Henry Chui
- Michelle Trotter
- Chip Gribble
- Ray Leftwich
- David Godsey

Community Members and Guests in attendance:

- Brenda McConathy
- Sheila Robuck
- Kent Weingard
- Randy Rose
- Melissa Diamant
- Dennis Robinson
- Diji Christian
- Richard Meyer

RAB Support from CDM:

- Regina Clifford
- Doris M. Bailey, Court Reporter
- Wally Neville

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 PM (1910 hours)

I. Welcome and Introductions

MR. DUNAWAY: Good evening, everyone. Happy New Year. This is our first RAB meeting for 2004. My name is Jerry Dunaway, I'm the RAB Navy co-chair, and my community co-chair, Myrna Hayes, is right here.

We'll start with introductions of folks around the table and those in the audience, and proceed into those two presentations, which are generally just updates to a couple of cleanups that are underway already.

So let's first start with the introductions.

Attendees introduced themselves, as requested.

II. PRESENTATION: Marine Corps Firing Rang Removal Action Update (Kent Weingard, Tetra Tech FW)

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Wally. Why don't I go ahead and invite Kent up to the front. He's going to actually do the presentation on the Marine Corps Firing Range update.

Kent Weingard is with Foster Wheeler Tetra Tech, and they are the Navy's contractor conducting that cleanup.

The handout that you have that looks like this is the presentation, and let me turn it over to Kent.

MR. WEINGARD: Thanks, Jerry. Hopefully this time I'll remember to talk into the microphone.

MS. HAYES: If you forget, I'll remind you.

MR. WEINGARD: I remember that you do that.

MS. HAYES: We're a good team, aren't we?

MR. WEINGARD: Absolutely. Okay. I don't know how visible this is, but you all have the handouts. I don't know if there's anything I can do. Is that better? Okay. Do you think maybe dimming the lights?

I don't know if that will help. Too dark? Okay.

Mr. Kent Weingard

Okay. As Jerry said, I'm Kent Weingard, I'm with Tetra Tech FW or Foster Wheeler, formally Foster Wheeler, now we call it Tetra Tech FW.

I'm here to talk about the project we're making for the Navy at the Marine Corps Firing Range. It's a time critical removal action Marine Corps Firing Range on Mare Island, and that also includes the Historic Outfall 4S.

A bit of a project overview. Again, this is a time critical removal action under CERCLA. Approximately 70,000 cubic yards of potentially impacted soil from the use of this site as a firing range.

The contaminants that we're concerned with out at the site primarily associated with bullets and bullet fragments are lead, copper, antimony, and zinc.

Also included in this project is a removal at Outfall 4S, which is primarily screening for MEC, munitions and explosives of concern, as well as Rad point sources. And that's associated with a removal action that was partially begun by another contractor, and then it was wrapped into this project, and we'll be finishing it up.

The planned approach for the site, as I presented this a few months ago to you all, is to basically excavate the impacted soil, perform some sort of screening on the soil, and then characterize the soil that is excavated.

And if it's hazardous then characterize it as hazardous, it would be disposed of off-site at a permitted and approved landfill. Or for that soil that was non-hazardous, we would be looking at potential reuse on-site or at the Mare Island landfill. Those options were left open and available in the work plans that we prepared in the action memorandum.

This is just an aerial photograph of the site; I also have one over on the board on this side. This is actually the most recent aerial photograph that we took; it was taken just at the end of December. And if you'd seen some of the earlier photographs, one of the main things you're going to notice is that one of the first things we did when we came out to the site is we did sort of a massive clearing and grubbing of the site, removing a lot of the vegetation that had overgrown so that we could actually see what we're dealing with in working on the site.

But just very quickly, it's about a twenty-acre site with the rifle range over on this side and the former pistol ranges over on this side.

The pistol ranges are basically divided into three areas: the south pistol range, central pistol range, and north pistol range, and then we have the firing range itself.

And over in this area you'll see some of the previous excavation work that was done associated with the Historic Outfall 4S, which we will continue the work in that area. I'll refer back to that -- well, I can just point out a few other things on the map right now while we're looking at it so you know when you see the, when you're looking at it, what these different things are.

These two large black areas and this one white area right here are stockpiled soil that we have already excavated from the site, basically starting in the south pistol range and the central pistol range.

We haven't done any excavation in the north pistol range or in the firing range yet, but so far we've generated these three stockpiles totaling about 15,000 yards of soil.

This area right here is where we had our screen plant set up, and I'll talk about that a little bit later, that's the physical mechanical screen plant that we were using for the soil and the pond or the tank that's associated. And it's a wet screening process; I talked about that earlier, the last time I was here.

And these are some other areas where we are going to be stockpiling soil. You'll see the orange fence all around the site, and that sort of represents some of our boundaries and some of our storm water control measures at the site. A silt fence, hay bales for storm water control.

Those are sort of the key features of the site I think to point out at this point.

Just to give you a real quick project status, after our last meeting here we did, we ended up finalizing our work plans, and those went through public review and were accepted and approved, and we ended up mobilizing to the site in early September.

We initiated our excavation activities on schedule in October, and completed the baseline excavation in the south pistol range as I noted over there in November, yeah, in November.

Then we initiated excavation in the north -- in the central pistol range actually that should say, my mistake, in the November, December timeframe. As I mentioned earlier, approximately 15,000 cubic yards that we've excavated to date.

And we initiated screening operations in December. Our screening operations were slightly delayed due to an issue revolving around some habitat issues at the site, and making sure we were avoiding some potential habitat for the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, and we had to work some issues out with that.

What we've accomplished so far in the work we've done out at the site so far. On the map that you have, one of the areas over here on the north side of the site, it's a triangular area, we call that the safety fan area, there's actually never any actual firing that was supposed to have gone on in that area so there was no planned excavation.

However, we completed a thorough sampling of that nature, we sampled on a fifty foot grid basis, two depths completely across the area.

I don't know, Randy, do you remember about how many samples we took, about one had you been 26 locations?

MR. ROSE: I believe it was 126.

MR. WEINGARD: About 126. All of those results came back below our target cleanup goals for the contaminants of concern, so that's a pretty good indication that it was as it should be, was not used for any firing, and we didn't detect any other type contaminants of concern. Every fifth sample we actually sampled for a broader suite of contaminants beyond the lead, copper, antimony, and zinc.

Other things we've completed. We've completed the demolition of a number of structures that were on the site that were on top of the firing ranges or in the way of us completing some of the construction activities we had planned.

We constructed on-site haul roads for trucks to haul the soil around the site.

We've disposed of 37 truckloads of wood debris.

We recycled about eight truckloads of wood debris.

We generated a lot of debris from the demolition of these structures, and we look for opportunities wherever possible to recycle that, and that's the way it's broken down so far.

We've also recycled about fifteen bin loads of scrap metal from these various facilities and scrap metal that was found on site.

That basically summarizes where we've gotten to on the project at this point.

So now I'm going to kind of talk about a couple of the key developments on the project. The main key development is that the screening plant, the screening system that we had planned for the site, we got out there, we started using it in the December timeframe, it's a wet screening technology, and we ran into some major difficulties with that technology in dealing with these types of soils.

We did anticipate some challenges with this technology, but the challenges we ran into were pretty major with this particular approach, and really resulted in the formation of clay balls and a lot of clumping and clogging of the clay on the site. And the technologies really ended up not being very effective, so we had to kind of make a decision pretty quickly because it's very expensive equipment to have out there on a monthly basis, and we made the decision to actually stop doing the screening operation, this was in combination with the Navy, and I know the Navy talked to the regulators as well somewhat, I'm not sure of all the discussions there.

But the decision was made to demobilize the screening plant, and to sort of take another look at the project approach and how we're going to deal with these soils that we're excavating.

So in combination with that decision on the screening plant, we developed a revised course of action; Tetra Tech Foster Wheeler did, in combination with the Navy, and we've discussed that with the Navy.

This revised course of action kind of takes a step back from the approach we were taking. It's looking at a more comprehensive pre-sampling of the site to better define the areas where contamination actually exists. And I'll give you a little status on what's going on with that pre-sampling a little bit later.

We're also going to continue to evaluate a couple of alternative technologies. There are a couple of other approaches we think we can take with this soil that would be effective, potentially, to screen them.

However, at this point with the results we've had with the screening plant so far we've kind of been taking a step back and saying anything we propose we're going to probably very carefully go through a testing program, make sure it works before we plunge into a full scale operation at the plant at the site.

The other decision that we made in this revised course of action, the other thing we've run into in terms of the excavation we've done so far out there is we, as you might know that live in the area, the rainy season kind of hit us right on

target in the, primarily in the December timeframe and a little bit earlier than that, and with the particular soil conditions at the site, the torrential rains that hit us out there really put a damper on production.

MS. HAYES: A damper.

MR. WEINGARD: Yeah. Very difficult to deal with some of those situations. So one of the decision that was also made is that we were going to delay the work at the Outfall 4S until after the rainy season. That's a piece of work that we can still proceed with. It's not necessarily affected by this screening operation.

And at this point we've just made the decision to move that off until approximately the April timeframe. We are proceeding, and then the other development in combination with this revised course of action is we are continuing to proceed with this pre-sampling approach. And do you understand what I'm talking about with the pre-sampling? Basically what we're -- I'll show you a map a little bit later, which will describe it.

Why are we doing the, why are we looking at the revised sampling approach? Really the objective here is originally we were looking at about 70,000 yards of potentially impacted soil. If technology was very effective and very efficient at handling those soils, then it would make sense to just go ahead and excavate and process those soils, not necessarily knowing exactly, well taking a more, let's just excavate it and get it processed through approach rather than very carefully defining where the contamination is.

Under this new approach we want to get better site characterization to try and minimize the actual quantities of soil that we would have to excavate and deal with, in case the technology that's applicable in these soils is much more costly and not as efficient as we'd hoped.

We've kind of looked at dividing the site into two categories based on our historical knowledge of the site, low risk areas and high-risk areas. The low risk areas we'd take more of the standard sampling approach of the fifty foot grids and two depths, and the high-risk areas we'd do a more thorough sampling with more depth increments and also doing some trenching into the berms and whatnot to get a better, more thorough characterization of where the contamination is.

And that's basically, yeah, basically what I say in the next slide. All in all, this revised sampling approach that covers the entire site would result in approximately 1,200 samples.

This is just kind of a map of the sampling approach that, the pre-sampling approach that we're proposing. The yellow areas are basically what we're calling the low risk areas, and the blue areas are what we're calling the high-risk areas.

Obviously the blue areas are in the impact berms, that's where all the bullets should have been fired and most of the contamination will be.

And the little dots on the nodes of the fifty by fifty foot grids are where, are our sampling locations.

We've also got some indications, some bold indications in here; this is where we're currently proposing doing some trenching into the berms. We'll do trenching into the berms and acquire samples from within the berms as well.

Would it be appropriate to give a status on how much sampling we've done so far?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. WEINGARD: Right now we've pretty much completely sampled all the yellow area on the backside of the berm back here.

We've pretty much sampled all of the yellow area in the north pistol range.

We've sampled all of the yellow area along this berm here.

And we've gotten into quite of a bit of the back part of the rifle range at this point.

We haven't done any sampling yet in the high-risk areas. And just briefly on the results, I have a sheet in the back there with some numbers. But I think it's roughly -- we've done about 130 locations, Randy?

MR. ROSE: Correct.

MR. WEINGARD: About 130 locations that we have results on, and the results have only come back above the target cleanup level in three locations. And it's in those three locations, it's really only been slightly above the target cleanup level, our target cleanup level being 200 PPM for lead, and we're also looking for the other contaminants, but they're not coming anywhere close to being a concern.

The samples we've done for lead, however, three of them, of the 130 locations have come up above the target cleanup goal, target cleanup goal 200, the

exceedences have been within the 200 to 300 range. So just slightly above. So this is actually what we should be expecting in these low risk areas.

This isn't really where the bullets were fired, primarily they were fired into the impact berms. Sure there could be some scatter of bullets in the floors, but that's really not where you're going to expect most of the contamination to be. So, so far we think the findings are kind of correlating with what we would expect.

Just a quick look ahead at what we're planning on doing. We're going to continue our sampling approach according to that last map that I just showed you. Primarily sampling in the rifle range and continuing into the high-risk areas.

We're continuing to investigate alternative technologies for cleaning the soils.

We're also continuing to investigate stabilization technologies. That's another approach other than screening the soils that could help us with the soils that we actually have to end up excavating.

Stabilization. Stabilize the lead so it doesn't leach and could help the soil not be classified as hazardous waste and, again, could potentially be reused at the Mare Island landfill.

And we've done some pilot scale testing -- not pilot scale testing, we've done laboratory scale testing on some stabilization technologies, and we've found some things that work and some things that don't at this point. We're wrapping up an initial study right now and should have the report from our stabilization subcontractor probably within the next week.

And these following slides are really just photos of the site showing the excavation. This is excavation, I believe, in the south pistol range. It's where we got the, most of the soil from so far.

It's just another photograph of excavation and doing dust control. We're continually doing dust control when it's dry, and also air monitoring. And all of our air monitoring results have been in good compliance.

That's just a look at the completed excavation, what the south pistol range looks like after our baseline excavation.

We're doing some, we did some demolition on-site as I mentioned, that's demolition of a building M159. That's a building that used to be located right

here, there's a large concrete building, and basically we just really needed that space for stockpiling soils that we excavate.

There's a picture of what the screen plant did look like, it's not there anymore, but that's what it did look like with the conveyors leading to and from the screen plant, the wet screen plant.

This might -- well, this is a screened soils. And one of the things I wanted to point out, this is, one of the problems is we're generating a pile of soil here and a pile of soil over here and then some more soil over there, and really that's not the way that we wanted this process to work.

We wanted, these piles should be very, very little soil going into these piles, and all we should see the bullets coming into these piles, but what we're seeing, because of the problems we ran into, is a lot of the soil is just going right where the bullets should go to and we're not getting an effective separation.

And this is just kind of a closeup of one of those piles of, this is actually soil, it kind of looks like little balls. It shouldn't be soil at all, this is where the bullets should be. But what we're getting is these little balls of soil. That's what we were getting with the screen plant.

And that's about all I have to present. So I guess we could open it up to questions.

Questions and Answers

MS. KREVSKEY: I have a question. Could you go over some of the potential technologies that you're considering? And also just go over again, explain stabilization technology. You kind of went over that and I -- if you don't mind repeating it?

MR. WEINGARD: I'll start with some of the other technologies. The other technologies we're primarily looking at have to do with other ways to screen the soil or to potentially pre-treat the soil.

Part of the problem we're running into with the screening process is you can't, it's very difficult to screen it in a dry condition because you have all these clay clumps there that don't tend to want to break down, and it's very difficult to screen it in a wet condition because you add water to it and it tends to form these balls and these difficult clay masses to deal with.

So we're looking at ways of potentially either using an alternative screening technology, we've talked about trammel screens which could break some of the clay clumps up so that the stuff could actually pass through a screen, or some thermal technologies. Or there's a technology that Dave has brought up -- I can't even remember what it's called right now.

MR. GODSEY: Attrition scrubber.

MR. WEINGARD: Attrition scrubber. Anyways, it boils down with ways to make the soil, turn the soil into a condition that it could actually go through a screen plant. Those are the primary alternative technologies we're looking at.

And then as far as stabilization: Stabilization is basically taking the soil, one of the main reasons why the soil -- we want the soil to be hopefully classified as non-hazardous waste. If it's non-hazardous waste, if it's hazardous waste it's very costly to dispose of.

And one of the things, the primary thing that makes this soil or that is going to make this soil hazardous waste is that it fails a leach test, meaning they add a leachate solution to it and extract the contaminants from the soil, and then they analyze that leachate solution.

And what stabilization does is you actually add a chemical or some sort of a substance to the soil that will prevent the lead, primarily lead is what we're talking about here, that will prevent the lead from leaching out into that solution, and then failing that test.

Or if you look at it from the more, from a more global perspective, the idea with the leach test is you're going to put this soil in the ground somewhere else, you don't want that lead to leach out and get into the groundwater.

So stabilization is adding a chemical, it could be, there's proprietary agents, fly ash, lye, cement that will bind with the lead and not allow it to, it will bind with the lead and the soil and not allow water or other leachate solutions to leach that contaminant out of the soil and then ultimately get into the groundwater. So it's basically just a chemical additive, some sort of an additive to the soil that you would mix in.

MS. KREVSKY: You're thinking in terms of in place, stabilizing in place or transport, so that once it's, you know, stabilized you're transporting it somewhere else?

MR. WEINGARD: Yeah, we have not considered stabilization in place for this particular site.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: If you stabilize it in place, well, if you stabilize it, even though you may not, you may pass the leachate test, it's still a California waste, right, so you would still have to dispose of it out of state?

MR. WEINGARD: No, not necessarily, but I'll accept a correction if I'm wrong on this. There is a specific California leach test; it's the STLC test that's a California test.

If we pass the TCLP, that's the Federal test or the RCRA test, that one is actually fairly easy to pass.

It's the California test, the STLC that's actually very difficult to pass, and that's the test that right now we think we would fail that would cause the soil to be classified as a Cal hazardous waste or what they call a non-RCRA hazardous waste.

But stabilization of the soil could still allow the soil to be a non-hazardous waste by California or RCRA standards, as I understand it.

MR. KARR: On the 37 trucks of wood that you disposed of, did that go to a composting wood or is it --

MR. WEINGARD: It's a landfill.

MR. KARR: Landfill. Because it was contamination issues or what? It just seemed like it would be a good source to put back into that operation, composting.

MR. WEINGARD: Non-hazardous wood debris, Randy, went to a commercial landfill?

MR. ROSE: Correct.

MR. WEINGARD: Non-hazardous landfill?

MR. ROSE: Correct.

MR. WEINGARD: Yeah. We put it out, what we did is we actually put it out as a competitive bid to several, to at least three subcontractors as to what to do with

the soil to give us the most cost effective price, and ultimately just chose the cost effective price.

If there is a, we really don't have much more wood to deal with at the site at this point but, you know, we'd consider alternate ideas if you have some.

But that's kind of the way we made the decision on that, price driven.

MS. HAYES: I think Jerry wasn't, I don't know that his answer really got fully answered, Kent. 37 truckloads went to a landfill or a transfer station?

MR. WEINGARD: Went to a landfill.

MS. HAYES: Was that landfill in Solano County?

MR. WEINGARD: Do you know what landfill it went to Randy?

MR. ROSE: I believe it was Forward.

MR. WEINGARD: Forward Landfill.

MR. ROSE: Manteca.

MS. HAYES: Manteca. Because generally California is trying to reduce waste that's ending up in its landfills and it has a pretty stringent law about that, and so I think Jerry has a valid point.

What made you choose between the 37 truckloads you took to the dump, and the eight that you recycled which is what we also have laws in place to try to encourage in deconstruction projects?

MR. WEINGARD: We did a pretty good search between, both our company and we worked with the navy on this in finding places that wanted to take the wood to reuse it basically, and that's where the eight truckloads went. They went to somebody who actually were going to take the wood and were going to be able to reuse it.

MS. HAYES: They were going to reuse it as wood?

MR. WEINGARD: (Nodded head.)

MS. HAYES: So why didn't you consider for the 37 truckloads going to a composting facility?

MR. WEINGARD: The way we approach most of our disposal is we do consider that, and we always write our, we're looking for subcontractors to take the wood away to transport and dispose of it, and we leave it open for either recycling or disposal. And quite often we don't get anyone that comes back and says we have a place to recycle this wood.

MS. HAYES: Well, I don't know a county in California that doesn't have a place to recycle wood now if it doesn't have a contaminant load. So I'm very disappointed. And this wasn't presented to us at your previous presentation that you were going to go with low bid and just go to whoever was handy to dump it in a dump.

MR. WEINGARD: We don't --

MS. HAYES: This is one reason why you bring the whole plan to us at the Restoration Advisory Board, not just what you thought was handy to bring to us. We're not chartered just to cover CERCLA. Our RAB is pretty comprehensive, I think.

MR. DUNAWAY: I think the way Kent responded is that we are chartered to do this project most cost effectively, and the market conditions just prevailed in stating that disposal at a landfill was the cheapest way to go. I think that's all we can say at this point.

MS. HAYES: Well, it's not in tune with what we have --

MR. DUNAWAY: Are there any other questions?

MR. LEFTWICH: Lennar's proposal for the residential neighborhoods up in the area right around the rifle range calls, there's going to be a roadway kind of crossing over the eastern-most section of the rifle range. Is there any plans, is there expedited cleanup of that portion of the rifle range?

MR. DUNAWAY: Actually Lennar has asked the Navy if we could take a look at possibly doing a license for that particular area. And, as Kent pointed out, this particular area here is the low risk area, and they had completed sampling in the area. I don't know if we have all the data back for that area, but we'll take a look at that data, look at the license requests, and possibly allow some work to happen in that area based on the conditions there.

As far as transferring the property to the city and then to Lennar, that would have to come at a later date.

MR. GRIBBLE: Is that your answer to your question?

MR. LEFTWICH: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: I had a number of questions. And one of which was, well actually what I wanted to state first, in the presentation you talked a lot about this revised sampling strategy to better characterize the site, and I just, to make sure people understand, that's something that was thought about once upon a time, but we didn't start out that way. I expect you would agree with this. Because the intent here was to expedite the cleanup, and to just charge ahead and get it done as quickly as possible.

One of the drivers for that was the surrounding Lennar development. And even though it sounds like it makes more sense, why didn't you sample before you started digging, but this was an expedited project to accommodate Lennar in large measure.

And with the delay that we now experience because of the weather and the technical complications, I would like to hear -- Sheila, could you comment for us for our benefit as to how Lennar is viewing this and what's the impact to your development plans?

MS. ROBUCK: Obviously we'd prefer if it had worked. But we, we're working with the Navy to try to minimize the effect on our development. I think that some of the areas that we were going to build homes we're going to have to delay, especially in this eastern area, although as Jerry mentioned, we're talking to them about the license agreement.

In the areas that are going to be adjacent to the homes that we're going to build, we understand that that's clean, so we're not worried about the fact that the work that is in the other areas hasn't all been done.

To the extent that we can work with the Navy and do some of the construction that we need to do to make the development happen, we'll do that. And we've only begun those discussions pretty recently. In fact, I just got the exhibit that we need to provide to request the license agreement through the city just today. So that's something that we're hoping to get done in the next few weeks or couple of months.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. So I assume at some point, Jerry, we'll be talking about LRRF or some type of sign-off from DTSC allowing such an agreement, license agreement or lease agreement to go forward?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, I was expecting that, but from what I understand, and that's why we're just really starting the discussion about this potential license. I need to talk with our real estate folks.

I understand there is not a lease for the Marine Corps Firing Range to the city of Vallejo, so a lease restriction revision form wouldn't apply in this case because there's no lease to revise.

So what we would do in the course of a license, of course, is to present what the license is requesting and let the agencies have a voice in that also. Obviously we would want your input before we license any other kind of reuse for the property before closure.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Good. Thank you; and a couple of other questions.

On the buildings with the structures that were demolished, like the M159, I can't remember that much out there, but did any of these structures have lead based paint coatings? And, if so, then I think we need to take that into account when we do our comprehensive sampling here.

So it was something to think about that we can talk about next week in our conversation on the site if any of those structures did have lead based paint coatings, because that would, I would think that might want to change the density, sampling density in that particular location or those locations.

MR. DUNAWAY: I know most of the wood were unpainted because they were just dividers between the pistol ranges. But maybe you can talk about the structures.

MR. WEINGARD: Yeah, real quick. There was one, there was a backstop structure back here, it was not painted or anything like that, but it definitely was creosote, it was coated with creosote. And the soil that, there was soil underneath it as well that definitely was mounded up underneath it that also has kind of a reek of creosote.

And we actually took that soil and we stockpiled it separately. We moved it, stockpiled it separately, and will sample it differently and make sure we look for those contaminants in that stockpile.

So I mean that's a good point with that particular wood. And also that wood that creosote wood definitely can't be recycled because it has the creosote contaminants on it.

MS. HAYES: That's all I asked you.

MR. WEINGARD: Yeah, I'll come back to that in a second if I could.

The building we demolished here we actually did sample for asbestos and lead, and it was below levels of concern from a lead based paint standard. There was detection of lead, but it was, the debris ended up being characterized as non-hazardous debris because of the levels of, the levels were very, very low, and we did not find asbestos of concern in that building either. We did sample it, and there was a previous survey on the building as well.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. And one more question. On the safety fan to the north, you said all the data that came back were below the screening criteria, which is 200. And can you, we haven't seen the data yet, but can you give me a little more than that? In other words, are we looking at numbers that are almost entirely in the fifty range or around the 200 range?

MR. WEINGARD: No, fifties and lower. Fifties.

Randy, can you, can you -- do you remember?

MR. ROSE: Yeah, there was very few that were even above fifty.

MR. WEINGARD: Right.

MR. ROSE: I don't think there was any at all that were above 75.

MR. WEINGARD: Right.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WEINGARD: And can I say one more thing on the debris? I talked to Randy back there too, and he reminded me, because we do, we always look at options for recycling everything. We've recycled a lot of the metal from this site and a lot of wood.

Another reason why we didn't on this particular wood is it was, it's all mixed in with a lot of other stuff, it's mixed in with concrete and asphalt and other things that a recycler, it may just not be cost effective or recyclers may not want to take it. But we always look at that option.

And we have some wood remaining out on site that will need to be disposed of, and I'll promise you we'll look harder at recycling options for that material.

MS. HAYES: I actually have a question if nobody else does, other than about wood.

MR. DUNAWAY: If there's no other questions, Myrna has one more.

MS. HAYES: I don't know if it's one more. Out of the 15,000 yards that you've excavated, maybe I just didn't pay close enough attention, but how much of that was transportable to the Mare Island Landfill, how much fit that category, and what, of what you've excavated do you have it stockpiled on site? I didn't get that information very clearly.

And let me see if there's any other questions so you can answer those both at the same time. I guess the other question I have is when you start working in April, will we have had some kind of presentation before then about what you're going to do, what other solution you've come up with?

MR. DUNAWAY: I think I can answer the excavated soil. We intended to sample for disposal purposes after the screening operation. And because we weren't able to screen it, we weren't able to characterize where the soil would go. It's all stockpiled on site. Those are those stockpiles you see right here. And so it's just awaiting how to treat that soil. So kind of in a nutshell.

The problem is not cleaning up the site, we got to site cleanup goals here, we got to site cleanup goals here, it's dealing with what we took out of the site.

And the screening was to get the bullets, you know. We all know what a bullet looks like, you have a lead slug or a projectile or you may have a complete cartridge, it's getting that out of the soil so that we can then just sample the soil for what it has in it, which may be lead contamination, and that lead contamination would be the basis of where we dispose of the soil.

And we will definitely, once we finish our evaluation of what other technologies will be applicable here, do another presentation of what we plan to do in conjunction with working with the regulators before we make any decisions.

So if there are no more questions, thank you, Kent. And we were planning that evaluation to be completed roughly at the end of March, so possibly the March RAB meeting would be the time we would do that presentation of the alternatives that we screened or evaluated for screening. It might be into April, depending on how far we get.

With that, why don't I invite Jeff Morris for the next presentation? This is a Lennar project on the eastern early transfer parcel, and I think you've seen possibly some of the work going on on Azuar, or at least I know I did.

But let me turn it over to Jeff.

**III. PRESENTATION: Investigation Area D Cleanup Update
(Mr. Jeff Morris, CH2MHill)**

MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Jerry. I'm going to break at least one rule and not use the overhead or a projector.

MS. HAYES: We don't have rules about that.

Mr. Jeff Morris

Oh. So you need two things in front of you, one is a copy of the handout, and the other is this eleven by seventeen map that is really part of the Lennar update in the second half of the agenda, but I will refer to it during the presentation here. Everybody has the two things? Okay.

As Jerry mentioned, I'm going to give just an update on the work that's going on right now in investigation areas D1 and D2.

D2 is this area here, which is the former Farragut Village housing area.

D1 is this larger area here, which includes former housing south of the school, part of Farragut Village, as well as Coral Seas. And I mention those two because those are of primary interest for the development, future development plans.

The topics I'll cover, I'm just going to give a very brief overview, and I'm on the second slide now, a very brief overview of the driver here and why we're talking about these topics tonight.

I have one slide on investigation area D2 and just what the status of closure is for that.

The remainder of the presentation is focused on the investigation area D1 area. I want to talk about the remedial action plan and what the status of that is, talk about some of the removal actions that we are currently conducting, and then talk about the, kind of wrap it up, and the steps forward here to achieve closure, and then we'll have questions.

Onto the overview slide. Really it's the development schedule that's driving the cleanup schedule. And it's important for the overall development of Mare Island that we're able to sell property in these areas that I mentioned here, in the former housing areas, so that new construction can occur. And before we can sell property we need to get the NFA certification from DTSC, and all the regulatory agencies --

MS. HAYES: Don't use acronyms; we have guests.

MR. MORRIS: Yeah, I need to be reminded of that, thank you.

We need to get no further action certification from the regulatory agencies before the property can be sold. It's critical now to get that NFA certification, no further action certification by September of this year. So that's the target that we've set, that's the target we're working towards, and that's what's driving the work that's ongoing right now.

In investigation area D2 we're almost there. We've got one last environmental issue that needs addressing, that's 9th and Tisdale, and I'll talk about that.

And then in investigation area D1 there's multiple environmental issues and actions going on concurrently with reporting and documentation that's also being prepared at the same time.

On the next slide, investigation area D2, we submitted a no further action remedial action plan in early 2002, and that went through the public comment period and review process. We had submitted a final remedial action plan to the agencies later that year.

Before that remedial action plan was signed, we encountered an unknown condition just west of the school here, the 9th and Tisdale site, that was about a year ago now, and we've talked a lot about that over the past year. That was a petroleum contamination site, it was discovered during some geotechnical exploration that was being conducted, and a rather large soil removal was completed throughout the year last year.

After that soil removal was completed, DTSC actually signed the D2 remedial action plan, they signed it in October this past year, but we haven't yet obtained the NFA certification for that area. And we still are working with the regional board and DTSC to get closure of the 9th and Tisdale site.

And in essence, the remaining issue there is we're monitoring groundwater, the wells were installed during that removal action, a report is being prepared and submitted within a couple of weeks to the agencies that describes the, summarizes the soil removal action and also some groundwater sampling results.

My understanding is that DTSC, when they review the groundwater sampling results, will likely sign the no further action certification. We still need to, depending on the results -- but I can say that the rounds of sampling that we have gotten back show no significant impacts to the groundwater. So I expect that they, that that will get signed.

We still need to work with the regional board to get closure of that site.

Okay. Investigation area D1, I'm now on the next slide. There we prepared a draft remedial action plan that was submitted to the agencies in October of last year. The public comment period of that remedial action plan is scheduled for March, two months away. From there we would then address the public comments, revise the remedial action plan, it would go through another agency review and a final remedial action plan, all to be prepared by June of '04 on the current schedule.

There are several environmental concerns that are impacting soil in groundwater in investigation area D1, and that's what we are currently working on now and what has been going on for the last couple of months. And we've really gotten several things going on in parallel. The next slide, the figure is meant to depict the different activities that are going on. And I'm looking now at this slide here.

MS. HAYES: Yeah, but ours looks that little.

MR. MORRIS: Yours looks small, I'm sorry.

Across the bottom is a timeline there from, starting from September of last year on through November of this year. And on the left side you'll see what we have are essentially three different pathways that we are trying to push these sites through towards closure on.

If I looked at the top pathway there, it's labeled EPA, and that's primarily talking about the PCB contaminated sites. And we are remediating, cleaning up, and closing the PCB sites in accordance with the consent agreement final order with EPA.

In addition to that, where the PCB contamination has affected soil or water, DTSC has a role, and we need to go through the DTSC closure process, which is the pathway on the next line down.

In addition to that, we have UST sites and fuel oil pipeline sites, UST is underground storage tank sites that we are going through the regional board closure process. And that's primarily to address, the regional board order addresses primarily petroleum and underground storage tanks.

So we have all these things going on at the same time. If we focus on the DTSC path, which is the longest path shown here, and probably the most comprehensive because DTSC also has an interest and some oversight in the UST and petroleum issues through RCRA corrective action.

So I'm going to focus just for a second here on that long path. And the steps within there are really the remedial action plan, the preparation, review, and approval.

And what this figure is trying to depict is that as we push these sites forward through these different regulatory processes, at some point downstream we have to get closure from all agencies for all the sites so that we get the NFA certification. And that point is, can be after the remedial action plan but before the certification.

So depicting it there, once the remedial action plan is approved, there would be a period of implementation for any additional remedial actions or land, even recording of land use covenants. And then an implementation report is prepared that summarizes all of the activities that were specified by the remedial action plan. And once that's done and approved by the regulators, then the NFA certification is issued.

Moving onto the slide that's title "Investigation Area D1 Removal Actions." We've been conducting those actions starting in November of last year and going on through February was the current schedule now, and I think we're going to make it, having these actions done by that time.

We have work going on at fuel oil pipelines, underground storage tank sites, PCB sites, polychlorinated biphenyls, lead based paint, and pesticides and soils. And there's some abrasive blast material sites that we're dealing with.

The fuel oil pipeline, a little bit of accounting here. We have 39 segments of the fuel oil pipeline located within investigation area D1. 26 of those segments have been recommended for no further action. We only have five of those segments

approved as today. The remaining are in documents that are in review right now by the regulatory agencies. But we don't expect that any additional remedial action work is needed there.

There are thirteen segments of the fuel oil pipeline in investigation area D1 that require further action. And the types of work that we're doing include vacuum testing, soil excavations and/or actual pipeline removal.

Remedial action at four of the segments have been complete to date. Two are soil excavations and two actual removals, pipeline removals. As these, as the work is completed there will be site specific implementation reports for these segments that will be prepared and submitted to the regulatory agencies for review.

On the next slide I want to talk a little bit about some of the current work that we're doing, fuel oil pipeline work. The photo that you're looking at is looking south along Azuar Drive -- am I pronouncing that right? I know that's somebody's name, and I've heard it pronounced several ways.

MS. HAYES: Right, Azuar.

MR. MORRIS: Azuar, okay. And the photo here is looking south along Azuar. The pipeline there is not the fuel oil pipeline. The fuel oil pipeline had been previously removed, and our investigation was targeted at removing additional soil or residual soil contamination.

The line that you're looking at is a water line. And we knew that we were going to encounter these water lines during these parts of the excavation. And it's this segment that I'm talking about along Azuar here, and that's what's got the road closed now, and if you've been out here you've had to detour around.

When we encountered the water line we essentially replaced it or we did replace the water line. So even though our work wouldn't necessarily have damaged the line, the city asked that it be replaced since we had it open and some of the water lines are older.

And so what this photo, the line that you're seeing in this photo is the new water line that was installed here. And it's a ductal iron line that's actually wrapped with visqueen. And that was something that we had done at the request of the city to give added protection to the pipeline. We'd done some pressure testing on that line.

The water service, as of this week the water service has been restored, and paving of Azuar is expected to occur next week, and we hope by the end of next week we can get Azuar opened up again.

The next slide, talking about a segment along, two segments actually along Seventh Street, which are these segments here. The plan originally, for those segments, was to conduct vacuum testing to ensure that the line was competent and that no, then we would flush it so that we knew there was no residual fuel oil in the line.

We had completed a trench here near Azuar, and then we also completed, so that we could daylight the pipeline and locate it here, and we found it. And we completed a trench down at the other end and found the pipeline. And it, the pipeline on this end was ten-inch diameter, and the pipeline on the other end was eight-inch diameter, but we thought they were both fuel oil pipeline. We tried to apply a vacuum across there and it wouldn't hold the vacuum. So we ended up digging a trench in the middle here to find it. We found it again, we thought, still could not get a vacuum in either direction.

So what we, what we have now decided to do is to use one of these video cameras, and that's what you see in the bottom picture there. Even before we did that the, this excavation on this end, the pipelines actually looked clean, we didn't see residual fuel oil in the line, so we believed that they had been flushed and that we had some chance of being able to get a camera down there so that we could see.

We had tried to trace the line, but that didn't work too well. So we ran the camera down and got in, I think it was about 200 feet, and encountered some residual fuel oil in the line. And the top photo there is what the camera looked like when it came out.

So at this point what we now are going to do is isolate these segments so that we can try to get some vacuum and some flushing of the segments. So that work is ongoing now.

Additional work that's ongoing, the fuel oil pipeline. We do have two segments, actually located down here in the Touro area that, again those two segments we tried to vacuum test, it didn't work. And because those are, they are two parallel segments, they are two inch diameter lines and they're relatively shallow, they're about two feet below the ground surface, we're going to go ahead and remove those lines. And we're working closely with the Touro people to limit the impacts on their operations.

There are also four segments in this area here of Touro, around H74. And three of those segments we're doing soil excavation that we actually began the work on before we started the work on Azuar. And once we started the work on Azuar we've stayed kind of focused on that so we could kind of try to minimize the time the road has been closed. So we need to return back to that H74 area and resume our work on those fuel oil segments, and we expect to do that in early February.

The next slide talks about underground storage tanks. Now there are 34 underground storage tanks in investigation area D1. At this point we have no further action approval at 24 of those sites. So of the ten remaining, five we don't believe need any additional action, but the reports have not been approved yet that are requesting no further action. And additional work has gone on at five, the last five sites.

The photo that you're looking at there is actually UST M130 which is down in the Coral Seas area. And the large soil pile is not contaminated soil that's been excavated; it's actually clean imported soil that was imported for the development. And the original location of UST M130 is just to the right of the photo and just off the edge of the photo.

What had happened is we had completed our excavation there, transported the soil off-site, collected our confirmation samples, determined that we had some residual contamination, yet towards probably right about where the track hoe is sitting. So we did that excavation right up to the edge of where the clean soils stockpile was. And what you see in the foreground there is that soil from that first over excavation is stockpiled there in the foreground.

And results, confirmation sample results came back, we still hadn't met our objectives, still had some residual contamination. And so what's actually being done in this photo here is we needed to move some of that clean soil out of the way so that we could get down to the dirty soil. And we didn't think we would have to go that far when that soil was originally imported, but --

Okay. The next slide, remedial action is complete at two of the UST's in the former Coral Seas area, in 130 that I just talked about, and also M51.

And one underground storage tank along Azuar Drive, which is OR15, and that's, the photo on this slide is the excavation at OR15, which OR15 is right here on the north end of the fuel oil pipeline segment along Azuar that we just talked about. That, you can see there in the photo, I hope you can see, is a concrete, a vault that has been filled with concrete that we've excavated around. And that was a vault that the fuel oil pipeline actually ran into that vault. The OR15 was

actually a cistern, which sits off to the right of this excavation, actually to the right of this photo, and this excavation was adjacent to that UST.

And we still have remedial action ongoing at two of the UST sites, 874 and OR-16. And 874 is down over here. OR-16 is at the southern end of the, of this FOPL segment we talked about. Both of those are scheduled to be completed in February.

For the PCB sites, I'm on the slide now, "PCB Sites in Investigation Area D1." There are 81 PCB sites in investigation area D1. 56 of those have been approved for closure, NFA approval, no further action approval by both DTSC and EPA.

In addition to that, no further action has been approved by DTSC for ten more sites, but we're still waiting for approval on those ten from EPA.

There are fifteen sites then that required some remedial action, and they're both soil and concrete actions that we're doing.

On the next slide we've got remedial actions completed at six of the fifteen sites, that's building 944 there were two sites, building 1322, building 872, 237, and Q17A. And we have remedial action ongoing at the remaining nine sites. Seven of those address soil contamination or involve soil contamination and excavation, and two of them are just for, just concrete remediation.

Again, we have site-specific summary reports that are being submitted to the agencies as the actions are completed.

The next photos there are of PCB site H83 that is in the Touro area. That, the photo, these are both photos of the same excavation. The photo on the right, do you see the two doors there? The narrower door on the left is the entrance to the room where the transformer was. The transformer has been removed, and it's that transformer that's caused the contamination. So the excavation there is completed. You'll see the tree that's to the left there is the same tree that you can see on the photo in the left.

And this work we've been doing on Saturdays only, because this is in kind of a high traffic area of the Touro area, and the building that it's next to here is an administrative building that has people working in it daily, so we've just been doing our work on Saturdays there.

The next slide, PCB sites H89 on the left -- just at this site here, the transformer that you see to the, in the right part of the photo on the pad there are new transformers and pads. The older transformer and older pad had been

previously removed by the Navy. Those were the, that was the transformer that leaked and resulted in the contamination.

We went back to target contamination some contamination that, as you can see where the excavation here is, was adjacent really to the old transformer. You'll see lots of utilities, cableways, and structures that we encountered during the excavation. This was essentially almost, essentially was done by hand.

I also wanted to point out that we've actually, are excavating a little bit underneath the pad to get to the contaminated soil, and it's gone even a little farther than what's being depicted in this photo.

The photo on the rate is PCB site M37. You can see the transformer in the background and the excavation in the foreground. There's a utility box that's sticking up there in the middle of that excavation. At all of these when we backfill, we will backfill and resod, because these three that I've shown here are in grassy areas.

Okay. Lead based paint and pesticides in soil --

MR. GRIBBLE: Jeff, did you say that H89, that's the new pad that SSPORTS put in?

MR. MORRIS: I don't know who put it in, but that's a new pad and transformer is my understanding. What you see in the photo there is not the old.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: The lead based paint and pesticides and soil issues that we've dealt are in what's called here the D1 deconstruction area. That's the demolition activities that were done in the former Coral Seas and Farragut Village housing areas.

We removed elevated concentrations of lead and soil from lead based paint around those structures as well as pesticides in both of those areas, and that's being finished now. There are some spots that we're still working on.

Right now the last one that we've got is this one on Radar Hill. It's just, access is difficult at this time of the year, and it's really slowed the completion of those actions. And again, a summary report will be prepared specifically addressing that cleanup.

The next slide is abrasive blast material. During the same deconstruction activities, abrasive blast material was encountered in utility trenches, about 4,500 linear feet of trenches, and also underneath building foundations around nineteen of the structures, the foundations of nineteen of the structures in both of those areas.

There was a total of 2,700 cubic yards that were removed between the March and August time period last year.

A report on that was, has been submitted to the agencies in November, and DTSC approved that work in December, for that report in December.

So the investigation area D1 summary, right now we're scheduled to complete these ongoing removal actions by February. As I mentioned, we'll be submitting individual implementation reports that document each of these cleanup actions, and will be referred to by the remedial action plan.

The remedial action plan is scheduled for public comment in March.

The steps after that, go through the public comment, address the comments, prepare the final remedial action plan by June of 2004, and then implement any actions that are specified from the remedial action plan, including land use restrictions where those may be appropriate, and prepare the NFA certification, and get all that done by September 30th.

Any questions?

Questions and Answers

MR. KARR: Jeff, just refresh me, I'm a bit cloudy on the terminology on this segmented pipeline. Is this like similar to a sewer system where you've got a main header supplying a bunch of laterals for fuel? I mean what are they segments of?

MR. MORRIS: They are segments of the old fuel oil distribution system which, UST 773, which is just north of the school was the two million storage tank.

MS. HAYES: 772.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, 772.

MS. HAYES: We made a big deal about it.

MR. MORRIS: So the fuel oil pipeline system distributed from across this track across the island. There's something like 4,900 feet of pipeline within the eastern early transfer portion. The segments, they're not really, they don't, they're identified as segments and, Jerry, maybe you can, maybe you know more of the history. But it's kind of like looking at a road map, and you see the little tick marks, and they've got mileage markers in between, and that's the way this pipeline had been separated or disertised so that it could be investigated or cleaned up.

So we've just, those segments each have labels which are a whole bunch of more numbers and slashes and things that are really hard to type in and read, but we've just followed that nomenclature.

So does that, they don't really tie it to physical parts of the line.

MR. KARR: I guess my only confusion is that it's one system and each segment is a different piece of that, it's an attack system basically?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, it was once a whole distribution system and it all generally came from that UST 772 area or prior to that AST 636 which was right next to it at the elementary school site.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. MORRIS: It's no longer intact. I mean there are segments that have been removed.

MR. GRIBBLE: But prior to your participation in the cleanup here SSPORTS had done a lot of work on that. Can you describe that a little bit to put it into a little better context as to what you're doing?

MR. MORRIS: I'm not sure I can describe all of SSPORTS work, but I'll let Jerry --

MR. DUNAWAY: I'll try to describe it. And it really came into play quite a bit when we were negotiating the cost of Lennar's work, the follow-on work they're doing.

But SSPORTS, I believe are the folks that dissected that distribution system into the segments that Jeff referred to. And they did the initial flushing and cleaning of the system basically in hopes to get closure.

Between the work that Lennar did in researching the documentation they realized there was still more work to do and that's what they're doing here. And

so the follow-on work here is really kind of a second step at some of those segments following what SSPTS had already done.

Does that help, Chip?

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah, thanks.

MR. MORRIS: I might just add that we've been working pretty closely with both Gary and Henry from the regional board and DTSC through this whole investigation because it's, you know, we're working off of very old maps, in some cases there are segments that had not been located but were identified, and we needed to try to figure out a strategy that could address all of these segments.

And some of them, you know, as Jerry had said, had been flushed or removed already, and others nobody was sure that they were there.

And so our investigation that we started in the summer of last year, the early summer was really targeted at trying to define where all these pieces are and what work was needed to get closure.

MR. RILEY: And if I could just add to that, Jeff, is that we realize in some cases that it's been extremely difficult to find some of the segments that are shown on old maps, meaning they may have been removed way before SSPTS came on the scene. There's a lot of other utilities in the area.

So in cases where these good faith efforts haven't resulted in locating the pipeline, the investigation strategy that CH2M HILL has been following that they worked out with Henry and myself, is really, even if the pipeline can't be located we can do good investigation to make sure there hasn't been a release to the environment that's going to cause a problem in the vicinity of that pipeline which may or may not actually be there.

So it's a piece-wise system because of all the historical removals and patches and changes to the maps and paving over. But the process was to sample all along the pipeline and make sure that there isn't a release, and in the areas where there are that's where a lot of ongoing work is happening, really with the goal to bring the whole thing to closure.

MR. GRIBBLE: On the abrasive blast material, the slide says 4,500 linear feet of trenches had ABM in them. How, did you have significant runs that, of continuous ABM? And did you, did you, did you address the question at some point, a question at some point along the way of your findings and the

consistency of that with the conceptual site model of the reuse of abrasive blast material on the shipyard?

MR. MORRIS: I think this, these occurrences of ABM do fit that conceptual model in that they were primarily located in utility trenches which, they were located in utility trenches, you know. I don't have, I don't know, there were stretches where it was, you know, looked like pure ABM. There were stretches where it was more mixed with other backfill soil. But it was confined to the trenches themselves and, because we had done, you know, during the deconstruction activity that whole area got addressed, so we could see that that, it was associated with those.

And then the ABM that occurred under the foundations was like a bedding for the concrete, so --

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, then building on that, what would you anticipate if you went to other parts of the shipyard and started tearing up all the utility lines? What would you now anticipate finding in other parts of the shipyard for ABM?

MR. MORRIS: I would -- the same thing. I don't, I don't think there's anything about what we observed during that deconstruction activity that was any, significantly different than the deconstruction activity in D2, nor the fact that this was bedding material and used for these types of things. And so I don't know that it's done much to alter the way we would approach other parts.

MS. HAYES: Okay. Jeff, to follow up on that, that Coral Seas and actually D2 are both rather recent housing developments as compared to some of the other sites, and I would expect that that was more uniformly used in these two developments than it is in other parts of the island where it might have had older systems. And it seems to me that I recall that you were mostly finding it in repairs as bedding material and repairs of those older systems, and not quite as ubiquitous as it sounds like it was in these. Is that possible?

MR. MORRIS: Yeah I would think that is possible. I'm not sure of the timing of this but I would agree that that has to be a factor in where you would find it or how it was used, but --

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Jeff. I was going to make that comment, Myrna, but you beat me to it. I would say that if you are looking at areas B, C1, C2, C3, those older areas may not have it as much. But then I would say if there were utility lines put in place in those areas that are more recent, then maybe those specific utility lines might be more suspect.

But in any case, a good presentation, Jeff, you covered quite a bit of material. It looks like that's your, D1 is your largest, by acreage anyway, it looks like your largest investigation area, so it looks like a lot of work.

With that, why don't we take a quick break and try to wrap up the rest of the meeting, say starting back at 8:40.

(A brief recess was taken)

MS. HAYES: I just want to welcome the RAB members back to their places. Okay.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

Welcome to the second half of the Restoration Advisory Board meeting. And you know, Jeff, I think we'll be able to bypass you on the focus group report, is that right, pretty much? Or you have something you're going to contribute there too, a surprise for us?

MR. MORRIS: You can bypass me.

MS. HAYES: Okay. So let's just go on. You want to all read your fortunes out loud for us? Caroline's said that she would have a good spring.

MS. HAYES: Let's just go down this list of focus group reports and community focus group.

Diana.

(a) Community - Diana Krevsky

MS. KREVSKEY: No report really. Just to compliment Myrna on the Flyaway Festival, and I'm sure we'll hear more about it.

But as from the community outreach point of view, it was good to have the Navy with their posters there, Weston, Lennar, all the representation for the public to, an opportunity for the public to get to know what's going on.

MS. HAYES: And how many applications for the RAB did we get that day, do you know, Brenda?

MS. MC CONATHY: I don't know that they got any right there, but they did have a lot of people taking --

MR. DUNAWAY: We handed them out.

MS. HAYES: Oh, you handed them out, so we'll be looking for them. Many of our RAB members have joined as a result of attending the festival and being, getting interested at the booth at the Navy desk, so thank you.

(b) Natural Resources - Jerry Karr

MS. HAYES: Natural resources, Jerry. Have you ever met as a focus group or do you just use this time to tell us all the good things you do for the environment?

Mr. Jerry Karr

Every morning when I shave I have a committee meeting.

All the recent efforts have been into the Flyaway Festival, and I'll defer to Myrna to give a synopsis of the event.

But it is always comforting to see so many people from outside the immediate area, and they ask very interesting questions on not only the environment, most of my time both days are out in the bush.

I spent all day Sunday out at Culanin Ranch, and most of Saturday out at one of the stations on the self-guided trail. So you get a certain amount of, oh, gosh, what's that, and what's this bird, and isn't this lovely. And that part's very nice.

But people have interesting, inquisitive, focused questions about Mare Island and how is the cleanup going and why aren't there homes and factories, and why aren't things going. And so they appreciate people that are involved in the process giving them some answers to, you know, there is a lot of community involvement, we're always looking for more, thank you for coming out and trying to learn more about Mare Island. So it's the high point of the season.

MS. HAYES: Well, and I must say that it's really helpful to have virtually all of the community members, anyway, of the Restoration Advisory Board in key positions throughout, either on the walks themselves, like Diana's taken the opportunity to do, or at some of the stations, because then all of the sudden they are talking with someone who's a little bit more informed. And they really appreciate that.

(c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

Technical focus group. Let's see, Paula is not here this evening. But it's, the one thing I guess we could report on is that we're going to be holding a focus group meeting on February 9th, just the community members are.

MS. KREVSKY: Potentially.

MS. HAYES: Potentially, hopefully, potentially, working on it, just to develop some strategy for the use of those TAP like and TAP funds that might, that are available to us, so that we can get some assistance in reviewing some of the documents that are coming, flowing towards us.

City report, Ray.

(d) City Report (Ray Leftwich)

Mr. Ray Leftwich

Okay. Jerry has asked me to give a brief rundown on the status of Lennar's specific plan amendment application. They've, the specific plan amendment is proposed to add approximately 2.7 million square feet of non-residential development. The residential development will stay approximately the same, it goes from 1,406 to 1,400, so that's basically a wash.

During the break I passed out a spreadsheet that shows the breakdown and the increases of square footage by different types within the different areas for your review.

The draft EIR, the latest update I've seen, it should be submitted next month. The release of the EIR and the specific plan amendment is scheduled for sometime this upcoming summer, and there will be a public workshop to be held at that time, and we'll announce it, and I'm sure you'll get the information as well, Myrna.

MS. HAYES: Not necessarily.

MR. LEFTWICH: You will, and if you don't I'll have it as well.

Also I just, aside from that I'd just like to kind of follow up on some of the upcoming development on Mare Island. And it hits on actually both of the briefings we were given with the rifle range and the cleanup areas D1 and D2.

D2 is the area that's known as Farragut Village. The tentative map was approved this last fall, and the final map, the grading and the improvement plans are also, the first drafts of the submittals have come to my office already for that.

Then there's also a tentative map that is, has just recently been submitted for another part of Farragut Village, the area just immediately south of the school in area D1.

And both of those will be served by a new road which is kind of cutting through the eastern most portion of the rifle range, and that was the reason for my question about that cleanup.

MS. HAYES: Thank you.

MS. KREVSKEY: Ray, I just wondered if at some point you'll be able to give the RAB an update on the negotiations, what's going on with the early transfer and the significance, and how it will affect the cleanup on the north end and the southern end.

MR. DUNAWAY: I'll have an update in my --

MR. LEFTWICH: Yeah, especially like the southern end is really beyond my scope of knowledge. The north end is ongoing negotiations; perhaps Cris might have additional information as well.

MR. JESPERSEN: Since Jerry was on the same conference call I was on on Tuesday, I'll defer to Jerry.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I'll provide an update.

MS. HAYES: We'll wait during your report then.

MS. KREVSKEY: Okay.

(e) Lennar Update (Jill Bensen)

MS. HAYES: Okay, great. Lennar, really truly, Jeff, if there was something, or Sheila, if there was something that you wanted to add to Jeff's report, you'd be welcome to.

MR. MORRIS: I think we're good, thank you.

(f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MS. HAYES: Okay. Cris, do you have a Weston report?

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks. I've got a handout here for the RAB members, and I hopefully have enough for the audience here tonight updating you of our activities through December and January.

And starting off with the investigation area H1, groundwater containment barrier and extraction trench.

The last time the RAB met in early December, Dwight Gemar made a presentation in regards to this particular time critical removal action. At that time we had issued a document for public review. The public review comment was up on the 9th of January, and as of that time we had received no public comments on the document.

We are working right now with DTSC to incorporate some minor comments they had on the document. And subsequent to that we also received a request from DTSC that we provide a separate document with some more details as to the design of the extraction trench and the slurry wall. We're in the process of completing that particular document.

For DTSC review it should go out next week. And because of the review cycle and the preparation time for the extra document, it looks like we won't be in the field until probably sometime in March to install the slurry wall.

We've also been undergoing some soil removal and consolidation in support of the slurry wall project. A portion of the slurry wall was going to go through areas that have existing utilities that required either abandonment or relocation. And we also had to remove some contaminated soil that was going to be in the area that the slurry wall was going to go through so we weren't mixing contaminated soil back in and injecting it into the ground.

So we were working in investigation area IR16 and subareas B3 and B5. And the contaminated soil that we have removed has been staged and covered on a lined storage stockpile adjacent to the landfill.

Pursuant to some requests we had from DTSC we've been conducting, for about the last three and a half months, what we'll call the data gap groundwater and soil sampling activities. And we've been going out doing soil borings, some cone penetrometer testing, and installing some new monitoring wells in support of our investigation area H1 remedial investigation

Part of the comments we've had on the draft documents from DTSC was they wanted additional information to more thoroughly characterize soil and groundwater in that area. And we're hopeful now that given this additional data collection, that we have indeed filled the data gaps that DTSC notifies us on.

On the back side, I believe it's probably close to six months ago we made a presentation to the RAB about developing an environmental news website for Mare Island. At that time we'd secured a web address, which is www.mareisland.org. We posted some draft information on the site. We requested some information from the Navy, the RAB, Lennar, and the city, and now things are up and running.

There is some interactive links in there that you can go in onto the map, click on various areas and it will take you to additional links with information as to what's going on in certain of those areas, what the areas were, some information on the history.

The web page is by no means complete, and we're certainly interested in having regular updates from all the parties, all the stakeholders here. And if you look on the handout there you can see an e-mail address for Rose Ergot who is tasked with doing the monthly updates.

So if you have any new information or any corrections on the information that's out there, please let Rose know via e-mail, and we'll try to get her to make those changes on a monthly basis.

Let's see what else we've got. Actually moving onto a slightly different project, that would be the Mare Island dredge ponds that Weston and the city of Vallejo are working to repermit as a regional dredge material disposal facility.

We've been working with the city for sometime on preparing an EIS, environmental impact statement, environmental impact report. And as of this morning I hear the Corps of Engineers is tentatively slated to put a notice out in the Federal Register as of the 6th of February, and that will start the formal time clock ticking for public review of the draft documents that will go out at that time.

We have been spending a fair amount of time trying to resolve some last minute comments from the Corps of Engineers. I'm hoping everything will finally be resolved next week and we can get this thing going.

The city will be holding a separate public meeting with the Corps of Engineers, and I've been told it will probably be held at city hall as a briefing potentially to the city council. It will certainly be open to the general public. And we'll be getting some information out next month with more specifics on that.

And we also intend to try to get a flyer out to the RAB members just making sure that everybody here is informed that the document is out for review, and we'll do our best to make sure that we've got copies available in the RAB library for ease of review for the RAB members.

Myrna, I'm sure, will touch on the Flyaway Festival. Weston was happy to participate, both as a sponsor, put some exhibits on, and lead some tours. This is our fourth or fifth year, I think, Myrna, running on that. And I know the folks we had out there all had an enjoyable time.

Thank you for your invitation, Myrna, for the cruise. It sounds like, even though I had other commitments and I had to miss it, the folks that did make the cruise enjoyed themselves.

And let's see. One last thing would be regarding the northern parcel, Weston's currently in negotiations with the city of Vallejo under an exclusive right to negotiate for the redevelopment of the northern parcel of Mare Island. And the response of some comments we've been receiving from the general public and the Mare Island Business Association, we've been conducting a general cleanup efforts, removing debris, cutting down weeds, picking up garbage and whatnot, to kind of improve the aesthetic appearance of the north parcel.

You can see the after photo, I guess, there, it's one of the softball fields. It would be more effective if you saw the before picture that had about five feet tall weeds sitting there.

But we intend to be doing that on a quarterly basis forthcoming. And we're also looking at a couple of other options to install some improved landscaping potentially at the north gate, and potentially taking down some of the buildings that have been damaged by vandals or also potentially the buildings that the Vallejo Fire Department have been chopping apart over the past year and a half. Although I've heard from the fire department that they'd like to keep chopping on those for years to come, so we will, guess we'll have to wait and see on that.

MS. HAYES: For a fee I'm sure they could, huh? Uh-huh.

And Cris, we are really thankful, again, that Weston, as well as Lennar and CH2M HILL, have been major sponsors of the festival, as you said, for a number of years. We really appreciate it.

And we have to say that we're extremely grateful that you didn't lease that building this year. But we are taking down our exit signs in anticipation of not having it next year. So if we're lucky enough to get it next year still we'll put our exit signs back up for the fire department. But we realize that it's only so long before we get kicked out of a building.

And people always want to know whether we're going to leave Mare Island. Well, I'll tell you, I'm not going to start holding a burning festival at Solano Fairgrounds. So as long as you'll have us, we'll be happy, even if we have to pitch a tent. Oh, yeah, there's a softball field there all nicely mowed up. Okay.

Then onto regulator agency update. Who wants to go first? We do have all three regulator, regulating agencies here.

(g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble/Emily Roth/Gary Riley)

Mr. Chip Gribble

It looks like everybody else is going to cover all of this in their reports, but we're expecting to finalize the slurry wall and extraction trench removal action work plan here within the next week.

And for the ordnance storage and treatment, storage and treatment removal action work plan we're expected to complete that also within the next week or two. And that's our focus at this point.

The other thing is, the other big thing I guess is working with the Navy to come up with a new schedule which we're kind of behind on. But the way, the current version is emphasizing, Jerry would probably say in his report, emphasizing getting to completion for the area H1 which includes the landfill area.

Oh, I'm sorry -- and Jerry, I was wondering, how often do you shave? But before you answer that question, you might be, might have to pay me if you answer that question.

MS. HAYES: You're in good company, anyway, huh?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: You going to have him answer that one, Jerry?

MR. KARR: No.

MS. HAYES: That one went right over your head, didn't it?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, our celebrity mom couldn't make it tonight, she wasn't feeling too good, and I think maybe it's a little bit of too much excitement for her this week.

I don't know if everybody here knows or not, but Emily's daughter, Patty Jenkins, wrote and directed her very first movie, which Emily had been telling us about this for two years. But I don't think any of us ever dreamed, it was never on our radar screen that "Monster" and leading lady Charlize Theron would win the Golden Globe for the best actress, and now, of course, the Oscar nomination as well.

I don't know who it was who came up with that theory that we're all within seven degrees of separation from --

MS. KREVSKY: Six.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Six degrees of separation from Kevin Bacon, but everybody be sure to watch the Oscars this time because we're all within one degree of separation of winning that award.

I don't know what I can say really to top that. But with regards to Mare Island, Emily and I have been working pretty hard on getting PCB letters out, and Emily's been participating in the landfill discussions. Right now this week I've got the paint waste site sampling plan, I'm looking at that, and hope to get a letter out to you next week on that.

But other than that, I think that's about all the news we have.

Mr. Gary Riley

Just for a quick update from the water board. Exciting news, we've been able to have an additional staff person assigned to the project at least part-time, so you may, at some point in the future, get to meet Sara Raker, a geologist who works in my group, who will be focusing on some parts of the Lennar parcel which will bring additional resources to Lennar. But so, by virtue of that, free up more of my time to attend to the other portions of the island.

And you may also know the RAB's not yet had the chance to meet Alec Naugel, another engineering geologist from our program who is working with,

specifically with the H1 cleanup. So we've been, definitely been able to bring more people on at the water board, well I should say assign more people to the project, not new hires, and hopefully keep things moving along on our new schedule, so I think that's very exciting.

MR. CHUI: I guess we also have some good news. We'll be able to add, I think, one, maybe two persons to the Lennar project also, so hopefully we'll work through the backlog of documents too.

MR. JESPERSEN: Chip, we don't get an addition to our projects either?

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, I've had meetings every time I shave --

MR. KARR: With your staff?

MR. GRIBBLE: With my staff. As we all know, logic doesn't apply here, but political pressure does.

V. CO-CHAIR REPORTS (Jerry Dunaway, Myrna Hayes)

Ms. Myrna Hayes

Okay. On that note, Jerry's asked me to take a shot at my co-chair's report and then he'll wrap up the meeting with his.

And I want to make sure that anybody who wasn't within the mailing addresses of the city of Vallejo had an opportunity to get a copy of Lennar's latest progress report that was just published. And in a very timely manner, like arrived a day, to 30,000 households a day before the festival. So I really appreciate you sneaking that little tiny bit in there about the festival, it was really great.

So it has a short synopsis of what Jeff gave us in great detail, I think right here, and then some information on some of their development plans and reuse plans. So it's a good document and useful, something that the RAB has asked for. It didn't take them very long to see that it was a valuable tool for them as well. But I'm not going to necessarily take credit for it, but we really do appreciate it. It's a useful vehicle for us to inform people about what's going on, at least on the Lennar property at Mare Island.

So there are plenty of these here if -- you'll want to pick up a copy if you haven't gotten one or you have someone you'd like to share it with.

I, as if I had nothing better to do, on January 14th I had the privilege of attending the former Camp Beale RAB. And I just want to send out around some of these publications.

They have 65,000 acres, twenty miles east of Marysville. Well, Marysville is the home to Beale Air Force Base, but the former Camp Beale was 65,000 acres in two separate counties. And they were, it was surface cleaned, it was a training facility for all the services. It was surface cleaned in nineteen -- and transferred in 1959 with deed restrictions.

The deed restrictions disappeared. And between the mountain people who kind of moved in at that time who have all kinds of interesting activities they engage in, similar to Lake County and other Appalachia parts of the west, there are also, it's within commuting distance from Sacramento. So suddenly we have 65,000 acres of private property that very likely has ordnance lower than two feet deep.

And so we, Lennie Segal and I had the privilege of going up to that RAB. It's a great RAB. They have two county Boards of Supervisor members who are serving as individuals, their director of emergency services for one of their counties serves as an individual, and they have a really great RAB.

They have a tremendous challenge, something that we couldn't begin to, I don't think, to imagine. You know, 65,000 acres of private property, which the Army Corps of Engineers has the responsibility to go in and do a FUDS cleanup on, a formerly utilized defense site investigation and potential cleanup.

And they've divided it into three volumes, and they're beginning, they have their ECA work underway for their first volume.

MR. KARR: No acronyms.

MS. HAYES: Oh, yeah. I don't know what it stands for.

MR. KARR: I don't either. Environmental --

MS. HAYES: Engineering --

MR. MORRIS: Engineering evaluation and cost analysis.

MS. HAYES: Environmental engineering and cost analysis, I always know the C-A.

The real challenge for them that we don't have here is that they have all private property, and it's been transferred, the deed restrictions have fallen off.

So it's publications like I'm passing around and these posters that are meant to actually inform people that ordnance activities that had ordnance involved with them even took place on their property. And then they have an aggressive program for kids.

Diana says this is, looks like, the little kid in the picture looks like they might be on the way to a summer camp and so it's called Camp Beale. So you'd send your kids off for explosive safety education programs.

But we're not sure whether this site invented this or if the Army Corps has, but we think it's a, Jerry and I were just talking, it has a great three part program of education, recognize, retreat, and report. So they have refrigerator magnets and Frisbees.

They go to every classroom -- no, let's see. They have a schedule they've started for that first volume where they'll go to the, every school in that volume and go to the teacher parent open houses in the evening, and then the next morning go to that same school's assemblies. And in third grade and below they go to each classroom with this educational material.

And probably the biggest job the Corps has is backtracking on a letter that only the U.S. Government could send, a nice thick packet that was sent three years ago that said there's very likely ordnance on your property and we'd like a writ of entry that would, for you to sign this attached writ of entry and it will allow the federal government full and irrevocable access to your property without any notice at any time for the next three years.

Well you can imagine the combination of newbees, the people who have the money to go buy a ranchette and build a trophy house at the top of the hill and two or three miles of paved road into it combined with the mountain people, neither one of them thought that was a good idea, so they have very, very few people signing up.

Anyway, that's kind of a long story to tell you that we had a really good session. Here's another coloring book. They're trying to help shore up that RAB and help them figure out ways to get the public engaged and involved in the process.

And then the last thing that I will say, since everybody said, "We'll save it for Myrna," to say something about is the Flyaway Festival.

As you know, that was held this weekend, our eighth annual festival, although I might note, I have every year noted, that the Navy actually held our first event nine years ago this month on Mare Island, and we had building 505 open for four hours, and we called it a "Family Wildlife," you know, No environmental open house. And we had a thousand people out that very first time. And Assistant Commander John Becker was our host. And that was just, I guess, three months before the base closed. But they wanted to gauge the public's interest in a permanent environmental education facility at building 505.

So we want to thank the Navy for leading the way and leading to a really highly successful event this weekend that just took a big, a lot of folks to pull off. But it was a beautiful weekend and a great opportunity to showcase Mare Island and, as Jerry has mentioned, to actually advance some of the information that we have here.

So Jerry, give this to you.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway

Okay. I'll try to wrap this up and end our meeting here tonight in short order. I handed out my report actually while Cris was giving his report, and I'll go through this briefly.

Because of our December meeting being loaded with the public presentations or public meetings on the two removal action projects, I realized I hadn't done a report since October. So there's a lot of information I'm just going to bypass that kind of is from last year, and I'm going to touch on what we started with at the New Year.

So during our January 9th RPM meeting we obviously went through the general status of projects there. Our next RPM meeting, which the RAB members are welcome to attend, is on February 4th, 9:30 in the morning, building 535 at Mare Island.

We held a teleconference on January 13th, and this was to talk about that revised project approach to the Marine Corps Firing Range that you heard earlier. And obviously we'll need to make some decisions on how to proceed once the weather cooperates with us. And we think what we're doing now with the sampling plan will allow us to kind of hit the ground running once we do get good weather and we figure out a better screening technology for that soil.

The RCRA inspection at Mare Island Landfill has been a pretty busy activity for us the last couple of months. We met with the enforcement side of DTSC on

December 2nd, and we discussed the purpose of the inspection. Obviously the Navy thinks that the inspection happening is just not in good faith with all the things that we have put in place to try to expedite the cleanup there, and we provided some additional information to them on December 23rd explaining some of the cooperative efforts we've put in place with DTSC as well as with the water board through the FFSRA, the cooperative efforts with the city and with the developers to expedite cleanup.

DTSC is supposed to issue an inspection report after they review that information that we provided on December 23rd. And I'll let you know the updates when we do receive that report.

On cleanup progress, the OBOD range is something we've kind of coined from a long time ago, but that was the, one of the two projects we presented back in December. It's called the Ordnance Storage and Treatment Facility, and basically the comment period for that was December 8th through January 9th.

We received no comments, so we'll be working with DTSC to finalize the plans for that. And we're looking to do probably some of our first treatment actions starting in the springtime.

The DRMO removal action, this is a site that we plan to do cleanup on later this year, and that site is located not on Lennar's parcel, but it's in this white area right here. And it is a former military scrap yard operation site.

And what we're doing there right now is we're doing some additional sampling, I believe that actually happened this week. And we're trying to sample the site to the northern end right here. This is, this is Dump Road that goes out to the landfill area. But parallel to the road are some railroad tracks, and because of those tracks being there there hasn't been a whole lot of historical data, so we're trying to build our database of sample locations in that area so that we can determine does that area need to be encompassed into the removal action.

So we're kind of doing that work, and it's delayed the actual ECA, the engineering evaluation cost analysis report by some time. We were actually planning to put that out maybe in the next couple of months to the public, but that will probably get pushed out more towards the end of spring.

And the cleanup, we're working with Chip to finalize the schedule with that. But we want to do it sometime later this year.

And then the early transfer that I think, Diana, you asked about the early transfer, we're actually making progress on that too. I listed the parcels involved

there, and they're basically parcels that the Navy still has left that are planned to be transferred to the city.

Some of them will be developed by Weston, some of them will be developed by Lennar. Actually some of those that Weston, that are listed under Weston won't be developed but are proposed for cleanup by Weston, and that's the regional park portion. The actual development I think is still left up to the city.

As far as progress, we made some progress in December also. On the 11th we met with the State Lands Commission, and basically we pitched the concept of what this early transfer is supposed to be about. No longer are we talking about any transfers where the Navy is retaining environmental cleanup responsibilities outright. I think after further discussions with the city it just was not something they were comfortable with. So what we're willing to do is kind of develop some kind of a plan to transfer that environmental responsibility.

And so we pitched that as part of the concept to the State Lands Commission. And the agreement that came out of that December 11th meeting is that the city, with their developers, would come up with a schedule on how to proceed.

That schedule attempts to try and get to a agreed upon cost for transferring cleanup. Some of those areas that are more difficult to put a cost on right now, the southern area, essentially the former ordnance or ammunition depot is the area that's hard to put a cost on right now. I think Lennar and Weston are giving it their best shot to try to come up with a cost. But in the event we can't at this time, we may schedule a future time in which we come up with a date or a plan to do that after the Navy does some further investigation and data gathering. So we may retain some of the environmental cleanup for some period of time, but we are committed to entering into a cleanup agreement at some future date.

That's, we're trying to first get to what are the general scope or general components of the cleanup agreement. And so we're, we've got that in the schedule right now. And we just had a teleconference on the 26th of this week, we reviewed that schedule, and what the action items were or are, and how to begin that process.

So we're going to start by taking a look at what the elements of the cleanup agreements would be that we would transfer to either, to Lennar or to Weston through the city of Vallejo. So that's where it's at right now. We're really just barely getting a start at this and more will come out of this obviously.

And there's one more item I wanted to discuss tonight that I didn't have room in this report unless I added another page, but we discussed also the community

relations' efforts here at Mare Island. We discussed with DTSC's community relations or public participation folks, with Lennar and with Weston, what kind of opportunities are present now that we can take the opportunity to exploit, and with the new year, with new staff from DTSC see what kind of areas of improvement we can make to community outreach, education, and information dissemination.

So what I'm proposing here is a focus group meeting with the RAB to discuss that with you all, and the agencies or DTSC is interested in hearing from the RAB, and I believe both Lennar and Weston are interested in seeing how they can improve their efforts too.

I don't have a great schedule for the month of February that allows for it, for my attendance during an evening focus group meeting, but I think we want to try and do this in February or, if not in February, early March possibly.

Maybe what I could do is put out an e-mail. But dates that I have available for an evening meeting are the 11th and the 25th of February, otherwise it would be the first week of March, the 1st through the 4th.

So why don't I put out an e-mail with those dates to you all, and we can get to all the other RAB members who aren't here tonight also to see what kind of a focus group meeting we can put together.

And if Michelle or Diane, you wanted to say anything? I think we're all just interested in getting together and seeing what kind of improvements we can make. Given the two years of experience with early transfers and kind of the new lay of the land we have here at Mare Island, I think this is a good time to take another look at this.

With that, are there questions about those things I just reported on?

MR. GRIBBLE: Actually, Jeff, in response to your comment earlier about more people for your project, actually we, I want, it's important to me that, and it is to you and everybody else, that you understand and everybody else understands --

MS. HAYES: Cris.

MS. KREVSKEY: Cris.

MS. HAYES: I think you mean Cris.

MR. GRIBBLE: What did I say, Jeff?

MS. HAYES: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: Jeff, it's important for you too, and especially for Cris, that you understand that the schedule that we're putting together for the landfill area H is extremely aggressive and very compressed, and that several of the people that are from DTSC that are working on that have had their schedules and their workload rearranged or are in the process of having their workloads rearranged to allow them more focus on that effort alone. And the department's commitment to getting that done as soon as possible continues to grow.

So, but I'm sure that even with the addition of those people for the Lennar project or any other project, there's never enough, and I'm sure that's the same for the Lennar work, or for the Weston work and the Navy work. So --

MS. HAYES: It is, it's for our work too.

MR. GRIBBLE: So please understand how compressed that is, that schedule for the landfill area.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I wasn't going to mention that. I know Chip mentioned the schedule with the Navy earlier. We are meeting with DTSC and with Weston on the 11th, in a couple of weeks here, and I think that is where we're, where we will hammer out and kind of get the head nods for this schedule.

But in looking at what's been proposed, it is very aggressive for H1, and certainly the Navy's happy about that, I think Weston would be happy too. So if we can keep that schedule I think we'll hear a lot more about the landfill during this year than we heard last year.

If there's no more questions, why don't we call it meeting adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 PM 2121 hours)