FINAL
MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

N00221_002307
MARE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A

HELD THURSDAY, January 30, 2014

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, January 30th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 8:41 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in Attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Paula Tygielski

RAB Navy, Developers, Regulatory, and Other Agency Members in Attendance:

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Steve Farley (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Brooks Pauly (Navy)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Elizabeth Wells (Regional Water Quality Control Board)

Community Guests in Attendance:

- Mike Chamberlain
- Jim Durkin
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC:

- Jessica W. Cooper (Sullivan International Group, Inc.)
- Wally Neville
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Everyone, let's get started.

Welcome to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board. We start our meetings with introductions.

My name is Janet Lear, I'm the Navy co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the community co-chair, and I live in Vallejo.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski, community member, live in Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, RAB member from American Canyon.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MS. COOPER: Jessica Cooper with Sullivan International Group.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Jim Porterfield, ex-Mare Islander.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley, Weston.

MR. DURKIN: Jim Durkin, I'm a member of the community from El Cerrito.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain, Tihydro.

MS. PAULY: Brooks Pauly, contracted support for the Navy.

II. PRESENTATION: *Investigation Area (IA) F1 Feasibility Study*
Presentation by Ms. Brooks Pauly (Navy)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Our first presentation for the evening is going to be given by Brooks Pauly with the Navy. She'll be talking about the Investigation Area F1 Feasibility Study.

MS. PAULY: Okay. Well, good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks so much for joining us tonight.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you have a microphone?

MR. NEVILLE: Right below you. Speak directly into the end of it.

MS. PAULY: How's that?

MS. PAULY: Great. Thanks, everyone, for coming out tonight. I am going to be talking about the investigation area that's (IA) F1 Feasibility Study, which I'll also call the FS.

And I want to point out that this is a presentation of a document that is currently in progress and has not gone to the agencies yet, so there might be some finer points to change in the future.

Okay. As always, I'll give you a presentation overview. The FS is part of the process where we come up with alternatives to reduce the risk to acceptable levels that we have found during the Remedial Investigation process, which is the part of the process where we go out and investigate and figure out where there is, again, residual unacceptable risk.

So this FS is for the Installation Restoration program which is a separate program under the Navy from the munitions program. And so I want to – I'm sorry, I'm saying this exactly backwards. The – no, I'm not saying it backwards.

Sorry, we just sped over here from Applebee's, and I might have a little bit of extra adrenaline going from that, so my apologies.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The restaurant or the ride over?

MR. COFFEY: If it's Applebee's you're going to have indigestion in a short period of time.

MS. PAULY: We'll blame anything else on that later. Okay.

So I am trying to make the distinction that this is – this FS is under the Installation Restoration [IR] program and not the Munitions program, which is a separate program under the Navy.

And so those programs will eventually, for this site, for F1 – which is also called the PMA, the Production Manufacturing Area, we'll get to that later – will come together at the Proposed Plan stage. But right now they're still separate, so they're being addressed separately.

And I see a potential question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, right. Already. I thought when we were on the phone you said F1 was the green sand area, now you're saying it's the whole Production Manufacturing Area?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: F1 is the PMA, yes.

MR. COFFEY: The whole thing?

MS. NAITO: Is she mixing up IR-04?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: IR-04 is F2.

MS. NAITO: But they did a big sandblast removal.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I know that. But I thought – I'm quite sure I thought you said it was the sandblast area on the phone, but okay.

MR. COFFEY: It was when she was at Applebee's.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or I had just been there – no, I don't go there, I can't take it. Nope. Nope. Nope. All right, press on then.

MS. PAULY: And they are right next to each other.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I know that, Brooks.

MS. PAULY: Okay. So, in any case, they're both in the CERCLA framework, and they're running in parallel again, until the Proposed Plan.

So tonight I'll give you a brief location history.

And we'll talk about the current and future land use at the site.

Previous site investigations.

We've done some recent total petroleum hydrocarbon sampling as a result of some of the recommendations in the RI, and we were able to rule out some of those areas. So I'll talk a little bit about that recent sampling.

We'll talk about the Feasibility Study actions that are going to be undertaken based on the Remedial Investigation.

The areas evaluated for active remediation are called the "target treatment zones," so we'll go over those.

And then we'll also discuss the fact that we're going to have some restrictions on the different areas that are administrative, and they're called institutional controls.

So then we'll get into the actual active remedial action alternatives, description of those alternatives as they relate to the NCP, or the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Program. All your acronyms are in the back. If I do say an acronym you can always look in the back there.

So first we'll compare those alternatives to the NCP, and then we'll compare them to each other, and that will indicate how we're planning to proceed.

And then, lastly, we'll finish off with the projected schedule going forward.

And any questions.

Okay. So let's see. I've got my pointer, my trusty pointer, here. Oh, it is activated.

And so you'll see here that our site F1 is this area bounded in orange. And here's a little map of Mare Island down here in the lower left-hand corner. And you can see that north is approximately pointing up this way.

So our site is located in the southeastern corner of Mare Island. And it's also broken up into some subareas which you can probably see in this map here, subarea one through seven. And in the RI we use these different subareas to help us evaluate the risk within those subareas to human health.

However, ecological risk was evaluated based on the upland area here, which is all this area, which is basically subareas one through five and seven. And then the wetlands area, which is subarea six right here, was evaluated separately for ecological risk assessment.

Oh, and I want to back up real quickly and point out that this is your reference to, this map, this whole map, for the current and future – well, this is mostly future reuse areas. The current use at F1 is industrial. And in the future you'll see it will be a little bit broken up.

So this area, this reuse is planned to be mixed industrial.

And then right here where it cuts across subarea five, this whole area, as well as subarea seven, is a regional park area.

And then, of course, subarea six will be the open space conservation area, because it's wetlands.

Okay. Quick Mare Island history of F1. It's also, as I mentioned earlier, known as the Production Manufacturing Area.

Ordnance was manufactured here and stored in these various buildings up until about 1973 when the production was ceased.

Many of the buildings were converted for storage, some of them were converted for office space, things like that.

And there were 22 underground storage tanks, but those have all been located and closed. So those are no longer an ongoing issue here at the site.

As I mentioned, the current use is industrial, but the area is currently inactive.

And we talked a little bit about the future uses. In the future the property is planned to be transferred to the City of Vallejo.

MR. COFFEY: Is there any timeline for that?

MS. PAULY: There is a timeline and it's located in the SMP.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Are those reversionary lands, aren't those transferred to the State of California?

MR. COFFEY: First.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: First.

MS. PAULY: It is [Economic Development Conveyance] EDC.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't think it is.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We can double-check on that and get back to you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's like old, that's why Lennar bid on it, that's why Lennar isn't doing houses there, one of many reasons.

MS. PAULY: Well, we'll definitely look into that.

Okay. So in the past, F1 has had a lot of investigations leading up to the RI. Starting in 1983 through 2009 we had thirteen different investigations collecting soil, sediment, groundwater, and soil gas samples.

The potential risks are related to the munitions production that we talked about. But the munitions themselves are being, as I mentioned before, investigated under the separate Munitions Response Program.

Again, in 2012 the RI recommended additional evaluation in the FS for five areas.

This was three TPH areas, or total petroleum hydrocarbon areas. So one is located in subarea one, which is area 2B.

And two groundwater locations are in subarea four, which is areas fourteen and fifteen.

Those areas don't necessarily mean anything to you, but they will be on maps later that you can see.

And you should also have large figures at the back of your handouts, because sometimes when we have the figures in the slides they're too small to really see, so you should have larger copies in the back if you want to refer to those.

The three main areas of what we're talking about active remediation are soil in subarea four, just south of building A75.

Soil in subarea five kind of horseshoed around building A17.

And some sediment in the northern portion of the subarea six wetlands.

And as I mentioned before, those are the active remediations that were evaluated. But we're also proposing, because of the reuse for the area as an industrial slash in some portions of it the regional park area, we're putting consideration of institutional controls. And so that's more of an administrative control or restriction on the land. And all of the subareas are being considered for those kind of controls.

And lastly, as I mentioned before, in the summer of 2013 we did the additional sampling for TPH that allowed us to close those areas. So – and here's where I'll talk about that.

So in the photos here you see some of the sampling that was done; hand-augering for the soil in TPH area 2B.

And then a couple of temporary groundwater wells to gather data from TPH areas fourteen and fifteen.

And like I said, in area 2B the important information that we needed to get was bounding the actual result that we had seen that was above our screening levels, and showing that it did not extend deeper into the soil. And we have already shown that it didn't extend widely laterally.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you show us where 2B is? I could see subarea two, but maybe my eyesight is not –

MS. PAULY: No, no, that's – your eyesight is fine for that, but hold on just a moment. Let me find the figure in the back. Actually, you know what, let me just flip to the next one.

It should be on figure A1 at the back of your packet. Sorry, everybody. Figure A1 at the back of your packet.

And so 2B is the little area on the far left, it's a little circle and it's got the results – oh, here, actually I'll shuffle my hands around. So it's right here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That little circle, I might have missed that.

MS. PAULY: Yeah, it is easy to miss. I had toyed with the idea of having them remove all of these other little TPH areas that we – but we've – I wanted to point out that we've closed all these other areas under the low-risk fuel site criteria, and so this was just the last one.

Elizabeth was very diligent in making sure that we cross our T's and dot our I's, and so we needed to show that the deeper results were below our screening levels. And we were able to do that.

So Myrna, thanks, good intro for that slide.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll tell you, twenty years pays off, the details.

MS. PAULY: The details are very important. And A-2 in the back of your packet, you'll be able to see the two groundwater sampling result areas.

And I believe this is – fifteen is actually on the top, and fourteen is this kind of triangle here.

And subsequently we were able to show that the motor oil in particular, was non-detect at both groundwater samples.

And the diesel range, TPH or total petroleum hydrocarbons, was reported in both samples, but below the Tier 2 screening level criteria. So we were able to close those as well.

MR. COFFEY: Do you know why there was gasoline and motor oil in those areas?

MS. PAULY: Yeah, it was most likely from vehicles.

MR. COFFEY: But due to –

MS. PAULY: Leaking Dodges. I can say that; I own a Dodge.

MR. COFFEY: Was this a parking lot?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was it a motor pool or –

MS. PAULY: In particular, in subarea one the location 2B was definitely a parking lot.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

MS. PAULY: So it was a staging area for vehicles.

And then fourteen and fifteen were near closed storage tanks, and so there may have been some migration that went farther away from them. Good question.

So for each of the subareas I did want to talk about the actions that are going to be taken in the FS.

So the things that are being evaluated, again to mitigate any unacceptable risk that was left over from the RI. So we'll just go quickly through the subareas.

One note here, beneficial use of groundwater was not deemed a complete pathway in the human health risk assessment that was done as part of the RI; and so, therefore, we need to actually put restrictions on people using the groundwater in that way just to be protective. So we're actually going to be putting those restrictions on using institutional controls. We'll be putting those on all of the different subareas. And so I've noted that in each one of these slides here.

So starting with subarea one. The RI had concluded there was no further evaluation needed to address risk to human health or the ecological receptors based on the future land use. So that was a good thing.

We talked about the TPH in area 2B and how we were able to close that as a low-risk fuel site. So we're recommending that.

And then again, IC's to restrict the groundwater use will be put on this subarea.

So moving onto subarea two. Same kind of thing. No risk, no unacceptable risk to human health or ecological environment based on the future land use there.

And then the IC is to restrict the groundwater use.

Okay. It gets a little more interesting at subarea three. Again, there was no risk to human health and ecological receptors.

But lead may pose an unacceptable risk to a hypothetical residential receptor. And so while the future land use is industrial, we always want to consider the residential receptor and make sure that they're protected.

And that there is, again, institutional controls that are put on the site that restrict sensitive land uses so, you know, it can't be a hospital or a school for people under age of 18, things like that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There again, if you would double-check on your transfer documents, you might find that you don't have to address that residential receptor.

MS. PAULY: Well, it's sort of a standard – it's sort of a standard policy within risk assessments. Is that what you're talking about?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

MR. COFFEY: She's saying you don't have to do it, but if you really want to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, you wouldn't if it was going to be transferred to State Lands. But if you're saying that's just the standard protocol, that's different, I guess.

MS. NAITO: Myrna, we require them to evaluate that so we can determine if there's land use controls that are necessary.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Even if there wasn't going to be a residential use –

MS. NAITO: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – allowed ever?

MS. NAITO: Because, as you know, sometimes property is zoned commercial-industrial, and that can change over time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, but it couldn't change if it would be a State Lands-granted land.

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be an impossible use, ever.

MS. NAITO: Then we might use that process to ensure the land use has the restriction, but we still need to ensure that. We need to know whether or not that restriction needs to be in place.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh. All right.

MS. NAITO: That's the only reason we make them monitor or evaluate that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. All right. It just – when it says residential.

MS. NAITO: I know.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's why we try to put that "hypothetical" in there, to clarify that it's not an expected situation, but it's something that we have to evaluate as a hypothetical scenario.

MR. COFFEY: You at least have to note that it's there?

MS. PAULY: Exactly. Because you have to do it as long as there's no way to prove unrestricted reuse, so there's a restriction essentially. But we'll definitely look into the other question.

Similar kind of thing for subarea four. We did confirm the groundwater. The TPH results were good there so that was good.

The lead in the soil, and you'll see this in the figure on the next slide if you wanted to look ahead. Lead in the soil poses an unacceptable risk to human health in the area. But it's very concentrated around the southern side of building A75. And so the exposure point concentration, considering those particular locations, the exposure point concentration for the whole of subarea four, is 623 milligrams per kilogram, which definitely exceeds the industrial screening level criteria, which is the 345.6 milligrams per kilogram listed there.

Now elsewhere, when you take out those results that are in that small area south of building A75, we find that there is no further unacceptable risk to human health or the environment in the rest of subarea four.

So again, we're proposing an action around the building, and then we're not going to need to propose an action anywhere else in subarea four.

Once again, because of this, the potential human health risk is acceptable for the planned reuse, which is industrial in this site, but because we didn't prove that it was acceptable for the hypothetical residential receptor, again we're going to put IC's on the area restricting the sensitive land use. Again, because it can't go unrestricted. And similarly for the groundwater.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I have two questions. I guess you'll get to this, I'll wait on one of them 'til subarea seven.

I have a question for all of you as regulators. The City of Vallejo offered this property, along with a number of other parcels on the island, to the National Park Service in 2010, I believe it was, for transfer to them as a national park. That wasn't – I mean National Parks didn't accept that transfer at that time, or that transfer proposal. But clearly the city had negotiated something with Lennar, who currently has the development rights to these subareas, as you show them, in reuse area 10A.

If that should come around again, and that parcel's reuse area should be offered again to the National Park Service or to some other park entity, you know, and it wouldn't be used for industrial uses, maybe be used something like Fort Mason or something like that, what extra work would there need to be done? Based on the data that you've seen so far in terms of changing the land use in area 10A to be consistent with subarea seven or subarea six?

MR. COFFEY: Are you talking about making it something other than an industrial use?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. I mean because right now it's contiguous with five, subarea five and seven, which are a similar historic land use. So what have you seen in 10A that would need more aggressive cleanup as compared to subarea five and seven?

MS. NAITO: I don't think we're prepared to answer that right now. I think we'd have to take a look at what the Park Service planned to do with the property so that we know what kind of exposure people might – or under what scenarios people might come into contact with the contamination there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I'm just talking hypothetical because it's definitely not on the books right now as any path forward for that. But it was offered once, it might be offered again.

I'm just saying you could compare, I would assume, subarea five and seven to one through four because you already – I mean those are contiguous historic land uses. So what – what extra work would you imagine would need to be done? Or maybe I'm jumping ahead because maybe we'll learn, you know, what's in five and seven that's different than in these other subareas?

MS. NAITO: Yeah, we would still need to determine what the correct comparison values are based on current toxicological information.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean it would be – I would be assuming that it would be the same uses as are proposed for subarea five and seven, it would just extend into reuse area 10A.

So I'm just curious, because the city clearly offered that to the National Parks at one time, so I'm just wondering, you know, how this area is playing out as compared to these other two subareas?

MS. NAITO: We can go take a look at that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In case that should be a scenario at another time.

MS. NAITO: Okay.

MS. PAULY: Okay. So as you can see in the next slide here, we do have the building A75 which you can see right here. And then south of it, which is actually outside of the building, that is the area of concern.

And again, by mitigating those results and taking those results out of the pool of data in the whole subarea, you find that the risk goes down significantly for both human health and ecological receptors.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's just lead?

MR. COFFEY: Is it paint?

MS. PAULY: It is lead.

MR. COFFEY: Is it lead paint?

MS. PAULY: The source is – I'm not sure right now.

MS. TYGIELSKI: It could be from vehicle batteries.

Mr. COFFEY: But, I mean, alongside the building it looks like the same type of thing that happened with the historic areas with all the paint and all that kind of stuff. But that seemed to be a fairly easy cleanup, and I would think this would be a fairly easy cleanup.

MS. PAULY: And I don't want to make judgments on the ease of the cleanup, but it's not a particularly sophisticated cleanup, it's removal of the soil, right, and/or scraping. And we'll get to the alternatives.

MS. PAULY: This is – actually it is shallow soil, so it's zero to two feet.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's pretty localized, is it not?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: It looks like it in the picture.

MS. PAULY: It is.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So let's just assume that it's not lead-based paint from the building.

MR. COFFEY: There's thousands of bullets there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: That's what it is.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They use lead in making munitions.

MR. COFFEY: Sure. Sure.

MS. PAULY: They did. Actually they did. It could be from lead solder.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, hey, that's cool, a lot of lead solder.

MS. PAULY: Moving on to subarea five which we were just talking about. So the current land use in this area is industrial. However, as you saw in the original figure, in the future the southern portion, which contains, importantly, building A17, which I'll show you just in a second, is within the future regional park area. And so we anticipate that that would include recreational receptors.

And so lead in the soil around the building A17 does pose an unacceptable risk to residential receptors. That was what was evaluated in the RI. And we're assuming that residential would be a conservative proxy for the recreator. So a lot of the same assumptions go into that, but the time onsite is just a little bit less for a recreator.

Okay. And so you see there, like I said, the exposure point concentration is higher than the screening levels for residential. So that's for surface soil and then subsurface soil.

And so what I mean by the difference between surface soil and subsurface soil is surface soil is the interval from zero to two feet, subsurface soil is the interval from zero to ten feet. So there's a little bit of an overlap there.

MR. COFFEY: But simply because of the fact that these are slated for industrial use and not residential, there's no reason to clean it up because of the percentage of contamination does not warrant the cleanup?

MS. PAULY: That is a good way to put it. That is a good way to put it. In addition, there's – in addition, there's not a complete pathway for the ecological receptors. Once those issues are removed, there's not an issue with the ecological as well.

MR. COFFEY: But, as you're saying, if there is a possible planned use, you know, for a park or any type of park at this building, if that ends up changing, is the Navy going to go back and clean up the soil?

MS. PAULY: Actually, no. Because the future reuse at this location around A17 is recreational, it is – is for a regional park, it's being cleaned up to regional park standards.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

MS. PAULY: Yes, but that is a good point.

MR. COFFEY: So it hasn't been done yet?

MS. PAULY: It has not. That's what this is all about.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Feasibility study.

MS. PAULY: Deciding the best way to do it.

MR. COFFEY: Feasibility.

MS. PAULY: All right. Moving along.

MS. PAULY: And so you can see here this is your building A17 right here, and then this sort of horseshoe area around it that has the primarily lead impact.

Okay. And you can see too, I guess I'm pointing out too that this is all subarea five here, but this portion is the industrial portion, and then it's at this dividing line that it becomes the regional park in the future reuse.

Okay. Moving right along to subareas six and seven. We're very happy to report that the RI concluded in subarea six that we did not need to do anymore evaluation for the risk to humans based on the future land use. So the risk to humans in that area would be to the recreator. We're not expecting a resident there.

But unfortunately, in the northern end barium, copper, lead, molybdenum, and zinc, some other metals there, did pose an unacceptable risk to the ecological receptors.

Now, we've done some evaluation of those values, and so you do various things like comparing the molybdenum to background concentrations. And the Navy is not allowed to clean up beyond background – I want to make sure I'm saying that correctly, Janet hasn't looked up so I guess it sounds good. Okay.

And again, barium is exceeding the regional background levels at only one location. So we've ruled out a lot of these as being a major problem, but there is definitely a problem, and you'll see it in the next slide, in the northern portion of subarea six around outfall 33. That's where all the high hits are, similar to the two building areas where we had the hits of lead in the soil around the buildings, there's sort of a localized area there you'll see.

Again, for subarea six we're going to restrict the sensitive land uses and the groundwater use.

For subarea seven we're also very happy to report, especially since it's going to be the regional park, that there was no unacceptable risk to human health or the environment in that area, and we'll only need to put the IC in for groundwater use.

And so in this figure you can see that it's the northern area is the targeted treatment zone, or TTZ. And by removing the impacts at this area, the rest of the area's risk goes down to acceptable levels.

Okay. And so this is my intro slide for all alternatives. So now we're actually getting to the meat of what we're going to be doing.

So I've mentioned before that the IC's are evaluated for all the subareas.

We've got the active remediation areas - the area around the building A75, the area near building A17, and the northern portion of subarea six near outfall 33.

As I we mentioned, those areas are the shallow soil and sediment. Those are the areas of concern.

And the remedial alternatives, just to frame this up for you, are being considered separately. In the same way that the ecological risk was separated and considered by the wetlands and then the upland portion, we have alternatives that are based on whether the problem is in a wetland or in an upland area. Because the alternatives have different considerations for those two different areas.

So this is our summary of the description of the alternatives. I won't go and read the whole thing.

We consider the no-action alternative, again, kind of the way we consider the hypothetical resident. You always have to consider what if you did nothing, what would be the worst case scenario?

In our situation here it would not be acceptable to do no action, but we do carry it forward just for discussion purposes.

So you'll see in the upland we have what we're calling U2 and U3. And the distinction between the two is essentially U2 has an asphalt cap over the contaminated area that would need to be maintained, et cetera, et cetera.

U3 basically has the removal of the contaminated soil, the impacted soil, and then backfill with acceptable clean fill, and off-site disposal.

Some of the things you consider with that are, well, you have transportation of that soil perhaps out of state, so you've got emissions from the vehicles taking it and things like that. So these are the kinds of things that we consider.

And as you'll see in this table, you've got the IC's on all of the different alternatives. So the general response action will always include the IC's except for under number one.

For the wetland sediment, again talking about possibly doing excavation and consolidation. So we would carefully, as we have done during the munitions non-time critical removal action recently, go in and do excavation, let's say in the wetlands. And then take that impacted soil or sediment into the upland area and do some sort of an on-site containment.

That would, again, prevent taking things offsite, and off-site disposal making it someone else's problem, that kind of thing. But the contamination is still there.

So – and so W3 option three, again for wetlands, is to excavate the impacts, backfill with appropriate fill, and then just remove it for off-site disposal.

And so what we then do as part of this Feasibility Study process is to compare these various alternatives, to the nine NCP criteria.

We get to the last two during the Proposed Plan phase. So that's where the community and state acceptance comes in,. They're not considered at this stage of the process.

The first two criteria are the overall protection of human health and the environment, and then compliance with the ARARs – the applicable, relevant, and appropriate requirements. So that is a legal requirement that they must meet. And so those two are required. They're the threshold criteria.

And you'll see that alternative one, the no action, does not meet those criteria.

So then you've got the other five criteria here, which you can read, and I'll go into them a little bit.

So the long-term effectiveness and permanence.

The reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment. And that actually means chemically changing the toxicity of something.

So even if something isn't mobile and able to get to a receptor, if it really hasn't changed its character, then it kind of gets a little ding against it.

So in any case, these are the five balancing criteria. Short-term effectiveness is always during the project, so during the actual action – that's what we consider the short-term and how things were affected there.

Implementability is pretty self-explanatory.

And then total cost.

And then they get an overall rating.

So you can see how the upland alternatives fared here. And, in particular, our alternative three, which is the off-site disposal, fared a little better. Primarily because the long-term effectiveness was better, and it was actual[ly] less expensive as well because there's not the long-term maintenance.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the cost of asphalt, I guess.

MS. PAULY: Well – probably more the design, but I'd have to go into the details to figure that out.

Okay. Similarly the wetlands had the same kind of comparison. Again, we first ranked these against the different criteria, and not against each other. And then once they're actually ranked against the criteria, then we go ahead and look at them against each other.

And you'll notice that for the wetlands the overall rating for the two acceptable alternatives that met the threshold criteria is good. They're both good. So how do we decide? Well, it's pretty simple. One of them got a little bit better score than the other, so one of them is a slightly better shade of good.

Okay. So in summary, for the uplands subarea, our ranking number U3 is the one that right now, given everything that we've investigated and done up to this point, looks like it's the one that we would recommend.

For the wetland subarea, again, both alternatives W2 and W3 had a good overall score, but W3 was just a little bit better because it had higher scores in two of the subcategories.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Also slightly cheaper.

MS. PAULY: And also slightly cheaper, that's definitely one of them.

MR. COFFEY: When does that ever matter?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, with change orders it will be fixed.

MR. COFFEY: It will be double.

MS. PAULY: All right. So going forward, the final – we're hoping to have the final Feasibility Study document completed in the late summer of 2014.

We've actually got a draft going to the agencies next month, so we're pretty excited about that.

And the Proposed Plan, again, is when these two programs, the IR program – I apologize, I'm getting tongue twisted – the IR program –

MS. PAULY: The IR and the munitions program both come together in the Proposed Plan, and so we're shooting for late spring of 2015 for that one.

And that is the part of the process where the public comment period comes in, so I just wanted to point that out.

Once we do have everyone's comments, including the regulators and the public, and we have all the information that we need, we'll go ahead and do the Record of Decision and the Remedial Action Plan and that is planned for the winter of 2015.

And that's where we actually document the selected remedial action alternative.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then would you expect a budget, I mean a project anytime after that, or 40 years from now?

MS. PAULY: The project would be shortly after that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. You think?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Funding dependent.

MS. PAULY: Funding dependent, exactly.

MR. PORTERFIELD: I was just wondering about something. The lead, is that refined lead like they used for the ammunition stuff? Or is it like the San Joaquin Valley that has hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of acres of low grade ore that's exposed, and we just have a little pocket there?

MS. PAULY: That is a good question. I don't have the answer. The type of analysis that's done doesn't distinguish that. That would – Janet, help me out. Have they ever done forensic kind of investigation to figure out sources like that?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I'm not sure what – I think maybe he's talking about like an ore deposit.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Whether it's naturally occurring?

MR. PORTERFIELD: Right.

MR. COFFEY: If you look at where the contamination is, if it's wrapped around the building and nowhere else, it's got to be from the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or from some activity –

MS. PAULY: In the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – off the dock or –

MS. PAULY: That's one of the reasons we don't think it's from an ore. But the analysis that we do literally just tells us, yeah, that the chemical is there or it isn't. It doesn't really – it's not like other chemicals, where there might be radioisotopes that you can kind of trace.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And this is all a fill area, so you wouldn't expect it to be –

MR. COFFEY: True, naturally occurring.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: – concentrated like that. Plus we also have background – for fill of Mare Island. So all that's taken into account in the Remedial Investigation.

MR. COFFEY: Is any of this property subject to [Land Use Controls] LUC's?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It will be, that's what she's talking about.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, I see. Are the IC's going to be part of the LUC's? So maintenance of the LUC's will be part of the IC's for all these projects?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I'm not sure of your question.

MR. COFFEY: You're talking about asphalt caps and they're not long-term resolutions. I mean, an asphalt cap has to be maintained.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Right. If that is one of the selections, then that would be a long-term maintenance issue.

MR. COFFEY: And so maintenance of that would be included –

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Correct.

MR. COFFEY: – in an LUC?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Right, it would be included in the institutional controls.

MS. PAULY: Even though technically that's an easy engineering control. Okay. Okay. All right. Your point is well taken, you want to make sure that that continues.

MR. COFFEY: Especially if you're going to continue to the city, you want to make sure that the city has some kind of legal responsibility to maintain all of this, because God knows they love to skirt those legal responsibilities.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And that's probably why, I'm going to say, that is why that particular alternative is more expensive.

MR. COFFEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Because of the long-term.

MR. COFFEY: Long-term responsibility?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The long-term responsibilities and the maintenance issues.

MS. PAULY: And probably why it is less likely to be chosen.

MR. COFFEY: Just clean it up and get it out of there.

MS. PAULY: Exactly. All right. If there aren't any other questions, I will yield the floor.

Thank you all very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Brooks.

III. PRESENTATION: *Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP), Update and Path Forward* Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Next up we have Neal Siler discussing the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel update path forward.

MR. SILER: Okay. Well, thank you, Janet.

And I'm going to run this along pretty quickly here because most of the sites that you're going to see on this list, like we do every year, we've already discussed over the past year.

So as I've done in years past, I'm just going to talk about some of these areas. And I'm going to show you a trend of how things are changing on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel and how they're going to change going from 2013 and 2014 and beyond.

So the next slide just tells you what I'm going to talk about. I'm going to talk about the field work, the reports, the sites we've closed, the sites we've had to do some additional work in 2014, in 2013 into 2014, and the proposed work we're going to be doing in 2014.

If you have any questions that you would like to ask me, please feel free to ask me at any time and I will try to answer them to the best of my ability.

So this gives you a map of the sites I'm going to talk about. And if you've not seen this map before, it's color coded. The areas in blue are areas that we've received No Further Action on.

The areas in green are ones where we're very close to getting No Further Action or there's very few items that we have to complete to be able to achieve No Further Action.

And then the areas in yellow are areas that are quite a bit along, but because of the number of sites in the areas, and these are predominantly investigation area C1 and C2, there's about 250 sites in each one of them, because then it just takes longer to get through the entire process to take it there.

Now, what we really tried to concentrate on in 2014 – in 2013, excuse me – is sites where we had to do additional field work to try to get to a point where we could get those sites closed so we could achieve no further action in certain areas. We also wanted to focus on areas where we could achieve No Further Action through documentation alone.

And a couple of those areas that you can see are investigation area B.1, which is the crane test area, and that work was completed back in 2011 by CH2M Hill. We've gone through the implementation reports, and we did receive concurrence on the implementation report. Right now we are going through the land use covenant and the operations and maintenance plan for that area.

Another couple of areas that are very close by, investigation area B.2-2 which is right to the south of – southeast of B.1 and H-2. And those areas have very few sites in them. So what we've done is we've concentrated on the field work in those areas. And as we move that along we should be able to get closure as we move forward.

The same is true for investigation area C3, which is right along the waterfront down here.

There's actually only one more site that we have to do any kind of work on in investigation area C3. Once we do that, all we really have to do is look at the land use covenants and for two sites operations and maintenance plans in these areas. So we're getting very close in those areas in green.

So moving right along. One of the major areas that we did a lot of work in in 2013 was the Building 637 area which is located in investigation area B.2-2. It's a former building that was a motor pool area and a railroad maintenance facility.

We excavated that material out. As we kept moving along, we thought that we had some areas that we weren't able to get all the contamination out because at the time we thought it was going to rain. But who knew? So we stopped work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you filled it up, that's right.

MR. SILER: And here it is, it hasn't rained, but we will be able to pick up that work moving forward into 2014 this year.

We did some other work in the IA-K sediments underlying a portion of IR-03. We did some site characterization in there. And the Navy will be taking over that work as we move on into the future.

We did a number of fuel oil pipeline areas.

One area that we're converting from commercial-industrial use to residential use, the building 866 area, we've done work in there, we were able to close out one of the sites, but we still have some additional work to do on one of the other sites.

Some of the other areas that we're looking at here. The next slide shows you a number of the PCB sites we're getting through. We've been successful in a number of these. A number of these sites we've had to step out and do further work, and we'll be doing work there in 2014.

And then the last slide for 2014 field work shows you some of the underground storage tank and fuel oil pipeline work that we're doing. And so that also occurred during 2013.

Now, the reports. We did – because we were concentrating on field work, we did a number of plans and notices, work plans, doing a number of different items in 2013. We got those through the regulatory agency process. I've talked to you previously about a number of those here during 2013. And many of those have already been implemented or they are under implementation right now.

We also submitted a number of implementation reports, both for PCB sites and a number of the different miscellaneous sites.

One of the things we also did was continue the groundwater monitoring that we've been doing in the installation restoration program IR-03 and IR-15 sites in investigation area C1, and we'll continue doing that into 2014 and beyond. But hopefully if we start getting things to clean up, we won't be having to do that much longer in the future.

And then, of course, because we have areas that we've closed out to commercial industrial standards, we have land use covenants and we have annual inspections on those. And we continue to do those annual inspections as we move forward into the future.

So there were a number of sites that we received No Further Action certification or we're close on.

I mentioned the implementation report for the crane test area. We received concurrence on that report. Right now we're negotiating through the land use covenant and the operations and maintenance plan for that area.

We were able to close out building 461 area which was – had a lead issue.

A number of FOPL sites.

A number of PCB sites.

So we're moving forward with getting some of these areas closed out in 2013.

Now, the next six slides I'm going to show you just photos of some of these areas that we're working at. They don't show up very well up here on the screen, but if you take a look at your packets you can see the first one is investigation area B.2-2.

There's the excavation of the building 637 area, and how we left it as we thought it was going to start raining and we wanted to make sure we buttoned it up so we didn't have a lake like we had in the past as it rained.

Investigation area C1 we have various sites. On the left-hand side of the screen – go ahead, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could I just ask you about, about 2.2 637 area?

MR. SILER: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I know that you're working really diligently to bring that up to residential use, planned reuse. I know that you've invested a lot of money there. At what point do you have so much residual concern by the buyer or the renter, the lessee, that it makes it impossible for you to go forward with funding for buildout or hesitancy on the part of a buyer?

MR. SILER: Well, we haven't seen that. And the reason why, because in the areas, not all of B.2-2 is going to be residential, it's about half of it. If we go back – let's go back.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Part's commercial, right?

MR. SILER: Yeah, let me show you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm just asking you the residential part.

MR. SILER: It actually kind of cuts down the middle, it's almost right down the middle of building 535 right here. As you go here, the area to the north will be commercial-industrial. The area to the south and then also this part of H-2 right here is going to be residential.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. SILER: We haven't gotten to that point yet to see that. I mean, it would have to be something that was very recalcitrant that we just could not get through.

But if you notice, in some of the work that we've done in past years, like the underground storage tank 231 area that was below 231, we actually had to knock the building down, we knocked a number of buildings down there to get to some of the contamination. And we thought it was only going to be in one certain zone, but as we get into it, what happens a lot of times on Mare Island because of the fill that they used, it just – it's clean above and below, gets in a certain layer and just keeps going, and we take that out. So we did that at UST 231, and that's exactly what we're going to be doing at underground storage tank area or Building 637 area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't doubt that, and I see, you know, your work and I can, you know, take this data and whatever, and the, what the regulators say.

What I'm talking about is passing the straight face test. I mean, people are going to be calling me, for example – because they have , you know, 25 of those properties over there – they call and they have these long conversations with me. But there are also just hundreds of people who aren't going to call me and, you know, who cares.

But it's just an interesting psychological kind of process that at some point where you've – you've invested so much, and you've convinced your regulators that everything is a go with the data, then how do you then still justify, you know, how do your funders trust these reports and, you know, how do your buyers? I mean, when do you decide there's a better land use that gives you less long-term headache?

MR. SILER: Well, it's a little more complicated than that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or do you have it set in cement?

MR. SILER: Because there's a land plan, and the land plan calls for a certain number of residential units, and we plan on doing that. So right now we're not doing anything different from that land plan.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I know you're not. I'm not making an argument here, I'm trying to ask you a legitimate question. Just, you know, what – what's a contingency plan for the psychological effects of this kind of buildout?

MR. SILER: And I'm not sure what to do. I know that the thing that we're doing, we're doing everything to comply with the laws and the regulations that clean it up to residential long-term use standards, and that's why the regulators oversee everything we do: to make sure we are complying.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I know that. Maybe I'll just not continue the conversation with you, because maybe that's just not your forte. But somewhere there must be other cases, maybe in your professional careers, where you had an area that just never quite passed the straight face test, even if it was cleaned up satisfactorily. And did people decide to have a different land use or a different land purpose based on that?

MR. SILER: The only thing that I can think of is that – and this is what we don't do, because we're trying to clean up everything to meet those regulations. But there are residential developments in this area where they put a residence on top of something, and they'll either have a fan underneath it, because there's an indoor air issue, or they put a slab on it or something like that saying you can't dig down, stuff like that. That's a real psychological issue when you tell people you bought this property but, you know, you can't, you know, dig here. You have to keep this fan in the basement going 24/7, it keeps having to take out the indoor air.

Now, that isn't the way that we operate. We're going to clean it up so that you don't have those types of issues here. And I think that's where the psychological issue would come in.

Janet, do you have anything? Or Elizabeth?

MS. NAITO: We have had sites where people were planning to put residential on the ground level, and because of the concentrations that remained and because of some of those concerns, they went and did podium style construction so that they have a garage with area exchangers on the first level, and then they built on top of that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. All right. Okay. I'm just bringing it up as a topic into a forum where you can have those kinds of conversations. I'm not trying to –

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – pin anything on you or anything like that.

MS. NAITO: And sometimes people realize they're never going to be able to achieve cleanup goals, so they do look at not changing the land use. But those aren't situations where you already have a property zoned for that land use.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. It just – you know, you're making a huge investment, like you are at 866, and at what point does it also just funding-wise not, you know.

MR. COFFEY: People also have to take a look at the amount of money that they've put into it and take a leap of faith saying that, you know, that that much money invested in it is going to be worthwhile.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mr. American Canyon, move on down. No, I mean they do have to, but they choose, they decide whether they will or will not.

Anyway, go on with your presentation.

MR. SILER: Okay. So here's investigation area C1. The site on the left-hand side of the page is building 461. You can see the vacuum truck taking out the lead battery acid precipitate that was underneath the building. On the right-hand side there's two different sites. On the upper right-hand corner that's the IR-15 site. On the lower right-hand corner, that's building A-72.

Moving onto the next site, investigation area C2, Building 742, building 386, 680. And then they're doing some geophysical work at a new oil pipe we found at building 46 which is the lower right-hand corner.

Here's the investigation area C3 area mainly in the triangle. The one on the upper left shows you part of a triangle, and the building 516, 516 a PCB site.

The picture on the central bottom that shows them actually putting the cap down on the IA-C3 triangle. And just another shot of the area.

Here's D1. One of the things that we did this year was demolish building 781, which was affectionately known by a number of residents here as the green monster. So it's gone. You can see above a before and after picture on the right-hand side, and then building 84 on the left-hand side.

And then here's some people doing soil vapor sampling at the underground storage tank 243 site. Just give you an idea of some of the work in relation to some of these sites.

Now, the change that you're going to notice here transitioning from 2013 to 2014, we were doing a lot of work in a number of the areas, you know, investigation area B.1, B.2-2, H-2, H-3, C1, and C2. That's going to really now get concentrated into areas C1 and C2 to get – you know, to try to close out some of those numerous sites that we have in those areas.

We're just getting to the point where all we have to do really is more documentation in those other areas, like the crane test area B.1, B.2-2, H-2, C3. Those areas are just going to have pretty much kind of paper moving along as we go forward. And the bulk of the work is going to be done in C1 and C2.

Now, the major document that we have to get done in C1 and C2, and what we're going to really focus on this year are the Remedial Action Plans. So we're going to get the investigation area C1 RAP into the regulators, that will probably occur late next month.

And then a few months after that we're going to get the investigation area C2 Remedial Action Plan.

And, of course, those will all have a public participation component. We'll be actually presenting not at the RAB, but in a separate meeting, talking about the Remedial Action Plans for both investigation areas C1 and C2, making sure the public has input as we move forward in those areas.

Again, we're going to have a few plans and notices, a lot fewer than we had in 2013.

A lot more implementation reports as we move forward.

Continue the groundwater monitoring in investigation area C1. And also in one area which is B.2-2 which is the Building 637 area, we just have to do some monitoring there.

And in addition to the land use covenant annual inspections that we do in investigation area B.2-1, the PCB sites in C3 and also the IA D1.2 commercial area, hopefully we'll be doing annual inspections as we close out the crane test area moving on into the future.

So the path to closure. One of the landmark items that we did in 2013, 2012, was negotiating an additional $8 million of funding for the ESCA First Amendment with the Navy.

We went through a whole request for proposal process, selected two contractors to do the work: Remedy Engineering to do some EETP-wide recording services.

And then ERM-West who does the remaining known environmental conditions in the remaining open investigation areas.

Then continuing on with the unknown environmental sites, we sent out requests for proposals, requests for quotation, and we'll select various contractors to do that work as we're moving forward.

Right now we're still projecting that we are going to be done with investigation area C1 and C2 probably in the 2016, 2017 time frame.

Hopefully the other IA areas that we should be able to close out, we should be able to get those done in 2015 and 2016.

So that's the path moving forward.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ten years behind.

MR. SILER: If anybody has any questions, I'd be happy to answer them now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll just say that when I attended the big gala for the ESCA and the early transfer, I remember a five year plan to complete this work, so it will be just ten years behind.

MS. NAITO: We're done.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, it's still an amazing amount of work; isn't it? MS. NAITO: This is a site that just keeps on giving.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes. Yep. Thank you.

MR. SILER: Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Neal.

All right. So we are at our first public comment period. Do we have any public comments?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Ten-minute break, folks.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Let's get started, people.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are at administrative business and announcements.

If you have any comments on the meeting minutes, get those to Myrna or myself.

Myrna, did you have any?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Nope.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Focus groups.

MR. COFFEY: No. No. No. No.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Let's see. No community, natural resources, no…

Technical focus group report?

MR. COFFEY: The motorhome is in the backyard.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Watch TV in it.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Nothing to report.

No city person.

a) Lennar Update

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Nothing to report.

MR. SILER: Just kidding. No, you should have the 11 by 17 handout where we give you an idea of what has been going on over the last month.

And the photograph in the upper left-hand corner, again I showed you that during my presentation, they're doing soil sampling around the underground storage tank 243 in the IA-2 area.

And then in the upper right-hand corner, that's actually PCB site building 69 UL-03, and we scabbled the floor in there, and we took some additional verification samples to confirm that we were – that we met the commercial industrial cleanup goal; and we did so.

MR. COFFEY: Why the jack-hammered session?

MR. SILER: That was just an area we had to take out deeper to be able to obtain that cleanup goal.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Beyond scabbling.

MR. SILER: That's right.

MR. SILER: So going down to the matrix, there's a number of documents that are in review and/or under modification.

Go down to what is the next line item, which is what the agencies have reviewed. They actually reviewed the final O&M plan. They provided us comments on that. We're trying to finalize that O&M plan at this time, and also the land use covenant.

Again, one of the things we concurred on was the pilot test for industrial pump station 4 T-2 oil water separator. They're out there performing that work right now.

Another one of the items was PCB site S34-02 UL-01 and we received concurrence on that. That's a bomb shelter that's right on the south side of building 746. You can see where that is.

Upcoming documents. Again, the major document that's upcoming during the next period will be the Remedial Action Plan for IA C1.

There's a number of other documents that are coming up, including the IA C2 RAP that should be probably in the next few months following the IA C1 RAP in the draft stage.

Field work that we implemented or under implementation in the last month. We finished off the IA-K sediment sampling.

We're performing that industrial pump station 4 T-2 oil water separator pilot test.

Did some additional sampling at building 69.

Additional wipe Sampling at Building 742 that the regulators asked us to do.

And then also did some work around building 733 and 737. They have been repainted, if you noticed that. We took off some old paint and made sure that was all clean as we did that.

Upcoming field work in the next period. The first quarter 2014 groundwater monitoring event at Building 637, and IR-03, IR-15 sites.

Finishing off the pilot test.

Working at a number of PCB sites to try to get work done to be able to close out those sites in the future. So.

If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to answers them right now.

If not, I'm going to turn this over to Dwight Gemar of Western – Weston Solutions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Western?

b) Weston Update

MR. GEMAR: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's that accent.

MR. GEMAR: Well howdy, y'all. Western Solutions, there you go. I'm going to barbecue after.

So just documents, we're pushing paper now at this point. So there's a year three annual report for the wetland monitoring at IR-05. That was submitted a couple months ago, and that's a compliance document that we don't have to respond [to] unless there's a comment, and so far we haven't gotten any comments, so that one would probably be considered final.

Then there's a couple of documents that we're looking at the comments from regulatory agencies or expect shortly. One is the post closure care plan for H-1, and the other one is the draft Feasibility Study for IR-05 and dredge pond 7-South in the western magazine area.

And then shortly, at the end of March – or excuse me – end of February we'll be submitting the investigation area H-1 annual remedy status report documenting, you know, the previous year's – or the previous year's sampling, groundwater sampling, and other activities out at H-1.

And then actually – and then today the annual report went out the door for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, which is the dredge pond area where the trail is.

And then further down the horizon are a couple more documents for IR-05. One is the Proposed Plan, Remedial Action Plan, that will come after the Feasibility Study. And then after that will be the Record of Decision for IR-05. And that would be May.

And then for IA-H1, pretty quiet out there. With the lack of rain we're not even watching the grass grow.

MR. COFFEY: You gotta be sucking air out there.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I think we're pumping along at, you know, maybe one gallon per minute. So it's pretty quiet out there. No oil to report this last couple of months. 30.7 million gallons so far and counting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow.

MR. COFFEY: Wow.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Regulatory agency report.

c) Regulatory Agency Update

CO-CHAIR HAYES. Oh, go together, come on, do it twice as fast that way.

MR. COFFEY: You can both talk into the microphone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, sing it together.

MS. NAITO: Oh, my God, you don't want to hear me sing, I am tone deaf. Let's see.

Coming up we are working on trying to catch up with all the documents that are sitting on my desk. Our goal is to be back on regular review schedules by April; provided I don't get selected for that six-month jury duty on – you know, I'm ever hopeful. I have to report for jury duty February 10th, or the week of February 10th. I am ever hopeful. Janet is shaking her head.

Your turn.

MS. WELLS: Gosh. I think the one thing you should all have – the RAB members received the draft rescission order that we sent out a little over a month ago. So the comment period ended, we had no comments.

So on February 12th that order goes to the Water Board, and I don't expect it to be contested. So hopefully they'll be adopted. And that is two more orders, two more historical orders that are out of the way.

And we're working with the Navy on one more order. And we may have come up with an easy and simple way to rescind it. And so we're going to do a little bit of research. If not, we have a little bit more digging to do just to make sure that the activities were done.

So I think, to give a little background, years and years and years ago, in the eighties, before there were agreements, the way that the Water Board would work to get things done out here was to write orders to the parties that were involved. So there are all these orders that the Water Board wrote.

So the remaining one is basically all over the island, has activities sort of all over the place, all over the island. Typically orders are on one site or something like that, but this order has a whole bunch of different sites.

So that will be our next project: just to see how we can get that one rescinded, because most of the work has either been completed or it's being done now under the CERCLA process.

I think that's it. And I'm also going to try and catch up on all of the documents that we're doing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You heard it here.

MS. WELLS: Here's my list of to do.

MR. COFFEY: Any truth to the rumor your department is going to change its name to the No Water Board?

MS. WELLS: I wish.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So Co-Chairs' Report. You want me to go ahead and go?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

All right. So this last month the Navy did some field work out at the crane test area north and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South. We drilled 29 borings, 87 soil samples were collected, and seven groundwater samples. That was completed earlier this month. And the data is starting to come in.

We submitted four documents. And DTSC gave us comments and concurrence on three documents, the Water Board did the same for two, and EPA submitted comments on one.

Also, on the table over there, there's a draft Navy field schedule. We are still hopeful that if the weather stays dry we can get out to the paint waste area starting the end of this month. The rest of the field work is for spring and summer.

And I think that's all except for if you have a chance, go to the website– it's the same website as on the bottom of the MPR, but they have changed the whole layout of the Navy website. Let me know, not much I can do about it, but let me know if you think it's improved.

MS. NAITO: Only let you know if you think it's improved.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's certainly harder for me because now I have to load everything up myself.

MR. COFFEY: Does your new website have signup for Obamacare?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Anyway, I think it's a little easier to navigate through, but I welcome your criticisms.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Compliments.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Compliments, criticisms.

MR. COFFEY: Input.

MS. NAITO: Think positive.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I had high hopes at the BCT meeting, but now I'm beaten down.

MS. WELLS: It's a little hard to click on the map when the instructions are on top of the map.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, they are, look at that.

MS. PAULY: Okay, first comment.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. I haven't gone onto the site on my phone, well –

MS. NAITO: Maybe it works better.

MS. WELLS: I don't know if I can do Nevada or California.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You're so much trouble.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's intentional, it's just for your area.

MS. WELLS: Oh, wait a minute.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right.

MS. NAITO: Sorry, continuing on.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, should I be using her microphone?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: No, you shouldn't, sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Very quickly now, it won't take me long to just make a Co-Chairs' Report.

I want to just note that, mentioning some of our RAB members who are not present. Wally had a chance to visit with Jerry Karr, and you probably recall he's having a long struggle, lifetime struggle it seems like with cancer. And – but we just want to wish him well. And there's no need to resign or do anything, just keep on being a part of our lives. So I just want to wish him well in the minutes because maybe he'll get a chance to read them.

The – for those of you who might be interested in the San Francisco Bay Flyway Festival, bird watching, a wildlife viewing festival held here for 19 events, eighteen years, here are flyers of different types.

And pick up one. Use them mostly as a poster, if you would, and just send people off to the website for the whole schedule.

And thanks to Lennar for allowing us to use the building again this year.

And for Weston Solutions for being a major corporate sponsor again this year.

And we welcome everybody to attend. And those who wish to actually be a part of it, Wally will be a field guide, the Navy and the city have generously worked with us to allow access to the historic south shore and the western magazine, and Wally will be giving one of those outings.

So come out. And that's about all.

I also do have an outing coming up, a boat trip on March 23rd. So if you want to do the Napa River or you know someone who does, or you want to post a poster somewhere, please grab one of those as well. That's – oh, yeah, it's February 7, 8, 9, a week from tomorrow.

So thank you.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What's February 7, 8, 9?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The festival.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Flyway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Flyway Festival headquartered on Mare Island with no berth.

MR. COFFEY: Or water.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks for coming everyone. Drive safe.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 8:41 p.m.).

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area F1 Feasibility Study
- Presentation Handout – Eastern Early Transfer Parcel Update and Path Forward
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, January 30, 2014