

**Mare Island Naval Shipyard  
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting  
Mare Island Conference Center,  
375 G Street, Vallejo, California  
January 29, 2015**

**This packet contains the following list of items:**

- January 29, 2015 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Notice.
- Agenda for January 29, 2015 RAB Meeting.
- Draft Minutes from the December 4, 2014 RAB Meeting.
- Comments or Corrections to the Draft Meeting Minutes Form: Please complete this form and return to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes at the conclusion of the RAB meeting. All corrections will be included in the draft final copy of the minutes, which will be located in the RAB library for review and comment.
- RAB Meeting Agenda Request/Comments Form: Please complete this form and return to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes.

**NOTE: Minutes from previous meetings that are to be finalized this month will only be sent to the information repository for review. Past RAB meeting minutes can be viewed on the following website: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>**

Future Mare Island RAB meetings are listed below:

March 26, 2015  
May 28, 2015  
July 30, 2015



**PUBLIC MEETING**  
**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)**  
**January 2015 MEETING**



**The Department of Navy (DON) invites interested members of the public to attend updates and presentations with members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) made up of representatives from the local community, Navy, Federal and State regulatory agencies. The DON encourages the public to keep informed about the environmental cleanup at former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY), Vallejo, California.**

**January 2015 Featured Topics**

**Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Program Investigation, Remediation, and Closure Status Update**

**Remediation at Storm Sewer Site  
Buildings 382, 386 and 388  
Investigation Area C2  
Eastern Early Transfer Parcel**



**Date: Thursday, January 29, 2015**

**Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

**Location: Mare Island Conference Center  
375 G St., Vallejo, CA**

**Ask questions and voice your concerns. You Can Make a Difference!**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:**

**Janet Lear, (619) 532-0976 or Myrna Hayes, (707) 249-9633**

Navy BRAC Web Page: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>

Mare Island Environmental Web Page: <http://www.mareisland.org>



# AGENDA

## MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD

### Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting No. 207

January 29, 2015 – Mare Island Conference Center  
375 G Street, Vallejo, CA

7:00 p.m.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> (Janet Lear, Myrna Hayes)	5 mins.
7:05	<b>Presentation:</b> <i>Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Program Investigation, Remediation, and Closure Status Update</i> Ms. Janet Lear, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator	25 mins.
	<i>Discussion</i>	5 mins.
7:35	<b>Presentation:</b> <i>Remediation at Storm Sewer Site Buildings 382, 386 and 388 Investigation Area C2, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel</i> Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island	25 mins.
	<i>Discussion</i>	5 mins.
8:05	<b>Public Comment Period</b>	5 mins.
8:10	<b>10-minute break</b>	10 mins.
8:20	<b>Administrative Business and Announcements</b> (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear)	
	a) December 4, 2014 Meeting Minutes	5 mins.
8:25	<b>Focus Group Reports/Discussion</b>	20 mins.
	a) Community (to be determined)	
	b) Natural Resources (to be determined)	
	c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)	
	d) City Report (Kathleen Diohep)	
	e) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)	
	f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)	
	g) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito/Carolyn d'Almeida/ Elizabeth Wells)	
8:45	<b>Co-chairs' Report</b> (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear)	10 mins.
8:55	<b>Public Comment Period</b>	5 mins.
9:00	<b>Adjourn</b>	

THE NEXT RAB MEETING WILL BE HELD March 26, 2015

***For more information concerning environmental restoration at Mare Island, contact:***

Janet Lear, BRAC Environmental Coordinator & Navy Co-chair (619) 532-0976;

Myrna Hayes, RAB Community Co-chair (707) 249-9633

Janet Naito, Department of Toxic Substances Control (510) 540-3833; Carolyn d'Almeida, US EPA (415) 972-3150;

Elizabeth Wells, Regional Water Quality Control Board, (510) 622-2440;

RAB Support Contractor: Jessica W. Cooper, Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC (415) 321-1782

Navy BRAC Web Page: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>

Mare Island Environmental Web Page: <http://www.mareisland.org>



# **DRAFT**

## **MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD**

### **Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes**

**HELD THURSDAY, December 4, 2014**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:02 p.m. and adjourned at 9:00 p.m. These minutes contain a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting.

#### **RAB Community Members in Attendance:**

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

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

- Patricia McFadden (Acting Navy Co-Chair)
- Kathleen Diohep (City of Vallejo)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Reginald Paulding (Navy Contracted Support)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (Regional Water Quality Control Board)

#### **Community Guests in Attendance:**

- Nick Bellavance (Qinetiq North America)
- Mike Chamberlain (Trihydro)
- Virginia Demetrios (ERRG)
- Andrew Lum (DRS Marine)
- Fred Ousey (Envirotech Services)
- Mike Tambroni (ERRG)
- Greg Tracey (Leidos)

#### **RAB Support from Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC, in Attendance:**

- Jessica W. Cooper (Assistant Project Manager)
- Wally Neville (Audio/Visual Support)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Patricia McFadden [Acting Navy Co-Chair])**

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Hello. My name is Patricia McFadden, and I'm sitting in for Janet Lear, the Navy's rep. I also work for the Navy, and I work at the local caretaker's site office which is located at Treasure Island. I help take care of Mare Island as well. And we're here to start the meeting. Welcome.

Myrna, do you have anything to say?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Nothing, not other than to welcome Patricia again, and welcome to everyone who is here today.

My name is Myrna Hayes and I'm the community co-chair of the Restoration Advisory Board.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: All right. Do you want to do introductions as you typically do?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Go ahead and go around.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Hello, I'm Paula Tygielski and I am a resident of Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: And I'm 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.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen. I'm a resident of Mare Island.

MR. LUM: I'm Andrew Lum, I work for DRS Marine.

MR. PAULDING: Reggie Paulding, contract support to the Navy.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Virginia Demetrios with ERRG.

MR. TAMBRONI: Mike Tambroni with ERRG.

MR. TRACEY: Greg Tracey with Leidos.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Nick Bellavance with Qinetiq North America.

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey with Envirotech Services.

MS. COOPER: Jessica Cooper with Sullivan International Group.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain with Trihydro.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Wally Neville who will not usually introduce himself.

MR. NEVILLE: We have a little different arrangement today so it was a little trickier.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Thank you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Thank you for that. Okay.

**II. PRESENTATION (Reginald Paulding [Navy Remedial Project Manager]):**  
*Investigation Area K Remote Operated Vehicle Demonstration and Remedial Investigation Preliminary Data*

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: So first on the agenda we have a presentation related to our -- the Navy's Investigation Area K. And part of it will be a demonstration as well as a presentation of information.

So I'd like to introduce Reggie Paulding from our San Diego office who is the project manager for this site.

MR. PAULDING: Sure, I'll start back here. Okay. So today, yeah, we're going to have a little something different. We're actually going to have a little live presentation of a piece of equipment here. This ROV remote operated vehicle, that we used out at IA-K submerged under water earlier back in November.

So what we have here, we have a team consisting of Greg and Nick here, they're going to show us a little bit of how it worked in action. So they're going to drive it around a little bit, and we have a metal wrench here that somebody can wave underneath the magnetometers, and then we can see the response on the computer screen just to get a better feel for the equipment and how it operates.

And then, as Patricia said, we'll go into the actual presentation.

So if you're interested. I don't know, Nick, you just want to show 'em it in operation?

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: You want to move it first? Feel free to stand up and look at it just so you can see kind of the mechanics.

MR. PAULDING: Right. So we operated it under water, it came out from a barge and then operated it under water.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: So yeah, don't be shy, go over there.

MR. PAULDING: This is why we brought it here.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: He promises not to run anybody over, so come on up.

MR. COFFEY: Famous last words.

MS. NAITO: But if you take anybody out, just him.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Maybe, Reggie, they can walk through the components.

MR. TRACEY: Yeah, we're kind of working together on this. This is what they call a C-Talon benthic crawler. And it's a system; its system is designed to detect metal under water.

MR. COFFEY: That actually drives into water?

MR. TRACEY: Right.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: It actually drives under water.

MR. TRACEY: It's amphibious, it operates on land and on the beach, in water. This is the front of the vehicle here. It's got video cameras looking forward and aft. It has an antenna here that

we can determine its position. The extension is actually right next to this gentleman when we're in water about eight feet deep.

The system is a track vehicle so it moves just like Wally does. And then in the back here we have the magnetometer array, we call it the mag array. And we call it an array because there are five magnetometers in a line. And each of these magnetometers is looking basically down into the dirt or into the mud for a signal of something that's magnetic.

And, of course, here it has a magnetic field, and objects that move through that magnetic field generate an aberration of that field and can be detected.

So it's really important that these sensors stay as close to the mud as possible because the signal that a metal object [has] falls off very rapidly with the distance between the sensor and the object. If it gets buried too deep, we can't detect it.

And the good thing about these particular mags is that they look mostly down and they're less influenced by what's around them. So if you're up against a pier or something you don't really care about, you won't lose your signal for what's near it, it's what's beneath the magnetometer versus what's out away from it. So that's one of the important points.

MR. COFFEY: It's not affected by its own metal mass?

MR. TRACEY: This is all aluminum and so there's no ferrous items on the vehicle whatsoever.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So it only has magnetometers on it, it doesn't have metal detectors?

MR. TRACEY: This is for ferrous metal detection.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: It would be difficult with an all-metals detector because the metals on the device would then interfere with it, so --

And the magnetometers actually have a more readable signal, like they can go through some of the data they collect with the magnetometer by some of the old metals detectors.

MR. TRACEY: There are systems that can do it simultaneously, but --

MR. OUSEY: How deep will it go?

MR. TRACEY: This can go over a hundred feet.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Under a hundred feet on it.

MR. TRACEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Are we allowed to photograph you with it or is it proprietary?

MR. TRACEY: No, it's not proprietary. Take a look. It's got a couple of other things. One of the other key challenges is the depth of the water that you're working in, because to have navigation, you have to have access to the satellites. And if your antenna is under water you don't; you can't see the sky.

So we have what's called a[n] ultra-short baseline system here which is an acoustic device; it sends an acoustic pulse over to the boat or the barge -- wherever these guys live with the laptops, and it computes the position of the crawler on the sea floor based on the distance; that acoustic signal that goes back and forth between the two objects. So that's kind of a special item.

Other than that it has -- Like I said, it's got the video cameras. There's an internal compass. There's actually a computer inside this box down below the sea chest we call it, that boots up and controls the operation, tells the speed and the direction and power supply and status of the batteries and the system.

And if you want to, we can walk behind here and you can see the screens, because you can see the video and see the magnetometer work.

There's also a sonar system, this little black cylinder down here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The black box.

MR. TRACEY: The sonar is really important, especially for the waters around Mare Island because they are so turbid. And in order to drive and make sure you don't run into anything, you have to have something out in front of you to tell you what you can see.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. TRACEY: And there's plenty to see.

I just have to hold it higher.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If you could just almost rest it on your chin.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: I've seen Shania do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. TRACEY: But I'm not --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, no.

MR. TRACEY: So that's pretty much the basics of it. There's features here that, you know, the system is, rocks a little bit potentially, so it's going over small mounds so the sensors can kind of roll, it can roll with the hills and still maintain that low level detection distance offset between the mud and where that object might be.

This is the fiberoptic cable here, this little green strand. That's actually a high density fiber that has a very high bandwidth, it's -- I don't know, Nick, how you characterize the bandwidth of that.

MR. BELLAVANCE: It's a multi gigabit.

MR. TRACEY: It's a multi gigabit. Everything that's going on on the sensor is the video feed, the cameras, the sensors, all the magnetometer array, the acoustic work; all that data gets fed up the cable up to the surface.

And we have a spool of cable over here. So this thing can just be fed out as much as we want, and right now there's some 300 meters of cable. We never let the system get that far away from us, to this point until we get very confident in its ability. But it makes it easy just to wind it up and let it out as you need to.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Let's show 'em --

MR. TRACEY: We need a volunteer to --

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: If you want to come look at the screen to see what happens when metal gets close to it. You can be the metal person or you can be the -- nothing's going to happen there, I'll tell you. It won't shock you.

MR. COFFEY: I'm not worried about that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, he can do the metal.

MR. COFFEY: I want to hear some tones, hear some tones.

(Thereupon there was simultaneous discussion.)

MR. TRACEY: A good move is to kind of play like a piano and just drape it right down the line and you can see each of the sensors fire up.

MS. WELLS: Do you want it actually near it or under it?

MR. TRACEY: Near it or under it is best, yeah.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: I wanted something to show up.

MR. TRACEY: Now you see five wiggle lines pop up in a row?

MR. COFFEY: Is that the wrench or her earrings?

MS. WELLS: They're gold.

MR. PAULDING: One more run.

MS. WELLS: Okay. One more time.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: The heat sensor, you can see a different color.

(Thereupon there was simultaneous discussion.)

MS. WELLS: Do you want me to do it once more, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. You should make Reggie do it.

MR. PAULDING: You're expert at this now.

MR. TRACEY: That's called the wrench test.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: What's the speed that it moves at, Greg? Can you talk about how it collects data and actually --

MR. TRACEY: It has to be moving really to collect data. I'm sorry, I'll try to remember. I'll hand this off to somebody. And it's pretty peppy. If you're just going down the beach you can do a couple of knots, which is -- what is it? -- that would be four meters per second, two knots? I forget the conversion. Point five meters per knot. Anyways I think of knots. About as fast as you can walk or faster than you can walk. But normally we move more slowly mainly because we have to be careful that we don't run into something.

When you're working right on the sea floor in any environment unless you've had a thorough scan of the area, the likelihood that you'll run into something is pretty high, especially when you're working around piers and things where, you know, things could fall overboard, so --

MS. WELLS: Does it then back itself up and go around it like a Roomba or --

MR. TRACEY: Yeah, the driver takes care of that. You do the classic three point turn, you know. You can back out of any problems. A lot of times you can sort of mousetrap your way,

mouse maze your way into an area you want to study, and then find out your only way out is the way you came in, and you have to basically back all the way out in the same direction, so you try to do that

MR. COFFEY: I think you just named it the mother of all Roombas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But this just maps, it doesn't suck it up.

MR. TRACEY: No, no, it doesn't.

MS. WELLS: Come back later and we'll --

MR. TRACEY: It comes up plenty dirty, but --

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Roomba --

MR. TRACEY: So it's got the video camera so if you ever want to see yourself on video camera it's on the screen here. Of course for Mare Island it's too turbid to really use the video cameras. But the sonar we have on it is pretty high resolution, and at some point there's a video that we have and you can clearly see tires and concrete blocks, cinder blocks. We see bicycles, kayaks, not all here necessarily, but ladders, classic. All kinds of -- all kinds of metal debris of any nature.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Bodies?

MR. TRACEY: We found a half of a side of a house, a door off of Pier 35.

MR. PAULDING: So we'll wrap up the -- this part of the demonstration and then we'll go and do the more traditional presentation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did I miss something? This just works in intertidal? I mean this doesn't drive around in the bottom of the --

MR. COFFEY: A hundred feet.

MR. PAULDING: It can go up to a hundred feet. And they did have it out, and we're going to talk about that in the presentation.

We went down around Piers 34 and Pier 35 and the Fleet Reserve Pier. And Andrew was part of the crew that headed out -- well, all of these guys were part of the crew, they were out on the barge in IA-K.

MR. COFFEY: Do you have divers standing by in case?

MR. PAULDING: We did have an option for divers to retrieve the equipment, but not to do the actual investigation.

MR. OUSEY: How did it respond in the bay mud?

MR. PAULDING: We're going to talk about that -- you're jumping ahead, but maybe that's a good transition. So let's get to the presentation.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Hello. I'm Virginia Demetrios, I'm the project manager for ERRG. You guys met Greg Tracey already and Nick, the operator of the vehicle, and obviously you know Reggie, he's the project manager.

And Leidos did a lot of the work on this job. They developed the plans, the approach, and did most of the fieldwork, so -- All right, moving on.

So we're just going to run -- We've already done the demonstration, so I'm just going to quickly run through the history, we've gone through this before. The sites that we have offshore, basically RI investigation, and the data that we were able to collect.

This was supposed to be a video that is not working of the crawler being placed in the water; I'm sorry, for some reason it's not working with the setup here.

So just, you know, this is the same thing you guys saw a couple months ago about the FS; it's the activities in the offshore area for IA-K. Mainly it's construction and maintenance, manufacturing, storage of munitions, and ship mooring and berthing.

So very similar to what you heard a couple of months ago when we had a presentation about the feasibility study.

This part of the study is to look at the MRP sites. There are four offshore MRP sites; you can see them here in blue.

One is at the Fleet Reserve Pier, berths one and two, the Production Manufacturing Area, and down in the south shore area.

We worked with the BCT, which is the regulatory agencies, and the Navy, to identify the areas that we thought would have the highest probability of MEC. The areas where we thought that we would be most likely to find any MEC items. And those were Piers 34 and 35. Which I don't know if you can see clearly are down here on the south shore of the island; 34 being the one that's the most east, so on this picture up. And the 35 is the one on the bottom down here.

MR. PAULDING: And it's also in the presentation.

MS. DEMETRIOS: We also looked at the fleet reserve area. Thank you. I've got the laser pointer.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Reggie is going to be Vanna.

MS. DEMETRIOS: So then we did a bathymetry study, we've presented that before, and based on that data we identified areas around these two piers where we could access using this crawler to do a survey.

So those areas that we thought we could access were in yellow. So you can see them here on this figure. Back in the corner here, the near shore area at the tip, and then over here on Pier 35 all along the eastern side, the western side, and also at the tip.

The other areas were not accessible for a number of reasons, either debris or slopes that were very steep slopes, so the crawler would not be able to go down those.

MR. PAULDING: And sedimentation.

MS. DEMETRIOS: And sedimentation, correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I know you guys know this presentation really, really, really well, and you've reviewed it together and pieced it together. I would like to ask you to do two things. One, not use acronyms, go ahead and say MEC, say munitions and explosives of concern at least once so that it's in the record.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Munitions and explosives of concern.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As not being an acronym it's a lot easier for people to review the minutes later.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Okay. Thank you, yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the second thing is, like, I know that there was a question about how it handled sediment, and you said sediment, and then you just went on blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Go ahead and tell us about why sediment was an issue, if you would.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- you know, in ruling out or deciding where you did or didn't do your work. I would appreciate that.

MS. DEMETRIOS: So the sedimentation that occurred was after dredging activities happened in the nineties and there was a lot of sedimentation that happened around these berths or these piers, and due to that we're looking for areas that we thought we could find items. And we didn't look in areas that would potentially be covered by recent sedimentation, we wouldn't be able to find those items.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: If I can --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, maybe.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: If I can clarify a little. So you can see the areas along each side of the pier where the boats would have been. Those are the areas that were also dredged most frequently.

When we did the bathymetry study, what we were looking for is how has the depth to sediment changed over time, and that then tells us what that depth of sediment is since the last dredging period. Just like on land, the magnetometers have a limitation to how deep they can detect. So if there was more than two feet of sediment, we wouldn't be able to see beneath that significantly enough to be able to do some work.

So the depth of sediment is what ruled out those areas that were dredged most frequently because they then also built up sediment over the time since the last dredging period.

MS. WELLS: So -- it's Elizabeth. So you're saying if there was more than two feet of new sediment since the last time it was dredged?

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Correct. Since -- because the activities had stopped, so there would be no munitions or explosives of concern, MEC is what we call it. Those would not be there in that, at the surface where we would be more likely to see it. The base closed in '96, but even the operations down here stopped in the seventies. But that munition that got dropped in, let's just say, '96, if it got covered with three, four feet of sediment we wouldn't be able to see it. So we were looking for the areas we'd be most able to and likely to find munitions and explosives of concern.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So just to finish up on what data you did collect or were expecting to collect here, This is just a sampling; you'll have large data gaps?

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. DEMETRIOS: All right. And here are the cells that we tried to sample also and investigate at the fleet reserve, yellow being the areas of investigation.

So the objective, like Patricia pointed out, is to identify the metallic anomalies in the offshore area, and we had identified a spot where we were going to pull up items and see what they were.

We did a geophysical study, and that was to look for metal anomalies. And then we also did, like I said, the intrusive investigation, which means that we went out and in a 15 by 15 and 2 foot deep area we basically sucked up that sediment to see what it was.

We also, prior to actually doing the intrusive investigation, which is really using a suction hose and sucking up that metal debris, we took samples in case we found any MEC items so we could correlate laboratory analysis, munition constituents and metal analysis with those potential MEC items that could be found.

MS. DIOHEP: I think what you said was --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Here you have to use this.

MS. DIOHEP: -- was that you took the sediment so that you could know that if, by sampling you then knew what kind of things were in the sediment near where something was found? So is the idea that later if you find sediment like that you would be suspicious of something near it?

MS. DEMETRIOS: So if we actually found an item, a munition of explosive concern, and we had taken a sediment sample then we could correlate that metal analysis and the munition constituents analysis with that item.

So we sampled prior to identifying if there was a munitions item because an intrusive investigation is required to recover the item and determine it was munitions, highly disturbing that area. So we took the sample, and then we went in and basically sucked up all at that sediment to see what was there.

And if we found an item we could say, okay, did we get a hit of munition constituents; is that item potentially leaking into the sediment or not?

MS. WELLS: So -- This is Elizabeth. To make sure I understand, you went out, found an area that had a hot geophysical signature, and you went out and you collected a sediment sample for chemical testing for metals or for munitions constituents, and then you went and you sucked it all up?

MS. DEMETRIOS: Right.

MS. WELLS: And you're waiting for the chemical data --

MS. DEMETRIOS: Right.

MS. DIOHEP: -- if you find munitions then you can correlate, because you can correlate the chemical results with where the munitions or metal stuff you found was; is that right?

MS. DEMETRIOS: Exactly right.

MS. DIOHEP: But what's the use of that data later? Because even if you found a munition that wasn't leaking into the chemical, it's a problem.

MS. DEMETRIOS: If I found a munition --

MS. DIOHEP: Yeah.

MS. DEMETRIOS: -- that wasn't having exposure to the sediment?

MS. DIOHEP: Yeah.

MS. DEMETRIOS: It's to help with the conceptual side model for the remedial investigation report. Again, just to get a better understanding of the site so you can more fully understand what's going on out there.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Yeah, we're only analyzing it for metals and munitions constituents, so that would be the components that make up an explosive component of a munition.

And we just want to know that should we find a munition in the sediment, did it contribute to contamination in the sediment outside of its container? So typically we have not seen it in the soil on land; we haven't found the munitions constituents even in soil directly adjacent to a munition; just because of the state they were in, they were all intact.

But because we're doing something new, it's in the sediment, it's a different environment, we wanted to collect the data to see if we find anything different. And you're right, if we found other chemicals of concern, we would still have something to assess for that sediment.

MS. DIOHEP: And then this was like dredge spoils afterwards? Where did the -- what you suck up end up? Or is it all off into the sampling?

MS. DEMETRIOS: I'll get to that in a second if you don't mind?

MS. DIOHEP: Sure.

MS. DEMETRIOS: So as you can see here -- well, you can't see very well. There's the barge with the crane to lower the crawler into the water.

And down here on the lower picture there's a Vanveen grab sampler similar to how we did the data gaps investigation in the offshore to take the sediment samples.

So here's the crawler, that's right over there, that was being deployed into the water.

And here you can see the suction hose. And basically what happened is there would be a suction hose that sucked that area into a cage to capture the metal anomalies. The other sediment basically would come right out of that; it wasn't held. Any item -- any sediment that was sticking onto anything that we pulled up, we did put into drums and containerized it. But the rest of the sediment stayed in the water and went back into the environment.

So here's an example of an IVS strip. The IVS strip is an instrumentation verification strip. That's used to test the equipment every day prior to going out and collecting the geophysical data.

So you can see the five magnetometers. As they go across the item it will peak. So here's the -- Where's Vanna?

MR. PAULDING: Oh.

MS. DEMETRIOS: So here's the -- So you see the five magnetometers down there, that's correlating to the five lines up here. As the crawler goes across this line, and the line is basically a string with different size pipes attached to it to make sure that the equipment is working. So as it drives by you can see a peak, and then it keeps going, there's another one, and then it goes over the other, there's a total of six.

And here's a more -- this is after the data has been collected, you can see the five lines of the magnetometer going down and running over each of the items on the IVS strip which is really just a string with metal pipes attached to it.

MS. WELLS: So the point of this was to calibrate your -- the geophysical machinery or the detector, and to actually make sure that you were seeing the metal when you were seeing the metal. And you would do that each day?

MS. DEMETRIOS: We did that every day, yeah, test it.

MS. WELLS: Okay.

MS. DEMETRIOS: And if it didn't work, the information would be considered invalid. And so you test it, everything is working, and if you go back and test it again and it's not working, everything you collected prior to that would be considered not valid.

MS. WELLS: So when you see a red dot or a blue dot or whatever the dots are out in the investigation area, you could be confident that it's something metal because of your test strip results.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Exactly. And we also had a blind seeding program done by a third party QA, and I'll show you that too. You can see that there's a line that they placed in the area and it showed up. So we basically make sure it was working.

So here's an example of the data, of an area of the data we collected at Pier 34. And what we did is identified the area with the highest number of metal anomalies. So the area that basically had the largest mass, and identified that to be the intrusive investigation area.

And so if you look at this, there's the color range, right, it's blue through red. And basically if it's either positively charged or negatively charged metal. So if it's either blue or red that's the metal item, and everything that's green there's not something metal out there; we aren't detecting anything. So we picked the areas that had the most blue and red, 'cause that would be the areas with the most metal.

This was done again at Pier 35. Collected data all along the eastern side. You can see the tracks of the crawler trying to ride around. And this is the area where we ended up -- we selected this, with the regulatory [agency's] too, approval, and found this was the side of a building and the door. And as you can see, you can barely see it up here, I'm sorry, you can see it better on your papers. There's just a long solid basically line that looks like metal, and it did turn out to be basically a side of a building.

MR. COFFEY: So it just fell into the water?

MS. DEMETRIOS: Yeah, probably fell off the pier.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Might have had some assistance.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Here's some of the data collected at the Fleet Reserve Pier. Same thing, we selected the area with the highest concentration of metal anomalies.

So here's an example of a sediment sample. It's the same gooey silty sediment that we find at Mare Island.

And then over here inside the cage, the metal debris that was pulled up, and it was basically a bunch of scrap and trash. We pulled up some clothing, like I said, the side of the building. We pulled up a door.

And then actually the picture here on my left is the picture of the side of the building. It was -- what did you call it, Greg? It was some certain kind of metal siding.

MR. PAULDING: Strap metal.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Here's a picture of the debris from the Fleet Reserve Pier. And strangely enough, while we were taking a sediment sample we just happened to land exactly on a 20 foot hose, metal hose. And as we pulled up to take the sample, we pulled up the hose as well. So we did recycle that hose and dispose of it. We didn't put it back in the water; we cleaned it up. But it was strangely pulled up while we were taking a sediment sample versus during an intrusive investigation.

So a lot of debris out here. And especially a lot of debris in the Fleet Reserve Pier area. And debris that we couldn't see when we did the side scan sonar and the bathymetry data. We saw some of it, but not the amount we ran into while we went out there and did this work.

MS. DEMETRIOS: It was just hard to determine what it was. You could see something but you couldn't tell exactly what it was. And being out there with the crawler right on the sediment surface we ran into a lot of junk, frankly, out there, mainly in the Fleet Reserve Pier. Down at the south shore island it was a bit cleaner.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well that junk is pretty much the, at least from what I've learned about munitions clearing, pretty much the way it is; you know, you're looking almost for a needle in a haystack sometimes. That the majority of what you do find is scrap.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Which is actually what we did find at Pier 35. We did find one 20 millimeter brass casing, and we did find a six inch naval round which basically is a sawed off end. You can see it's cut off here.

And from the MEC guys, the UXO guys, they told me that often they would cut off the end and use like as an ash tray or something. This was pretty much considered just discarded like scrap. So we did find those two items at Pier 35.

And like I mentioned, we found a lot of debris, actually 130 pounds that we pulled up in those three areas where we did the intrusive investigation. So we did one in each area, the 15 by 15 foot areas. Pulled up most the debris at Pier 35; part of that is the side of the building. And then most of the fifty pounds from the Fleet Reserve Pier was that hose, that hose is probably about 45 of that 50 pounds. The other part was clothing.

So like we mentioned, the sediment samples, the analytical data will be coming back at the end of July -- or January. So you might have noticed on the figures that, you know, our intention was to go to cover the -- all the area of the yellow boxes and we were not successful in doing that. And that was largely due to the site conditions, which we expected, but they were far more hard to overcome than any of us thought.

Tide fluctuations caused some issues as far as getting into the north shore areas. The barge was unable to get close enough to deploy the crawler. Even though we had the long line, it was still hard to place it into the water close enough to the locations we needed to be.

The currents are very strong at Mare Island, in excess of one knot, and the crawler basically at some points could not go into those currents.

At the Fleet Reserve Pier the currents were quite strong that day, and as we deployed or basically put the crawler in the water, by the time it went down 30 feet to the sediment surface, the current had pulled it to the edge of the study boundary, so it had gone about 45 feet out. We were going in a fifty foot area outside of the pier and it was pushing it out, so we couldn't position the crawler in the right location, and then we couldn't put it back going into the current.

We all know that there's very silty sediments in the bay, and Mare Island Strait is no exception. And the soft sediments around the piers was soft and highly silty sediments, and the crawler basically would sink. And that was probably due to the dredging that happened in the nineties, the recent sloughing of the sediment going into those areas, just very --

MR. COFFEY: Fine.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Very fine, yeah. So it couldn't get traction on the sediment floor, the sea floor.

The steep slopes I mentioned, we saw a lot of those in our bathymetry analysis, but they were, you know, I guess up to 50 percent at times very steep. The crawler did take a tumble at one point down a steep slope, and we decided that wasn't a good idea anymore. And like I said, excessive amount of debris in some of the areas, mainly in the Fleet Reserve Pier.

So in conclusion I hand it back to Randy -- not Randy, Reggie.

MR. PAULDING: All right. Thanks. So -- So to kind of tie it all together here. So what we saw was that the digital geophysical mapping part of the equipment worked underwater fairly well, worked as designed. However, it was difficult to get data, as we've -- as Virginia was stating. And, you know now the reasons why it was difficult to collect that data, the slopes, the soft sediment, debris and such.

So on the positive side, what we did get from this, from the investigation, was we were able to support our site conceptual model that we had developed operating when we were creating the work plan.

Why did we look at the sites that we looked at? 'Cause we felt that if there were munitions in the strait, they would be close to the piers. We didn't expect to see much munitions, and we didn't find much. We found, the previous point, we found a lot of debris.

We did find two items. Those items were what we call MDAS, material documented as safe, not dangerous to the community.

And so at this point we're going to continue to analyze the data that we do have and produce the RI report moving forward. And that's part of our next steps.

We're going to put together the RI report, and present that.

We'll have another presentation when we get to that stage.

And then we'll also have a feasibility study, that's where we evaluate remedial alternatives. What are we going to do with the property, with the IA-K and submerged lands?

And at that point we'll have a Proposed Plan and a public meeting that goes along with the public comment period.

And then we would finish up the CERCLA investigation phase with what we call a Record of Decision where the actual remedy is selected and signed off on.

So at this point I open the floor up for questions. And we have a lot of very intelligent people here that put a lot of effort into this project, and please feel free to ask any questions.

MR. COFFEY: So it said at the very end of this that the ROV is not feasible for this.

MR. PAULDING: Right. So if you remember, we did a study maybe four years ago at this point, where we looked at various technologies. We looked at different types of rovers, ROV's. We looked at towed arrays, you know, where you put it on the back of a boat and you could traverse the IA-K.

Those different technologies were ruled out for use at Mare Island for various reasons. So the towed array is pretty much the standard for a marine environment. But we didn't use the towed array because of our conceptual site model where we felt that munitions would be close to piers and under piers, and with the towed array, you know, you have to have a buffer from the pier.

MR. COFFEY: Okay. But the point is you can't do that?

MR. PAULDING: Right.

MR. COFFEY: This isn't feasible?

MR. PAULDING: Right.

MR. COFFEY: What's next?

MR. PAULDING: What's next? This was the next thing. This was our best shot. And unfortunately this is where we are. We're going to analyze the data, work with the regulators. At the point where we develop the work plan and the meetings that we had, it was kind of settled that this was our last best shot. And if this didn't work, there was like not much out there that would work.

MR. COFFEY: But my concern with this now is you found an awful lot of debris, a lot of crap out there, and you found a few questionable items that are deemed safe, but these are probably the most likely areas in all of Mare Island left that could have possible MEC items still out there.

And it sounds to me like we're in the position now of oh, well, we gave it our best shot, walk away. Is that what we're talking about?

MR. PAULDING: Yeah, with a caveat, yes. But, I mean, that's in essence where we are.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Walk away with land use restrictions.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Yeah, there would be some kind of controls to help make sure should there be something there.

MR. COFFEY: But that still doesn't rectify the situation. I mean are we going to say, okay, we have to wait for another day when we have greater technology that we might be able to do something else? So, therefore, we just don't disturb anything until that period of time, but we know that there's the possibility of something else, so we just leave it alone?

That's disturbing to me that we're finding this is the area that could have the most possible issues, and yet we're just going to say, oh well, we just won't do anything with it until some other day.

MS. DIOHEP: And another point I would add is that what we're finding is there's a lot of economic value about using the piers and things at Mare Island

that can create jobs and revitalization. So that if your land use covenants are don't dredge or don't go into this --

That's actually what's working at Mare Island economically.

MS. NAITO: You know, similar to what we've done for, I forget the name of the company that's doing the dismantlement of the ships. In areas where they formerly dredged, we don't have a problem with them re-dredging that area. It's if you go beyond where they've dredged there may still be munitions or something there. There's a lot of debris out there.

But for the areas that -- we're only concerned with the historic surface. If they dredged it before we would expect that anything that was on the surface at that time would have been picked up. And that's why we found a bunch of munitions and other assorted items in the dredge pond outfalls. So that should help with your economic reuse.

MS. DIOHEP: Just one real thing to clarify there is that ship dismantling isn't what's going on anymore at Mare Island. It's Mare Island dry dock, and they're doing ship repair.

MS. NAITO: Okay, ship repair.

MS. DIOHEP: So we're on the third generation, which is actually a very different function and more economic value.

MS. NAITO: But they still have to dredge the area in front of it to bring the ships in?

MS. DIOHEP: Right. So you're saying that as long as they don't go below the historic dredge line. But that still means -- so how -- what would your land use -- could you -- What if a ship came in? What if something came in that disturbed low? Would you not envision restricted use?

MS. NAITO: In some areas it's not possible to go lower without potentially undermining the quay wall.

MS. DIOHEP: And then the other question is, aren't any other things just deteriorating and just risks to the river and the bay?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be part of the analysis.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Yeah. And I don't think what -- I don't think what we're going to, the controls we would have would be, like Janet said, on the sediment that was basically the level that we knew it was dredged to historically, and those would be those same areas that ships would use, because that's exactly why we dredged it.

And so the controls would not say don't use the pier, because the risk from the surface is nil, you're not encountering anything because you're not disturbing the sediments or anything below it which is where we believe anything is.

It is challenging because we don't know, we're suspecting, based on the fact of pier operations, that this end of the island was the munitions handling pier, so that's why we say most likely to have it. We don't know if there's one item, one hundred items, 1,000 items. We were hoping this technology would help us answer that.

And it's just a very challenging environment to work within. So, you know, should it, you know, in the CERCLA process there's also a five-year review. So if suddenly there was a jump in

technology, that would be part of our review and then the regulators are part of that and they'd say, well, you know what, let's consider this, and that would come up to the table.

MS. WELLS: And I want to say -- this is Elizabeth with the Water Board. One thing is that people can't just go out and dredge. You have to get a permit and go through a process to do the dredging. And so they have to work with the dredge materials management office which is a group of agencies that are informed.

So as an example, the previous tenant, I think it was ADR, Allied Defense Recycling, had to go through and do some testing and some evaluation before they could bring the ship that they were doing into the dry dock. And I know that at least at our agency the woman that's in charge of dredging actually came to me and asked me some questions about what was out there and what testing had been done. So there is communication amongst the agencies as part of this process.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Another thing I'd like to point out, right around this time and into next month at least and maybe beyond, there are several proposals being put to the city regarding the reuse of north Mare Island. One of which, if I'm not mistaken, includes in its proposal the potential reuse of the Fleet Reserve Pier which might entail dredging up there.

This whole question about, you know, this investigation being to some degree unsuccessful in terms of its overall scope brings to mind questions about such a project.

What would they be confronted with, you know, a year or two down the road if that's what they intended to do and that was the project that was approved; how would they go about, all these things have been mentioned, Elizabeth, about dredging, all these other agencies would become involved in such a proposal, would they be brought into all this kind of thing, plus the result of this study?

MS. NAITO: They would certainly take a look at everything that had been done previously, but they would also, and looking at what historic dredging was done in the area, when it was done, and when operations ceased in that area to make sure dredging was done after any operations would have ceased.

They would also have to test the sediments because the dredge materials management office, in order to give them a permit, requires them to know what's going to be in the material they're going to be removing so that they can put it someplace else safely.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Right. But with this kind of study for like MEC being at least partially, if not largely, unsuccessful, and getting a good sense of what's really down there, how would they go about that?

MS. NAITO: We would assume that they would only -- we would assume that they -- or I'm assuming that they're going to be dredging where they historically have dredged so that ships can access the berths that are along that pier.

So to the extent that they're dredging where there's been historic dredging, they would just be testing the sediment for potential chemical constituents.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: So perhaps the answer to your question is that they wouldn't be able to dredge without having access to all this information because, you know, you know, if a request to dredge in the Fleet Reserve Piers came to, it's the dredge group, they would say hey, wait, we should probably check with the Navy because that's their base and I think they still have an issue with the water.

And the Fleet Reserve Pier is a lesser concern in the sense that it was not part of the ammunition area, it was just, as its name says, it was where the reserve fleet, ships were basically stripped but made to be ready in 48 hours, like the ready reserve, sometimes a week. So they would be up there and ready to go but they wouldn't typically have had ammunition or, you know, a lot of the supplies on them. So we don't expect it.

MR. COFFEY: And we're not concerned either about any of this old MEC sitting down there, and suppose we have a tremendous storm similar to what we just had where we get a great big flow of water coming down the Napa River and strips away a lot of the sediment that's there, that's loose sediment, and uncovers all of this, and we are reusing the pier and any of that type, that's not really of any concern because it's underwater pretty much?

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Yeah.

MR. PAULDING: Well, I mean, think the answer to that is, from what we know based on the studies that we have done, is that in general Mare Island Strait is more a depositional environment where we get a lot more sedimentation that -- sediment that comes down from the upstream and it sits, it doesn't strip it out.

And that's part of the problem or one of the issues that we had with identifying areas that had less than two feet of sedimentation since the last dredging event. So, I mean, that is really not a concern.

And then I just wanted to add about how the whole dredging program works. I think that we have a system that works really well right now.

Mare Island dry docks has come to the Navy, that I'm aware of, at least twice in the last year to dredge the area in front of the dry docks. They brought in a Coast Guard cutter, I think relatively recently, and they wanted to dredge, and I think, I mean from our side it was a pretty smooth process. They put in a request, I think we turned around that request in a timely period, and I think that, from what I know, they did the work.

So, I mean, I think that I wouldn't be concerned about the dredging. That we have a process in place and it has been working. I wouldn't be concerned about the sedimentation or stripping of sediment, that doesn't seem to be a concern from what we know.

And I think Patricia is absolutely right about, you know, there's a process, a periodic process to reevaluate.

And I guess then the last thing I would say is we also have sonar data from all of these areas that we did look at. We'll have more information once we take a look at that and process it.

What was on the surface, we found a lot of debris, ladders and, you know, just a bunch of, you know, household almost type stuff that was out there from various sources, I'm sure.

We don't have a lot of data, but we have data that we can definitely use, and we can probably extrapolate it and say, you know, this is what we think is out there and we'll work with that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I would just like to make a few comments on this topic. First of all, I think that for the last more than 20 years we have been talking about this issue, and we've had some pretty fantastical ideas that have been proposed about how to go out and look for this material. And I'm going to tell you something that you haven't probably read in the minutes lately because was a long time ago, that there were proposals by the Navy to actually send divers

down to mucky around in the river and see what they could find. The turbidity obviously made that not possible in this water.

So as the environmental cleanup conversations have taken place over decades, I think one of the ideas that was pretty strongly urged by some, including I believe the state regulators, was the idea of just going and dredging and having big magnets on the dredge and, you know, just sucking it up and running it like you would have through --

MR. COFFEY: A strainer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- on the Marine Corps Firing Range where you run it through the sifters and just strip it out.

And I know that's not something the Navy has wanted to do. The costs have been probably the biggest issue on that. But, you know, you could go do that.

Another alternative is land use restrictions. One of the ways that this community has, in my experience, addressed the issue, the issue of -- I mean you have to look at the pathways, how are people going to get exposed to the munitions? On land you have some rules, some guidance. You're going to have land use controls on no digging, or if you're going to dig you're going to get, you're going to request a UXO support. You're going to have a plan. That makes sense on land.

So how is it going to happen in the water? Who is going to get exposed in those depths? One of the things that we came together as a community and decided was the best use of the land, whether we factored in because it happened to be -- have a risk of exposure to munitions or not, on the south end of the island was to set it aside as a park. So if you're not -- and both piers that we're talking about at the south end of the island are set aside for parks.

So unless you are sending children 30 feet deep in the water to go scouting about, you know, you put some protective measures in place, you know, already, similar to what you have on land. There will -- I would assume that in our management of that property offshore we'll have some best practices for management of that property.

I'm not saying there is no risk, but I think that the best direction to take in this process is to really imagine for yourselves what some of the uses are of the offshore areas at those depths, and then make a plan that is protective.

I don't think that, any more than we are on land, going to find every single munition item, so we're going to live with a certain level of risk, and we're going to do aggressive management, and education is one of the biggest components of that, similarly you're going to do that with the offshore.

That's my experience, and that's my opinion, and that's my recommendation.

MR. COFFEY: The one thing, the one problem that I have with that is at some point in time we have to talk about Mare Island becoming an economic engine. And something, something has to come out of reuse to make money for this community, because this community is quite obviously in great need of some kind of economic stimulus.

And to just blanket say that the only way to rectify the situation is to set the property aside, to me, is weak. Because it -- You just can't say, well, we're just going to set all this stuff aside,

where it's probably one of the most viable things that we could possibly have for this island, and just set it aside and say, well, the only option we have is to set this aside and do nothing with it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well don't count me in as the do nothing person. Hello. Who has been revenue generating for this community and goodwill generating for this community on that property for the last F-ing eight years? Come on, let's get real.

And there's -- there are -- We made a recommendation to council in December of 2007; you can do the math and figure out how long ago that was -- It was very, very well prepared document, and it explains in pretty nice detail as far as a master plan, as close to a master plan as we could get. The city hired a consultant, and we put together some good plans for those properties.

But to say that every property has to make money directly versus economic multipliers, I mean, you have to do some pretty fancy analysis if you're going to say that -- that there is revenue to be had on every square inch of the shoreline of Mare Island, the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, particularly in the ammunition area.

We can look at ammunition depots, and there's how many hundreds, thousands of them throughout the country, and we can decide what the highest and best use is for those properties. And very often they are parks. Very often they are industrial areas restricted. Very often they're simply somewhat off limits to the public or they don't have a full and robust reuse capability. It's simply the way it is, it's munitions.

We're lucky that we don't have anything to date that we found that's ever been fired, fused, or armed. We're not dealing with a maneuvers range or, you know, an active bombing range or something like that. So nothing is impossible.

And I don't hold up the preserve and the decision that this community made to operate or to designate the land use planning as a park, as I believe it is the highest and best use of the property, and I am going to continue to, you know, support that use.

But this community made that decision in several different reiterations of -- or iterations of specific plans. And they must have made it for a reason. And economics must have been a factor, not just my opinion coming before a council or somebody else's.

But anyway, not to go on and on about this, but I think that at some point the Navy does have to just, and the regulators do just have to make a management decision so that these properties can be used.

I mean, we've been operating tours one day a month under Navy escort for 19 years. That's kind of crazy to have that property on land and off land off limits while we kinda can use it. And people are then just going on the land anyway. So it isn't a very good management model right now in terms of protecting public health.

And public health should come first, you know, and the environment. And then if you can make an economic, if you can make a penny off of it, you know, that's what environmental cleanup makes possible is reuse, regardless of what your reuse is.

And if you, for one minute think that nature-based tourism is not an economic generator for a community, you should go do some research. That's the last thing I'll say on that topic.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: We should also just recognize the time, we're about a half hour behind. I don't want to cut off public comments. If there's any other additional comments? Any?

Certainly all these things will be taken into consideration and put to the public. This is not the end of the decision train. This will go through the CERCLA process where there will be other decision points and presentations. So certainly it was a good discussion. So thank you.

Reggie, anything else?

MR. PAULDING: No, I don't have anything else. I was just going to try and help set up the next presentation.

**III. PRESENTATION (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island]: *Land Use Covenant Termination Building 781 Polychlorinated Biphenyls Site AL#01 Investigation Area D1.2, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel*)**

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: All right. The next presentation is by Neal Siler of Lennar Mare Island, and it's about the land use covenant termination for building 781 for polychlorinated biphenyls PCBs, site AL-01.

Go ahead, Neal.

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you, Patricia.

What I'm going to do is talk about a land use covenant that we were able to terminate in an area that we have cleaned up to unrestricted land use.

I'm going to do that by going through some of the background, give you a description of the site, talk about the activities that we performed to terminate the land use covenant, and if you have any questions after that, please feel free to ask me. I'll try to go through this pretty quickly here.

The background. Investigation area D-1.2 was closed, received no further action certification in 2006. Although we'd cleaned the area up to unrestricted land use, there were three small sites that were electrical substations that we needed to keep active so that they could supply power to the area that we had just closed out. Those were building 781, 671, and Q17-A.

But we'd always intended, as the opportunity came up and as we moved along with the environmental cleanup, to actually remove the land use covenants on these three electrical substations and return them to unrestricted land use.

So what happened was we had that opportunity when there was some remediation that took place along Azuar Drive, and we were able to decommission electrical substation building 781, which is substation C, decommission the transformers and equipment in there, remove the equipment, and then be able to demolish the building, the additional environmental cleanup, cleaning up the residual polychlorinated biphenyls that were left in place, and then terminate the land use covenant on the property.

So what I'm going to do at this presentation is talk about the steps we went through to do that.

So the building itself, and you can't really see it up here, you're better off looking at the presentation you have in front of you, is nothing spectacular. It was constructed in 1943, covering an area of approximately 1,400 square feet.

It was an open air facility, it had no roof on it. Cinder block concrete walls about ten feet high. And a floor that had -- was composed of concrete and asphalt.

It had a few interior structures in it. There was a small brick shed in it that had some battery backup that was contained in that shed, and there were two subsurface vaults where live electrical conduits went through.

So the next slide just kind of goes through what I talked about right there. It was operated as an electrical substation from 1943 to 2012. And we had to keep these operating because we needed to be able to provide power to the residential areas that were to the south of Kansas Street.

So that opportunity to actually clean up the site came around the 2011, 2012 time frame when we did the -- within the Navy and Lennar Mare Island did a joint cleanup in the crane test area, the defense reutilization marketing area, and also along Azuar Drive to clean up petroleum hydrocarbon contamination.

When we did that, we had to cut all the power out of that area, or all the lines out of that area, and we were able to decommission the electrical power in the building 781 and reroute it around there.

So in 2012 we prepared for that, the building demolition and the LUC termination activities.

First thing we did was we constructed a hazardous material building survey to make sure there was nothing we had to abate prior to demolishing the facility.

And then as we did that, we actually got the permits from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the city of Vallejo to be able to facilitate that demolition.

Now, luckily enough, we found out that there wasn't any hazardous materials in the facility so we were able to get those permits rather quickly.

And then we prepared the notification for the land use covenant termination that went to both the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

So in 2013 we started to implement those LUC termination activities. We did some additional waste characterization sampling, some building demolition to get the building down. After we demolished the building we did confirmation sampling. Then we had to do some hot spot remediation because there was a few areas where we had to go back and do multiple iterations of excavations to get down to the cleanup goal. And then we actually restored the site.

So we started in May, June 2013 with waste characterization sampling, and that really focused on the building itself. We took samples of the walls and of the floor and also in the vaults. And we had a number of composite samples. We wanted to see if we could recycle as much of the material as possible. Unfortunately, the level of PCBs and lead in the building didn't allow us to recycle it, so we had to dispose of that material off-site.

So in July, 2013 the actual building demolition started. We actually started to remove the super structure of the building, take down the walls and start taking down the structures, that little brick shed I talked about, and the vaults that were subsurface vaults that were underlying the floor of the facility.

There was also a very large traffic light foundation that was sitting right on the northeast corner of the building that had to be removed. We took that out.

And we also, there was a number of -- Remember I told you about the cables? There were a number of cables and electrical switches that we had to take out also.

So we ended up disposing of about 350 tons of concrete, brick, and asphalt out of the facility. We were able to recycle about 2.25 tons of metal that we took out of the facility.

Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If it's non-hazardous at Hay Road landfill, why couldn't it have been recycled?

MR. SILER: Well, it was above the level that they allow to recycle it, that's why, that was the problem.

So this next slide here, you can probably see it better, it doesn't show up here on the screen. You can see the slide on the left actually starts showing the demolition of the building with the excavator there taking all the walls down.

And then on the right side of the slide itself, which is actually to my left right now, is that you can see they're loading the materials to off-haul to the disposal facility.

So confirmation soil samples. It was done on a grid, and we wanted to bias that grid to areas that we had seen in the floor that had levels of PCBs that were above the unrestricted land use level that we were cleaning up to.

Or what happened in the past was that the original samples, although they were non-detect, they were at a level that was above the cleanup goal that we had. So we went ahead and biased towards that to make sure we were getting everything out.

So we collected 11 samples. There was one location that was a hairline crack in the concrete, so we wanted to make sure that we got soil samples below that after we took the concrete out. And after we did all that, the 11 samples, we found that 5 of those 11 samples still contained polychlorinated biphenyls above our cleanup goal of .22 milligrams per kilogram. So we had to go back and do additional excavation work and additional sampling.

And there were a couple of areas that we had a hot spot; one that is in particular that we had, we went back, took those five samples, found out that three of those samples still contained PCBs or polychlorinated biphenyls above our cleanup goal. We went back, took additional samples there, did about two or three iterations at that point.

Finally we actually went back, took samples at multiple levels, knew where we had to get down to, excavated down to that area, and at that point we were actually able to clean up the site.

So we excavated down, I think it's somewhere about four or five feet in that area. And after we excavated all the materials, we disposed of 45 tons of soil as non-hazardous waste to Hay Road landfill.

So you should have an 11 by 17 figure in there so you can see this. This is the area right here. If you take a look at the -- at the legend and the little data boxes on here you can see where you have a red symbol, that was something that was above the cleanup goal of .22 milligrams per kilogram.

And then you should see something that has a different or a greater depth alongside of that that has a black marking on it, and that passed the unrestricted land use level.

So again, you can probably see these better if you actually look at your presentation, they don't show up too well right here.

You can see the excavator sitting atop the actual footprint of the building itself. There are some white grid lines there that show where the samples, the grid area where the samples were taken.

And then the figure on the right, which is on my left right now on the screen, that shows somebody actually doing confirmation sampling in the over excavated areas.

So after that was all done we restored the site, made sure that we brought in material that met the unrestricted land use level, and we did have material on site. We requested that it be reused with the regulatory agencies. They agreed. They reviewed all the chemical analysis and results for the material and agreed we could reuse it. We brought that up in six inch lifts, compacted it, did verification tests to make sure it was compacted to 90 percent.

And then after we did all that, we had to document this. So we actually prepared a application for termination of the LUC. Once that was accepted by the regulatory agencies, US EPA in May of 2014 and DTSC in October of 2014, then we prepared the release of the land use covenant, made sure everybody had that and was happy with it.

That was executed on November 25th, and we recorded that in Solano County earlier this week on Monday, December 1st.

So that completes my presentation. If anybody -- That's what the site looks like right now. If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

MR. COFFEY: Dirt.

MR. OUSEY: Looks like a pretty thorough cleanup.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So in other words, there is no land use restriction on this property?

MR. SILER: There is no land use control on this property anymore.

MR. COFFEY: We can grow corn on there.

MR. SILER: If you want, Mike.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Non-GMO because this is Mare Island, it's a special place.

MR. COFFEY: That's right.

MR. SILER: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Before you leave, Neal, I had requested you to present a second topic and I don't see it on the agenda, I don't know how that happened. We had a pretty spirited conversation about it on our agenda setting meeting.

MR. SILER: What I'll do is I'll talk about it. If you take a look at the 11 by 17 figure, you can see in the upper left-hand corner it talks about what we did, and I'll talk to you about what we did at that location.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. I just want to make sure that that topic does get -- because it's a serious one and I take it seriously.

MR. SILER: Certainly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Well, thanks everybody for your patience with the delayed schedule. Let's take a break. There's lots of snacks out there. Let's take a five minute break. Five minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Patricia McFadden [Acting Navy Co-Chair])**

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: All right. Welcome back. Thanks for letting us take a shorter break.

Let's get into the administrative business and announcements.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't have any on there.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: And I don't have any on there. And the minutes, what do you do with the minutes?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just if you have any corrections to the minutes, please get those to either Janet or myself for the September 25th meeting. That's what we do.

#### **V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS**

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Okay. Great. Then let's start with the focus groups. I like -- is to be determined here?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Chris, weren't you the community? Weren't you on it?

MR. RASMUSSEN: There's still a question, and I have nothing particular to discuss this evening.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Okay. Well, I'll just go through these.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Natural resources, does anybody have anything related to natural resources whether you're the chair of the subgroup or not.

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Paula on technical then.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report from technical.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I did it again. I have to finish chewing.

MR. COFFEY: Paula ran interference for you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: City report, Kathleen.

##### **a) City Update (Kathleen Diohep [City of Vallejo])**

MS. DIOHEP: We are definitely moving on north Mare Island. Just an update on that is we got a lot of proposals, eight of them we deemed substantive and worthy of moving forward --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Congratulations.

MS. DIOHEP: -- after first review. They fall into three broad land use concepts. And what, which one of them is industrial, industrial users. Including one of the interesting ones is Earthquake Protection Systems is on the island now, wants to expand.

The other concept is office, business park, conference center, hotel. There's a couple of them kind of falling in that -- some of them more officey, more conferencey.

So the first set are very much consistent with the Mare Island specific plan in general. Now issues like reusing the pier may require changing the specific one, would require changing it.

The next set after the office, and then the third set is there are three groups that want to do a casino anchored hotel thing.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, dear.

MS. DIOHEP: So what we kind of explained to the council on September 13th where we had a really fascinating meeting. We had each of those give a 15 minute presentation, so it was like an epic council meeting. And then the community had opinions.

And then what we explained to the council was we really think you have to kind of choose one of those concepts, and then we can choose between the parties. You know, if we're not going to go with the casino, then we don't have to worry about which tribe we're going to partner with.

So we're in the middle of that. And then they asked us to make sure we get the report to them at least two weeks before the meeting so -- which makes it so the next meeting will be in January.

So we're going to get a report out that will analyze the pros and cons of those three concepts, including the legal risks of doing a casino, the impacts of a specific plan.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Let's do something more useful than a casino.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We're not supposed to be commenting on that, it's not our role.

MR. COFFEY: Go to the council meeting next time, okay.

MS. DIOHEP: Yeah. And then -- The interesting concept I think you all are aware of is how long and what a complicated process it was to take these lands out of federal control to then turn around and put back into the control of the sovereign nation, it's an interesting turn.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, the irony.

MS. DIOHEP: Yeah. So that's what's coming there. The other thing you may be aware of is we had, the badge and pass building came down that had been a locust of problems and homeless and things. That seemed to mean that the people moved across the bridge.

And so on this Tuesday the police and the public works and social services and everything did an orchestrated action to clear out illegal people living in vacant buildings on north Mare Island. And trying to up the, up the ante on surveillance and all of that.

MR. COFFEY: Is it a lot?

MS. DIOHEP: You know, they also were dealing with some of the areas like across 37 . They let people know, because there were some squatters who asserted that they'd been given permission to be there. So we took notice and --

MR. COFFEY: Myrna.

MS. DIOHEP: No, actually, so we're on record so I'm not going to. But so that happened.

So the next one, so my division, economic development division, we've been -- I've been really fortunate, at the beginning of this year there was really one person in the division, and we're going to end the year with six. So I've had three starting in the last few weeks. So one of those will start December 15th who will be the Mare Island project manager.

MR. COFFEY: Wow.

MS. DIOHEP: But there's a lot to pick up on learning about Mare Island, so yeah.

MR. COFFEY: Big steps.

MS. DIOHEP: And that's the short update. Any questions?

Oh, I know. Speaking to dredging, I almost brought it up earlier. We, the city has formally requested the Army Corps of Engineers to evaluate dredging the federal channel again.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: The middle of the channel?

MS. DIOHEP: Right, the federal channel through. And that that used to, in many places the Feds maintain the federal channel to promote commerce and aviation and navigation and promoted that. So we put that request in, and we're hoping that they would come back. And that would be to the benefit of a range of our maritime businesses.

MR. COFFEY: Where does that begin and end?

MS. DIOHEP: I'm -- There's maps, we could send the link to it. It's roughly in the middle of the river, and I don't know how far, I think it kind of doesn't go past the bridge, roughly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The Highway 37 bridge, I think it's the 37 bridge.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Yes.

MS. DIOHEP: So and that, you know, and it's interesting because their rationale is basically better improvement to the economy as a whole. Like you reduce travel times and truck trips. So it's not the benefit of any one business, it's really by helping interstate commerce and commerce you, by creating just kind of like federal highways.

So, you know, that will take a while. We're hoping, and then the next step, first you do the study, and then you do the next study, and then eventually you get back on their queue, and the Corps would do that dredging.

So we actually had the head of the DMMO office out here. And there's a been a working group organized by several of the council looking at just the Mare Island strait's economic development, looking at dredging and how do we grow and capture on the maritime industrial uses.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Kathleen.

Neal Siler, Lennar.

**b) Lennar Update (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island])**

MR. SILER: Okay. If you want to go along, you should have the 11 by 17 figure right here. And one of the major items that we were able to do, if you look on this map and you compare it to maps that we've had in the past, is that B.1 has changed from green to blue. That area has

been closed out now. So we have one more little piece that we're trying to finish off, and hopefully that will get done here before the end of the year. But that area is closed out just so everybody knows, the crane test area.

We actually got a number of documents, we got comments back on a number of documents or approvals on a number of things.

We got comments back on the investigation area C-1 remedial action plan.

We also got comments back on the investigation area C-1 and C-2 initial study for the remedial action plan.

We actually got concurrence and no further action on three fuel oil pipelines in investigation area C-1. You can see them there.

We were able to get comments back on a draft cleanup plan for a PCB site in building 742.

Also we were able to get the release of land use covenants, as I talked about, for building 781, PCB site AL-01.

And we actually got the release of the land use covenant on the investigation area D.1-3 north, which is where the success center sits. So you can see that's in blue also.

And then we were actually able to actually get approved, and then execute and record the final land use covenant for the installation restoration program site 10-13 which is in investigation area H-2. You can see it in the map just right above, outlined in a very dark green right there.

As far as the fieldwork that's been going on, we've got a number of things that we completed, you can read them there on the list.

If you look at the upper right hand corner, that's removal of a PCB site in building 225 where we took off part of the vault roof and took out some soil that was around there that still contained PCBs. We're waiting for the confirmation sampling back on that, and hopefully it will be good to go, we will get good results.

Obviously we can't take anything underneath the vault roof because the vault roof is gone, so it looks like we should be okay there hopefully. Unless Janet comes up with something that she wants me to, you know, test air.

And then the other thing Myrna had talked about was a removal action that we did down at the corner of Narius and Railroad Avenue, which is right down here. It's in this area right where my finger is right here. And we had started this a while back. We finally got approval to go forward with some additional work down there. We were able to remove those pipelines, take our confirmation samples and get the results back. So we're backfilling that right there.

But one of the things we had to do, because when we started looking at the end of the pipeline as it went to the south, we did it through geophysical means. And anybody who knows, who has used geophysical means knows there's limitations to those geophysical means. So it's not uncommon on Mare Island for excavations to double in size at any time, as people who know, have excavated here knows that happens.

So we had to close the road off to make sure that we kept that closed while we were doing that. Now, we had to go out a little bit out in the road, and there was one weekend, it wasn't last weekend, it was the weekend before last, we kept it closed because I couldn't stabilize the road

right there at that time period, and we didn't have our sample results back, so it was very hard for me to do that, we did that afterwards. But we actually did that traffic control plan that was actually reviewed by the city of Vallejo and approved by the city of Vallejo to go through.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This is when I'll go on the record. And I asked for you to have this on the actual agenda, and now I guess I'm going to have to review the agenda because I was not honored in that. And I would say it's whoever put the agenda together didn't send me a copy, now they'll have to.

I don't care who reviewed your plan. If you went out, and even your own staff couldn't find out how to get to our park, you basically did call and say, "We're going to be closing this," period.

And I trusted, I expected that you would have a detour plan that would allow for people to get to the only business impacted by your closure, and that was the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve.

The Army Reserve can tell its people how to get to its site, they already know how to get to its site. Sixty to seventy percent of the people who visit our preserve -- and -- I think I've mentioned this in the past -- but you could have come and asked about it, you being Lennar, and you're the project manager on the cleanup.

This is when cleanup doesn't work, okay, is when it impacts a business that is considered a non-profit and doesn't matter, it's not one of your tenants and it doesn't matter to you. That was my experience.

So 60 to 70 percent of our visitors come on the weekend to the preserve, and I'll say this to the regulators too, and they have never been there before. They are driving around Mare Island interested in, excited to find, explore. There are no visitor serving amenities on the island. There are no directional signs to our preserve in Lennarville, in the 600 acres that Lennar more or less, that Lennar manages. There is no way that people meander on a detour and come to our property.

So there was no accommodation made for the fact that you would be shutting off 60 to 70 percent of our visitors. And the fact was you hadn't mobilized for the entire week that it was closed before the weekend, and you weren't mobilized on the weekend.

MR. SILER: That's not true, we were actually out there that week.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In the roadway, not in the roadway. And you could have closed even one lane and allowed one to be opened.

We've never seen this. It's unprecedented to have the level of lack of detour clearance. We had regular customers to our park who could not make their way on your detour.

I took it as if I had never been there before, and I couldn't have found the way to get there. There were no directional signs that said preserve ahead, preserve ahead, to the right, preserve, preserve. It had nothing at Railroad. I'll go on and on and on.

But the point is this is an example of when environmental cleanup impacts negatively on the community. And I -- have I not been a champion of this project, of this, how many billions of dollars -- let's say millions of dollars, tens of millions, hundreds of millions have been spent here, and have I ever failed to support environmental cleanup? Tell me. Anybody in this room, have I?

But when it impacts the ability of the public to enjoy property and for our non-profit to be able to maintain the revenue that we need to keep that park open, then I have a problem with it.

And let this be a lesson, okay. Let this be a lesson. Do not mess with businesses on the island, whether they're for profit or non-profit, ever, ever, ever again, without fully engaging the people who you are impacting.

I can't imagine that you've been doing this to your tenants. And I'm really disappointed in the regulators for not having hopped on this as well. I'm just very, very, very, very angry, if you couldn't tell.

It didn't work for us. We made the least amount of money to keep that park open that we've made in six years. And nobody stepped up to the plate, you know, and said, "Hey, by the way we're going to impact you." And it was going to be for up to 60 days. By just great chance you were able to find that it didn't, it didn't go further into the road. But the road was not actually impacted. Because I began just driving on it, you know. I didn't care. I was mad.

But you could close even one lane, you could have had even one way. But that's not here to sit here and explain all the ways that you could have done an operation that would have been effective, but it wasn't for me and for our resource.

Yes.

MS. WELLS: If you have more to say I'll let you keep going.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I could, but I won't, I'll let you talk.

MS. WELLS: So I have my light on, as my son would say. So thank you. I didn't know about this because I'm actually not the regulator for this particular site, but that's beside the point.

So what I will do is I'll take that back, so that there are future projects that we're working on together, we'll understand this concern, and I'll make sure that Adriana hears what you just said, also for the sites that she, Adriana Constantinescu -- and I'll come over and spell it for you later if you like -- so that she understands this concern also.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

MS. WELLS: Sure. Turned it off, sorry.

MR. SILER: Well, thank you, Myrna, for your concerns. And we'll address that upcoming in the future. So if there's any other questions on anything else I have here, I'll be glad to answer them.

Okay. Thank you.

**c) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar [Weston Solutions, Inc.]**

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: And then Weston update, Dwight Gemar.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. I've got a flyer over there if anybody didn't get the Weston update.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's getting --

MR. GEMAR: It's getting a little small.

MR. COFFEY: Nice picture.

MR. GEMAR: Which is a good thing. I'll start putting in the Braille version or something to try to stretch it out.

MR. COFFEY: Word of the day.

MR. GEMAR: So yeah, it's a bit of a snoozer which is a good thing because we're winding down on the Weston early transfer parcel ESCA, Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement.

Pretty much just have one document that's out being looked at, and that's the Annual Wetland Monitoring Report for IR-05, which is the property at the south end of the island, pretty much just underneath the, on the background photo, it's right underneath the last paragraph. And so the new wetlands out there are looking good, and this is just our annual status report.

And then there's one other document that is in preparation, that's the proposed plan for the final remedy for that site, IR-05, and the adjacent Dredge Pond 7 South and Western Magazine Area, and that's being looked at by the Navy.

And then after that there's just one major document remaining, that's a record of decision and the remedial action plan for those sites.

And then in terms of the ongoing O&M out at H-1, about the only thing to report is we did have some oil collected that was removed. You might recall that in the former landfill area there is a former oily water disposal area that still has some free oil in it, but it's inside of the groundwater containment barrier, and our leachate and groundwater collection trench intersects that former disposal area. And so occasionally we do get enough oil out of that area to warrant emptying our oil water separator, and that occurred in October.

We pull out just under a thousand gallons every time that separator fills up with oil. And so to date, since we've started operation way back in 2005 -- hard to believe it's almost ten years.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow.

MR. GEMAR: We've got a little over 16,000 gallons out of that system.

And then also we did some maintenance on groundwater wells, primarily replacing some concrete pads around the risers which are the steel that sticks up above ground that protects the casing for the wells. And some of those were loose. And so we repaired the concrete pad around those and repainted the risers.

So that was about it. And hopefully maybe the grass is starting to grow again.

MS. DIOHEP: Is that just essentially because this is expected to settle, so concrete doesn't settle well, is that the reason for those?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I mean part of the problem is you've got clay soil out here, and so it expands and shrinks and expands and shrinks. And over time sometimes the soil underneath the pads will actually separate from the pad and then they'll crack or whatnot, so you have to go in and remove them and re-pour the concrete pads.

So that's all I've got.

**d) Regulatory Agency Update (Carolyn d'Almeida [Environmental Protection Agency], Janet Naito [Department of Toxic Substances Control], and Elizabeth Wells [Regional Water Quality Control Board])**

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And regulatory agency updates?

Looks like Janet and Elizabeth are -- can duke it out as who goes first.

MS. WELLS: We're it. I'll start since she's pointing at me. So there's a few things. I don't remember exactly when the Napa earthquake was, but I wanted -- to.

MR. COFFEY: August 24th.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: August 26th.

MS. WELLS: I didn't say this before, but I wanted to thank the Navy and Lennar for getting back -- our agencies wanted to know if there were any issues associated with the environmental sites that came up as a result of the earthquake. And so we sent out some e-mails and we got some very quick responses and photos, mostly about bricks coming off of buildings and those kinds of things. But both the Navy and Lennar were on top of that and went out right away and did some inspections in terms of the environmental sites, so we appreciate that.

The other thing I wanted to say is that I've now been on this project or site for four years. And while Moffett has been sort of the love of my life, I've become very attached to Mare Island. A couple things I wanted to say is thank you to Kathleen, because in the four years that I've been here there's been more reports about what's going on and more movement from the city in the last few months.

MS. DIOHEP: Well, if you can get Google here, can you work on that?

MS. WELLS: I don't know. I'm still arguing with them --

MS. DIOHEP: They just leased Moffett, so --

MS. WELLS: That's right, for a lot of money and a long time.

(Thereupon there was simultaneous discussion.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: They built it at Treasure Island.

MS. WELLS: Right. So I wanted to say thank you. That's really phenomenal some of the changes that have been made. And I think the other thing -- obviously I'm not really doing a report on what I've done.

But I wanted to say that -- The other thing is a lot has actually really been accomplished in the four years, not only by witnessing the length of these reports, but just looking at the changing colors on maps and documents moving along and sites starting to be redeveloped or available for redevelopment. So I actually think it's pretty fantastic.

So what have I been doing is basically reading reports and trying to move them through the system as best that I can.

MR. COFFEY: Okie dokie.

MS. WELLS: And I wonder who would like to bring the snack next time?

MS. NAITO: How the heck am I supposed to follow that?

Things I have to report. My public participation specialist Richard Perry has announced his retirement. He's retiring December 16th. His last day was, I believe, the beginning of November. My boss Barbara Cook has also announced her retirement.

MR. COFFEY: Something's going on over there.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: So you're going to get a promotion; right?

MS. NAITO: No, I'm not actually eligible for her job, thank the good God. So her last day will be the end of the year. And this affects me how? Well, she does sit right outside or she's the office right next to me. And in the last, in her last however many days she has left she's making a list of the things she wants to get accomplished. So my job is --

MS. WELLS: To get them accomplished.

MS. NAITO: No, to get Lennar's and the Navy's stuff done in the next three or four days before she finishes compiling that darned list.

MS. DIOHEP: What do you need, cookies, Rock Stars?

MS. NAITO: Sleep.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Massage.

MS. NAITO: Thanks a lot, everybody.

## **VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Patricia McFadden [Acting Navy Co-Chair])**

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Then I guess we're on. Why don't you go?

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Co-chair's report. All right. Our reports are still just as long. They probably could be longer but we take a snapshot of what happened. But yes, our monthly progress report is here.

On there you'll see a little summary of the IA-K, which is the offshore area that we had the presentation of. And that was -- it was good to see, to have some fieldwork out there and to see some, even though it wasn't as successful as we'd hoped -- did you want the microphone.

MR. COFFEY: That was the co-chair's report right there.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Putting a dog to sleep, I feel really bad. But anyway, it was good to see some fieldwork even though it wasn't as successful as we had hoped.

And then on the back you'll see our document submittals, and I won't go through them, I'll let them speak for themselves.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And thank you actually for really great reports, everyone. Sometimes we end up with a, with not a whole lot more information from those focus group reports than what we started out with, but it's really great presentations.

The Flyway Festival is really all that I'm going to report on at this moment, February 13th through 15th, 2015. And we're looking forward to learning where our new headquarters will be for that festival. We have a chance to move.

And also, come out to the preserve. We're open every weekend. But beginning -- for the next five weekends we'll be open additional hours five to eight with a lighted trail.

And also a tea on December 14 at four and December 21 at four, so with a bell concert. So that would be a good thing to do.

Come out and experience a piece of the island that is, has been made available to the public and is actively being used by the public on a weekly basis. So environmental cleanup does pay off.

Thank you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: All right. Any public comments or RAB comments? Last call. Last call.

(No response.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR MCFADDEN: Hearing nothing, we will adjourn the meeting. Thank you all for coming.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:00 p.m.)

#### **LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area K Remote Operated Vehicle Demonstration and Remedial Investigation Preliminary Data
- Presentation Handout – Land Use Covenant Termination Building 781 PCB Site AL#01, Investigation Area D1.2, Early Transfer Parcel
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, November 27, 2014

RAB Meeting Minutes Comment/Correction Form

Meeting Minutes: December 4, 2014

RAB Member: \_\_\_\_\_

- I would like a copy of the final minutes of the above noted meeting.
- No comments or corrections to these minutes.
- See comments or corrections listed below.

Page No.	Line No.	Comment/Correction	Reviewed by	
			BEC	Hayes

**Each RAB Member, please submit this form to:**  
**Ms. Janet Lear or**  
**Ms. Myrna Hayes**

## RAB Meeting Agenda Request/Comment Form

Meeting Date: March 26, 2015

RAB Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Agenda Item No.	Request/Comment	Reviewed By	
		BEC	Hayes
1			
2			
3			

**Submit form to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes**