

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2004**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, October 28, 2004, at the J.F.K. Library in Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:03 p.m. and adjourned at 9:22 p.m. These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance during this month's RAB meeting.

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Jim O'Loughlin
- Kenn Browne
- Jerry Karr
- Paula Tygielski
- Justice Bude
- Diana Krevsky

Regulatory Agency, Navy Representatives, and Developer Representatives in attendance:

- Jerry Dunaway (Co-chair)
- Henry Chui
- Steve Farley
- Carolyn d' Almeida
- Joyce Whiter
- Chip Gribble
- Dwight Gemar
- Cris Jespersen
- David Godsey
- Lee Sauders
- Gary Riley
- Ray Leftwich
- Michelle Trotter
- John Kaiser
- Sheila Roebuck

Community Members and Guests in attendance:

- Diji Christian
- Caitlin Gorman
- Christy Smith

RAB Support from CDM:

- Regina Clifford
- Wally Neville

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Jerry Dunaway, RAB Community Co-Chair and Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) for former MINSY, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and asking for self-introductions.

Attendees introduced themselves as requested.

II. PRESENTATION: Lead-Based Paint Cleanups on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (Mr. Steve Farley, CH2MHill)

Mr. Dunaway introduced the presentation relating to lead-based paint (LBP) cleanup efforts that CH2MHill is conducting on behalf of Lennar Mare Island on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP). Mr. Steve Farley was introduced as the presenter.

Mr. Farley began the presentation by providing an overview. A handout for the presentation was provided. Mr. Farley stated that the presentation will describe the LBP program components including LBP abatement and evaluation on the buildings and evaluation and removal of lead in soil from LBP on buildings. The presentation will go through the status of the LBP program components.

Mr. Farley stated that currently 71 buildings have been identified for LBP removal and follow-up priming and painting. A Notice to Proceed was provided for 51 of the buildings in May 2004. Mr. Farley stated that work has been completed for 39 of the buildings and funding allocated by Lennar Mare Island to pay for this work is approximately \$1,385,000. Two contractors are conducting the LBP abatement and restoration work. They include Bluewater Services, Inc., who is conducting the LBP abatement and Masker, who is conducting the priming and painting work. Mr. Farley explained that all scraped paint is fully containerized and disposed of off-site. A few photographs were shown of before LBP abatement and after paint restoration.

Mr. Farley summarized that the remaining portion of his presentation would include a status of evaluation and/or remediation of lead in soil from LBP on buildings. All characterization and remediation was performed in accordance with the LBP Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) dated in February 2003 approved by regulatory agencies.

Mr. Farley referred to a table included in the back of the presentation handout when discussing four categories of lead removal in soil from LBP including the current status of the number of buildings determined to have LBP and surrounding soil; the number of buildings characterized for lead in soil in the Summer of 2004; the number of buildings for which lead in soil was remediated in 2004; and the number of buildings for which future remediation of lead in soil is planned.

Mr. Farley explained that work was performed based on three things: the approved LBP SAP, the focus group meeting with RAB members, and a series of California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) meetings.

Mr. Farley first talked about the number of buildings characterized for lead in soil during summer 2004. A total of 162 buildings have been determined to have LBP and have soil surrounding the buildings that required characterization. These are listed by Investigation Area (IA) in the presentation handout. IA D1.1, IA D1.2, and Q Quarters are all summed on a line titled "D1 Total."

Mr. Farley reported that with the exception of eight buildings in IA B, all 162 buildings have been characterized. The Navy previously characterized 16 of the 20 Q Quarters buildings. Four additional buildings required characterization in the Q Quarters.

Mr. Farley reported that the range in concentrations of lead in soil by IA were presented on a slide and in the table in the back of the presentation. Based on the concentrations of lead in soil, the number of buildings with soil requiring remediation was identified and was shown on a slide (see handout).

Ms. Myrna Hayes asked if there was a pattern in concentrations such as the 33,000 milligram per kilogram (mg/kg) being from a low point or where the downspouts drain. Mr. Farley stated that the higher concentrations were found closer to the buildings. Mr. Farley was not aware of a distinct pattern in lead concentrations related to the downspouts. He further explained that the SAP addressed the interest in the downspouts along the sides of the buildings.

Ms. Diana Krevsky pointed out a discrepancy in the numbers presented in the handout with the numbers presented on the projected slide for IA D1.1. The handout shows 34 buildings requiring remediation and the projected slide shows 37 buildings. Mr. Farley responded that 34 is the correct number and explained that there were several last minute changes to the numbers on the presentation. He also pointed out a few other discrepancies between the projected slides and the handouts, but stated the handouts are correct with the exception of one number in the summary table at the back of the presentation under the column for number of buildings requiring remediation for Area D1.2; the correct number should be 74 versus the 71 shown.

Mr. Farley then presented the number of buildings for which lead in soil was remediated in 2004, including 34 buildings in IA D1.1, two buildings in D1.2, and 17 buildings in the Q quarters. None of the buildings in IA B have been characterized or remediated and none of the buildings in H2 have been remediated.

Mr. Farley presented the range in concentrations of lead in soil following remediation (see handout). He then presented the number of buildings for which future remediation of lead in soil is planned including 72 buildings in IA D1.1 and 8 buildings in IA H2. All of the buildings in IA D1.1 and Q Quarters have been remediated. In addition, characterization will be completed for soils at the eight buildings in IA B.

Questions

Ms. d'Almeida asked what the cleanup goal is for lead in soil. Mr. Farley responded that the residential cleanup goal is 210 mg/kg and the non-residential cleanup goal is 750 mg/kg.

Ms. d'Almeida asked for clarification of the cleanup goals and pointed out that on the presentation table under IA D1.1 post remediation concentrations of lead in soil ranged from 6 mg/kg to 370 mg/kg, but it is presented that no further remediation is necessary. Mr. Farley further clarified that the cleanup goals presented in the LBP SAP identified a maximum point concentration of 400 mg/kg of lead in soil and an average concentration of 210 mg/kg in soil as the cleanup goals for residential.

Ms. d'Almeida asked whether the cleanup was being conducted to 400 mg/kg or 210 mg/kg. Mr. Farley explained that both concentrations are being used. If either an absolute value of 400 mg/kg of lead in soil is exceeded or a building average lead in soil concentration of 210 mg/kg is exceeded, then the area would require remediation.

Mr. Farley summarized that there were 162 buildings in the LBP program, that eight more buildings in IA B need to be characterized, and that additional remediation is required in IA D1.2, IA H2, and possibly IA B depending on the results of characterization.

Ms. Hayes asked where the photographs were. She explained photographs would have been helpful to show people who have not been out to the buildings how extensive the work has been. She explained photographs showing before, after, and in-between abatement would have been helpful to show what abatement and excavation looks like.

Mr. Farley responded that figures and photographs are included on monthly summaries that have been prepared over the last six months including tonight's handout. A lot of the work they do is surgical in nature.

Mr. Chip Gribble asked that a diagram be drawn of a building that shows how areas were sampled and how areas were cleaned up.

Mr. Farley responded he would do this but first wanted to respond to Ms. Hayes' comment. Mr. Farley found photographs of areas showing Quarters P (photograph on monthly summary handout) and projected them during the RAB meeting. He pointed out how the excavation was completed with shovels around sidewalks and around the drip lines of the buildings. He explained some of the work is done with shovels and some of the work is done with small excavators. Mr. Farley asked if this addressed Ms. Hayes' question.

Ms. Hayes commented that the photograph did help and stated that photographs are usually included with Lennar's presentations. She also stated that another useful handout would have been the one prepared by Lennar that Ms. Hayes and Ms. Krevsky reviewed previously regarding LBP. Ms. Hayes stated that the Lennar handout would have been useful for the presentation because it is easy to read and understand. She further commented that although the RAB members may understand the presentation, the RAB needs to communicate these issues with the public, and it would be helpful to have the tools to do it.

Ms. Sheila Roebuck responded that the handout Ms. Hayes was referring to was made available at a RAB meeting three months ago. Ms. Hayes commented that it must have been the meeting she had missed.

Ms. Roebuck pointed out that the LBP remediation would be part of the upcoming RAB tour. Ms. Hayes responded that the reason she is bringing up this issue is that she wants to go back to a standard of having graphic representation of topics. She further explained that some people are graphically oriented and other people like to look at tables. She wanted to remind them that

sometimes people from the public attend the meetings and photos should be used and acronyms explained for the public.

Mr. Jerry Karr asked what techniques were used to conduct the abatement and how the contaminated paint chips and soil were stored and disposed. Mr. Farley stated that CH2M Hill is not directly involved with the abatement, but that he has seen it several times. He provided an example of Building 545 that he had visited that day where he saw workers in blue tyvek suits and respirators on cherry pickers scraping loose paint with hand scrapers. Plastic sheeting was taped to the building and extended out about 15 to 20 feet. The building was then primed and painted. The paint chips and plastic are containerized and shipped off-site for manifesting and disposal. Soil is being removed down to approximately one foot and is then containerized, characterized, and hauled off-site for disposal. Disposal location is determined by the characteristics of the soil and whether the profile of the soil is accepted by the facility. Soils may be placed in bins, drums, or stockpiled depending on the quantity. Mr. Farley showed a photograph of a stockpile area near Building 545 near IR site 18.

Ms. Hayes stated that there may have been a mis-statement earlier that all of the LBP was removed from the buildings, but that is not true. Mr. Farley clarified that not all of the LBP was removed; the loose paint is removed and then the building is primed and painted.

Ms. Hayes commented that during a previous presentation the issue was brought up of what would be done to make sure that flaking of the paint would not happen again and what will be done to protect the soil along the buildings. She asked what the time frame was to cover the soil with some sort of protective covering for the buildings that have been completed. Mr. Farley responded that the only areas with a concern with flaking paint are those areas that have had no work done yet. There is not a plan currently to lay down plastic sheeting before the work is scheduled.

Ms. Hayes clarified that she was asking about the buildings that have already been treated and what will happen in the future when the new paint begins to deteriorate and possibly impact the soil. She further explained that during a previous presentation by Jeff Morris, they were told there was going to be some kind of soil cover to protect the soil.

Ms. Roebuck responded that the reason for the LBP abatement was to protect against soil impact from lead. To the extent possible, efforts are made during the abatement process to scrape as much of the LBP off as possible and very little LBP remains. If in three to five years paint deterioration occurs, then Lennar or the new owner will be responsible for maintaining the paint.

Mr. Chip Gribble commented that not all of the structures are being cleaned up to levels for unrestricted use. He asked if Mr. Farley could talk about the deed restrictions. Mr. Farley stated that the cleanup level for lead in soil in residential areas is 210 mg/kg and the industrial use cleanup level is 750 mg/kg. He further explained that the abatement was conducted based on the future land use plans. If the area was designated residential then residential cleanup goals were achieved, and if the future land use designation is industrial then the industrial cleanup level was used. Land use restrictions will be applied based on these uses.

Mr. Gribble asked whether land use restrictions would be applied on a building by building basis versus an area by area basis. Mr. Farley responded yes. Mr. Gribble asked pursuant to a remedial action plan (RAP), is Lennar still allowing tenants to do their own work or remediation as part of their lease? In other words, if a tenant wanted to paint their own building would Lennar contract to paint the building? Ms. Roebuck responded that while they are in the process of LBP abatement, one tenant wanted to paint their own building and Lennar wouldn't let them. This may change in the future but tenants are not allowed to conduct abatement at this point.

Ms. Hayes stated there is no requirement to her knowledge that requires the disclosure of LBP in buildings except for disclosure rule relating to housing. She explained that the work Lennar is doing on behalf of the Navy may not be subject to disclosure.

**III. PRESENTATION: Navy Cleanup Plans for Fiscal Year 2005
(Mr. Jerry Dunaway BRAC Program Management Office)**

Mr. Dunaway began his presentation by stating that we are in a new fiscal year that started October 1, 2004. As part of the cleanup agreement with the state, a schedule is developed that summarizes the proposed cleanup schedule for the upcoming fiscal year. A draft schedule is submitted to the state for comments and once comments are addressed, the approved schedule will guide cleanup activities over the fiscal year.

Mr. Dunaway explained that the draft schedule has been submitted to the regulatory agencies and the Navy is currently waiting on comments. Many of the projects on the schedule are ongoing projects that have been active over the last couple of years.

A presentation handout was provided. Mr. Dunaway explained that there are many acronyms throughout the presentation and that they are presented on the front of the handout. Maps are included in the presentation handout that show the transfer parcels as well as Navy retained property. Another map identifies IAs.

Mr. Dunaway pointed out that the Navy retains cleanup responsibility for certain IAs that have been transferred such as the landfill area, western magazine area, and Installation Restoration (IR) 05 that are covered under the Weston Environmental Service Cooperative Agreement (ESCA). These sites are not part of the discussion tonight since Weston provides regular updates on that work, but they are part of the schedule.

Mr. Dunaway explained that there are two programs covered by the Site Management Plan (SMP) schedule including the IR Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP).

Mr. Dunaway presented a slide in the presentation that lists the IR sites within the program. Mr. Dunaway explained that one change from the previous schedule is the DRMO Scrap Yard site has been removed from the MRP and added to the IRP because munitions have not been identified and the contaminant of concern is lead and polychlorinated biphenyls in soil.

Mr. Dunaway summarized the following planned actions for IR sites:

DRMO Scrap Yard: The Navy plans to conduct a removal action in summer 2005 and to have a public meeting in early 2005.

IA A1 (IR17): A remedial investigation (RI) has been underway for the past few years. The Navy hopes to have a public meeting in summer 2005 and a final record of decision issued in October 2005. The design and cleanup phase would occur in 2006.

IA D (Elementary School): The Navy plans to complete the site inspection (SI) report process and then issue a draft finding of suitability for transfer (FOST) to the Department of Education in April 2005.

IA A2 (Former North Building Ways): The Navy has issued an RI and follow up Technical Memorandum for additional investigation conducted at IA A2. The Navy plans to complete the RI over the next year and issue a Draft Feasibility Study (FS) in September 2005.

IA F2 (IR04): IA F2 is also known as the Green Sand Beach site and is located next to the production and manufacturing area. The Navy plans to complete the RI and issue the Draft FS in March 2005.

IA F1 (Production and Manufacturing Area): The Navy will issue the Draft RI in February 2005 and plan to prepare and submit the Draft FS in June 2005.

IA I (Fish and Wildlife Parcel): Within the Fish and Wildlife Parcel is a site known as the Paint Waste site. The Navy will issue a Draft Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI) report in January 2005 and hopes to issue the Draft Final PA/SI by April 2005. The PA/SI will determine whether additional work is required.

IA C2 (Manhole D1-C85): IA C2 is a manhole and storm drain site. The Navy has issued an SI. The next step is to conduct an expanded SI (ESI), which will include soil sampling and the installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The Navy plans to submit the Draft ESI by May 2005, which will determine if an RI will be required. This site is located within Lennar's property, near the water front. This site was retained by the Navy and not included in the ESCA due to the timing of the discovery of the site.

IA I (Horse Stable Area): The Navy is currently working on the SI for the Horse Stable Area. This site was in the ESCA for western early transfer, but was taken out because it was determined to be out of scope. The Navy plans to complete the SI in this fiscal year.

IA K (Offshore Sediments): IA K is the offshore areas surrounding the eastern and southern portions of the island. The Navy plans to complete the conceptual site model (CSM), the data quality objectives (DQOs), and SAP for the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment this fiscal year to support additional sampling of sediments in 2006.

IA A1 (Parcel XV-B(2)): IA A1 is also where IR 17 is located but is a different piece of land. The Navy was not aware they owned this parcel until a few years ago. The Navy has documented the environmental condition of the parcel in an Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) issued two months ago. The Navy would like to get regulatory agency concurrence with the document.

IA D (Army Reserve): This site is a portion of the industrial wastewater pipeline that ends on the Army Reserve parcel near the finger piers. The Navy plans to submit a Draft Closure Report in July 2005.

Mr. Dunaway showed a map (included in the presentation handout) showing the location of the MRP sites and summarized the following four planned actions for the MRP:

Marine Corps Firing Range Removal Action: Mr. Dunaway explained that over the last year Foster Wheeler has been conducting a removal action. The cleanup process has not been completed due to scope and cost increases. The Navy plans to propose changes for the project due to new information gathered during the recent work. The cleanup remediation goals will remain the same, but the disposal of soils need to be handled in a different way. The Navy plans to get a new contractor on board and submit a Draft Work Plan Addendum to the regulatory agencies by the end of 2004. The Navy plans to complete the removal action by September 2005.

Production and Manufacturing Area (PMA)/South Shore Area RI Work Plan: Mr. Dunaway stated that these two portions are contiguous with each other and have a similar history of munitions discovery. The Navy plans to prepare a Draft RI Work Plan in June 2005 that will aid in characterizing anomalies detected in subsurface soils. Once the work plan is approved, the Navy will mobilize to conduct the RI.

PMA Offshore/South Shore Offshore Areas Munitions Survey Report/RI Work Plan: Mr. Dunaway stated that the PMA Offshore and South Shore Offshore are offshore sediment areas where potential munitions sites have been identified. The Navy plans to issue an RI Work Plan. ECC has been working over the last 1 ½ years conducting magnetometer surveys and digital mapping. This survey work will be documented in the RI Work Plan to identify areas where further characterization should occur. The Navy plans to issue the Draft RI Work Plan in May 2005.

Munitions Treatment Facility Ongoing Removal Action Operations: Mr. Dunaway stated that an Action Memorandum was signed this year for the Munitions Treatment Facility. This project will be ongoing for several years. The Munitions Treatment Facility is the collection point for munitions discovered on Mare Island. The treatment facility has a magazine for storage of collected munitions and a detonation range for detonating munitions. There is also an option to use a contained detonation chamber. The Navy plans to operate the facility for at least four years.

Mr. Dunaway summarized that the next step of the schedule preparation is to get input from DTSC and RWQCB. The Navy submitted the proposed 2005 fiscal year schedule to DTSC and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in October and held a meeting on October 20,

2004 with DTSC. DTSC and RWQCB are expected to provide comments in November. Mr. Dunaway pointed out that in no way are the dates presented in the draft schedule final. The Navy realizes some dates may get pushed out to the next fiscal year due to Navy and agency limitations. Ultimately the goal is to obtain an approved schedule by the end of December.

Questions

Ms. Christian asked what the current condition was at the horse stable area and what needs to be done for this area. Ms. Christian also asked how many years it would be until all of the munitions would be removed. Mr. Dunaway replied that the problem at the horse stable is that sand blast material was discovered in the area. The material was removed about 1 ½ years ago. The Navy is documenting sampling that was done during the removal and will identify if any additional work is needed. Mr. Dunaway responded to the munitions question by stating that a definite date is not known. The overall goal is to have all of the environmental cleanups completed by 2011. However, this is a target date and the Navy cannot say for certain if efforts will be completed by that date.

Ms. Hayes commented that the really correct answer is that we will never be able to assure 100 percent removal of munitions. The Navy will do their best to identify and remove munitions with the available technology, but we should always be prepared for a surprise discovery.

Mr. Dunaway agreed with Ms. Hayes and further clarified that after the munitions have been removed, legal restrictions would be put in place to control digging below certain depths in limited areas of Mare Island to prevent potential exposure to undiscovered munitions.

Mr. Kaiser commented that although human health is extremely important, it is not the only concern. The RWQCB is concerned with munitions in the offshore areas. The RWQCB does not want to see anything that may comprise the beneficial uses of the waters of the state including impacts to recreation and aquatic species. Mr. Dunaway explained that chemicals of concern would be covered under the baseline ecological risk assessment.

Mr. Karr asked why the contractor is being changed for the Marine Corps Firing Range. Mr. Dunaway explained that the work with Foster Wheeler got compromised last year from the rains that started early in the season and the work took longer and cost more than anticipated. Also during the characterization of the outfall, the test pits and excavations identified the area to be larger than previously thought. Foster Wheeler was doing more re-work of areas versus new work. The funds were exhausted under their contract. The Navy plans to hire a contractor who will work with a faster production rate and also complete the rest of the work. The Navy would like to change the type of the contract from cost reimbursement to a fixed price contract, which would work for this site since the lateral and vertical extents of contamination have been identified.

Mr. Gribble commented that during the October 20th meeting it was decided that the Navy would review and submit a slightly revised schedule. Mr. Dunaway stated that there are four sites where the schedule will be revised. The revised schedule will be submitted electronically on Monday.

Ms. Hayes announced that the Architectural Heritage and Landmarks commission is meeting in the City Council chambers. The City's consultant, Nory Winter of Winter and Company Designs, was hired to prepare design guidelines for Mare Island and has gotten to the Naval Ammunitions Depot portion of his design, which he is reporting on tonight. He is holding that portion of the presentation until the RAB meeting break. Ms. Hayes invited members of the Mare Island Regional Park Task Force and any others who are interested to go to the City Council chambers during the break. She also stated that they should ask for a copy of the report for those who serve on the task force.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes, Jerry Dunaway)

September RAB Meeting Minutes

Mr. Dunaway announced that the September RAB meeting minutes were mailed out. Mr. Dunaway stated that there is a new format to the meetings minutes and that any comments should be provided to Mr. Dunaway, Ms. Hayes, or Ms. Clifford in writing, by phone, or email.

Ms. Hayes commented that she believes many things were missing from the minutes. She stated it took over ½ hour to review the minutes and if she had to write everything down that was wrong it would take another hour. She stated that it doesn't seem very efficient from her standpoint even though it may be cost effective from the Navy's standpoint. She further stated that she disagrees with the new format and that it is not working very well.

Mr. Gribble commented that since we are not using minutes that are a transcript from the meeting any longer, where everyone has confidence in the accuracy of that record, then the RAB should go back to an approval process where the minutes are validated or invalidated. He asked how this process would work to get to an end product. Mr. Dunaway responded that this issue should be discussed and asked what the opinion of the meetings minutes was and if the RAB would like to go through a formal motion and approval process.

Mr. Karr stated he had not read through this month's meeting minutes, but commented that he was impressed with the previous format of the meeting minutes.

Mr. Dunaway stated that the RAB should try this format for a few months and he encouraged the RAB to read through the minutes and give feed back. He stated if we need to go back to the former format, that will be considered. Mr. Dunaway stated that it is very common for minutes to be prepared in this format and part of the duties of being on the RAB is to review the meeting minutes.

Ms. Hayes stated that this needs to be put on the agenda. She stated that laying on these kinds of edicts without having a discussion doesn't seem right. She further stated if reviewing every single meeting minute and then typing up a long list of comments is what she signed on for then these are new rules to the game. Ms. Hayes stated she doesn't think it is fair to state that this is part of her job.

Mr. Dunaway responded that this was not an edict because they had a discussion before the format was changed. He explained that it wasn't quite so negative at that point and suggested further discussion where a decision can be made on what needs to be done.

Mr. Gribble commented that he did review the minutes and had discussed them with Henry Chui. Mr. Gribble stated that he doesn't think it makes sense to take the time to go through these minutes. Mr. Gribble and Mr. Chui think there are inaccurate representations or deletions from the meeting minutes and that it would take a significant amount of time to review. Mr. Gribble provided an example on Page 6 of the minutes where they talked about the DoD response protocol and where he had said it had not worked in the past. Mr. Dunaway had responded that he was unaware of that and then Mr. Gribble had provided a couple of examples that were left out of the meeting minutes. Mr. Gribble stated it looks as though he didn't substantiate his statement. Also in the minutes there was mention of a discussion of the meeting minute format change and how it was discussed with the regulators and Ms. Hayes. It leads the reader to think that it was agreed upon when in fact they all object to the meeting minute format change. Mr. Gribble stated that this is an unfair representation and he doesn't want to spend time to go through the minutes to make sure it is acceptable to DTSC; he cannot approve these minutes.

Ms. Trotter reiterated her stance from last month's RAB meeting that there will be removal actions over the next fiscal year that will require a transcriber anyway and she recommends a partnership between Lennar, Weston, and the Navy for a local transcriber to come out to the meetings. Ms. Trotter concurred with Ms. Hayes and Mr. Gribble and their issues relating to the new meeting minutes. Mr. Dunaway thanked Ms. Trotter for her comment and stated there will be additional discussion about this in the future.

November RAB Meeting Date Change

Mr. Dunaway stated that the date for the November RAB meeting has changed to December 2, 2004. The RAB meeting will be held in the Marketing Center, which is now called the Mare Island Conference Center, due to a scheduling conflict at the library.

RAB Tour on November 6 at Building 535

Mr. Dunaway announced the RAB tour will be held on Saturday, November 6th not November 10th as indicated on the Agenda. A flyer was included in the mailing. Mr. Dunaway asked that attendees RSVP to Tommie Jean Damrel of TetraTech EMI and that her contact information is on the bottom of the flyer. Mr. Dunaway stated that the Navy will try to get attendees from the local newspapers. Mr. Dunaway stated that Weston and Lennar will pick some of the sites for the tour.

Other Administrative Comments

Mr. Dunaway announced there were additional items in the mailing including a handout from last month's presentation and another version of the handout is also available at the table with better photographs.

Ms. Krevsky commented that these additional items were not pointed out on the list of items. Mr. Dunaway indicated that they were not called out in the mailing and that is why he is going over what was in the mailing.

Ms. Hayes commented that the photographs should be identified as to what they are since a month later they couldn't take notes on the handouts. Mr. Dunaway responded that they had just prepared the handout and that maybe the minutes would help with identifying the photographs. Ms. Hayes responded she had tried and it didn't help.

Mr. Dunaway announced there was another handout provided in the mailing titled "Review of the Draft Final Remedial Investigation Area H1" that were prepared for the RAB by Rhea and June from San Jose State University through the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) grant. This document includes follow up comments on the Draft Final RI at Area H1 that Weston issued on behalf of the Navy. Additional comments were provided. Mr. Dunaway urged the RAB to review these additional comments, which can be used by the RAB to provide technical comments on the Draft Final RI.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

(a) Community (Diana Krevsky)

Ms. Diana Krevsky asked that Mr. Jerry Karr read her RAB Community Outreach Report due to a sore throat. Mr. Karr read the following report:

"Myrna Hayes and Diana Krevsky met with Michelle Trotter of DTSC on October 18 to identify what issues to discuss at a future community outreach focus group meeting. This meeting has been set up for either November 15th or 17th. Details to come.

The following concerns were suggested for possible agenda items:

Surveys: results from earlier Community Relations Plan (CRP) should be evaluated and acted upon first before embarking on a new survey. A new survey could target those on Mare Island who are most directly affected by the cleanup.

Need for a non-technical newsletter updating the current status of the cleanup on Mare Island with an easy-to-understand overview. This can be a valuable tool that educates the public, encourages respect of restricted areas, at the same time as acting as a public relations opportunity (especially in light of increased accessibility).

Cultivating connections with news media using press releases and opportunities for media to visit sites such as Weston's tour of the landfill. Myrna was instrumental in getting press coverage for this. This kind of coverage does far more for public outreach than fact sheets.

Difficulty in keeping on top of all the reports amplified by the early transfer and multi-contractors/developers. Need to hear more regulatory overview about Lennar's Eastern Early Transfer.

Figure out how to get ALL stakeholders on board to fill gaps where Navy support for the RAB is disappearing such as paying for a stenographer to take minutes at our meetings.

TAPP-like funds can be used to get independent expertise, present new technologies, and get alternative perspectives in addition to those offered from the usual contractors. Funds could also be used to update public databases, enhance website links, and use the recent well-designed GIS maps to help make the cleanup more accessible to the public.

How to resolve the increased tendency for stakeholders to use RAB meetings as a vehicle for their required public meetings. RAB members could be more active in pursuing topics important to the RAB. Often, the RAB relies on focus groups to cover such issues.”

(b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

Mr. Karr reported there was a meeting of the Mare Island Regional Park Task Force. He stated that a good portion of the meeting was presented by Cris and Terry from Weston about projects on the south end of the island and about the Regional Park. Mr. Karr stated that it was a good meeting where The Regional Park Task group and Weston could discuss these areas.

(c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

Ms. Paula Tygielski had nothing new to report.

(d) City Report (Ray Leftwich)

Mr. Leftwich provided the following update.

Mr. Leftwich reported that on Tuesday November 2nd, there is a resolution in front of the City Council for approval of the Final Map for Mare Island Farragut Village Unit No. 1 Subdivision, which is the first final map for residential development on Mare Island.

Mr. Leftwich stated that last Tuesday, the City Council approved a resolution for construction of Flagship Drive Phase 1A. Flagship Drive is the residential collector street that will serve the new residential developments. Phase 1A begins at the intersection of Kansas Street and Azuar Drive and travels in a curv-a-linear path behind the elementary school, roughly aligning with the former Tisdale Avenue, terminating at the former Marine Corps Rifle Range. Phase 1B and 1C will continue to the south through Coral Sea Village, and ultimately connecting with Club Drive where Sargo Avenue used to connect to Club Drive.

Mr. Leftwich stated that last Friday, Weston Harvest Properties terminated the exclusive right to negotiate with the City of Vallejo for development of Lease Area 1A.

Mr. Leftwich announced that there are two proposals on Tuesday's City Council Meeting agenda: One proposal is to begin request for proposal/request for quote (RFP/RFQ) process to find a North Island Developer, and the other proposal is to enter into a 120 day exclusive right to

negotiate with Lennar. The staff recommendation is to enter into a 120 day exclusive right to negotiate with Lennar.

(e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

Mr. Steve Farley provided a handout and provided the following summary of recent activities.

Mr. Farley referred to photographs on his handout during the discussion. Mr. Farley described that the photographs show some of the field activities including soil removal at Building O on Walnut Avenue; soil removal at a Fuel Oil Pipeline (FOPL) segment at Building 388, and other photographs showing LBP soil removal activities at Building P.

Mr. Farley explained that work is being done at four FOPL segment locations in the EETP. He explained that these locations are being investigated, that the ends are being exposed, and the FOPL segments are being vacuum tested to see if they are sound.

Mr. Farley explained that polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) concrete and soil removal activities occurred at Building 521 and that the photograph in the handout shows the site after concrete removal.

Mr. Farley stated that concrete within Building H83 in the Toro area has been impacted by PCBs. He explained this site includes an electrical switch room. The work on the outside of the building has been completed, but additional work is still required from within the electrical switch room.

Mr. Farley reported on the status of the underground storage tank (UST)/Cistern investigation. He stated that the old cistern or secondary containment structure may have previously held acids. Tests will be conducted for pH and metals in the soil at this location.

Mr. Farley reported there are two upcoming public comment periods including a public comment period for the RAP for IA C3 in January 2005 and the public comment period for the PCB work plan either later this year or early next year.

Mr. Farley reported that several PCB sites and FOPL segments have been closed.

(f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

Mr. Cris Jespersen provided a handout and summarized the following recent activities.

Mr. Jespersen reported that there was a meeting held in October with regulatory agencies to discuss various wetlands issues relating to the IA H1 landfill cap. Additional meetings and discussions will be held to discuss details to avoid any temporary impact to various species at Wetlands X including the salt marsh harvest mouse.

Mr. Jespersen reported that maintenance on the IA H1 landfill soil cover is underway to provide additional soil cover to areas with limited existing cover (i.e., areas with exposed debris).

Mr. Jespersen reported that pumps have been installed in the IA H1 containment barrier and extraction trench. He pointed out that the photograph in the handout shows the well head and associate piping.

Mr. Jespersen reported that Weston has received comments on Draft Final RI for IA H1 and that they are currently formulating a response to comments. He reported that Weston is currently preparing the Draft FS which is anticipated to be issued in November 2004.

(g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble/Carolyn d'Almeida/Gary Riley)

Department of Toxic Substances Control (Chip Gribble)

Mr. Gribble reported that as Weston reported earlier there is landfill cap maintenance currently underway at the RCRA landfill and he would like to give credit to Weston for bringing this to the attention of DTSC. DTSC is careful in approving this because they do not want this to be considered approval of applying a landfill cap outside the remedy to maintain a temporary cap. Weston is authorized to maintain the two-foot minimum cap.

Mr. Gribble stated that they have finished their comments on the RI report and he has copies of the comments available if anyone is interested.

Mr. Gribble stated he has spent a lot of time reviewing the Draft SMP schedule that Mr. Dunaway had talked about earlier.

Mr. Gribble also reported that for the Wetlands Mitigation Plan that they were successful in getting many of the regulatory agencies involved in working on the issues. Mr. Gribble reported that discussions regarding the Wetlands Mitigation Plan, specifically regarding the impact to the wetlands from the remediation at IA H1, have progressed. He reported that California Fish and Game regulations would not allow a take of salt marsh harvest mouse habitat during the remediation. A way around this may be to possibly conduct hand removal of the vegetation which may be acceptable to California Fish and Game. In that way, Weston may be able to avoid regulatory authorization of the take. However, these discussions are still ongoing and need to be resolved soon.

Mr. Gribble commented on the Navy's monthly report that is distributed every month. Specifically, he commented on a box on the handout that lists documents that have been submitted and a column for the number of documents that have received responses from the regulatory agencies, which often shows a negative number. Mr. Gribble stated he thinks this is not accurate, is counter productive, and is dangerously misleading to put the statement out to the public, which they have done for some time. In reviewing the SMP, Mr. Gribble reported that he found 41 documents the Navy submitted that were never listed on the last SMP; these include unannounced documents and others documents that came without notice. Mr. Gribble reported that there are 15 documents listed in the last SMP that were significantly later or were not submitted at all by the Navy. Mr. Gribble also reported there are six projects that were not

included in the SMP. Mr. Gribble stated that these numbers provide a perspective of what is going on versus the Navy submitting lots of documents and DTSC not commenting.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Carolyn d' Almeida)

Ms. Carolyn d'Almeida reported that John Lucey got comments out on the Landfill RI and she brought copies of the comments for those at the RAB who are interested. She also brought copies of comments on the SI report for the horse stables relating to the green sand removal. Ms. d'Almeida stated that sampling was not done prior to the removal but was done afterward. She stated additional work may be required due to the results of sampling. Ms. d'Almeida reported that some progress has been made on PCB sites. Two letters on PCB sites have been completed and five more PCB letters need to be discussed with the attorneys.

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) (John Kaiser for Gary Riley)

Mr. John Kaiser reported for the RWQCB. Mr. John Kaiser commented about the back log of documents as reported on the Navy progress report. He stated in these times where there is political pressure and the perception that regulatory agencies are not doing their jobs, these reported numbers give the wrong perception of what is going on and are counter productive. It could also give a negative impression of the Navy as well. He would like the issue resolved.

Mr. Kaiser commented on the SMP and stated neither himself nor Mr. Riley could attend the October 20th meeting to discuss the SMP due to previous engagements (Mr. Kaiser had to attend board meeting to push through an enforcement action and Mr. Riley was giving a presentation to board members on the same date). Mr. Kaiser reported that Mr. Riley has provided the Navy comments on the Draft SMP and looks forward to discussing the schedule further with the Navy.

Mr. Kaiser reported that the RWQCB has submitted comments on the RI for IA H1 landfill.

Mr. Kaiser reported that RWQCB attended a meeting where the Wetlands Mitigation Plan was discussed. RWQCB has submitted comments on the plan. One of the concerns has to do with the mitigation ratio. Mr. Kaiser explained that when wetlands are destructed it is common practice to not only replace the lost acreage, but to augment that with additional acreage. This is called the mitigation ratio. There is difficulty at this time with a 1 to 1 ratio. Mr. Kaiser indicated that this topic will be discussed further in upcoming discussions.

V. CO-CHAIRS' REPORT (Jerry Dunaway and Myrna Hayes)

Navy Co-Chair Report (Jerry Dunaway)

Mr. Dunaway first responded to the issue regarding the Navy progress report and the box showing the document submittals. Mr. Dunaway stated that this box has always been on the Navy's reports even back when the reports were black and white and that it may be more visible now because it is in color. Mr. Dunaway stated it was not intended to be a way to berate the agencies. He suggested that the issue be communicated directly between the agencies and the Navy and not at the RAB meetings. Mr. Dunaway stated he does not believe they presented the

schedule in a way that emphasized delay and he stated the goal is to make progress and show that progress in the schedule and progress reports. If a change needs to be made, he stated it should be discussed separately from the RAB.

Ms. Hayes stated that she thought the Navy may have borrowed the graphic representation of the deliverables status from Lennar's handout. Ms. Hayes further explained that Lennar had changed their status to not show so blatantly how behind the agencies were on document reviews. She commented that they Navy may want to use a format similar to Lennars.

Mr. Gribble commented that it is not about the agencies being behind on reviews. Mr. Gribble stated that the problem is the Navy is not managing the projects adequately, which translates into the appearance that the agencies are behind. Mr. Gribble stated that this issue was raised before and it is still being shown on the Navy progress reports.

Mr. Dunaway responded that Mr. Gribble had brought up this issue a previous RAB meeting but that Mr. Gribble had not communicated to the Navy on what he would like to see. Mr. Dunaway stated that schedule issues need to be communicated between the Navy and DTSC and that this issue needs to be discussed separately from the RAB.

Mr. Dunaway handed out the Navy Monthly Progress report and began his co-chair report with an announcement that as of October 4, 2004, BRAC operations are now directly under the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and no longer under Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC). Mr. Dunaway referred to an organizational chart on the Navy's monthly progress report that shows the new organization. Mr. Dunaway reported that the BRAC Program Management Office (BRAC PMO) is directly under one of the Assistant Secretary's of the Navy. He explained there are five Assistant Secretary's of the Navy and that BRAC PMO is under the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and the Environment. Mr. Dunaway reported that the management chain has transferred but that the environmental project managers still remain under NAVFAC. Mr. Dunaway reported that he has moved over to BRAC PMO with the remedial project managers remaining under NAVFAC. Mr. Dunaway explained that both BRAC PMO and NAVFAC personnel are still in the same location and it is basically a seamless change. Mr. Dunaway also reported that Commander of Navy Installations (CNI) is a new command established last year and that CNI will become more visible as they become in charge of installations around the world.

Mr. Dunaway stated that other ongoing work is described in the Navy's Monthly Progress Report handout provided. Mr. Dunaway also suggested that RAB members can refer to their RAB orientation handout or the www.navy.mil website for additional information on the Navy's organization.

Community Co-Chair Report (Myrna Hayes)

Ms. Hayes wanted to remind people that the base is open with no guard. In reviewing the SMP and during these discussions, Ms. Hayes stated that the SMP should be updated to reflect that guards are no longer present and new ways need to be developed to protect the public from potential exposures from the cleanups that are ongoing. This is an opportunity for regulators and

those responsible for the environmental cleanup to actively educate the public on safety with respect to environmental cleanup activities on Mare Island.

Ms. Hayes stated that another opportunity for educating the public about the environmental cleanup on Mare Island is during the Flyway Festival that will occur from January 22 through January 23, 2005. Ms. Hayes indicated that the previous Flyway Festival building needs electricians to look at the building to see what needs to be done to get power supplied. She also stated that she will be on the look out for a new building for the festival. Ms. Hayes asked that for those who own and manage buildings on Mare Island to expect a phone call from Ms. Hayes asking for help.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no further comments and the meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout: *Summary of Lead-Based Paint Program (Mr. Steve Farley, Lennar Mare Island)*
- Presentation Handout: *Fiscal Year 2005 Cleanup Program Goals (Mr. Jerry Dunaway, BRAC Program Management Office)*
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update October 2004
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update October 2004
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard October 2004

HANDOUTS

PRESENTATION HANDOUT: SUMMARY OF
LEAD-BASED PAINT PROGRAM

PRESENTATION HANDOUT: FISCAL YEAR 2005
CLEANUP PROGRAM GOALS

WESTON SOLUTIONS MARE ISLAND RAB UPDATE
OCTOBER 2004

LENNAR MARE ISLAND MARE ISLAND RAB UPDATE
OCTOBER 2004

NAVY MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT
FORMER MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
OCTOBER 2004

THESE HANDOUTS WERE NOT RECEIVED IN THE
RESTORATION RECORD FILE.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:

DIANE C. SILVA, COMMAND RECORDS MANAGER, CODE EV33
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, SOUTHWEST
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY (NBSD BLDG. 3519)
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 556-1280
E-MAIL: diane.silva@navy.mil

CDM Transmittal

CDM.

9444 Farnham Street, Suite 210
San Diego, California 92123
(858) 268-3383
(858) 268-9677

To: Diane Silva
Organization/Address: Navy SWDIV
1220 Pacific Hwy., Bldg 129
San Diego, CA 92132
Phone: (619) 532-3676

From: Regina Clifford
Date: January 25, 2005

Re: Mare Island Information Repository – Final Minutes for the September and October

Job #:

Via: *Mail:* *Overnight:* Fedex 2-day *Courier:*

Enclosed please find:

For your information

X

For your review

For your signature

Approved

Approved as noted

Returned to you for correction

● **Message:**

Diane,

Enclosed please find two copies each of the final RAB meeting minutes from the September and October 2004 RAB Meetings at Mare Island Naval Shipyard for the administration record/information repository. Please call me with any questions

Thank you,

Regina Clifford
Project Manager

Signed

