MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, June 23, 2005

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, June 23 2005, at the J.F. K. Library, Joseph Room in Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:09 p.m. and adjourned at 9:19 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of 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 (Community Co-Chair)
- Kenn Browne (Community Member)
- Jerry Karr (Community Member)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)
- Carolyn d'Almeida (EPA)
- Gary Riley (RWQCB)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Jerry Dunaway (Navy Co-Chair)
- David Godsey (Navy)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston Solutions)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Dennis Kelly
- Marti Brown
- Diji Christian
- Neal Siler
- Jim Robbins

RAB Support from CDM:

- Regina Clifford
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville
- Darlene McCray

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good evening. Since I've been here for about five minutes and the meeting can't start without me, I'll welcome you all to this evening's Restoration Advisory Board. My name is Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community Co-chair of the Restoration Advisory Board, and I live in Vallejo. I'll turn the microphone over to Jerry.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Myrna. Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board meeting where we're actually starting off the meeting with a public meeting, and a presentation on a proposed cleanup we expect to do later this year. But first, let's start with introductions around the table and those in the audience. Again, my name is Jerry Dunaway, I'm BRAC environmental coordinator for the Navy at Mare Island.

(Attendees introduced themselves as requested.)

II. PRESENTATION: *Soil Cleanup at the Former Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office Site*
Presented by Mr. Bernie Wong, Project Manager, CH2M Hill.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, everyone. Moving into the public meeting, the presentation will be on the soil cleanup of the former defense reutilization and marketing office site. We call that the DRMO scrapyard site. And this is a cleanup that really resulted from the early transfer negotiations and really back as far as 2001. Jim Wright, the head of our environmental programs at Naval Facilities Engineering Command, kind of put the final touches on negotiating the early transfer for the Lennar parcel, the eastern early transfer parcel. And as part of that, he committed to having the DRMO site cleaned up; where the Navy would do the cleanup, but we would use CH2M Hill, who is Lennar's contractor also, but they do a lot of work for the Navy too, and we have a contract with them out of North Carolina. So Jim Wright has committed to using that contract, and that's what we're doing here. It's taken us some time to get to the implementation phase of this removal action. And DRMO sites are kind of interesting.

In the thirteen years I've worked with the Navy I think I've worked on seven or eight different DRMO sites. Their operations are basically, like the name says, they take material and try to reutilize it. I've got plenty of stories of going to DRMO sites and trying and find desks and chairs and office furniture and refrigerators and conference tables. But they also take in a lot of scrap metal that may not get reused by the Navy staff, and it will be packaged together for people to bid on outside the base, pick it up and take it away for scrap and salvage.

They don't have the ability or have the authority to handle hazardous waste, but what happens is some of the materials they take in have hazardous materials. And through their operations they inadvertently generate hazardous waste by not managing that material properly.

And so the common thread I've seen at DRMO sites are PCB's. And much of that comes from transformers. And transformers are big chunks of metal, and quite frankly I'm not quite sure why the copper miners haven't figured it out yet, but I think a transformer has about a mile's worth of copper cable in it each.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You heard it here.

MR. GEMAR: They're pretty heavy.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: But they're pretty heavy, so they probably can't pick 'em up. But that's the challenge we have with this site. PCBs is one of our chemicals that we're cleaning up at this site. And Bernie Wong is going to do the presentation. So what I'll do is I'll turn it over to Bernie. And Bernie is with CH2M Hill, Melissa is helping him out with the presentation. And if you want to ask questions, feel free, for clarification. If there are any questions that you want to save until the end, Bernie and I can help answer them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: While Bernie is giving Melissa his password, I'll just note that the DRMO site is not a new site to this Restoration Advisory Board. Many of us probably had the opportunity to buy pallets of bicycles from DRMO when the base was closing and all other kinds of treasures. I think I have some of those cloth bound federal record books that I got at the

DRMO during that time. But the RAB was very influential, as was the City of Vallejo, and the regulators in all working together to influence the Navy before the base closed at this particular site to go ahead and do the necessary survey and removal of radiological contamination that was on the site. And we led a pretty aggressive effort to do that. And the technology wasn't there at the moment, and it got invented pretty much overnight. And the captain came out to oversee the project personally. And what was his name Chip, Paula Roberts? Yeah. Forget it.

Well, but it was impressive because we had a captain here. And so we do have a long history with that site, and we were really happy that the Navy didn't leave that little pocket of radiological contamination, and we were happy that the base could be certified as clean of radiological contamination before the base closed. So we're happy to see that.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And I know this isn't the first presentation to the RAB on this cleanup project, we've been planning this for four years now. I do want to mention before handing the mike over to Bernie that this presentation essentially supplements the public comment period for the engineering evaluation cost analysis report that was issued for public comment on June 3rd, I believe it was, and a fact sheet was mailed out that week. Hopefully you all got a copy of the fact sheet. The comment period ends July 2nd. So --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It says June 30th.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Actually the comment period does end July 2nd, so you have a couple more days there. And of course, that's right before the Fourth of July holiday, so if there's any mail delays we're certainly not going to ignore any comments that come after July 4th. So with that, I'll turn it over to Bernie.

MR. WONG: Thank you, Jerry. I think Jerry already gave a great detail and a very good introduction to this project, so I think I can just jump right into the presentation itself. Basically what I want to try to cover tonight is to go over briefly site history and the chemicals of potential concern, and MEC or munitions considerations for removal action. And also for the remediation alternatives evaluation, and also the approach for the removal action. And I'll close the presentation with talking about a discussion of the schedule of the removal action.

Basically, as Jerry mentioned, in this project, the Navy will conduct a non-time critical cleanup action at the DRMO scrapyard. And the goal for the Navy is to basically reduce the risk posed by the chemicals to clean up the environment.

For site history. Basically this map shows the location of the DRMO site on Mare Island. As you can see the top line on the map shows the fence, basically the fence area. So most of, if not all of the industrial operations are within that heavy dotted fence line, and that is the focus of our removal action for this summer. For site history I'd like to just go over the next few slides that show some photos and I'll talk about. Melissa.

This map actually shows the Navy yard in 1911. The interesting thing from this map is that the DRMO site at that time was actually offshore under the water. Basically what happened is the original Mare Island shoreline that's actually east of the existing DRMO site -- oh, wait.

And over the years the Navy, you know, used dredge material kind of in the western part of the island, and that eventually create where the DRMO site is nowadays. So between 1910 to 1940 that whole area around the DRMO site was backfilled.

And starting in 1944 the Navy decided to put the DRMO scrapyard in the area. So they trucked in fill material or backfill from the local pit and quarry, and kind of constructed the buildings. So by 1944 most of the buildings were all constructed, and the operation began that year.

This aerial photo from 1949 shows the fully operational DRMO site at that time. It shows, I think, it's the buildings they used for storage. I don't know if you can see from the picture, but there's also a couple smaller buildings. This is a view from 1959, and also shows the DRMO site right here actually operational. The picture is showing the entire Mare Island, and you can see actually at that time there was a dredge pond over there, even in the fifties. And also the area around are Island in the fifties is not as crowded as it is today.

So, and you know, in the eighties, this major change in the DRMO site is that big building is gone now, and it was replaced by more storage area for, you know, various operation. And the site was eventually closed in 1995, and the Navy moved all the DRMO operation to the new site. Since 1995 there's really not much going on there, the whole site is basically left empty without any additional operation.

And the next photo shows, you know, the best way to see it. The DRMO site nowadays is basically this industrial area overcome by vegetation and stuff like that. Starting in the early 1980s, the Navy started a series of investigations in and around the DRMO site. I'm not going to go into all of these investigations. But there are two investigations that are worth mentioning.

The first one is what Ms. Hayes already talked about, in 1997 the Navy conducted a radiological investigation and assessment and caused the removal of about a hundred thousand pounds of soil contaminated with radiation. And during the process of the radiologic removal action, we actually gained a lot of information on what the surface soil looked like at the DRMO site, and that actually formed the basis for our conceptual site model. And those information was the latest supplement by remedial investigation that was done in the late 1990s.

On this slide it shows basically radiological cleanup, and also the removal investigation. The Navy has collected over 130 surface soil and subsurface soil samples, and also installed three groundwater monitoring wells to check on the area around the site. And all this information assists the Navy to conclude that action is needed to reduce the risks at the site.

So the plans for the site, for the future site is basically from the Mare Island Final Reuse Plan, and the Navy concluded with Lennar Marie Island that the site will be commercial facilities. Is there any questions about site history or investigation or anything?

If not, I can move on to talk about the chemicals of potential concern for the site. So basically in the remedial investigation we were able to determine in the field chemicals that they can see at the site. They include lead, PCBs, PAHs, pesticides, and TPHs. Two of these compounds are very important, the lead and the PCB.

As Jerry mentioned, PCB is always a common chemical you find at any of these DRMO sites. You've also got past operations as shown in the next slide here. Basically it's a source of metal scrap, and also it's also buried, and it's also the source common to most of the chemicals in the soil. That's why lead and PCB are the two most common chemicals found on the site.

And PAHs and pesticides are a minor compound you'll find in some areas. And also, we also have a TPH contamination on the site in the deepest soil. Most of that's due to a suspected oil line on the west side of Azuar Drive, although that would be a subject for the Navy in the future. And based on all of this previous investigation, basically two important things that stands out. First of all, most of the chemicals of potential concern are actually found in less than eighteen inches below ground surface. Basically this is a result from a past industrial operation. And also in the next slide you can see most of the contamination is actual on top of the site. Those purple dots are the locations that we found the chemicals that exceeded the target cleanup goal. And all of the purple dots are basically exceedences of target cleanup goals and are in less than eighteen inches of soil.

And the reason why we believe most of the contamination is found in the southern half of the site is because that's where most of the industrial activities occurred, because most of the storage bins and all the scrap bins is all located in the southern part of the site, and it's also near the railroad track. Because, you know, most of travel to the scrapyard is by rail car, and that's why it's logical that most of the contamination is concentrated to the south.

And another important point is that most of the sites had actually been paved in asphalt for a very long time, and so that's why when you punched through the asphalt, most of the soil turned out to be pretty clean. And based on that, we found five small areas totaling about 10,000 square feet, that has deeper contamination, probably due to the past operation as well.

Those are scattered all around. So like one locations has PCB and TPHs. And the chemical is basically down about six feet. So the deepest, you know, spot we found is probably about five and a half feet or so. In addition to chemicals that we talk at the sites, Jerry talked about also that they had some munitions concern. Yes, Chip?

MR. GRIBBLE: Could you repeat that last part, how deep?

MR. WONG: Of course. All of the contamination that we found so far from the existing data is less than six feet. And those five squares shown on the map is where the contamination is about three and a half to about five and a half feet. So as I say, that's only the six -- five locations that we found so far that that's deep.

I try not no use acronyms, but munitions and explosive of concern is kind of too long to say every time, so I will just call them MEC. And MEC is a really general term that is basically inclusive of any of the ordnance items, components, or explosives that, you know, have been abandoned or fired or buried, or tested or something. So MEC, that's inclusive of anything that's related to ordnance items. And that's the term that I'll try to use for the rest of the talk about anything that is related to ordnance items or explosives.

Since this site is a scrapyard basically, the Navy used it to recycle the material. So a MEC item, you know, was not a regular presence on the site. Basically what happened is the reason why

found MEC items is people made mistakes. They inevitably took in, you know, munitions items with scrap material. So the site was never used as a firing range, and also was never used as a site for ordnance burn or detonation. So any of the MEC items that they found, have found, or we expect to find would be safe munition, have not been fired and not just being abandoned, that kind of thing.

So the history of the munition items is when the DRMO site was closed in 1995, the Navy conducted a surface sweep to try to clear the area of remaining MEC items. What they found is numerous items which poses no danger. And the only exception is they found was one small bomb fuse that was under the surface. And also during the, you know, during the exploration, they also recovered a certain amount of small arms cartridges, like fifty caliber, thirty caliber, all of that stuff.

And the interesting thing that they find is that all the MEC items that they recovered during the removal action is confined to less than 14 inches deep. So they have not found anything deeper than 14 inches, which kind of confirm what we, you know, expected. If this is not a range and not an open detonation area, there was no driving force to try to force any of the MEC items to be part of the site. So that is actually our conceptual model for any of the MEC that we encounter, that we might encounter at this site.

And the final note is, in 1998 the Navy did a geophysical survey to attempt to try to map any suspect MEC items at the site. And they found that to be impractical because of the amount of metal debris in the soil. And this is an important point because that formed the basis of one of our construction approach. So the conclusion for the MEC items is basically it's a scrapyard that poses minimal MEC hazards. We don't expect to find any important findings of MEC items.

And also, as I mentioned before, the MEC that the Navy had recovered so far at the site was basically in a safe condition. So they never have any cases, any reported cases of exploded ordnance. And also because most of the scrap bins are located on concrete pads, so we wouldn't expect any of the MEC items that would be very deep at the site. And also, the final point, just like it's basically, anything that we might or we may encounter during the removal action would be basically near the surface.Any questions about the MEC issues or MEC conclusions at the site? If not, then I'll move on to –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually, sorry, I couldn't get to the microphone fast enough. So what kind of confirmation sampling or confirmation surveying are you going to do once you've, I would assume you're going to be clearing a certain amount of the soil down to at least eighteen inches, and then are you then going to do some sort of confirmation --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- on that.

MR. WONG: Yes. Actually I'll talk about that in a few minutes, but let's talk about it now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, all right. Well, no, I'll let you cover it later then.

MR. WONG: Basically the confirmation will be done by confirmation sample and also by geophysical method. In this case mostly we'll use a magnetometer, to answer Ms. Hayes question. After we excavate the soil, we'll actually do a physical confirmation of each grid to the eighteen inches to make sure there are not MEC items. And we'll check the excavation bottom with a magnetometer or geophysics for anomalies. If there are any anomalies, we'll continue the process until we don't find any metal debris or until we reach a three foot depth. At that time we do a geophysical sweep to check and see any suspect MEC. If there's no suspect MEC items then we will use the as-built final documentation that that certain area is clear of MEC items. And, you know, based on the surveys and the site investigation, we don't expect to find much metal debris even beyond 18 to 24 inches depth. But we will repeat the process down to three feet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But you're only using magnetometers?

MR. WONG: And also if we need to we'll also use the EM-61 instrument. But right now the reason we concentrate on the magnetometer is basically because it's ferrous metal. But we have the EM-61 to, you know, to check for any non-ferrous material. So once you get the results and once they determine that there's a need to -- another question?

MS. CHRISTIAN: It's hardy worth mentioning, but a sentence like this at the bottom, "Any incidental MEC is likely to be found at surface or shallow depth." Does that mean they will be, or does that mean it doesn't matter, it's just not that important to bother with the incidental?

MR. WONG: The reason we used incidental is because we believed that we may not even encounter any MEC items. The MEC hazards at the site is bare minimal, and that's why we used the word incidental.

We expect to find very minimal amount of MEC, if at all, during the removal action. However, you know, any suspect MEC or any MEC we will treat it very seriously. So we will take out any piece of MEC that we find at the site. Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, this goes back to a comment that we made when we discussed in developing this work plan. You said you're going to survey down to three feet. And again, we were looking for you to go to where you have a clean bottom, whether that's three feet or thirty feet. But you reasonably anticipate that you will not go below thirty feet. And here you stated you're going to go only to three feet. So, could you clarify that one more time, please?

MR. WONG: Right. Basically our concept is based on all the historical findings. We don't expect to see any MEC even beyond eighteen inches. But, you know, for, you know, the safety and for the risk expected the Navy would prefer to go down to three feet just to be clear of any MEC item that might even exist below eighteen inches to two feet. So this is an approach that we go because we don't expect to see anything even beyond eighteen inches.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, we would agree that it's reasonable that you're not, it's not likely that you will see anything below three feet.

MR. WONG: Right. Right.

MR. GRIBBLE: But in the event that you do, because this is a business about surprises. In the event that you do, you're saying that you're not going to go below three feet? That's a problem.

MR. WONG: No problem. We decided to keep the three feet conceptual site model. However, in the event that we found a lot of MEC items down at three feet, then we basically, the Navy would be consulted and discuss the recommendations and the cost action. But right now we feel that three feet is pretty adequate to address any MEC hazard. Do you want to address that, Jerry?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: If we found anything at the three foot depth we would certainly keep going. It wouldn't be an instant stop, and we'd notify you. But as the conceptual site model has shown, and as our history on site has shown, we use three feet just based on that history, based on the data we have so that we can plan for it, and negotiate a contract with CH2M Hill. If there are changes that go below three feet, we certainly would not ignore that.

MR. WONG: So once the Navy had determined the need for the removal action at the site based on the chemical, the next step for the Navy to do is to look at the appropriate remedial action to address the contamination. And in this case the Navy has used the standard EPA method for removal actions based on technical feasibility, implementability, and cost. And those are the three criteria that the Navy has used to find the most appropriate removal action for the site.

The Navy has picked five different alternative, and kind of going through each alternative based on three criteria. And the five alternatives are listed on the next slide. And I'm not going to go into all of them because the discussion is in the IRAP which, right now, is undergoing public review contract. But the Navy has picked alternative number four as the preferred alternative for this site, you know, based on the conceptual site model, based on the presence of chemical at a certain depth, and also based on any MEC consideration.

And so the alternative four basically is the excavation of the soil down to eighteen inches to address all the chemical and any MEC issues. And also go out to the five areas that have been delineated with chemical contamination deeper than eighteen inches, remove soil up to six feet to address any remaining chemical issues in the southern area. And also to meet the industrial land use cleanup scenario from the EPA based on human risk. And basically the selection of industrial land use scenario is to match the future reuse of the site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Bernie, on that note, that slide says you're cleaning up to industrial land use.

MR. WONG: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Earlier it said that Lennar was going to use the facility for a commercial center. How is that different from an industrial center? I think of a commercial center as a, as having a lot more people and a lot more varied ages of people. What are you intending again for that site, Sheila?

MS. ROEBUCK: It's likely going to be a commercial building. But I believe the cleanup is a commercial industrial standard, so that the cleanup standard implies that people will be there for work at a certain number of hours per week, a number of years of a working life. So I think that

the cleanup standard, Jerry can, and Bernie can talk to that, but it's planned to be a commercial building.

MR. WONG: Right. I think that's correct, because basically industrial and commercial land use scenario is based on the risk scenario based on human exposure to different kinds of chemical. And in the case of industrial and commercial, you know, the assumption is made that people go to that site or that building or that area for work only. So that basically the exposure to whatever chemical is in the area for the site is basically either business hours or shopping hours, shorter duration compared to residential land use.

You know, residential land use scenario you actually live there and spend most off work hours at that site. So that's basically the two scenarios that EPA used for any of the cleanup goals. Yes.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I'm interested in the difference between four and five. Four says meet industrial cleanup goals, and five is the same cleanup, but meet residence cleanup goals. How different are those goals?

MR. WONG: Well, residential cleanup goals, you know, imply people actually live and stay longer at the location. So in most case the EPA residential goals are a lot more stringent than industrial land use goals. So that's the difference. It's based on a risk model. I mean a land use goal allow for more chemical in commercial or industrial goals. So that's the difference. And we actually looked --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula, were you asking for the difference between three and four or --

MS. TYGIELSKI: Between four and five.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Maybe what she wants to know is what's the difference in terms of how much you would excavate between four and five.

MR. WONG: If I remember right, the amount of excavation or the amount of work for -- let's see what it takes. The amount of excavation and the resulting costs would be about almost 40 percent difference. So that's the difference in terms of the scope of work and also the associated costs. It's about 35 or 40. So it's quite a difference. Because for the land use or land use scenario, okay, residential land use scenario, a lot of the metals are actually lower exposure than the industrial.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not to just go on and on this point here, but this is a public meeting about this topic. Where do you, I understand now that the industrial and commercial are similar land use. Where do you discuss the, or was this in the RI, the impacts to the environment, like to groundwater, in this cleanup scenario versus residential? Because that's a filled area, and I would think that there would be exposure pathways for environmental receptors.

MR. WONG: The remedial investigation concluded that the environmental receptor at the site is minimal because the site had been in use or had been in use as an industrial site for many years. There's really not much wildlife that uses the site as their home, and also to reside and live there.

So early on in the process the remedial investigation has concluded that human health is the major risk driver for this site.

MR. RILEY: If I can weigh in, Bernie.

MR. WONG: Yes, Gary.

MR. RILEY: I believe, to my knowledge, the remedial investigation was never actually submitted to the agencies yet, it's a draft remedial investigation for this site. So there will be more risk evaluation for the site there. There also is a, there is groundwater pollution associated with petroleum product on the groundwater table. And that is a threat to groundwater quality, at least that's the Water Board perspective, and could be a threat to groundwater discharging in the wetlands if it were to get there. So that's a future -- but it's not the subject of this action, but it is something that's down the road.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yeah, and that's a good point to clarify here too, Gary. This is a removal action or an interim cleanup. After this soil cleanup we are going to do a further assessment of the site after this cleanup, and that would be a comprehensive investigation that would also look at what groundwater risks there are, as well as ecological risk.

The groundwater issue is compounded by the existing petroleum problem underneath the site too. So I think it would be pretty hard to try and clean up or use residential for this cleanup scenario and still leave the petroleum issue deeper underneath the site. So further evaluation will occur after this removal action.

MR. WONG: Just to supplement on Jerry's comments. The removal action we're doing this summer is confined to the surface or shallow soil, and specifically addressed to the chemical left over from the DRMO operation. And the petroleum action will be a, you know, additional removal action to be done by the Navy. So the, in order to execute or implement the alternative number four, we have developed the construction and removal action approach for this removal action. That's the subject that we're going to do this summer.

Now, this first slide is about the technical design criteria. And I'm not going to go into detail with this. Most of the stuff we have already discussed. But from this slide there's a very important note that I'd like to point out. First of all, when we conduct a removal action we divide the site into a hundred grids, fifty foot by fifty foot. The division of this site is to facilitate our exploration process. So the chemical and the MEC surveys will be done in an orderly fashion.

And also that way we also can establish control points on the site, so that we can track our progress, and also we can locate any problem. We can actually go back to the site and pinpoint any of the, you know, additional chemical problem. And also, a fifty foot by fifty foot site is also easier for a confirmation sampling process, so that we have enough sampling density to demonstrate that the removal action and the remaining site soil would have no remaining chemical that would pass any of the risk based cleanup goals.

And another important point of this technical design criteria, it's to ensure the removal and to try to locate the MEC items. So our approach is actually to excavate all the soil, and then we'll run the soil through a screen plant. Basically we screen the soil for metal debris, and we screen for

any of the suspect MEC items. And so that's the method we use to try to, you know, to do a comprehensive cleanup. The third very important focus, even though this is a chemical removal action, because of the presence of potential MEC, all of our work procedure and our construction approach will strictly follow any Department of Defense guidelines for any MEC removal action. So even though our focus here is mainly chemical, not MEC, but we will actually execute it as a MEC removal action to maximize our concern for safety for the site workers and also for the surrounding public.

The next two slides basically are kind of, you know, would be a step by step approach to show what we're going to do this summer to achieve this removal action. The first thing that we're going to do is to, following mobilization, is, you know, if we get all the equipment on the site and then we'll remove all the surface structures at the site. For example, the truck scale, the small buildings, and also all the asphalt pavement. We'll take off all the stuff so we have a bare ground ready for the excavation to happen after that.

And also one important factor is when we do the site preparation, we upgrade the fence and we make sure the site is always fenced at all times in the construction. That way we can keep out all the unnecessary visitors during or, you know, or after hours during the removal, because of the chemicals and also the potential presence of MEC.

And the construction approach, as I mentioned, is the whole site will be divided into fifty grids. And then we'll start grid by grid down to eighteen inches. And again at the end of eighteen inches we will do a confirmation sample for each grid, and analyze that for all the chemicals of concern at the site.

If the confirmation samples pass, then we're done for the site, and then we will do a geophysical survey to make sure that there's no more, you know, MEC presence beyond the eighteen inches.

If we found any MEC or even suspect MEC, then we will continue to excavate that, as I mentioned before, down to three feet. However, if the confirmation samples fail the chemical standards, we will, regardless, if we have any debris or anything, we will go down in six inch increment until we found a clean surface for chemicals. And that way, in that scenario we don't plan to have any limit. Basically we'll go down till we get all the chemicals out of the soil.

You know, once the soil is excavated from the site, from those grids, we will run it through a screen plant. What a screen plant does is separate any debris from the soil. So the end product is we'll have piles of debris or wood debris according to size, and also a pile of soil. Any metal debris we would inspect, you know, at least two times to make sure that none of them contain any MEC related items.

So, and then after inspection we certify and dispose of the scrap metal as appropriate. For any screened soil we will sample the soil for analysis of COPCs to confirm the chemical in the screened soil. If the chemical levels are below our MEC industrial land use scenario, then we will put the screened soil back to the site. If any of the chemicals exceeded the chemical level, then we will actually haul it off-site for off-site disposal. Any questions? Any comment on this, the closure for the removal action?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Bernie. Something that I'd like to see, not just you, but other contractors try to include in your presentations, and particularly in your public fact sheets, because I get too many phone calls about it. Where is the material going to be disposed of and how is it going to get to the site?

MR. WONG: To the site?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To the disposal site off-site, from this site to that site.

MR. WONG: Right now, you know, we don't have a final plan. But our approach would be depending where the soil goes depending on the level of chemicals present in the soil. You know, in the State of California we have different standards, both federal and the state, to determine, you know, the level of the chemical in the soil, where it should go. Either it's hazardous waste or non-hazardous waste, and RCRA waste, RCRA waste is the federal hazardous material. So we will sample the soil. Screen the soil. And once we get the chemical data back, we will make a determination on, you know, on how bad or how good the soil is.

If the data shows that the soil clearly failed the California hazardous waste level, then the soil will go to a permitted landfill that will accept California hazardous waste in this instance. And the method of tranport that we are looking to right now is to basically load and secure a truck and cover the soil, and then we will transport the soil through public highway to the landfill. And the trucking company that we use, of course, we will do a check to make sure they have all the required permit and all the required certification, that they would be able to transport the hazardous material from, you know, off-site to a landfill through any public highway. Did I answer your question on the disposal process?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well mostly, like from this fact sheet, even though it doesn't have my name on it I don't know how this happens, oh, it does to. People have called me and want to know where specifically it's going to go. And is it going to go on a rail car or on a truck? And is it going to go through neighborhoods or is it going, how's it going to get off Mare Island? They have these types of questions. So I just think, I noticed that Jerry told me that further on in your presentation you do have that information.

MR. WONG: We do have.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But that needs to be put in these things because then I don't have to get those kind of calls.

MR. WONG: We'll make sure we include this information in the future. And there's one reason why is because it is all depending on the chemical content of the soil, and right now that's undetermined. That's why we have the basic approach, but we didn't specify the location of the landfill and the way of transport is because there is a lot of uncertainty on where and how it goes to the disposal site. So --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Bernie.

MR. WONG: Yes.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Now, this site is somewhat near that elementary school which I understand in the next school year or before that is going back to the elementary school. And I would, I'm looking at your, regrettably I'm looking ahead of your slides, but this could go on into October and November. And I'm wondering if, number one, I think that somebody ought to go over and talk to the school. But number two, if there's going to be any effect to the kids, because that's where the busses go, and we're talking about securing the road there, and in your truck route slide you're talking about securing the road, and the busses can't go, can't weave around through small areas. So it's going to have to be a consideration.

MR. WONG: Right. We've actually already thought about it, that potential problem there. Basically what we're going to do is -- actually we might as well jump to the last slight. The red marks shows there's a potential for road closure because of the construction activities. What, the way to address this issue is, first of all is we will not close down any road until, unless we absolutely have to. So, which means we only close down the roads when we have to have work near those roads. And otherwise we will not, actually we'll let the traffic flow through.

And second of all, if we have to close a road, most likely we will close it during the night. Because we understand that Azuar Drive is a public roadway and also used for the school traffic and residential traffic. So we will actually do some of the construction activities at night. So that, you know, when we close a road there won't be too much impact to the community.

That's the two solutions that we will try to, that we will do during the removal action. Since we're here we might as well talk about traffic consideration. Basically when we start the removal action, Azuar Drive will be our main access route for equipment and supplies and personnel. And what we're looking at is, the construction traffic for this removal action would be intermittent and minimal. And the reason I say that is most of the construction activities and most of the processing will be done on site. So we're not trucking soil or whatever debris and stuff to other sites, we're doing the processing. So most of the stuff is actually done right next to the site. So that way we minimize any of the construction traffic on the island.

And second of all, yes, because we are doing restoration grid by grid for MEC consideration, the construction process or soil removal process is going to be painfully slow. So our potential for soil needing off-site disposal is going to be really, really small. So we don't expect any daily runs of trucks, you know, to and from the site. So most likely we will have a truck coming in maybe only two days a week or maybe we won't have any, and next week we do a little hauling. So that way, you know, these local people will most likely not notice any increase in the truck traffic.

Our truck route, I mean basically if we have a truck heading off-site it's going to go on to the left, turn left on Azuar Drive, and then go onto Dump Road or G Street, and then go Railroad Avenue to the highway. So any of the haul trucks or any of the heavy activities is going to be away from the residential area and from the school also. So the local residents and the children, you know, they should not expect to see any of our equipment or trucks coming in front.

And another important important consideration is if we ever found any MEC items, what we will do is we will take it to the magazine area that is maintained by the Navy on the southwest corner

of the island. What we would do is, the route is actually going to be out of the public sight. We're actually going to utilize non-public, restricted access roads.

When we get going on the MEC items, we will actually get the MEC items on the back side of the site, and go up to one of the dredge pond levee, and we will use those levee roads all the way to the magazine rear. So actually for the transportation route of MEC items we will not use any of the public roadway that is actually, right now is not open to the public yet. So that way we minimize any MEC risk during transportation to the public. That are, I think that basically concludes -- oh, wait, actually the schedule, I forgot about the schedule. Too quick.

So in terms of schedule, we expect to begin our site preparation and site mobilization in probably July. After the public comment period is done and after the Navy adequately addressed all the public comments, and DTSC and the Navy concur on the final EE/CA/interim removal action plan, then we will begin our excavation activities in August. And right now the schedule looks like we're expecting about six to eight weeks of excavation and screening activities. So that basically brings us from August all the way to the end of September.

And, you know, throughout our excavation and screening then we will begin our off-site, if we have to, disposal activities. So any off-site hauling would probably start coming in late August and continue through, you know, maybe October, and at the latest early November.

And by late September, October we should be able to finish most of the excavation in that time, and we expect to complete the backfill at the latest November. And that's the schedule that we have right now. And we're beginning preparation of our remedial action closure report in January. Any questions about the schedule? No. I think that's basically it. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe I misunderstood. Did I hear you say the traffic removal pattern or the removal through the city would involve Redwood Street?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Railroad Avenue, Railroad Avenue. That's the road going back to the highway, Highway 37.

MR. WONG: Yes, Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: I wanted to address all this. By the way, to answer Bernie's question, it's Captain David George who was a very pleasant and professional man, if not intense. So Paula's comment about option number four versus number five. This removal action is a little bit, somewhat uncommon in that the removal action is not consistent, we think that it's not consistent with a, with an unrestricted, eventual unrestricted use for this site.

We think that this limited removal action that's consistent with the deed restriction or use restriction for industrial is warranted because we think it's potentially very complicated to actually achieve a cleanup that's suitable for residential, and it's also hard, and I'm not sure we can justify it in light of the fact that the designated reuse is industrial or commercial industrial.

So what we wanted this removal action in the document to clarify is this is the decision point for that kind of removal. Basically we're casting the, making the decision that this site is going to

be, eventually it's going to be an industrial cleanup, even though this is an interim action. And I think it's been -- and I want people to understand that. So just to clarify.

And Carolyn, did you have a comment that you, on the asbestos question, or did you want to --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, one of our comments was that in the, in one of the radiological survey reports it was indicated in there that asbestos was a contaminant of concern at the DRMO yard, and there was nothing else in the report that had given any indication that there was any sampling that had been done for asbestos. And given that it's a scrapyard, it's hard to say what might have been scrapped there. But there potentially could have been an asbestos in just about anything that could have been torn off of there. And it could release even very small fibers of asbestos in the area.

I think one of the responses, one of the Navy's response to the comments was that the area was paved so that maybe the fibers wouldn't be exposed to soil. I don't know how long the yard was paved. I think you said earlier that there was some, or maybe it was in the comments, that there was some asbestos found in one area. Was that in soil? Was that under asphalt? I guess I don't quite understand the full nature of where that information came from.

MR. WONG: I've also seen something like that, I think it was in regards to the investigation report, there was a report of some asbestos debris, kind of half buried in the soil. But the asbestos was unconfirmed in the report. And they didn't do any confirmation, they said suspect asbestos, they never confirmed if the material was asbestos or not in that report. So what we will do in our final plan, we will address this issue in the site health and safety plan. We will have, you know, we will have asbestos training, and also we will have a procedure in place for site workers in case we encounter anything suspect during excavation. Then we will implement an asbestos sampling and monitoring and protection program.

But right now that's the only report that's saying suspect material, and we haven't seen any other report of any other site that there might be asbestos material on the site. But we will have all the procedure in place to address any encounter of any suspect material.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: So you don't really know exactly where that suspect material was in the soil?

MR. WONG: No.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Apparently there must have been some area of it that's not paved where that could be –

MR. WONG: Right. If I remember right, the site is about 85 percent paved, something of that figure. So the unpaved area is basically along the southern fence line, and so if it's, if we see any asbestos debris, it's probably in that place. But the report is, it's basically just one sentence saying that there is found suspect material during part of the investigation. But the report didn't say anything about, you know, where did they see it, what type of material did they saw, what did they do about it. So we didn't see any detailed report. So, you know, with that one sentence of the report, I mean it's hard to even know if that's true or not. But as I said, we will be ready in our work plan.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay. If you see it. But my comment was to just take some samples to characterize it ahead of time so that you know that it's not going to be a problem out there. Because very small fibers can be released and you may not necessarily see it as large chunks.

MR. WONG: My experience with DRMO site is if you found any asbestos materials, it's probably big chunks and not small fibers because of the, because basically it is a recycling yard. So if you have, you know, small fibers, you know -- I never had any experience working at any DRMO site that had small fibers that would actually pose any confirmed health risk.

And basically most of the stuff have probably come from visible fibers, not invisible fibers. Actually personally I worked on a different site about ten years ago, and we actually encountered broken pieces of piping in the DRMO that actually contained the asbestos. In that case we had to double-bag all the material in the soil and transfer off-site to a landfill. In that case we actually initiated all the worker safety plans as soon as we saw the suspect material. So, but I understand your concern. There is a chance of asbestos found, but so far we just haven't seen anything from the reports, but we're ready for it.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And just to add to that, the DRMO operation wasn't a salvaging operation on the site. They didn't tear apart items and deconstruct them to generate asbestos waste. So it's a bit different than what you might be envisioning where people may be taking lighting off of piping or taking asbestos out of a boiler or something. That wasn't done on this site. These things were just packaged for sale basically, and people take them off-site to do the salvaging work.

Also on this site it is a bit unique in that we had the landfill right down the road. And we know there's an asbestos disposal site there, or an area designated for disposal of asbestos. The RCRA landfill was authorized to receive asbestos waste. So I believe the management of asbestos waste was probably a little bit cleaner here at Mare Island in that they had a place for it, as opposed to burying it at the DRMO Site. I think our excavation work will show evidence, if there is anything buried, as we dig into the dirt. So I hope that helps.

MR. KARR: Bernie, I had a question. Earlier in the presentation you talked about petroleum hydrocarbons and noted that they are found in a much deeper part of the site and will be addressed in the future. What does that mean?

MR. WONG: Based on all the previous investigation, most of the petroleum exceedences or petroleum presence in the soil is found on a deeper part of the site. Because most likely the petroleum contaminated soils is associated with the groundwater table that Jerry talked about on the eastern part of the site, and kind of like along Azuar Drive. So because we, you know, we suspect that the petroleum contamination at the deeper part of the site is not related to the DRMO scrapyard operation, that's why we treat it as a separate issue. But the Navy would address it probably next year.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: What we're doing with petroleum is; one, it's a chemical that really doesn't undergo the CERCLA process, and so it would be an action they would take outside of a removal action or a remedial action. We can do those types of cleanups working directly with the Water Board through things like a corrective action plan.

And because we're trying to address surface soils here, the deeper stuff is just something that's not in the scope of this cleanup and, quite frankly, we don't have the money to get into that right now. But we plan to get into it as part of the overall investigation and assessment of the site following this removal.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. GRIBBLE: And I would add that if and when we ever do anything with hydrocarbon that that, this needs to be done first anyway. So it's not, it doesn't preclude doing anything or predetermine anything one way or the other with hydrocarbon depth.

MR. WONG: Okay. Any other questions about this upcoming removal action? Yes. Okay.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I was just wondering, are you using basically the same separation technique that you were using at the Marine Corps Firing Range? I guess you're not using a wet separation, but basically it's going to be probably the same kind of soil.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I know what you're getting at, Carolyn. We had bay muds or dredge material that we tried to sieve or screen at the Marine Corps Firing Range, and we did not have very good success with that. We're using the same equipment screens and basically sieves, but the soil at the DRMO is not bay mud or dredge material, the soil was imported from a borrow source off the base, and it's better than that other soil, and hopefully will perform better through the screening process.

MR. WONG: Also, in view of the Azuar site line, the bay mud that you mentioned, I think they encountered about almost ten feet down below at the DRMO site. So most likely we will not see the bay mud, the site materials should all silty material, silty sand. So that's why I don't expect we will encounter the same problem that we encountered at the Marine Corps Firing Range. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Bernie. Thank you, Melissa. If there's no other final comments, why don't we go ahead and take a break and return to finish the rest of the Restoration Advisory Board meeting. Let's try to return about 8:20. Thank you.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

III. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes, Jerry Dunaway)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: If we can get back to the table, please. Okay. So let's finish up this meeting and I think we can get it all done. The May 19 meeting minutes were in your mailing packet. If you have any comments or corrections to those, go ahead and fax them onto myself or Myrna or to Regina. The, a couple of focus group meetings that are listed here are things that are, that were discussed during the agenda setting conference that we had for tonight's meeting.

And the two items are the management of land use controls. Lennar is working closely with regulatory agencies and the City of Vallejo on these land use controls, and offered to do some kind of focus group meeting to discuss the progress that they're making on that. And I think the

July timeframe is about right. Maybe what I could do, Sheila, is put out an e-mail proposing a few dates. So I'll talk with you to figure out some dates that will work for you guys.

The second item is we've had some -- well, we've had quite a few changes at Mare Island over the past couple few years. And we've had a loss of Diane Krevsky, who was our community focus group team leader. With her loss and just a change of, kind of the nature of Mare Island now, we're thinking about a subcommittee meeting to, or a focus group meeting to restructure the subcommittees for this RAB. And that will be later in the summertime. So those are just for your heads up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I want to also add one other thing to that, and that is that Diana leaves another hole in the RAB, and that is the nomination committee. She was the public, or a representative from the community members of the RAB on the nomination committee, so we need to fill that slot too. Because we actually have a potential new RAB member here tonight, and the nomination committee will be considering her application if she is interested in coming back for at least one more RAB meeting. Marti Brown, do you want to just say hi?

MS. BROWN: Hi.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Maybe what we'll do is we'll ask Marti to introduce herself to all the RAB members. But feel free to introduce yourselves after the meeting and tell her how great the RAB is and how great it is to work on it. So that would be later in the summertime and just for your planning purposes if you're interested in that topic.

So what I'm going to do is skip over all the first three focus group reports, and also the city report, I think Gil's new, he has already described why he's here, and he smiles to be here, so that's very good. At least we've got someone from the city to talk with here at the RAB. So moving right to the Lennar update, Steve, I'm going to turn it over to you.

a) Community (need to select a new group leader)

Report not given.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

Report not given.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

Report not given.

d) City Report (Ray Leftwich)

Report not given.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Jerry. We have a handout like we do every month. If you haven't gotten one, they're over on the table where you signed in. I'd like to draw your attention to the left side of the map. There's areas on there that are either in yellow, green, or blue. Those three areas collectively represent the eastern early transfer parcel that is owned by Lennar.

Those different colors represent the phase of the investigation and cleanup and closure of various portions of the EETP. Blue being closed or nearly closed; green being that there's some remedial action going on; and the yellow areas are areas where there's some investigation and a feasibility study phase of work.

The blue lines on the drawing are the lines of the industrial wastewater pipeline system that we've been performing cleaning and flushing on for some time now. We are currently at, about 23 of 26,000 feet have been cleaned and flushed and/or video logged, and we've got a few thousand feet to go. We hope to be done sometime in July.

On the right-hand side of the, of the handout there's several boxes that show various documents that are in review or upcoming. Looking at the top set of boxes, the documents in review, upcoming documents and milestones, those have all been on there for some time now, and the only change is that there are four additional PCB sites that have been closed in the last month. In the lower boxes, new issues of concern, none.

Upcoming public comment periods, I draw your attention to a couple. The public comment period for IA C3 remedial action plan, which it notes here is on hold pending some additional characterization work in IA C3. The middle photograph in the upper half of the right-hand side of the handout is an example of some of the work that we've been doing at the agency request to perform some additional characterization in IA C3. That area is generally the area around the dry docks.

And so we're working through that characterization phase. And then once we have those data back and evaluate them, then we'll move back down the road relative to the IA C3 RAP. Also we have an upcoming public comment period for the interim removal action that's been planned at the industrial wastewater pump station number four. And if you look back at your map, pump station number four is in the upper right-hand corner of the yellow area labeled C1. You'll see there's three little dots up there, it's the bought in the middle. So just to get you oriented.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's where the island dock lives.

MR. FARLEY: What's that, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's where the island dock lives, that's her neighborhood.

MR. FARLEY: The public comment period we're hoping will start about July 5th, and it's pending completion of the fact sheet. And I believe, Myrna, that we've been working fairly closely with the RAB, and in particular you and Gary getting input on that, making sure the thing is properly scoped and focused and organized and presented so that it meets all of the requirements and goals. So that fact sheet is in it's, I would say its final stages of review.

And again, hoping that we would get out in the field or start the public comment period in, on July 5th, and finish around the 3rd of August, I believe. And I think that's it, Jerry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This is a mysterious photo up here on the right-hand side. It just says you're preparing for work.

MR. FARLEY: There's a --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why don't you have -- you've got enough space there, you might embellish that.

MR. FARLEY: Would you like me to write it or should I just tell you about it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well now you can tell us, but we dont' want to wait for you to writ it.

MR. FARLEY: The workers there -- building 680, as many you probably know, is a fairly large building. And the workers that are getting ready there are actually donning, which means putting on, some respirator equipment to go into some pits that are below the floor within building 680 to examine the condition of the pits inside the building, and basically to do some visual characterization of those areas. So that's what they're doing right now.

The large yellow tube that's on the floor is actually an air vent hose, and you can see the yellow tape marking off the area where folks are going to be working. The fellows in the upper right corner, sort of maybe in the middle, are actually putting on the respirator gear and getting ready to enter the pit through the floor.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what are they visually characterizing or snooping around for in those pits? And by the way, that building is rather large, you're right, three football fields long, 5.32 acres, you know.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. Right now we're just trying to figure out what the conditions of the pits are, and following that we'll do some further characterization. So we're very much in the beginning phase of that.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Steve. If there's no more questions for Steve, why don't we move on to Cris' Weston report.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks, Herry. I also have a handout, I have already handed one out to everybody, if not I have some more here if you didn't receive one. Starting off, first up would be the investigation area H1 wetlands mitigation status. And we've discussed this in

several prior RAB meetings and at a coordination meeting held earlier this week between the parties you can see there.

Essentially the regional board indicated a general agreement with our proposed approach for cutting some vegetation after we do some trapping within wetlands X to verify for the presence of the salt marsh harvest mouse in that particular area. We're waiting on a draft biological opinion from the Fish and Wildlife Service.

And based on our investigations with the State Fish and Game, it occurred that they would like us to go ahead with the trapping and cut the vegetation within that area so that the area would not become repopulated if there are any marsh mice that have to be relocated. Right now we're scheduling the trapping and task relocation for late August, early September, and that's based upon the issuance of the final biological opinion. If that slips, that may jeopardize when we can do this work this calendar year. So we're certainly hoping we stay on schedule there.

Investigation area H1, remedial investigation remedial action plan status. I believe we resolved the final comments on the draft final remedial investigation, and that's scheduled to go final the first of July.

We have a conference call scheduled for later this month to discuss upland and wetland hot spot delineation, which should allow us to complete the draft final feasibility study. And I'll move onto the RAP, remedial action plan, and the record of decision closure plan which is scheduled to go out in July. On the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that going to include plans for the, containing the public or repelling the public from the above ground area that's --

MR. JESPERSEN: Let me move to the next bullet item and I'll answer that question. That would be the area the H1 landfill cap is on. In April we received some correspondence from DTSC asking us to move forward with the RCRA closure plan for the investigation area H1 RCRA landfill surface impoundments. We're on schedule to submit this plan to the agencies in July.

One significant issue that was poised with that letter was that the state had determined their feeling that the entire seventy acres within the H1 slurry wall should be provided with a RCRA cap. That's likely going to require the exclusion of public access for the foreseeable future. As opposed to just putting that remedy in place around the 25 acres, that really fell under the RCRA permit application for the RCRA landfill. So we're going to look at both approaches.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And when is the public going to get involved in this? We've still been playing a bit of phone tag with the public participation specialist from DTSC with a phone call yesterday that I missed, about me and anybody else interested from the community meeting with the director and the deputy director of DTSC about this issue. But where do we get slotted in here? Or do you guys just do this so that you can move forward? And when does the public comment on that, on, let's say, the seventy acre fence or RCRA cover and all that? Am I out of line in asking that question or can anybody help me?

MR. JESPERSEN: I can touch base on it or, if you want to take the lead, Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: Go ahead.

MR. JESPERSEN: We are definitely interested in engaging with the public and, most importantly, the agencies impacts on our perspective to put in the approximate twenty RCRA cap versus a seventy acre. That's a substantial sum of money. And then we certainly do understand from prior meetings that members of the RAB and other members of the community were concerned that they would like to be able to reuse a portion of H1 if at all possible. And we'd certainly like to make our remedy consistent with the public's ability to access that, certainly if the agencies concur. But maybe this was more directed towards you initially about how is the public going to be able to participate in the process.

MR. GRIBBLE: I think that was the Collin letter, I think that was the one that talked about the RCRA cap and the -- no, I guess that was before that. The letter with the memo from Scott Ward that talked about the RCRA cap and the regulations behind that, and then that it was a performance standard that was required. And it's really, it doesn't say that you have to have a seventy acre RCRA cap, that you have to -- it didn't say that you had to have a fence, but you have to meet performance standards.

Weston has yet to offer or provide or submit any alternative to that performance standard other than the fence. And I mean that's up to Weston if they want to propose an alternative as far as I'm concerned. As far as the public's opportunity to comment, this all comes at the end, it's in a draft RAP at some point on H1 which is, I'm not sure what the schedule says now, later this calendar year.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we're just, we're getting into a logjam here. This cleanup needs to go forward in a timely manner, and the public has invested a few tens of millions of dollars in putting, getting this thing rounded up and off, done. And the City of Vallejo -- Gil, I'm happy that you're here, because both you and Lennar, certainly as the developers of this island so far, have a big investment in, I would think, in seeing that property capped in a way that it, that is compatible with your final reuse plan. And I haven't seen this on anybody's radar screen.

And right now I can't understand why Lennar hasn't, maybe you have, but why you haven't come to the table and said, hey, can we come up with a creative way to make sure that public health is protected and all those good things?

Because you have some wonderful new housing that's gotten all kinds of Bay Area press lately. Well right there in the backyard, the landfill is their backyard. And the City of Vallejo has, and Lennar both have, I would think, a pretty big incentive to make sure that that area still qualifies as public open space as it's defined in the final reuse plan, unless you're going to designate some other seventy, ninety acres someplace else on the island to meet that, that calculation.

So I've been kind of, I've gotten the feeling from some comments made by DTSC that I'm like a loose cannon out there complaining and carrying on about an irrelevant topic that nobody else in this town cares about. And it would be really nice if we can get some

clarification about those who will be impacted. So I'm the only person in the community speaking. And if you ever read the Bible there's a story about Abraham and, when God was supposedly going to go blow up Sodom and Gomorroh. And Abraham said, "Would you not do it if there was only one or two people in the town?" And God said, "Well I'll think about it."

So I'm asking the agencies to at least consider that there might be, even if there's only one cuckoo person in Vallejo that doesn't think that we need a seventy acre RCRA equivalent cover and a chain link fence around our theoretical park -- and lots of parks in Vallejo are theoretical -- that you ought to take this seriously. And I'd really like to see some legitimate dialogue. We were told in this meeting, in this forum, that in mid-February the agency was going to send seriously considering, seriously going to send a decision-making individual from at least the RCRA side of the house to come chat it up with us informally in a focus group meeting. I've never heard another thing about that.

But I have heard now that I'm going to get a hearing with the deputy director and maybe the director. And quite frankly, that would be a great experience. I mean, we've met the deputy and the director before. But I'd really rather have this community have this dialogue, because it's not just me, for goodness sakes, there's a lot of people highly invested in this project coming out to the benefit of many players, including Weston, who has, and the Navy, who have some calculations that they've done on the whole budget that we've all committed to as well, and as well as their insurers.

So we're all in this together. So, you know, I'm sorry that I'm the only one who seems to lose any sleep about it, maybe you guys have more pressing things to lose sleep about. But I'd like to get it, get us together talking.

MR. GRIBBLE: My recollection is that nobody in the department has promised a decision maker come to this meeting. That the request that was made of the department was for a RCRA decision maker is for, I believe that's how it's phrased in the meeting minutes, to come to a focus meeting. The department's response was we would make ourselves available, and the person from DTSC, the representative from DTSC at that meeting would be Dan Murphy. That was communicated to the community co-chair, Myrna Hayes, who was not happy with that decision, and that's where it stood.

So the department's offered to meet with the community members of the RAB at a focus meeting on that basis, was rejected by Myrna Hayes, and nothing has happened since then that I'm aware of.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, right. Yeah, something has happened. Michelle Trotter sent me a letter, an e-mail saying that the director and the deputy director, some guy named B.B. King, who's that? Or B.B. somebody -- no, that's a famous jazz musician. See I got your attention, didn't I? B.B., B.B. It only referred to him by first name, maybe that's first and last name.

MR. GRIBBLE: B.B. Blevins is a historical --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, Blevins.

MR. GRIBBLE: Head of the historical society.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, Blevins.

MR. GRIBBLE: As well as the soon to be former director of DTSC, I understand.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh.

MR. GRIBBLE: So, but I'm not sure if he is, I think he's still there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, all right. So there has been communication since then, so I'm sorry you haven't been up to date, but there has been an e-mail where there's been an offer made to meet with the director and the assistant director, deputy, I think you call it.

But yes, I did announce that it wasn't -- Dan Murphy, as far as I know, is not on the RCRA side of the house. So when we asked for a decision maker on the RCRA side of the house, and then like two days before they wanted to schedule the date, the meeting with him, they call? Huh-unh. And say that we want OMF's guy just above you? That isn't the decision maker. If it is, then we need to leapfrog two or three over.

But anyway, I don't want to waste a whole bunch of time here tonight. The point is Mr. Hollingsworth, representing the city; Sheila, and your new colleague Neal representing Lennar; Dwight; Cris; Jerry; Chip; and Ed Hall from DTSC, at least meet. At least you have to meet with me, I mean I would like for you to. And I suspect there would be just one or two other people in the town who might be interested. And we need to resolve this before we get a cap out there with a big fence on it and it becomes an attractive nuisance rather than serve the purpose that it was intended to.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Just to make sure that everybody understands. Even without the land that was going to be recreational in reuse area thirteen, otherwise known as H1, Lennar and the city meet all the requirements for recreational property, we're over it. In fact, at one time, and it probably is still the same now, we have been quite worried that we will not have enough money to maintain all of the recreational property.

Above and beyond that, and I'm not protecting Lennar at all on this, Lennar and DTSC and the city have known that we had a problem there for some time, and we have built in alternate into the plan the reversion of property that was going to be light industrial up in reuse area one, we are now working on identifying that as a replacement property in, for the H1 reuse area 13 which is the same property, it's just two different names.

So the bottom line on that is that, we know that it's going to be, and we've known about the problem, Chip and DTSC's management has been telling us about it for some time, and so we've built in solutions to it.

I think even if we could come up with a alternate plan for reuse area thirteen, H1 per se to use the property, we would still build the recreational property and redesignate the recreational, the current light industrial property up in reuse area one to recreation, because there is considerable, now that we know a lot more about it, we have found that we can't do

what we wanted to do in reuse area thirteen. What we wanted to do is lighted soccer, baseball fields, and things like that. Guess what? We can't do that because it will upset the mating habits of the mice, which seem to control a lot of things that we do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not to mention some other habits, maybe not mating, of the people who would be living right next to those lit fields at night. I mean daytime too.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm not touching that. Anyway, I think -- I don't think that the answer, the final answer of the cap, the fence and the blankety blank and all the other things, but the bottom line is that we already have the solution to it, and it's going to go through.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well it's grand to hear that the city has in the back room made a nice solution to the problem to, you know, the issue of environmental, I mean of the ultimate use of that property. That property is not, however, going to just like slither into the bay as far as we know, it's going to be the highest point on the south end of the -- the north end of the island. It's going to be visible, highly visible from some very nice new homes, some prime property.

And it doesn't matter whether it isn't soccer fields. I don't think that the reuse plan envisioned lit baseball fields at the time, it just envisioned that as public open space. And we could go to a much, much, much lower level of recreation and still make it a lovely spot for the City of Vallejo rather than an attractive nuisance which, quite frankly, a six foot chain link fence is, in my mind. But maybe some people like that look.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The only other thing I would point out is that not all of the land that is available will be within the controlled area. There is still some land left over, and Lennar has been, we've been trying to take that additional land, we call it a dog leg, we had to give it a name so we called it a dog leg and, when we're identifying it. And so we're looking to see if we can come up with some other uses for it. But once again, the answer is going to be the final solution to the capped area, and that we shall see.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And the Navy is continuing to do its homework and research the content of the Collin letter. And we are working with Weston to collaborate on what our response will be to that. I think because of the delays with the remedial investigation, submitting a RCRA closure plan by July 9th is just not practical, I would say. Because we want to submit that as a combined document with the record of decision and remedial action plan, it would be a joint document. So I think that letter raised a lot of concerns that will not be solved by July 9th. So there's just a few things we should do. So at a minimum I would say July 9th the Navy may be submitting the request for an extension. I don't think you're done yet, huh, Cris? I think you had a second column.

MR. JESPERSEN: I'll be very brief. Two of the things on the updates. One was we were successful in completing a two foot soil cover on the eastern face of the pond levees on ponds 4M and 4N as was a requirement of the RAP and the agreement signed back in 2002 associated with the western early transfer parcel. And we plan to do pond 4S later. We wanted to take care of the areas that might be bothersome to Lennar's new homeowners before we allow homeowners in there.

And then finally, I believe, Jerry, you probably touched on this in your report. We've been doing some work on the Marine Corps Firing Range under a separate contract with the Navy involving the excavation and removal of some lead contaminated soil. And that's been ongoing since last month. And we've been continuing to excavate some grids that have some concentrations of lead that exceed the cleanup criteria, and removing that material over to a stockpile area adjacent to area H1.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Great. Are there any questions for Cris? All right. I will move on to the regulatory agency updates. And we have all three of our representatives here. Chip, do you want to start with DTSC?

g) Regulatory Agency Update

MR. GRIBBLE: I think most of what we've been doing in the last month has been covered, but I wanted to go back to the last RAB meeting where the wetlands issue was discussed and I was not present for that. I wasn't able to make the meeting. But regarding the H1 wetland issues that were mentioned in the RAB meeting in April, it is missing the point to characterize this as bureaucratic bickering when, in fact, the Navy in the Weston plan details at various times that development has taken the form of one that would violate the Federal Endangered Species Act, the State Endangered Species Act, the Federal Clean Water Act, the State Water Porter-Colone Act, the State California Environmental Quality Act, and the Federal National Environmental Protection Act, and would add significant delays by potentially triggering an EIR under CEQA.

As the regulatory agencies have discovered these elements bit by bit, they have worked to bring this awareness to the Navy and Weston. Much of this feedback has been unsolicited. The Navy and Weston, rather than engaging all the regulatory agencies collectively to fashion a plan, with details that comply with all the laws and regulations and to achieve remediation within the desired timeframe, and without unnecessary associated costs related with extended timeframes, has worked with selected agencies separately, and continues to do so, thereby running the real risk of executing a plan not in compliance with all the laws and regulations, and also creating significant delays by triggering an EIR.

The regulatory agency's ability to identify problems with the plan and details is complicated by this Navy Weston approach dealing with the regulatory agencies separately. The Navy and Weston approach has followed the adage of not enough time to do it right the first time, but time to do it over the second time. Every agency representative involved has expressed concern and confusion over the Navy and Weston approach regarding the H1 wetland issues. We are making progress, but I don't think this is necessarily the most efficient or effective way to do that.And we certainly hope, as well as everyone else, that this works out to be able to make the timeframe to relocate the mouse in August, I believe it is. And that's my report.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Chip. Carolyn and Gary.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, this month I started back working full-time for the first time in about seven years, I've been working half time. So right now I'm full-time on Mare Island, that is they haven't given me anything else to work on yet. That's not to say that they won't. I've been busy getting PCB letters out. I've got probably at least a dozen, probably more in

the signature chain, which should be hopefully going out in the next week or so on PCB sites. I pulled our reviewers on the landfill RIFS, and all of our responses. The responses to comments have all addressed our comments adequately. And we have no further comments on the document.

Today I got comments from Tom Hall, our ordnance consultant. He has completed review of the draft remedial investigation work plan for the southern offshore area, that's the field verification of the geophysical survey out there. And he's very pleased with what's been proposed, and his comments are going to be fairly minor. So I think you'll be happy to hear that.

And lastly, today I received an e-mail from my management. We had just gotten notice that there is going to be another delegation, this time from South Korea, who's coming in. And their interest is in seeing a site with metals contamination with active work ongoing.

We've got the Marine Corps Firing Range, I don't know if there's anything on the Lennar side that they could possibly look at as well. But we need someone to entertain them for a while. I guess the delegation from Vietnam was pretty pleased a year ago with the tour that they had, and probably especially the ride on the ferry over from the city.

So the date they are planning to come is July 5th, which is probably not the most convenient date for everyone, it's really fast. And unfortunately I'm not able to attend that particular date because I've got something that I can't get out of. So if people are available I would like to hear. If there's something that could be arranged.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: A week and a half is going to be fairly difficult to try and get all the logistics together. But again, if you can provide all the information and details, and maybe the Army has a project going on.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yeah, that's possible too.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: But we'll seriously take that request into consideration.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: All right. Well, I'll find out as much information as I can and get back to you as soon as possible, and let's see what we can put together for them.

MR. GRIBBLE: Is this north or south?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: South.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: She said south.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Maybe a uranium cleanup site. Well, thank you, Carolyn. That was it?

MR. RILEY: I have not been contacted by any delegations from southeast Asia yet, but it's on the website. I guess just one thing to highlight. Steve went over briefly that a public comment period would be coming out soon for the industrial wastewater pump station

number four interim removal action work plan, which is the petroleum and soil cleanup project that will be going ahead later this summer. It's being conducted under the Board's order and under our program. And we've asked CH2M Hill and Lennar to prepare a fact sheet for the public to describe that cleanup. And I'll offer a public comment period that should begin on July 5th. It sounds like everything should be on track to do that.

Not all of the activities going on under the board order have always been subject to fact sheets, like you've seen with some of the DTSC work. That's in many ways because a lot of the petroleum actions under the order are very small sites, they're underground storage tanks, pretty minor contamination and not a lot going on.

The pump station site is different, it's more complex. And we also have a recent initiative from our headquarters in Sacramento placing additional focus on our public participation and public involvement program, and asking us to ensure that what we're doing at the water board is comparable to the rest of the California EPA agencies.

And we've always felt that our board hearings and other outreach provides a good opportunity for public input but, then again, there's often room for doing more. So to maintain parity and keep the community involved we've asked for the fact sheet on this petroleum action. And Myrna very graciously and quickly provided comments earlier this week on very short notice on the fact sheet. So that's very near completion, and you should be seeing that in your mailboxes quite soon. That's all.

V. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Gary. If there are no questions for Gary or Carolyn, why don't we move to our co-chair reports. Myrna, do you have anything?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't have anything.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Nothing. On the Navy report there is a handout that looks like this. Does everybody have a copy of this? If not, there are copies up at the front. Maybe if you'd just pass them around if others don't have them.

We talked, we touched a bit on the Marine Corps Firing Range, Cris mentioned that. As part of that cleanup though -- and there's a picture in the right-hand corner of some of that work going on. The Marine Corps Firing Range portion that we talked about last month where Lennar is doing some investigation, they have concluded their investigation work and have actually showed a few areas that have some elevated hits of lead. And to be consistent with the rest of the cleanup on this site we worked with the regulators to essentially incorporate those areas into the removal action.

I'm not sure if Lennar was able to start work this week yet or not? Yes or no?

MR. GODSEY: They're still doing sampling at this point.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Oh, they're still doing sampling. And so by next week maybe they're looking at doing excavation. So they'll just bring the soil over to the Navy's site, and we'll deal

with the soil disposal. And they're just trying to get the site prepared for building their corridor, their roadway through that area for the second set of housing at Coral Seas.

We're also completing or conducting ongoing work at the building 742, the degreasing area within investigation area C2, as pointed out on the map on the lower left corner.And, of course, we had the DRMO presentation earlier this evening.

On the second page, the one thing that I want to highlight is the early transfer progress. And we had some pretty good information come out, actually just this week, of folks back at the Department of Defense who we've been working closely with to resolve some legal issues on how we can make new early transfers happen.

They've told us that they have a plan to fix this legal problem. It's actually going to require a Congressional fix, a legislative fix. But they're very confident they can get that done this year. And they have given the Navy the approval to go ahead and continue to, or resume those early transfer discussions. So we'll be kind of back on that and have more to report by next month, I hope. And then lastly, I wanted to point out some of the changes that we're making in our office, in the Navy BRAC program management office.

As you know, the BRAC '05 list came out for this area, Concord is on the draft list. That list isn't final yet, but we're basically restructuring our office around that. For the Mare Island team, Mare Island has always been grouped together with two other bases, Point Molate -- and what is our third base? Novato. I don't work on those two bases obviously.

We're reshuffling the deck, if you will. Mare Island is now going to be grouped with El Toro and Tustin, and that will effectively change some of the things and, of course, we have a new BRAC '05 team. I am going to continue on as the BEC for Mare Island, but I'm also taking on the acting base closure management role for the whole team. So that won't change anything here, but that will just let you know what's going on in the background. I am giving up Tustin in my position.

So I just wanted to pass that information on to you. I think we'll be putting out a formal message about that and about actually a change we're making for office location later this year too. So we're just moving to a bigger office to accommodate the new BRAC work. That's it for my report. Are there any questions? Okay. With that, why don't we adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:19 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – DRMO Fenced Scrapyard Area Removal Action
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update June 2005
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update June 2005
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard June 2005

CDM Transmittal

CDM.

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

To:	Diane Silva	**From:**	Regina Clifford
Organization/ Address:	Navy SWDIV 1220 Pacific Hwy., Bldg 129 San Diego, CA 92132 Phone: (619) 532-3676	**Date:**	October 24, 2005

Re: Mare Island Information Repository – Final Minutes for June and July 2005 RAB Meetings

Job #:

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

Enclosed please find:

For your information	X	**Approved**	
For your review		**Approved as noted**	
For your signature		**Returned to you for correction**	

● **Message:**

Diane,

Enclosed please find two copies each of the final RAB meeting minutes from the June and July 2005 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 Regina Clifford