NAVAL FUEL DEPOT, POINT MOLATE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
02 March 2000

Location: Richmond City Hall, Conference Room 1
Community Services Building
330 25th St.
Richmond, CA

Purpose: To: 1) discuss and finalize last month's meeting minutes, 2) provide a presentation on the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Order, 3) discuss the RWQCB Order, 4) provide update on the installation restoration (IR) program, 5) provide an update on the compliance program, 6) discuss community outreach, and 7) discuss questions and suggested topics for the next meeting.

These minutes summarize the items discussed during the RAB meeting. They are not a verbatim transcript. Attachment A provides the attendance list.

RAB community members present: Bruce Beyaert, Elizabeth Dunn, Sarah Eeles, Gaye Eisenlord, Bunny Ford, Richard Frisbie, Sharon Fuller, Don Gosney, Arnie Kasendorf, Jil Kiernan, Don Kinkela, Stephen Linsley, and Eileen Whitty.

Government agencies present: Marianna Potacka, Navy Co-chair and BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC); Linda Dorn, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); Lisa Fasano, Public Affairs and Community Relations; and Michelle Gallice-Sondrup, EFD SW.

I. WELCOME, AGENDA, HANDOUTS

Don Gosney, Community Co-chair, commenced the meeting at 7:06 p.m. He welcomed the attendees and called for changes to the minutes. Bruce Beyaert noted that the word "motate" should be changed to "metate." Mr. Gosney moved to accept the minutes with the proposed change.

II. REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (RWQCB) ORDER PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Linda Dorn, RWQCB project manager for Pt. Molate, distributed a handout which will be included in the monthly mailing. As the lead regulatory agency, the Board oversees the investigation and the cleanup of Pt. Molate. Ms. Dorn discussed the Board's involvement from three perspectives: the historic (1968 to 1994), the current (1995 to the present), and the future (present to the date of

transfer). The Board's goal is to protect both surface water and groundwater while assisting with the property transfer.

The Board's involvement began in 1968, when the Board first issued the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The Board issued this waste discharge requirement for the sanitary sewer two years before the Dickey Act became effective, which created the Regional Boards. After 1970, the EPA granted the Board the authority to issue the permits. The Board continues to issue waste discharge requirements and NPDES permits. The Board issued a three-year enforcement order in 1980 regarding modifications to the sanitary sewer system. It also conducted numerous site inspections, during which oil was found to be seeping into the Bay. Since then, conditions have improved with regard to surface water quality.

With regard to current activities, the Board issued a 1994 resolution to enter into a Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA). This resolution specified investigation and remediation tasks, the schedule for meeting those tasks, and identified the four installation restoration (IR) sites: Site 4 (shoreline area); Site 3 (treatment pond area); Site 2 (sandblast grit areas, for which the Record of Decision (ROD) has been signed by the Navy); and Site 1 (landfill).

The underground storage tanks (USTs) are also an area of concern, for which the first phase (investigation) was completed. She displayed a sample of jet fuel (JP5) found at a skim pit around Tank 18. She noted that bunker fuel is associated with treatment pond areas. It is thicker, less mobile, and more difficult to remediate. She was unable to bring a sample of the bunker fuel or JP5 fuel collected from monitoring wells.

The 1994 resolution resulted in the completion of the extraction trench, which was installed next to the treatment ponds to prevent oil from seeping into the Bay. Some separate-phase petroleum product remained south of the extraction trench and was heading towards the Bay. The resolution stated that an FFSRA should be created by August 1995. This was not adhered to, as no agreements were made regarding the enforcement of the due dates and the specific removal action. She added that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) was the lead regulatory agency at that time, and not the RWQCB. Sixteen tasks were listed in the resolution, many of which were not completed.

In 1995, the RWQCB issued site cleanup requirements which listed 31 tasks for remediation at the site; some of which were not completed. One of the main tasks was completion of the extension of extraction trench. In 1997, the Board issued an NPDES permit for the wastewater originating from the extraction trench and going to a small treatment plant, and for another waste stream treated by the treatment plant pertaining to rainwater originating from the French drain (oil recovery) system.

The Board also asked for the two reports concerning the acceptable total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) concentrations that could be discharged through the water and drains to the Bay. The first report reflected 2,000 parts per billion (ppb); this was based on a statistical analysis established

using Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance. The second report reflected 66,000 ppb due to that fact that the treatment plant was using organo-clay polishing on the water, which resulted in higher concentrations. Since then, the Navy has switched to activated carbon, which is more effective and results in decreased discharge, according to monthly reports.

In 1997, the Board issued 16 site cleanup tasks along with the associated schedule (Board Order 97-125), 11 of which have been completed. The final reports have not been submitted; these were listed in the summary table that Ms. Dorn distributed at the last RAB meeting. Because of non-compliance with the previous 1994 resolution and 1995 Order, Order 97-124 prescribed potential administrative civil liabilities (ACLs) if the tasks are not completed within the specified time frame. To date, the Board has issued five Notice of Violation letters, four of which the Navy has responded to.

The Board and the Navy met for the first time in August 1998 to discuss compliance with the time schedule order; there were follow-up meetings in December 1999 and January 2000. There is a potential ACL complaint, as five final reports have not been submitted as of 1 March 2000. The Board and the Navy are currently working together on a revised master schedule; a meeting was held on the previous day. Ms. Dorn commented that the meeting was productive in that there were few problems and disagreements encountered.

Ms. Dorn provided tables that compare the maximum toxicity concentrations found at the site to the U.S. EPA preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), also taking into consideration the chemicals that do not have maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). She explained that the PRGs and MCLs are screening levels. The PRGs are based on exposure pathways to human health (inhalation, dermal, and ingestion). Determining the toxicity of TPHs has always been tricky, as there is not one definite number that can be used. The number for drinking water has primarily been considered a secondary MCL, which is 50 to 100 ppb for a taste and odor threshold. The tables provided use 100 ppb toxicity in water, which is based on the Central Valley's RWQCB compilation of water quality objectives, which itself is based on U.S. EPA's findings in 1980 (No Adverse Response Level). The 1980 findings do not specify whether these levels pertain to human or ecological receptors.

Ms. Dorn stated that the numbers that exceed either MCLs or PRGs are in bold. She noted that Pt. Molate is primarily a petroleum site, although there are some volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), both of which can be carcinogenic. The numbers used for TPH are based on a Board Order for the San Francisco airport. Other studies done at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS), Treasure Island (TI), and the Presidio show concentrations as low as 640 ppb as toxic to aquatic receptors. Ms. Dorn compared the site numbers with the areas that are adjacent to the Bay, as opposed to inland areas.

With regard to the landfill area, Ms. Dorn could not list any numbers for TPH in soil as the numbers were supposed to be developed by the Draft Fuel Product Action Level Development Report (FPALDR). Drum Lot 1 (south shoreline area) shows high concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs and SVOCs.

The investigative phase is close to completion, and corrective action will then begin. This is an important time to develop a new set of site cleanup requirements and its schedule. The NPDES permits for the waste treatment ponds and extraction trench will also need to be redone by 2002; this is dependent on the remedial action that will be taken at the treatment pond area. The Board needs to approve the ROD for the sandblast grit areas already signed by the Navy in January 2000. Mr. Gosney commented that it was his understanding that the Site 2 ROD was finalized over one year ago; he asked what remains to be approved. Ms. Dorn replied that it needs to be presented to RWQCB as an informational item and that the Board's executive officer needs to sign off on it. Mr. Gosney asked as to the reason for the delay. Ms. Dorn replied that she just received the signature page from the Navy last January. She noted that since she was assigned to Pt. Molate last May, she has received 13 documents to date.

Mr. Beyaert noted the prolonged time that elapsed from the time the ROD was signed, to the time that Ms. Dorn actually received the signature page. She commented that she received the draft ROD in August, and submitted her comments in November. Brian Schuller, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI), stated that it was issued on 30 June. At that point in time, she was reviewing six documents, with her highest priority being the Draft Phase II RI. She was informed by Navy representatives that the ROD should be considered high priority also. She noted that although the ROD signifies a milestone, she felt that it was better to review the characterization reports.

The new site cleanup requirements entail a corrective action plan (CAP) for the USTs, and an Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for Site 3. Additional groundwater monitoring data will be collected and a human health risk assessment will be done to determine if an EE/CA is needed for Site 4. This will involve comparing numbers to TPH levels in the FPALDR. The NPDES Permit 97-045 needs to be redone and will include stormwater from the ORS system. Stormwater can be included in one permit as long as it concerns the same site. The renewal date is 2002, for which the application is due in October 2001.

Ms. Dorn stated that the bottom line is that the Board is here to assist with the transfer of the base to the community. The Board and the Navy have been cooperating well and have resolved some of the issues with regard to groundwater monitoring and the schedule. She expects to have a final copy of the schedule at the end of March.

In light of last month's vigorous discussion regarding the compliance orders, the lateness of the Navy, and the potential for fines, Mr. Gosney commented that there seemed to be a difference of opinion between the Water Board and the Navy regarding whether cleanup funds can be used to pay the fines, or whether other projects can be funded by the Navy in lieu of paying the fines. He contacted the office of Congressman George Miller for clarification.

Mr. Gosney was informed by staff member Kathy Hoffman that in order to obtain that information, Congressman Miller would have to write the Secretary of the Navy, with an expected response time of four to six months. Mr. Gosney pointed out that the information was needed by the March RAB

meeting, as it was his understanding that by 15 March, the Water Board was going to make a decision regarding the penalties and fines.

Ms. Hoffman called Larry Kolb, RWQCB, who informed her that the Board will not make a decision by 15 March as they wanted to discuss the issues with Congressman Miller. Mr. Gosney asked as to the status of this decision.

Ms. Dorn replied that no decision has been made regarding the potential ACL. She hopes that this issue will be resolved soon given the elapsed time since the Order was issued. Mr. Gosney noted that some of the reports in the original Order are well over 420 days overdue. He asked if anything was being done between the Board and the Navy to establish some workable due dates.

Ms. Dorn replied that the recent meetings between the two parties have been quite productive. One of the things that the Board and Navy included in the decision documents is a "working meeting," which ensures mutual cooperation in the early stages regarding the contents of the document and how it will be developed. This will allow time to work out issues in the beginning rather than waiting until the document is done and submitted before attempting to resolve disagreements. She stated that the Navy and the Board are making great strides to bridge the gap between the time a document is submitted and when it is actually completed. Mr. Gosney commented that things seem to have calmed down considerably since the last meeting, adding that the Navy and the Board seem to be working more closely to achieve a resolution.

Marianna Potacka, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC), commented that she still hopes that the ACL will be dropped as it will be a detriment to the cleanup and transfer. The Navy is committed to working closely with the Water Board in a team effort to expedite the process. The Navy is not in the business of real estate and is anxious to transfer the property. The City of Richmond has indicated that if certain conditions are met, the City would like to receive the property before the end of the Navy's involvement in the cleanup. This would involve the Navy giving funds to the City to continue the cleanup, and the Water Board will be involved in the transfer. She added that this will not happen if an ACL suit goes before the Department of Justice, as plans will be delayed in the event of litigation. The dedicated Navy team has been working very closely with the Board. She expressed her wishes to move forward and commended the RAB for its efforts. All in all, there is a lot of potential for a positive outcome.

Saul Bloom, ARC Ecology, stated that the site is also operating under an agreement with ARC Ecology and Baykeeper. He noted that ARC Ecology sued the Navy at five different locations in the Bay Area, that at no time did those fines ever impede the cleanup, and that the cleanup funds were not used for settlement agreement moneys. In fact, in many cases including this case, these litigation and negotiation activities helped to create the time schedule that Ms. Dorn is working on. He opined that this type of activity has actually accelerated the Navy's cleanup program.

As a result of legislation passed by Congress earlier this year, the funding for payment of fines has

Mr. Bloom mentioned that ARC Ecology and Baykeeper are currently updating the data on their settlement agreement to ensure the Navy is in compliance. Mr. Beyaert asked Mr. Bloom as to his opinion regarding the utility of fines. Mr. Bloom replied that there is a wide variety of uses for the fines. The states and the military signed a Defense-State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) that provides cleanup funds for regulatory oversight. Prior to this time, the states used fines and penalties to fund regulatory oversight. The Department of Defense(DoD)felt this situatio caused an oppositional relationship and proposed DSMOA in order to foster mutual cooperation and team effort.

Mr. Bloom stated that the DSMOA has been in effect in California for 12 years. This process was effective until the funding to maintain regulatory oversight was substantially diminished. ARC Ecology is encouraging the state to move forward with additional penalty programs so that the penalties can be applied to the regulatory requirements around military bases throughout the state. The penalties can also be brought to the table during negotiations for early transfer. A number of different strategies can be used with regard to penalties. He stated that ARC Ecology will be happy to provide a more thorough presentation to the RAB about Baykeeper/ARC Ecology litigation, cleanup funding, and early transfers. ARC Ecology will provide information on the next meeting of the National Caucus of RAB Community Members, which will take place in Washington this coming June, to those interested.

Mr. Beyaert noted that one of the reasons that the Navy has not met the deadlines is because DoD has cut back the necessary cleanup funding at all of the bases. He asked if anything can be done to accelerate funding and cleanup at Pt. Molate in light of the pending Order. Ms. Potacka replied that early transfer of the property can achieve acceleration of funding. She added that she has recently come from the Marine Corps headquarters and that she was extensively involved in the budgetary process, as well as in dealings with the Department of Justice. She noted that her experience is different from what Mr. Bloom has indicated, although she respects his opinion. She expressed her confidence that this can be clarified. She acknowledged that less funding is available for cleanup, and emphasized that the sites that show progress toward property transfer will compete favorably for the funding. The choice is either to conduct the cleanup now, or to delay it further; she stressed that the Navy is committed to cleanup. She commended the current Navy team and does not foresee any problems if the Board and the Navy just forge ahead.

Mr. Beyaert noted that the discussions with the Water Board regarding compliance cannot be predicated on the potential early transfer to the City. Ms. Potacka replied that the lawyers will be involved in working out the agreements, and the City would then continue the cleanup with the funds that the Navy would provide.

Phil Lovett noted that the Navy is under duress on the time line established by the Water Board, irrespective of whether the City takes the property or not. Ms. Potacka replied that the Navy and the Water Board are working together to ensure that reasonable deadlines are established, along with a provision as to the protocol in the event that a deadline cannot be met.

Mr.Lovett stated that the carrot from the Navy is that if the City will take responsibility for cleanup, the funding will be accelerated. Otherwise, the funding will be delayed in the future according to budgeting.

Ms. Potacka replied that a lump sum payment will be made in the event of early transfer. She acknowledged that budgeting is instrumental to the whole process, noting that among BRAC IV bases, Pt. Molate is ahead. She stated that this is something to be proud of, and something to keep striving toward. A lot of work has been done at the site, with more work left to do.

Kent Kitchingman, City of Richmond, clarified that even if the site is being cleaned up by the Navy, funding may still be cut. If it undergoes early transfer to the City, funding will be accelerated. He opined that these two courses of action are not compatible. Mr.Lovett asked how the community can be assured that the Navy will indeed accelerate the funding in the event of early transfer. Ms. Potacka replied that such situations have already happened, citing the Long Beach and Oakland bases as examples. She noted that liability and cleanup are backed by an insurance policy, as was discussed in a presentation given by Mark O'Brien from Marsh and McLennan two meetings before.

Mr. Kitchingman commented that he does not believe the City doubts that the Navy will provide accelerated funding for an early transfer. He clarified that the transfer may be accelerated, but not necessarily the cleanup itself. Mr. Beyaert added that the City may be fined, rather than the Navy.

Alan Wolken, Redevelopment Agency, stated that the Long Beach and Port of Oakland examples are not applicable to Pt. Molate. He explained that both were going from like-use to like-use, in that both bases were previously being operated as a port. On the other hand, the reuse plan for Pt. Molate requires usage to change from industrial use to mixed use, including historic, residential, light industrial/research and development, and recreational use. This involves a more complex transition. The City is interested in early transfer for several reasons. One reason is that the Navy does not have a good record with regard to transferring bases, as they are not in the business of real estate. Although the Navy wants to take the bases off their books, the City does not want to take on the liability involved with cleaning up Pt. Molate. He stated that the City and the Navy need to discuss cleaning up the base to residential standards, which has been a point of concern since base closure.

Mr. Wolken stated that the City needs to know where the residential units will be located. That is, the master developer needs to coordinate the cleanup with the reuse plan. There are several stages that need to be reached before the transfer, such as the Navy's agreement with the City's reuse plan. Bob White asked who decides how much money will be provided for cleanup in the event of an early transfer. Mr. Wolken replied that the City has been negotiating with the Navy in Washington D.C.

Mr. Wolken stated that when the Navy approaches Congress for additional funding for the next round of base closures, the Navy will want to show that they have transferred more bases than they have already. They are interested in showing that cities are willing to accept early transfer, but the City of Richmond does not want to accept it until the amount of funds is defined. He stated that the Navy will give the City a deed and a check, but the City wants to hire a private consulting firm to

help determine how much money is actually needed for cleanup. He stated that according to the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), federal property must be cleaned up before it is transferred to a local municipality. The City has to go around the CERCLA process and encourage the governor to sign off on early transfer to the City. In doing this, the City needs to be assured that they will not take over property that will result in a further burden to the City. He noted that the Navy has acknowledged its continual liability for the cleanup, but it is not known how quickly the Navy will respond in the event that additional contamination is found. There are many issues that the City must consider prior to accepting the property. A private cleanup firm will indemnify the City.

Mr. White asked as to the time table for early transfer, and if it is shorter than that required for the Navy to clean up the site. Mr. Wolken stated that if the City receives the necessary funds from the Navy, the City can clean up the site at a faster rate, and according to their reuse standards. Because Pt. Molate is a small base, the City can handle the cleanup. The downside is that the larger bases, such as Mare Island and HPS, have huge cleanup numbers. Further, all of the bases are competing for funds for early transfer. The City would benefit if it can get ahead of these bases with respect to obtaining funding.

Mr. Bloom commended Mr. Wolken for his comprehensive understanding of the situation. Mr. Bloom reiterated that the Long Beach and Oakland examples are not broadly applicable to most communities that are affected by BRAC activities. ARC Ecology is advising communities as to the actual numbers needed to clean up the site. Further, Mr. Bloom added that DoD requires the community to purchase insurance that bonds the work of the Navy to a certain extent, which he feels is inappropriate.

Also, the City is secured against the overages caused by known contaminants, as opposed to unknown contaminants. The latter could significantly affect the City's budget. Unknown situations can cause the City to turn to the military for additional funds, which can extend the amount of time needed to recover the funds. If the City is working in tandem with a master developer who has invested in the property, this increases pressure on the Redevelopment agency to come up with the funds to bridge the gap in the funds.

Lastly, Mr. Bloom stated that if all bases accepted an early transfer, the military in general would have to come up with quintuple the current budget. Currently, the Navy set-aside is $284 million dollars for all BRAC cleanup sites in FY00. If all bases accepted early transfer, the Navy would have to come up with about $2.8 to $5 billion dollars in a single year.

There are a variety of hidden problems in the negotiations process. The cost to clean up HPS is estimated to be between $300 to $400 million dollars, although the Navy has already expended about $200 million dollars just for the site characterization. He stated that the community must be a very careful consumer when entering negotiations for early transfer.

With regard to compliance with the Water Board Orders, he noted that the Presidio early transfer negotiations just took place, resulting in the Presidio receiving a $100 million-dollar-commitment over four years from the Army. The feasibility study (FS) for the site was put on hold while the Army exerted pressure on the Presidio Trust to accept the agreement. Once the cashout agreement was concluded, the FS was continued under the Presidio Trust, rather than the Army. He reiterated that the community should be very careful with regard to the negotiations process, adding that the Redevelopment Agency seems to be very aware of the situation, as indicated by Mr. Wolken's input.

Mr. Lovett noted that the City has not decided which parts of the site will be reused, which the Navy needs to know in order to negotiate how much it will provide for cleanup. Mr. Wolken replied that the City's reuse plan is very broad. Mr. Lovett stated that since no specific information was provided, the Navy does not have to go to the level of providing a number. The catch-22 is that the City will not hire a developer without a settlement from the Navy, but the Navy will not settle because the City has not provided specific information as to the actual reuse plan that will be implemented.

Mr. Wolken stated that the Navy wants an early transfer in order to take the property off their books. Secondly, prolonged cleanup is costly, and early transfer will accelerate the cleanup and thereby save money because it will not be spread out over a longer period of time. The City needs to know from a private developer how much money is needed, because cleanup methods have changed over the years. For example, placing contaminated dirt under a road rather than transporting it off-site will result in significant savings. Until a developer is on board, the City cannot give the Navy an accurate estimate as to how much is necessary to clean up the site.

Mr. White stated that, according to his experience with master developers, the estimated cost is always off by a factor of 10, and is always too low. Land has to be cleaned up to a higher standard as rules change. He commented that he can see why the Navy wants to extricate itself from this responsibility by transferring the property to the City. He estimated that it will take ten years before anything will be done at the site.

Mr. Wolken replied that the reuse plan spans 20 years, as the City cannot build 600 homes and 200,000 square feet of research and development overnight. He explained that this is a long-term reuse plan which requires a developer's input as to the usage and location, so that the cleanup firm can be informed as to where to clean up first.

Mr. White asked as to how long the City will take to come up with a number with which to approach the Navy. Mr. Wolken replied that this question is hard to answer. He stated that there is a lot of interest in Pt. Molate with regard to developers and cleanup firms. The process of finding a master developer will take about six months.

Mr. Gosney reminded the RAB that the topic pertains to the Board Order and not early transfer. Ms. Dorn stated that the CAP for the USTs and the EE/CA for the treatment pond area can be used to help determine how much money is needed for cleanup. Mr. White commented that it is difficult to

tell what is underground. For example, Chevron Land Company experienced unforeseen problems and increased costs when the actual cleanup began in Huntington Beach. Ms. Dorn noted that Mr. Bloom had mentioned that unknown factors can increase the cleanup costs. She reiterated that using a regulatory-approved technique can give the City some idea as to the cleanup costs.

Mr. Beyaert reiterated that the discussion regarding compliance with the Water Board's Orders should not be based on early transfer. He noted that the Navy is responsible for cleanup. The deadlines must be achievable and yet firm, and they must facilitate compliance while protecting the water quality of the Bay.

III. IR PROGRAM UPDATE

Ms. Gallice-Sondrup, EFD SW, stated that a public meeting on Site 1 was held on the previous night; comments are due by 15 March. The Navy will then prepare a response summary to all the public comments. It will be appended to the EE/CA, which will be finalized by summer time. The Action Memo and the CAP design for construction will follow. The Navy is awaiting the Board executive's signature on the Site 2 ROD. The Site 3 EE/CA is slated to begin in the summer also. A pilot study will begin at the end of March. The Navy will conduct groundwater monitoring and a human health risk assessment at Site 4 to determine if an EE/CA is necessary.

In response to Mr. Beyaert's inquiry, Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that one of the public comments asked the Navy to ensure that it does not create an unsightly remedy like that at Brickyard Landing. The Navy also received the RAB comments. She commented that, overall, the public seems to be comfortable with the proposed soil cover.

In regard to Stephen Linsley's inquiry, Ms. Gallice-Sondrup stated that the Site 3 pilot study will involve bioslurping. Mr. Schuller added that this would be a good opportunity for the Navy to see if the innovative technology is effective in extracting the product. It would also be an opportunity to obtain data for the EE/CA.

IV. COMPLIANCE PROGRAM UPDATE

Ms. Potacka gave the update in place of John Kowalczyk. She stated that the Phase II UST characterization was completed in November 1999; the internal draft will be issued in late April. The load test at UST 19 is scheduled for the week of 6 March; the actual loading of the drums is set for Tuesday and Wednesday. AGS will revise the draft structural evaluation report to include comments received, as well as the results of the load test. The Navy expects the final report in April; the Oil Recovery System (ORS) Closure Summary Report will be issued in the coming week. With regard to the pipeline removal, the construction field work began in November 1999; the planned completion date is August 2000; and it is on schedule.

An archaeologist has been present during the excavation of the south shoreline area. A HAZMAT-trained Native American observer is present during the excavation in Area 283, where human remains were found in the past. About 25,000 linear feet of pipe were removed; the total to be removed was revised from 29,000 to 34,000 linear feet, as more pipes were found. Next week, the Navy will begin contract modification for additional pipeline areas. The Phase II environmental baseline survey (EBS) was completed in December 1999; the internal draft will be issued in mid-April. The Navy is preparing a delivery order to clean USTs 2, 3 and 18.

Ms. Potacka introduced Maynard Gensler, IT Corporation (IT Corp.). She distributed pictures of the mortar and pestle that were returned to her at the close of the meeting. She is hoping that the actual mortar and pestle can be brought to the RAB at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Gensler stated that the mortar and pestle were found in an archaeologically sensitive area in the south shoreline in late December. It was located about four feet below the ground surface, after which excavation was stopped. Andy Galvan, a member of the Ohlone tribe, gave a presentation to IT field staff on the significance of the find; he also showed them various examples of artifacts. Mr. Gosney stated that Mr. Galvan will give a presentation at the next RAB meeting.

Gaye Eisenlord stated that the word "molate" originates from the Spanish word *moleta*, which was Red Rock Island's original name. *Moleta* was used to denote a cone-shaped stone that is used to grind pigments, whereas *metate* is the flat part of a millstone. There is no connection between *metate* and *moleta*. Mr. Beyaert stated that the round mortar is called *molcajete*.

V. COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE

In response to Don Kinkela's suggestion last month, Mr. Gosney stated that he sent letters to the principals of local high schools to elicit interest in Pt. Molate. He gave a presentation to a class at Pinole Valley High School. He introduced Geoff Chandler, instructor, and Jennie Sexton, student. The next quarterly newsletter will be sent by the end of March. Mr. Gosney is working on upgrading and improving the onsite bulletin board.

Mr. Gosney will contact the Neighborhood Coordinating Council regarding increasing community participation, and to recruit new members. Currently, there is one vacancy; Lyle Fisher has also indicated his interest in resigning from the RAB. An advertisement will be posted in the local newspaper to solicit membership applications. He encouraged RAB members to refer interested individuals to himself or Lisa Fasano, Bay Area Public Affairs and Community Relations Officer.

VI. COMMUNITY INPUT/WRAP-UP

Mr. Beyaert distributed a card for Lucretia Edwards, who suffered an accident and is now recuperating in a rehabilitation facility.

Mr. Gosney concluded the meeting at 8:55 p.m. He thanked the attendees for their participation.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Thursday, 6 April 2000.

A copy of the approved final minutes will be placed in the Information Repositories located at City Hall and at the Public Library.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

- Project Update
- Presentation on Archaeological Find

HANDOUTS

RWQCB Presentation