

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, July 26, 2007**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 26, 2007, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Mare Island, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:03 p.m. and adjourned at 8:51 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Kenn Browne
- Wendell Quigley

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy)
- Richard Perry (DTSC)
- Larry Maggini (Weston)
- Chris Jespersen (Weston)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Brian Thompson (RWQCB)
- John Kaiser (RWQCB)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Tessa Bemis (Tetra Tech)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- James Porterfield
- Neil Morgan-Butcher
- Helen Luechauer
- Diji Christian
- Dr. Jarvis

RAB Support from CDM:

- David Lange (CDM)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: We'll go ahead and get started. Welcome to the July, 2007 Mare Island RAB meeting. We'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the Navy co-chair and the BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

Attendees introduce themselves as requested.

We'll go ahead and get started on our first presentation. It's an update on munitions and explosives of concern -- what we call MEC -- on the production manufacturing area, south shore area, Western Magazine area, and installation restoration site five. It's going to be given by both Marie Dreyer with the Navy, project manager, and Larry Maggini with Weston.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Onshore Update Production Manufacturing Area (PMA) and South Shore Area (SSA), Western Magazine Area (WMA), and Installation Restoration (IR) 05*

Presentation by Ms. Marie Dreyer, Navy and Mr. Larry Maggini, Weston Solutions.

MS. DREYER: Thanks, Michael. Good evening, Myrna, RAB members, guests. As Michael said, today the Navy, with help from Weston Solutions, will be giving an update on the four munitions response sites in the southern area of Mare Island. The areas we are speaking about are the Western Magazine area, IR05, the production manufacturing area, and the south shore area. Before we get started with the update I just wanted to give you a little background on some of these sites. The Western Magazine area is a former munitions and storage area. It was created from tidal wetlands using upland fill in the late 1930s. It was used primarily for the storage of gun ammunition and related components. It was later deactivated in 1975. The IR05 site is a former munitions disposal site. The construction of a diked well and the addition of artificial fill created this area. It was used primarily for open burning and open detonation of unwanted munitions. This site was later enlarged to include the adjacent dredge pond, 7-S. This was done due to some agency concerns about kickout; however, so far, unexploded kickout has not been found at this site. The PMA is a former munitions production facility. Many munitions processes took place here, including projectile loading, projectile rocket warhead assembly and breakdown, propellant loading, and munitions refurbishment. From the picture you can see that munitions were definitely handled on the piers, as you can see Navymen loading from the piers to the cruiser. The south shore area is created from fill in the 1930s and forties. It was used for munitions storage and handling, and had the capability of shipboard loading at pier 35. It also supported marine component manufacturing and assembly, container maintenance, and dunnage.

In the early 1990s the Navy did several emergency response actions at these sites. However, it wasn't until 1994 that these sites were determined areas of concern. The first UXO geophysical survey of these sites was done in 1995. This geophysical survey was primarily completed with hand-held instruments, and anomalies were done by the judgment of field technicians. The munitions which were found were removed in the later 1997 intrusive investigation. And all these munitions that were removed were categorized as discarded military munitions. In other words, those were not armed nor fired. The update we'll be focusing mainly on tonight is the second geophysical investigation done at these sites. This time the objective of the Navy was to provide a digital recording of the anomaly locations, something we had not previously done. We utilized improved survey instrumentation and techniques, as well as implemented more extensive QA/QC measures; thus, for the most part eliminating the judgment done by the field technicians and relying on the more up-to-date technology we have now. Now to give you the details of this investigation is Larry Maggini from Weston Solutions.

MR. MAGGINI: Thank you, Marie. Tonight I'm going to be giving an overview of the digital geophysical mapping and some of the anomaly investigation activities that Weston has been doing pretty much for the last two years now in the Western Magazine itself and the IR05 sites. One of the things that we did to support all of the geophysical surveys of all four sites was to install a geophysical prove-out area. And this was installed on the south shore just near the head of pier 35, which is an L-shaped pier which sticks out in the Carquinez Strait. And in the grid that we established we buried representative samples, either inert ordnance items or surrogates, as they're

called, that are very similar geophysically to the original items. Then we went in with the instruments we planned to use, and the methods and techniques to collect the data and process the data, and we surveyed the grid.

The goal was to be able to identify all the items in the grid. And these included several items that were buried next to a utility line that happened to be in the grid that was selected in that location to include the utilities, because there were a lot of utilities in some of these areas, and we wanted to be able to distinguish, if possible, the MEC items buried near utilities. So we went in to survey it and we refined the survey methodology, the field methodology, and also the data analysis techniques, all the different parameters and the processing that the raw data goes through to arrive at an anomaly map where the anomalies can be picked out. And the goal of all this was to be able to distinguish a 20 millimeter round. And the 20 millimeter is by far the most numerous and most dangerous item on Mare Island because of its lack of safety features. And one of the things that we did is we found out we had to go to a one foot sensor space with the magnetometer. We have a picture in a couple more slides of that. But the spacing between the magnetometer sensors on the cart normally isn't that tightly spaced. But we found out that to get the data density that we needed to be able to distinguish the smaller items, we had to do some tweaking on the spacing. Two types of instruments were used. The magnetometer was used, and this will locate ferrous items only, only those containing iron, at fairly deep depths. So that's a good instrument. The items we're going after are primarily iron or steel. In several areas where we had historically identified other items that were not primarily made of iron or steel, for example, mostly brass, we also used a magnetometer -- excuse me -- an electromagnetic system. And this is nothing more than a kind of very expensive metal detector. It will actually transmit a signal that will interact with the metal in the ground, and it will receive a signal that's transmitted -- in effect, transmitted back by the material in the ground. The magnetometer is purely passive; it will detect changes in a magnetic field that are caused by metal items, steel items. And both of these systems were used with a centimeter accuracy navigation system. The anomalies were picked, you know, very precisely. In fact, when the people went back to dig them up, we had to relocate the position of each anomaly within an inch, up to a tenth of a foot actually, very near an inch. And this shows an example of a couple of our guys pulling a one, two, three -- looks like a four extension cart. This would be a magnetometer. Another problem that we had that was historically a concern with the regulators was under buildings. Not so much in the Western Magazine, we had a pretty good idea there that the building footprints were clean because they were constructed with the material from the hillside of Mare Island. But there was a possibility that there could be shallow buried items that were thrown or buried under there. So for fourteen buildings with above ground magazines they got Matt Gifford and sent him out with his trusty sidekick and his Flintstone mobile, like he calls it, and they did a survey under the buildings; this is one of the amazing things. He was able to collect dense enough data and do enough manipulation on it that he was actually able to get results from underneath a steel reinforced roof, next to steel reinforced pilings, and find pins as small as a 20 millimeter. You know, that was kind of a new idea to a lot of people. We had people from the Navy very interested, kind of amazed that he could do as good a job getting the anomalies out as he did.

One of the areas that this survey differed from previous ones was quality control. When the first surveys were done there was some quality control, but it was nowhere near as extensive and well documented and followed as what was done this time. Weston placed seed items, you know, similar, you know -- they were pieces of rebar is what they were -- similar to a small MEC item in the grids before they were surveyed, and this was done blind to the people doing the survey and the target selection. And we also went in and resurveyed a portion of each grid and compared results

for consistency. If we were to go back like three days later and do one grid that we'd done previously, and the data looked significantly different, then we knew there would be a problem obviously. So that was another Q/C check. Once the anomalies were selected, the process was reviewed by an independent geophysicist, not one of the ones that had done the initial selections, to make sure that was done correctly and consistently.

In addition to the Weston Q/C, measures the Navy implemented several quality assurance (QA) measures. They also placed blind seed items, similar to what we did, blind to Weston, to the operators, and the selectors of the anomaly. The review of the survey data was done by -- independently by a Navy geophysicist. And there were some independent geophysical surveys of selected grids to compare data collected by the Navy using their equipment with the data that Weston collected with our equipment. As I said before, the anomaly selection was based on 20 millimeter projectile profile. The survey coverage covered all accessible areas, and this was done with either a magnetometer or a combination of a magnetometer or electromagnetic systems, depending on their previous history. And the building footprint surveys were done, fourteen in the Western Magazine, which are primarily aboveground magazines. And there were three other buildings selected as trial buildings by the Navy in the production area and the south shore to get a feel for the effectiveness in that environment. As you can see, there are a lot of anomalies selected. In the Western Magazine over 21,000; IR05, 10,000; PMA, almost 17,000; and the south shore, 15,000. Considering the average rate of about a hundred per day, that would be probably several years worth of work for somebody there to do every one of those. And this shows an example of a Western Magazine. This is a hundred by hundred foot grid -- 200 by 200 foot grid. Each of those little black X's you can see up there represents one anomaly. The colors represent the magnetic field density, the changes in the magnetic field, with the green being like very small, and the red and the other colors being more pronounced. And you can't see on this with the colors set to this scale with some of the anomalies, but in this they manipulate the amplitudes and things, and they can actually pick these out that wouldn't be visible using this scale that's on the photograph. And this is one from south shore. This one you can see, again, the really high density of anomalies. Because of the high density and the difficulty of doing that many anomalies, we had to develop some way to place priority on areas for data anomalies. The experience with the Western Magazine showed us that primarily, you know, the sites with the history of MEC, either MEC having been found there or some history of handling or storage of MEC when the installation was open, were the areas that warrant the most attention. And when we selected area to determine those anomalies would be selected where to actually dig. Although we selected a hundred percent of anomalies in those areas with the history of MEC, we also did 20 percent of anomalies minimum in every area that was surveyed. And this was done to make sure that we didn't miss any areas that hadn't previously been identified.

All large anomalies were picked, and the other anomaly picks were distributed across the entire grid. And there were also a pick of widely different sizes to make sure we didn't pick all small ones or all large ones. So we got a pretty good cross selection of picks that were detected. When MEC was encountered, the excavation was expanded to determine the lateral extent. If what we found was mostly -- in fact, all the areas we found MEC in, where we found one, the chances were there was a cluster of things there. There wasn't anything -- very few things that were found discreetly. This is an example of a photo analysis of MEC origins. The photo analysis was used to determine some of the areas that were suspect based on past history. The picture on the left shows this is a section of the Western Magazine, kind of down next to the golf course on the southern end. In fact, that is a golf course up there in green you see. The area now looks like a flat area, it doesn't look

interesting at all, there's nothing there to tell you that you would expect anything to be found there. However, the red dots are where we found MEC. So you can see something had to have been happening there. So we went back to the 1949 era photo, overlaid the MEC item locations on the picture from 1949, and you can see it was laid down in there, which is probably a munitions open storage area at the time. Following World War II the Navy had a lot of excess bullets. So we used this in other areas to expand our anomaly search where we didn't really have a -- any other known reason to do the digging. The process to investigate the anomalies -- they would be reacquired. Again, this was like one-tenth of one foot accuracy, tenth of a meter accuracy. The UXO technicians would go in and do a surface sweep to verify that there was no MEC or other radiological items on the surface before they started doing their investigation. And then each anomaly flag that was marked would be excavated. If they didn't find anything, they would go two feet laterally and a depth of four feet. Some of these areas were, you know, when you're dealing with that low of an anomaly signature, some of them are going to turn out to be nothing, that's just the nature of the beast. And some of them could be buried deeply enough where the techs, with their handheld instruments, couldn't detect it where the survey instruments used for the mapping could. So they did a pretty thorough investigation before they'd give up on an anomaly location. If MEC, MD, or RAD items were found, the investigation was continued. If they went deeper, we go deeper. If they went off to the side, you know, we'd follow until we found more. And, again, they were primarily in clusters, you know, in groups of things buried with other, you know, trash and things that had been dumped there.

Once the excavation was complete and the technicians doing the digging were happy, our independent UXO quality control specialist that we had working with our team went in and did his inspection. And he determined whether the excavation could be cleared or whether there was still something there. And what we found was that a lot of the locations, in fact, most of the locations there was so much other trash, you know, non-MEC trash, rebar, wire ropes, railroad spikes, and, you know, track blades, and in some cases even the rock they used for the railroad, the ballast gave off enough signature where he couldn't clear the hole. So if no MEC was found and we went, you know, a couple of feet beyond and there was only other trash and we found no MEC, then we would call it quits for that anomaly. UXO Q/C specialists also checked all the soils and -- dirt and soil that was excavated before it was put back into the hole to make sure that they hadn't missed anything when they pulled it out initially. Again, there was independent oversight by the Navy. We had a gentleman that the Navy hired that came in, usually came in once a day, to oversee the excavations to make sure that everything was being done correctly.

This is a photo of the Western Magazine. You can see we got a little excavator. We wanted to be really careful. And this is a UXO Q/C specialist, I believe, pulling up the MEC item. This is a summary of the Western Magazine and IR05 investigations. And what we did was compare the initial 1995 to '97 investigations with the current one that we did now. And we listed the anomalies that were investigated, the number of MEC items that were recovered, the munitions debris, the inert munitions items that were recovered, and the RAD items that were recovered. As you can see, when the IR05 was done initially, there weren't any anomalies, it was done mag and flag. The people went out, hand-held instruments, every square foot of the site, dug up whatever they could see. So we don't know how many anomalies they had. But you can see they did find 421 MEC items. So apparently that process was a little more effective because it looks like they found more than we did now, and that's good. Unfortunately, in the Western Magazine it was kind of the other way around. The locations of items did match though. There were primarily two sites on the north end, there were a couple of outfall locations that were used for several years in the golden era of

MEC unfortunately. There were a lot of items found there, and also in the open storage areas at the south end next to the golf course along that side there. So really those are the only places where a lot of things were found. You can check out the maps we got up here, the Western Magazine and IR05 map over there, and the WMA and south shore map over here. But the red dots on the Western Magazine, you can tell that's pretty tightly clustered up except for a couple of isolated ones, and they are in areas that were done before. This is a listing of MEC items for western mag and IR05. And I tried to break it down by general category, I didn't get too specific. But, again, you can see the biggest item by far numerically is the 20 millimeter rounds, with some other larger rounds, seventy of those for the western mag. And you can see IR05 had very, very few different types of things. Most things that were found there were 20 millimeter. And fuzes, lots and lots of bomb fuzes, rocket fuzes, and we even found a hedgehog fuze. That's like an anti-submarine rocket used in World War II. Lots of fuzes were found, less twenty milliliter rounds. And western mag area had kind of a selection, but very heavily in the fuzes. This is in IR05, an end of day picture from one of the days the guys worked. And you can see, I don't know if you can read them or not, but you've got rocket fuzes in the upper left, cartridge cases and bomb fuzes on the right, projectile fuzes in the middle, and more bomb fuzes across the bottom; so lots of fuzes in one area. This was an item that was just found actually just a few weeks ago in the Western Magazine, a single item, we found a case of twenty millimeter rounds; still in the case, still in the cardboard tubes around each round. And on the blowup on the right there you can see the different colors at the bottom, the red and yellow, that's explosive. The one on the left the guys thought was high explosive incendiaries, which is a little red. Usually it's the yellow which is the second one from the left. This is one I think we showed before. It was the biggest item found in the western mag which was a five inch, 38 caliber projectile. So it's like destroyer through battleship rounds. And this was the hedgehog that we found. You can tell the scale by the five gallon bucket. So he's a pretty big item. That was the biggest item found at IR05.

Some observations that we made after completion of the two sites were the improved survey techniques and Q/C identified obviously a much larger quantity of anomalies than the prior surveys. The high level of debris that we found there was really hard to work through because it, you know -- originally the idea was to dig and clear holes, and they figured -- we found out we couldn't do that, so we kind of had to regroup and develop a criteria that we felt was effective in finding the MEC and still let us, you know, filter out some of the other metallic clutter that was in the area. The MEC and MD locations correlated well with the area's that were identified as being either outfall locations or places where munitions had been laid down. And again, the MEC was found in discrete -- you know, in groups, and not in individual discrete items spread all over the entire site. Next let's move onto the production manufacturing area and south shore. This is the summary of anomalies, again for the previous survey that was done in '95 through '97. And the number of items recovered by those removal actions in the bottom was the number of anomalies detected now. And you can see for PMA it's probably ten times the number of anomalies. And for south shore, you know, fifteen times the number of anomalies. And you can see on the second line the relatively high numbers of MEC items that were found in the initial removals, together over 2,000. We can head to PMA and south shore. These are areas that have not been investigated. The conduct of that is pending issue from the Navy.

What we did now is take the experience that we gained at western mag and IR05, take that, look at the large number of anomalies. Some of the similar conditions that are on the sites, they're also -- they also have a lot of debris, they also have railroad tracks, the ballast is going to be there, the track place -- the spikes are going to be there. Many, many more utility lines either documented or

undocumented that still exist there. So what we did is we came up with an idea to create two categories for the PMA south shore. Category A sectors -- and these are not necessarily, you know, nice little square grids. These are areas that share some common background or reason for being, either being a former MEC storage handling area, or areas that had a previous history of MEC contamination. They were grouped -- they would be grouped together. They would receive, again, a hundred percent anomaly investigation. Every anomaly that was detected would be investigated and examined. The remainder of the area would be classified as category B sectors, and these would receive a 20 percent minimum anomaly investigation. Again, this would be -- you know, the selections wouldn't be just big things or little things or things in one corner, they would be a variety, you know, some big things, some little things, spatially dispersed to get a good sample so we wouldn't miss any disposal or areas of MEC contamination. And again, this is an example of a photo interpretation. You know, this was used, to some extent, in selecting category A, category A sectors. On the left is a current photo, and overlaid over that, which you can't really see them, there are some red and yellow dots. You can take a look at the map after over here if you'd like at the break. These signify areas where MEC was found previously. The center photo is a 1949 aerial shot with those same anomaly locations overlaid on it. And as you can see here, there's another laydown area, another storage area. And so, because of that, on the right, the upper shot shows the laydown area in '49. And what we did is we drew the line around the laydown area and superimposed that on the bottom over the current photo, and that's what we proposed to be a category A sector that would receive a hundred percent investigation. And again, a hundred percent investigation for the category A sectors, a minimum 20 percent of the category B. If the category B sectors were cleared, a random ten percent of the area within the cleared areas would be treated as category A and receive a hundred percent. And this is an extra quality assurance, quality control measure to give us the feeling of -- a better feeling that we didn't miss anything doing the 20 percent. If any MEC is encountered in category B area, then it would be converted to the category A area and everything would be dug. If we were to find a MEC item, we would start digging anomalies around them, every anomaly, to find out if it was a discrete item, or if it was a sign of bigger things that we had missed previously.

Anomaly selection will be spatially random and, again, would include a selection of anomaly sizes; not just great things or not just small things. And again, the investigation will be done to a minimum four foot depth and two foot radius until we found something that we thought was the anomaly. I got a bigger picture of this hanging on the wall, this is -- I know you're not going to be able to read it because I can't read it from here. But this is a flow chart of what I just talked about. The -- these are the categories, types of areas. This would be the category A side -- oh, this is the wrong thing. Okay. Look at the one on the wall -- this has three categories. I don't know how I did that. But okay, anyway, category A and category B. If MEC is found in B it's treated as A, and basically all anomalies are investigated until no more MEC is found. Okay. The deadly issue of land use controls. Three things are required. Number one, you have to be able to get on the site. Right now it's fenced and, theoretically, that can't happen. The second is there has to be some kind of intrusive activity. The surface is going to be cleared when whoever cleans it is done, that won't be a problem. Everything that's visible or detectable is going to be investigated. But if you get on the site and you dig, you get to number three. And if you find something, and you do the wrong thing to it, then three are satisfied and you could have a problem. But it does take all three, and the chances of that are, I think, pretty remote. But to ensure that, land use controls may be required. And this would be determined by the Navy, the regulators, and all the involved parties. But there would probably be a deed covenant associated with the property that will follow. Any grading --

permit to do grading would require notification and approval. Excavations more than four feet would require oversight by a UXO technician while it's being done just in case, you know, something comes up. You know, some of these items are not what they appear to be. A 20 millimeter bolt, some of the fuzes at IR05 look to me like nothing, and I've seen a lot of things. And, you know, the pictures they came up with that are bomb fuzes look like, to me, to be crap that I've seen at, you know, ten different outfall locations that weren't MEC. So it's not always what it appears to be. There would be education programs for anyone having access to the site or dealing with the sites. And I know Myrna has been to some good presentations that the Army did, she knows all about that, so she'd probably have some ideas on that. But basically we're trying to communicate the fact that there is a risk there and, you know, that you need to look out on what you do and how you handle things. And the last item should be a response system for items that are found. And I think right now it's the Air Force DOD out of Travis, but there needs to be a system set up for people that are knowledgeable on the items that might be found. This is a proposed schedule for the sites. PMA, as I say, the geophysical survey summary, the draft version came out in April. Agency comments are hopefully received by August. Draft final survey summary, once the comments are received, would be put out in September. And hopefully get concurrence on the draft final in October. The western mag in IR05. The draft conceptual site model is out, and I believe the date's been moved back a month or so to April, it was originally supposed to be earlier. The agency comments received in October. The draft final put out in November. And hopefully concurrence in December. Any questions?

MR. THOMPSON: I didn't see it to track that well, but I'm curious, and I recognize up front that there's a bigger map on the wall.

MR. MAGGINI: I would be glad to answer any questions.

MR. THOMPSON: And this is not really the objective of the study, but I'm curious what happens when you're reviewing anomalies and you see something that looks suspiciously like an underground storage tank or a buried drum, or when you're excavating if you struck oil what your response is.

MR. MAGGINI: We've struck stranger things. Well, again, when the excavation is done, the guys go in, they dig up, you know, they investigate. If they find no MEC at all, and if everything looks like debris that's not associated with MEC, you know, they would do a reasonable amount up to four feet, two foot radius, four foot depth. And, you know, if they had no reason to go any further, they probably wouldn't go any further even though there were no items there. Unless we found a drum or something we would deal with that. But MEC-wise, if there's just, you know, railroad ballasts or concrete with rebar in it or whatever, it would be called off and that would be it. It would be written off as cleared -- not as cleared, but as anomaly investigated. Does that answer your question or --

MR. THOMPSON: Kind of.

MR. GEMAR: Well I think the bottom line is that something as large as a UST would really be screaming loud to the operators, and so they would most assuredly continue to dig until they uncovered what was creating such a large, you know, metallic signature. And then at that point if it was a UST, you know, that would get reported up to the management like myself. And certainly if they encountered stained soil or TPH, that would be provided as well, and then we would address it through the toxics agency.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Larry, where the RAD items found -- for those people that don't know what a RAD item is, it's radiological --

MR. MAGGINI: Yeah, they were used, really low level radiological items. They were sealed in a metal button behind a glass plate, and they were used aboard ship for kind of -- as night lights or whatever to find things if the power should go out. And typically they're found in dredge outfalls. And that's where they were found in the western mag were the dredge outfalls were; only there, nowhere else.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That was my question on that item. And moving along here. When you say that you -- the MEC items that you found were in discrete caches rather than these individuals items, have you ever discovered any kind of log or interviewed anybody who worked during this time period that could explain how these -- whether these were, you know, lazy nighttime workers, or whether this was a common practice to be the most protective way of --

MR. MAGGINI: We can only go by what we've seen. There were a couple of discrete places that could have been -- either been a lost item off a truck or could have been, as you said, a nighttime single item somebody had and wanted to get rid of. But for the most part it was pretty evident where you can see the cluster of dots that it was disposal areas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That it was purposeful?

MR. MAGGINI: Yeah. Yeah. And, in fact, we did an interview here a few months ago with a gentleman that worked there, and the only place he could remember disposing of things was on the south shore in the dike fourteen area which has already been pretty heavily cleaned out. But that was his big concern was that area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And had he -- how had he recalled disposing of the material, in wheelbarrows or pitching it as far as he could throw it?

MR. MAGGINI: I believe the dike fourteen one was pretty much the accepted disposal area until IR05 was open to do disposals after the war. This was pretty much right at the end of the war or during the war that they were mostly -- items that were at that location were disposed of.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a couple of questions about -- well one, I guess. How do you detect for ordnance, like on dike fourteen where you have -- or maybe on the mine loading pier, where you have so much ballast of concrete debris and that has reinforcing steel?

MR. MAGGINI: Well, the good thing about pier 35 is it was put in about 1941 or so, and it was probably not built on fill that was, you know, the ballast was probably over the top of a fairly clean fill. I personally wouldn't expect things there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I have photos of them building that, and it was out of clean fill off of the hill with actually oxen and mules and carts. But what about the overlay of just concrete debris and all of that, there isn't going to be any --

MR. MAGGINI: No. That was one of our problems with the Western Magazine. You know there also that it was supposedly created with clean fill from the hillsides. And what we found was the roads in the magazine paths may have been clean fill, but the shoulders of the roads were not clean fill, they were created with everything they could find to dump there, you know, everything, bricks and pieces of wall and concrete with rebar and all kinds of metal. And it was a pretty bad mess in those areas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's an archeologist's delight, I imagine. Okay. Two other questions then, or comments, I guess. One would be that, I suppose that one of your land use restrictions would probably, if the property is used as a park as is intended by the city of Vallejo's reuse plans, I suppose you wouldn't recommend metal detecting?

MR. MAGGINI: They can metal detect as long as they don't dig for what they find.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean that's one favorite thing, that pastime of particularly the male division of the species. Do we have to pat them down?

MR. MAGGINI: That would be something to consider.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be an education, huh.

MR. MAGGINI: Because everything we have here at this point is proposed. I mean, it has to be developed. I mean the land use thing is something that I know the regulators are interested in, and it's, you know, it has to be thought out well because it can have big consequences down the road if you don't do it right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I have a couple of ideas. One of them could be that in certain high risk areas -- and I don't know where that would be -- as long as we have ferries that are eroding the beach away, pretty soon maybe we can hire them to remove the beach and then we won't have that as an attractive nuisance.

MR. MAGGINI: They are.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And they are. But I was thinking maybe, would you ever consider in some attractive nuisance areas or more attractive spots to go digging, would you ever consider using -- bringing in clean fill and cover?

MR. MAGGINI: There's been a lot of ideas brought up. One is clean fill, and the other is, you know, rip rap in the shoreline where there's still a concern that is, like you said, the things are still moving around and could expose more items.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I guess the only other idea I'm thinking about is that rattlesnakes and ticks were -- are certainly indigenous to the area, and maybe just plant a heck of a lot of them in the area you don't want people to go.

MR. MAGGINI: You don't have to plant them, they're there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. That's it.

MR. MAGGINI: Any other questions? Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Your purpose of slide 33, anticipated land use controls. In general that was just a thought, these are possible; right? Is that what you were trying to get across on that?

MR. MAGGINI: Which one?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The one on land use controls.

MR. MAGGINI: I'm in an echo chamber back there.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Number 33 at the top.

MR. MAGGINI: Again, these are ideas at this point --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

MR. MAGGINI: -- based on --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Gil, do you want to follow up on your question?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, you know, grading permits triggers review and notification; it doesn't. That would have to be a system that would have to be developed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, here comes deed restriction oversight by an organization, an independent entity that would get a notice when a grading permit was pulled.

MR. MAGGINI: Again, the specific comments would be dependent a lot on the reason that we develop the site. If it becomes a park it would require less, hopefully, oversight because there wouldn't be any, you know, serious development or moving the soil or anything like that.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Thanks, Larry and Marie. We're about ten minutes behind. Neal.

MR. SILER: Want to take a break and I'll change the computer out?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Sure. Why don't we -- we have our first public comment period, because we have that scheduled right now. Does anybody have any public comment for this first time? No? Then we will take a break and we'll come back.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: The next presentation is going to be given by Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island on path forward on investigation area B.2-1.

III. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Investigation Area B2-1 Path Forward.*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. SILER: Thank you, Michael. Well, I'll try to make this as short and sweet as I possibly can so you can go ahead and get out of here -- Gil can get out of here before 9:00 o'clock. What I'm going to talk about tonight is the steps that we would need to take to achieve no further action or NFA for investigation area B.2-1, which is a sub area of investigation area B.2, which is a sub area of investigation area B. And that's as far as I'm going to go right there. Okay. And I'll show you a map where this investigation area is. And how I'm going to do that is I'm going to talk about the steps that we need to provide an overview of the proposed path to no further action or NFA. I'm going to talk about why this area of the subset investigation area B.2, and then present in conceptual terms the types of remedial actions that we have to take in the three sites within that area; and those three sites are building 455, building 803, and underground storage tank 839. So as you can see right here, I'm going to talk about the overview, I'm going to talk about some boundary considerations which deal with some uncertainty in this area, and I'm going to talk about those remedial actions that will be taking place at those three sites that I talked about. But let's get a real good idea of where investigation area B.2-1 is. And it's this investigation area that is bounded by G Street to the northwest, by Colony Street to the southeast, by Railroad Avenue to the northeast, and by Azuar Drive generally to the southwest. And it covers almost the entire footprint of investigation area B, which is the rectangle, this entire area right here, except for two carve out areas that are in the southwestern corner. And one of those areas we know with quite a bit of certainty, and that's the building 811 and 637 area, which is this rectangle right here. And there's another area that we don't know with a lot of certainty, and that's what's called the defense reutilization marketing office, total petroleum hydrocarbon area. And the reason we don't know that area with very good certainty

is that the last time that we had some data on at least our side of Azuar Drive, which is the Lennar Mare Island side of Azuar Drive, was in 2002. And that area was generally characterized between 1994 and 2002, so the last data that we have is five years old.

Now, the Navy has done some work on the western side of Azuar Drive as late as last year, it was about 2006 we did some work there. So what we have to do is kind of characterize that data to see exactly where the carve out would be. So I mentioned to you that there's these boundary considerations. Why are we doing this if this is carved out? Now, this right here is this DRMO TPH area. And it's affectionately called the Peanut for a lot of people, because if you look at it it looks kind of like a peanut. What we're really concerned about is this eastern section across Azuar Drive here. Now, there's a lot of questions that we have to answer about this. Again, exactly where is this boundary currently? Because I mentioned the last data that we have is 2002, and it's generally characterized between 1994 and 2002. So we want a really good idea of what this looks like today as we carve it out. The other thing we want to do is find out exactly what chemicals of concern are in this area. We know that there's petroleum hydrocarbons in this area, but we want to make sure there's nothing else like polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons or anything else that would cause a problem. If you look on the sides of what we know, the snapshot back in the data that we have; if you look in this section which is colored in this green color right here, the highest total petroleum hydrocarbon concentration we have in there is about 71,000 milligrams per kilogram petroleum. Now, there's a lot of controversy over exactly what that represents. If you saw that right at the water table you would say for sure you've got floating product or free phase hydrocarbon there. In some areas that's probably true. In other areas, if you look at some of the border walls, you see people describing, they talk about interstitial oil. An interstitial oil is not continuous across the entire board or anything else like that, so it's hard to understand exactly what this thing really looks like until we get out there and take a look at it ourselves, because we've got different firms that are describing it two different ways. So what we plan on doing is characterizing this eastern boundary so that we can define this carve out. And what's going to be part of this carve out is it's going to take an idea of what exactly this petroleum hydrocarbon area looks like: If it is free product. If it is affecting groundwater. If it's static. If it's moved appreciably since we looked at it last in 2002. If there are things like polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. And the thing that we would look at would be naphthalene, because that's a potential for air concern. And that's going to go to the monitoring we have to do, whether we have to monitor groundwater or vapor because it has the potential for intruding into indoor spaces.

So there's a lot of questions that we have to answer or we have to ask and we want to answer. We plan to do that by putting in trenches and bore holes all along this boundary and trying to characterize this entire boundary just to see exactly where it is. But with that in mind, what we're going to do is we're going to propose some sort of a buffer area, depending on what media is affected, what the form of the petroleum hydrocarbon is, exactly what the constituents are, and try and go ahead and put forth a buffer zone, and then propose a monitoring program so we can monitor it as we develop the other portions of the property. So that's a little bit about the boundary consideration which is a little bit of an uncertainty that we have to deal with. So now I'm going to talk about, start off talking about are those three sites I talked about where we have to do remedial actions. And the first one is building 455. And building 455 is a two story structure that was used as a warehouse by the Navy, but there are a lot of areas on both the first and second floor, and there's one area in particular on the second floor, where there's a lot of areas -- where there was oil staining in both concrete on the first floor and wood on the second floor. So the site we're looking at specifically is what's called AL, or assessment location 0.1. And that is room four on the second

floor. And it, I think it measures something like thirty feet by twenty feet, might be a little bit larger than that, but it's something like that. And I'll show you a picture of that. There's the building right there. And that pink area right there on the second floor is what we're talking about. Now, under the consent agreement and final order that is in place for this property, I can close this site out right now and not have to do anything else. But what's kind of really funny about that is that this building is scheduled for demolition. And remember when we had the discussion about land use covenants a while back, a few months ago? We wondered do they make sense. Now, it doesn't make sense to put a land use covenant on a building that I'm going to knock down. So to make sure we don't have that land use covenant and have all the administrative requirements that would be imposed because of that, we're going to go back in and we're going to remediate this site right here by taking out the entire floor. And then what we're also going to do is we're going to re-characterize other areas where we do have data for this site. But the problem with those is that the reporting limits for those sites are higher than what we would need to be able to close the site out without imposing a land use covenant.

So what we're going to do is go back in and re-characterize those sites and make sure that our -- some of these are white samples where we don't know what the reporting limits were or soil samples, and some of them are -- like these two right down here -- we know what the reporting limits were, but they're like five milligrams per kilogram and two milligrams per kilograms, and what we really need is 0.74 milligrams per kilogram, and make sure our remediation is underneath that to go ahead and not have a land use covenant imposed on the site. So it could very well be that after we characterize those areas, if we get some hits we may have to go in and do some additional remediation. But right now what we're going to do is remediate this area right here where we know we have two milligrams per kilogram in the wood floor on the second floor. And what I'm going to do in that room is take out the entire wood floor. And then go ahead and do confirmation samples in the sides of that floor to make sure we've got it all. There's not much more we can do after that. We'll characterize these areas, and then we'll perform remedial actions as necessary. So that's what we're going to do for building 455. So now building 803 is a very small structure that's kind of in the southwestern portion of B.2-1 and outside that carve out area, that the Navy, when they were using the facility for storage -- and they used it for pipe storage, plumbing storage -- and if you go in there there's a big sign that says, you know, Bob's Toolbox or something like that along the walls. But it looks like there's anecdotal evidence that they also stored pesticides and batteries in this area. And what makes this problematic for us is that a portion of the floor in the southeast corner is basically wooden planks. In the northwest corner and the southwest corner, the floor is concrete, but what happened is there's this evidence and there's this story about spilling an unknown unidentified white powder on the wood floor, and then having it actually go through the cracks in the floor down to the soil underneath that. And the Navy knew that, and they went and they did some remedial actions. They removed about a fifteen by twenty foot section of the floor, and they removed some soil underneath that area that they removed, put it in drums, and sampled the drums. Now, as they sampled the drums, they tested for petroleum hydrocarbons, they tested for organochlorine pesticides. And what those are -- and I know you've all heard this -- is DDT, an organic chlorine pesticide that everybody's heard about -- and they also tested for metals. And the thing about pesticides is it could be anything, because probably mankind has used everything under the sun to try to control pests. So we looked at possibly everything they used at that time, but pesticides are the ones they could have used and most likely used. But when they took those samples, got the analysis back, they did find high petroleum hydrocarbons, about 2,900 milligrams per kilogram; they found DDT at about 1.9 milligrams per kilogram; and the highest metal they

detected -- although they detected arsenic, chromium, copper, and lead -- lead, which was 854 milligrams per kilogram.

We went back and did some additional investigations in the soil underlying that area, and found the same types of chemicals of concern; petroleum hydrocarbons, not as high as we found in that sample that they cleaned up, about 370 milligrams per kilogram. We did find DDT, DDE, and EDE -- which are derivatives of DDT -- Chlordane, and we also found the metals chromium, copper, and lead. And, again, lead was above the industrial commercial PRG which is 800 milligrams per kilogram, about 880 is what we found. So what we're going to do is we're going to go in and take that entire wood floor out, and we're going to move -- remove about a 25 by 35 foot soil section underneath that area down to a depth of two feet. And we're going to come back in and test. And one of the things that we're also going to do is we're going to see if it meets the tier two environmental screening levels, if it meets that. But we're also going to take a look at what more do we have to do to get it down to -- a potential concern for the Board, as far as petroleum hydrocarbons are concerned, are odor nuisance levels. And diesel at that level is 500 for commercial industrial sites, and motor oil is 2,500. So we're going to make sure, see if we can go ahead and get it down. If that's the case, then there would be no restrictions on this site, except for the commercial industrial restriction that would be on the entire commercial industrial area in the investigation area B.2-1. So that's what we're going to be doing in building 803.

Now, the last site -- there it is right there. And it gives you an idea of what the area is that we're going to look at, go ahead and take out. But the last site is underground storage tank 839. And that is in the southeast portion of investigation area B.2-1, and it was a 6,000 gallon diesel tank that the Navy used for an emergency generator that helped pump domestic pump station four, which is right next door to building 851 which is right next door to that site. And I'll show you that picture now. There it is right there. This building is 839. This is 851. This is the domestic pump station four. But what happened was that the Navy went in in 1996, 1997, removed this tank. When they removed it they found that what they had backfilled it with was abrasive blast material that they used in the shipways to take paint off the ships. When they tested that material they didn't come up with a lot of high metals, but one of the metals that they came up with when they tested the extractable fraction -- and in California you can define, if you're going to define a waste you need to define its solid fraction and its extractable fraction -- they found out it had nickel at about 27.3 milligrams per kilogram, which rendered it to be hazardous waste. So the Navy only took out a small portion of this area -- which is about this area right here, it came up a little bit like this. So we know there's abrasive blast material in a much larger area. In addition to that, there's an area over here -- which is about right there -- which is warhole GB0103, which has total petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil about seven and a half feet, which is right about the water table, at about 10,000 milligrams per kilogram. Now, that again is above our tier two environmental screening level of 4,172 milligrams per kilogram that we've historically used on the site. But what we're also going to do, we're going to go ahead and take a look at this and find out can we go ahead and clean this entire area up, clean all this material, and get the petroleum hydrocarbons down to those odor nuisance levels so that we don't have any kind of a restriction on this site. Now, the only uncertainty about this site -- and we may have to do this in somewhat of an iterative fashion as far as moving this material -- is the fact that I don't know if it goes into the building or not. So this building here is designated for demolition. But to do that, we have to go through a determination analysis with the city, make sure that there isn't any issues that would prevent us from demolishing that building, it doesn't have any use right now, it's not used for the emergency generator; and if we can do that, and we do have contaminants underneath this building, we would go in and remove

those contaminants also. Now, it doesn't end right there because obviously it's an underground storage tank site, so we're going to have to do some groundwater monitoring after we remove that material. So we'll probably have a well, at least in the source area where the tank goes. We'll probably have a well upgradient. And if any of you know about groundwater flow on Mare Island, it tends to be a little bit variable, so we'll probably have two to three wells that will be downgradient of that. We'll at least monitor those wells for a year, see if the concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons or any other chemicals of concern in those wells go down. If they do, we'll start looking at closing out this site. So that sums up my presentation tonight of what we're going to do in investigation area B.2-1. So right now I'd like to open it up to any questions anybody would have.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't have a question, I -- these are really great graphics, they're improving all the time, I guess, as your software does. I would also like to see a standard photo of the site so I can figure out which building it is.

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Otherwise a good presentation.

MR. SILER: I want you to know that I did all that myself, Myrna. (LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow. Hey, have I got some volunteer jobs for you.

MR. FARLEY: Myrna, he's lying.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I still have some good volunteer jobs for whoever did that, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Can you -- I have one question or -- am I on here? Am I live? You indicated that you'd like to see like an index map or an index photo or a standard photo?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, an --

MR. SILER: Elevation photograph.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Photograph, yeah.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. Gotcha.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Like that.

MR. FARLEY: I gotcha. Okay.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thank you, Neal. Next we're on administrative business and announcements. I will ask if you have any comments on the meeting minutes, please give them to myself or Myrna. Brian, Myrna did give me your comments on the minutes. I'm assuming it's from the last meeting?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Don't give them to me, I'll not give them to Michael.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: So we'll take care of that. Any other administrative business? No. Okay.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: We'll go into the focus group reports. First is community and Wendell.

a) Community

MR. QUIGLEY: No, I have nothing to report.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Jerry -- any report from natural resources? I know Jerry is not here. No.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Paula is not here either, technical. So we move on to Gil, city report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We have no Mare Island environmental issues pending before the city council.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Gil. Next, Steve.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: I have something to say. Okay. Two handouts.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did Neal do these handouts for you?

MR. FARLEY: No, I had to do them myself.

MR. SILER: Yes, I did.

MR. FARLEY: Again he's lying. Okay.

MR. SILER: I did 90 percent of them.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. What that really means is it took him nine times as long to look at them and review them as it took me to make them, that's what he's really saying. Two handouts. A deliverable schedule that just gives you an idea of the documents that are in the queue and being reviewed; and our normal handout. I'm sorry Chip's not here tonight, I wanted to describe for him the photos, but he's not here. We're -- the primary focus of the work so far or recently is a lot of the PCB sites there, you can see them in sort of the body of the map, they're in blue lettering, blue circles. The photos on the right-hand side show us removing the wood block flooring. Wood block flooring in these buildings is very, very common, and so to give you an idea of the labor involved in removing wood block flooring as part of these PCB sites. The photo above with the bucket is a floor slab above a vault that we had to remove to get down inside and do some work at one of these PCB sites down inside the vault. On the left-hand side, just sort of for your information, is one of the oil field transformers that we removed from building 85. You can get an idea of the scale of that transformer by looking at the forklift driver. And then the other photo is some excavation that we're doing around UST 31-243 area, which is a little south of the area that Neal was talking about within IA-B. This is actually in area H2, you can see the USTs labeled on the figure inside the investigation area H2. So those are some of the things that we're doing right now in the field. We have lots and lots of PCB sites that we're still working on, and more are coming soon. In terms of documents in review. One report that's been almost through the agency review is final IR-19 RI report and the RI summary report. We're looking forward to getting comments on that fairly soon. Some significant upcoming documents. A technical memorandum and interim remedial action work plan for FOPL segments in IA-C1. That work is based on some previous comments from the agencies on a draft version of that report. And we actually met with the agencies earlier this week to work out some of the final details for that scope of work. And we hope to be in the field in

August for that. And then two other significant upcoming documents are the IA-C3 implementation report, and the IA-B2 implementation report. Under the environmental site closure status, the only thing that's changed there is we got closure on six additional PCB sites, and we have seventy USTs that are closed with two more that are pending. So we're looking forward to getting that -- those final approvals as well. So that's all I have for this evening. I'm happy to entertain any questions. Thank you, Michael.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yes, thank you. Okay. Next, Cris, Weston update.

f) Weston Update (Chris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks, Michael. I won't read through the various documents, but you see what was submitted to the agencies in July. I've got an update for the area H1 upland hot spot soil removal and consolidation. We're nearly complete with consolidation of hot spot soil in area H1. And we're consolidating the contaminated material for use as subgrade fill under what would be the remaining portion of the engineered cap to be installed later this year for the H1 landfill. And we've excavated all 58 identified hot spots. We've still got a few areas on some of the sidewalls. We've excavated the areas, but we have to go back and do a little bit more work there. But in general, to date we've removed 155,000 cubic yards of soil in these hot spots. And once we get the regulators to review the sample results and bless them, we go back and backfill the area with clean soil that's also been sampled and passed muster with the regulatory agencies for use as clean fill. And you can see a photo there of the excavation activities going on. For the area H1 wetlands mitigation, you may recall as part of the remedy selected for area H1 we had approximately 8.2 acres of wetlands within H1. We excavated these areas in late fall of 2006, upland areas, created wetlands. And it's primarily going to be used as habitat for the salt marsh harvest mouse, the migratory waterfowl, and some other species that utilize the seasonal wetlands on Mare Island. We planted 14,000 individual plants earlier this year including pickleweed, alkali heath, and salt grass. And then we've also scattered seeds of those various species within the area. And due to the lack of rainfall this year, we're in the process of watering our wetlands this summer. In addition to that, we have to go in and pull weeds so we can pull the invasive species and try to get the various plants that we want in the wetlands to grow and flourish there. You can see a picture of the wetland area, which isn't looking terribly wet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you actually do that weeding yourself.

MR. JESPERSEN: I don't.

MR. GEMAR: It's my therapy. I get pissed off, I pull weeds.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Along with counting the cubic yards.

MR. GEMAR: I've had a lot of weeds pulled.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that also your job to count the cubic yards?

MR. GEMAR: That's Charlie's job.

MR. JESPERSEN: Relieve stress that way. And then finally, I won't belabor the information there on the IR05, dredge pond 7S, and Western Magazine, Larry did a nice job of presenting what we've been doing out there. So if anybody has any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Cris. Next is our regulatory update. And Brian, you are the sole regulatory agency.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Brian Thompson)

MR. THOMPSON: Holding down the fort. I see that both the DTSC and the Water Board have been working with the Navy to get the work plan -- agree on the work plan for the time critical removal action. We got a little hung up on what was actually going to happen in the IR-04 area. But it looks like we appear to have an agreement, so they're moving forward to address our comments, and I think we're approaching the public comment period. So that's good. I've been looking at underground storage tank sites for both the Navy-owned and Lennar-owned land that's taken -- it's nice to see movement forward on a lot of those UST sites. And I guess on a somewhat unrelated note, the Water Board has been getting calls about ships, the ones that are in the mothball fleet in Vallejo, and about a gunboat, I guess, that someone wants to bring to Mare Island. And so that's been an interesting new development to be involved in. And that's it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Brian. Next is our update, you want to go first?

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just wanted to give a report on the -- and hand out copies of the upcoming -- the agenda or the schedule for the upcoming 150th anniversary of the Mare Island Naval Ammunition Depot. And we had to extend the name a little bit, so it's a commemorative celebration of the 150th anniversary. 150 years of anything doesn't come along very often, and I'm very pleased that we've been able to very quickly put together a -- just a dynamite event if you -- I probably shouldn't have used that word. We're staying ahead of that time critical removal action. So thank you for delaying long enough, regulators, so that we can slip this event in before that -- those truckloads of materials start going through our area. And thank you to Weston Solutions and ECC and C.S. Marin Constructors on Mare Island, and some other organizations who have come forward so far as sponsors of the event. It's what's going to make it possible for us to keep it free. And to the City of Vallejo as well for making the property available to us that they manage for the State of California, as well as the Navy making access possible to the areas that they still own and manage. So, very briefly, Friday afternoon outings and guided tours, and then a little social hour in the evening with a bit of a champagne toast. And then up to the top of the hill, unless we have fog, for a sunset viewing. And then we have some ambitious painters who are going to night paint the Carquinez Strait area, and some star gazing. We're trying to pack in every kind of activity that might be possible in the area as it's slated for a regional park. We may be a little ways away from getting it open on a daily basis, but we think that getting people out there during this event is a way to test people's interest, and to also test our own thoughts, as many of us serve on the Regional Park Task Force, we're preparing a final report to the City of Vallejo on our recommendations for the use of the property as a regional park. So this will be a way to introduce the public in a day and a half as to what the area could be for them, and to gauge their interest in being park stewards, and whether they can really stand up to rattlesnakes, ticks, poison oak, and a potential exposure to ordnance. So that will be an interesting two days. And we're definitely looking for volunteers. We still need some sponsor money. And we're looking for a lot of people that will come out and have a good time.

Related to that, I attended the Port Chicago Explosion Memorial that the National Park Service does every year, this last Saturday out at the site. And in the process of being at that memorial -- it was very well attended with close to 275 people, and it was hosted by the Army because it is a Navy-owned but Army-managed marine terminal -- I learned that Vallejo, that Ryder Street -- maybe some of you knew this, but I didn't -- is where the so-called mutiny of the sailors took place,

the black sailors who refused to go back to work after the explosion. So according to the speakers that day from the National Park Service, and a man who's an author of a book who teaches at Cal, Vallejo is really the heart, the beginning of the modern civil rights movement. Because within the year the Navy had a desegregation plan, and within three years President Truman had introduced a -- an integration plan for all the services. So that's something that we're going to -- and, of course, Mare Island was the manager of the Port Chicago facility. So we're just continuing to find, I think, as we experience the place, the impact that it had on American military history as well as maritime history and now civil rights history as well. And the only other thing I'll tell you is that I met yesterday the grand great niece -- great grand nephew of the lighthouse keeper on Mare Island for 35 years. And he's going to be guiding a tour to the ruins of her home and her garden that's terraced up the south side of the hill on the way to the top of the hill. And it's just extremely exciting to be connecting with these people. He found her grave 35 years ago when he got out of the Navy in Florida and came out here, but it took 35 more years until I made the phone call that connected him with his great grandaunt's property. I mean, what she managed for us and for the Navy for 35 years as a widow. So it's -- we have a heritage to care for and take care of that inspires, at least, people like me every day. And I hope that two days will be a way to get a few more people in the community aware of the resources at Mare Island that we're all here to work hard to bring in to civilian use from the military use that it was. So that's all. That's my long comment for tonight.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Myrna. The Navy update is up there and you should all have a copy. We continued our field work at the DRMO, defense reutilization and marketing office, on our non-time critical removal action in the defense scrapyard area. And we are -- some soil confirmation samples were taken of the sidewalls and bottoms of the excavated pits, and we are awaiting results. We also completed, excavated our final two grids at the Marine Corps Firing Range finally. And we're contracting that out -- that was finally worked out -- and that was completed on July 18th, and we are expecting results any day on that. We are going to be participating, having a few people there on this 150th celebration. We received -- or we submitted one document since last month. And it was a response to regulatory agency comments on our draft supplemental site inspection in the fleet reserve pier berths one and two. We had our BCT meeting today actually, this morning. And early transfer is, I guess, still moving along. There have been some meetings back and forth with various individuals, different parties, City and Navy regulatory agencies, etcetera. We still plan -- the goal is to get that, you know, accomplished in, we say, early 2008. That is still the goal. And that's about it. Any questions?

MR. FARLEY: No.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Steve, would you --

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, I had one thing. This is a little off topic, but I just wanted to make sure folks heard about this. We have a Congressional Medal of Honor winner or awardee at the Mare Island cemetery, two actually. James Cooney is one of them, and his birthday is tomorrow.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We actually have three in Vallejo, two there and one over there.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: We'll go into our final public comment period. Is there any other comment from the public? If not, we will adjourn. We'll see you next time. Thank you, everybody.

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Onshore Update Production Manufacturing Area (PMA) and South Shore Area (SSA), Western Magazine Area (WMA), and Installation Restoration (IR) 05– Navy
- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area B2-1 Path Forward – Lennar Mare Island
- CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island Deliverables Schedule July 2007
- Mare Island RAB Update July 2007 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 2007

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:51 p.m.)