



FINAL MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

HELD THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, June 25th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:08 p.m. and adjourned at 9:24 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)
- Kenn Browne
- Michael R. Coffey
- Jerry Karr
- Paula Tygielski
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Tony Megliola (Navy)
- Ed Aromi (CH2MHill)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Stephen Watson (CH2MHill)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Janet Naito (DTSC)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Diji Christian
- Russ Farnell
- Wendy Plank
- Joe Railla
- Bill Stevens
- Marilyn Wong
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, everybody, we'll go ahead and get started. Welcome to the June, 2009, Mare Island RAB meeting. We'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the Navy Co-Chair and the BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen, I'm a resident of Mare Island, one of the lucky ducks.

MR. FARLEY: Is that like the Oregon Ducks or is that different?

MR. RASMUSSEN: It's a lot different.

MR. KAISER: Yeah. My name is John Kaiser, I'm substituting for Paisha Jorgenson who will be back next week on Monday. And, boy, does he have a bunch of reports to do.

MR. COFFEY: He's already behind.

MS. NAITO: Hi, I'm Janet Naito, project manager for DTSC.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth representing the City of Vallejo.

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, RAB member from American Canyon.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Vallejo resident, Napa Solano Audubon Society.

MR. BROWNE: Kenn Browne with the Solano group of the Sierra Club from Vallejo.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Diji Christian, tour guide and docent in the historical area.

MS. MOORE: Carolyn Moore with CDM.

MR. AROMI: Ed Aromi, CH2M Hill.

MR. MEGLIOLA: Tony Megliola with the Navy BRAC PMO WEST.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. PLANK: Wendy Plank, Iowa volunteer.

MR. FARNELL: Russ Farnell, Iowa Group, also known as HSMPS.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Jim Porterfield, ex-Mare Islander.

MR. RAILLA: Joseph Railla, architect with the Iowa group, and I also am a resident.

MR. WATSON: Steve Watson with CH2M Hill.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston Solutions.

MS. WONG: Marilyn Wong, Historic Ships Memorial, USS Iowa.

MR. STEVENS: Bill Stevens, Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific Square, USS Iowa.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Okay. We'll go ahead and get started with our first presentation. It is on the Building 680 Cleanup Plan having to do with the PCB sites. And it will be given by Steve Farley with CH2M Hill for Lennar Mare Island.

II. PRESENTATION: *Building 680 Cleanup Plan, Investigation Area (IA) C2*
Presentation by Mr. Steve Farley, CH2MHill

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Michael. Good evening, everybody, it's nice to be here. We're going to talk about Building 680. We've prepared a couple of documents recently.

Can everybody in the back hear me? Anybody having trouble hearing me in the back? No.

We've prepared a couple of documents recently, they're called a Notification and Cleanup Plan, two different documents. These two documents, one's called a Notification, this is a document that goes to USEPA. The other document, a Cleanup Plan, is a document that's prepared for DTSC. So we're going to talk about the actual purpose of this presentation, talk a little bit about the site identification, all the different PCB sites that are within the building, the proposed remedies, and then the schedule for implementing that remedy. So we're going to give you an overview of the planned actions. There are a number of different PCB sites in Building 680. We're going to go through those in a fair level of detail, but because there are so many it would be very difficult to go through them all.

The Notification and Cleanup Plan documents are in the repository at the JFK Library. If anybody has an interest in taking a look at them, they're over there now.

So we're going to talk about the details of those plans. Provide a status of agency comments. I have to say the agencies have been outstanding in their response. I'm not even sure the ink was dry and we had comments back. So that was a terrific thing. And then we'll talk a little bit about the schedule.

Building 680. I'm assuming, even if you don't know it, everybody knows Building 680. It's a photograph over here on the wall behind Chris, a view of Building 680 from the Vallejo side of the strait. One of the truly iconic buildings out here at Mare Island. It's quite a staggering building, both from its exterior looks and the inside. It's one gigantic open space, so it's really quite something. Yes, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: First of all, and a staggering photograph, thank you, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: I worked all day to get those birds to fly. They're actually not real birds, they're just plastic.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But they're not whatever those birds are.

MR. FARLEY: They're not osprey?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, those flamingos. No, they're not flamingos. I just wanted to make a very small historical comment on this building. Our friend Laurie -- Laureen Palmer Seward, whose father worked at the Naval Ammunition Depot from 1924 to 1955 as the porterman for hydraulics, started his career at Mare Island in 1917, and one of his first jobs was to work at this building at some point during his career, and in the machine shop. Maybe it isn't this building, but this -- I don't know when this was built. When was it? '36? Yeah, all right. So, okay, it was a different machine shop, forget the story.

(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I'll still tell you. The bridge --

MR. FARLEY: I knew you were going to tell me anyway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The bridge didn't work, and he didn't know that, he got to work early, and he started all the machines working. And he's a young man and he's just there and all the machines are working away, and nobody's at them. And the commander came along and said, "Young man, you know what you're doing?" "Yes, sir. And he said, "Oh, by the way, the bridge is broken, that's why nobody's at work."

MR. FARLEY: It's like the furnaceman that gets there first.

Okay. Located near the intersection of Nimitz and Oklahoma Street. It's basically very near the waterfront, a couple blocks off. As Myrna pointed out, constructed in 1936. A very heavy industry oriented building. A lot of fabrication, tooling, repair, maintenance. A lot of very, very heavy duty kinds of things in that building. We'll see some photographs of the interior of the building in a little bit, give you kind of an idea of the kinds of working platforms that they had.

The area around it -- it's down in IA-C2. The area around it is all slated for commercial/industrial. Just for everybody's purposes, this map over here on the right-hand side, there's Building 680, that's where it's located within the footprint of Mare Island right over there. The project that CH2M Hill is performing has sites that are listed in the consent agreement. The consent agreement is with DTSC, the State of California. And in that consent agreement there were three PCB sites identified. Since that time there were 45 other PCB sites that were identified. They happen to be relatively small kinds of things within the footprint of the building, a couple of electrical vaults, some machine bays, that sort of thing. So the total number of PCB sites has grown as part of the evolution of the process, and we're going to talk about all of these tonight. So everybody needs to sit back, put their feet up, we have a lot of information - - Myrna. The first floor of Building 680 is referred to --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Are these known unknowns or unknown unknowns?

MR. FARLEY: We're so far beyond that it's not even worth worrying about it anymore. But that's a fair question. But again, Myrna, thank you for the prompting. You'll see terms here tonight that are either AL or UL. AL is a Navy terminology that stands for assessment location, and they'll number them one through however many they find associated with the building. Tonight you'll also see the designation of UL, and you'll see, if you come up during the break and look at this map, you'll see UL's and AL's. The only difference is that the UL is a designation that CH2M Hill applied it to sites when it wasn't certain where they fit within the whole scope of the GFP, the Guaranteed Fixed Price contract. It doesn't affect what we're talking about here tonight, the scope is the scope, the work is the work, that's all something that is way behind the scenes. The building footprint is 226,000 square feet, inside that, in portions of it, are wood block floors.

I don't know how many folks have been in these buildings, but in a lot of these major industrial buildings they have, essentially it's -- they're like three by fives, or they're larger than a two by four but not quite a three by six, but they're fairly substantive chunks of wood, about four to six inches long, that are standing on end, standing grain up. And so when you look at the floor you see cross sections of the lumber. And there's 134,000 square feet of these wood block floors within that 226,000 square feet. The wood block flooring was part of the operational history of the building. Some other folks who have been around a lot longer than I can probably explain it. The way I understand it is it just basically was a -- it was sort of a softening surface in case

somebody dropped a tool. Is that right? Am I even close? Yeah. So if you look at -- here's Building 680, the first floor. Yellow is the wood block floor, and the gray color here is concrete. On this figure over here the yellow is the wood block floor, and the sort of orangish or pinkish color is the concrete.

So just to get an idea, there's a very large percentage of the floor of this building that is wood block floor. There have been numerous sampling events, and in some cases some removal events, that occurred back from about 1996 -- '95, '96 when the Navy started their preliminary assessment process for these PCB sites, all the way up until early 2009 -- and sort of fairly recent two months ago. The point is that the Navy started work way back in the nineties, and we've continued that work for AL01, which again is just the first floor of the building. There have been 240 samples collected. The maximum remaining concentration of PCBs in the floor of the building, I haven't attempted to designate between concrete and asphalt and wood block, but in the solid media is 42 milligrams per kilogram. The maximum indoor air concentration is 9.6 nanograms per cubic meter. A lot of folks haven't seen the 'ng' terminology before, it stands for nanogram.

The information that I'm going to summarize for all of these different sites, I refer to the page in the Notification and Cleanup Plan where you'll find the details, all of the details, all the sample numbers, all the media, all the individual concentrations that I've attempted to summarize here. So as we go through this you'll see a page six, a page nine, a page ten, that will help you get to sort of the meat of things quickly as you read through the Notification and the Cleanup Plan. Here's an indoor shot of Building 680, AL01. You can see here the wood block flooring. These chunks of lumber sitting here. I don't know exactly why this is in the condition it's in, but probably some past action that somebody performed years ago. And once these wood blocks, once you start pulling the wood blocks apart, for some reason they tend to just kind of fall apart, sort of like pulling pieces out of a puzzle, they started coming apart pretty quickly. So as you can see here, it may be a little hard to tell from back there, but in your handouts you'll see these sorts of runners of different colored material. This is the concrete that you see here in gray with the wood block flooring around it.

The mezzanine level, just like, you know, you go to the mall and there's a mezzanine level. Mezzanine levels are levels that are sort of halfway up the side of the building, and they're not really the entire floor, they're more the kind of floors that rim around the outside or just on the inside of the building. Within that mezzanine area there are three Substations, A-1, A-2, and A-3. The only one that is currently active is Substation A-2 and it's -- it provides the power for the adjacent Building 688. A-1 and A-3 are not currently in use. All of these substations have a cyclone fencing structure all the way around with a locked gate to prevent unrestricted or uncontrolled access. For these three mezzanine areas, again samples collected and/or removals occurred between '96 and 2004. 76 samples were collected from those areas. There's a maximum of 330 milligrams per kilogram in one of the substations, and the maximum indoor air concentration was 19 nanograms per cubic meter. This is the highest level of indoor air, total PCBs in indoor air in the building, this 19. And just to sort of jump fast forward, it's below the commercial industrial reuse standard for indoor air. So this says that the indoor air is not a problem. But we'll get to that.

Also, this is the highest concentration of PCBs remaining in solid media within all of Building 680. So these transformers were sort of the meat of the problem relative to current conditions

out there. Doesn't mean that they were the highest concentrations ever, the Navy's done a lot of work out there and these are the maximum remaining concentrations.

Here is Substation A-1. You can see it's a relatively small room, a lot of electrical equipment in here. I've shown this fence as a typical. If you see this TYP, what I'm trying to convey is this is just an example of what the fencing looks like for all of the transformers on the mezzanine level. So just refer to it as a typical. Typical fencing here, cyclone fencing, you can't see it very clearly on the photo, but there's a lock and a hasp that sits in here that keeps that gate closed. Lots of overhead piping and stuff. I think the biggest problem out here is banging one's head while they're wandering around inside the building.

The fifth floor of the building is only accessible by an elevator and a stairwell. The only identified source of PCBs is a former machine shop that's on the order of twenty by fifty feet dimensions, and it's got a wooden floor. I'll show you a photograph of that in just a second. And on page ten of the Notification and Cleanup Plan it provides this information. Again, lots of sampling events over time and some removal actions have been performed. Something on the order of 60 samples have been collected. The maximum concentration, I believe this is Aroclor 1260 -- for those who aren't familiar with PCBs, there are different Aroclors, they relate to the number and location of chlorines on the molecule. 1260 is one of the ones that are considered high risk PCBs. It's not uncommon out here to find 1254 and 1260, they're pretty commonplace out here -- Maximum concentration of any single Aroclor is 0.74. That's the maximum remaining. And for those who aren't familiar, this happens to be the USEPA Regional Screening Level, formerly known as a PRG. And this level, 0.74 milligrams per kilogram, is the RSL for commercial industrial use. So what that says simplistically is there's no action necessary for the fifth floor because the cleanup levels -- the max is actually below or at the cleanup level.

Indoor air, at 3.8 [nanograms per cubic meter], again below the commercial industrial number for indoor air. Here's a view of the Building 680 fifth floor location, former machine shop. You can see these lines, these red lines and these numbers and such that go all the way around, that was the grid pattern that we set out to do some confirmation sampling that we performed. And there were some wood removals. This is all wood flooring in here. And what you're actually looking at in here is about a second level -- you can see all the lumber that was removed here, and if you were not careful you would probably get lots and lots and lots of nail holes in the bottom of your shoes if you walked around out here. There's a lot of nails that are popping up here, so -- anyway, that's what the fifth floor looks like.

Then there's some deep maintenance bays. These are some of the sites that are considered UL's or unknown locations. There are five deep maintenance bays. And again, if you want to skip forward to the photographs while I'm talking, that would be okay too. The maintenance bays, they have depths ranging from about six to eight feet below ground surface. So if you think about them in terms of their structure, if here's the floor of the building, these deep maintenance bays are actually structures that are below the floor. So this is all open space underneath the steel grates that -- or the steel plates that sit on top. Now, there are some supporting structures underneath there, usually these things are concrete. They're supporting structures for the steel plates. Steel plates, I think I mentioned to a couple folks earlier, these steel plates were used to hold these gigs, and they have these grooves in them, and they used to -- the Navy would get the gigs in place to hold a propeller or a piece of submarine and get it all locked down tight, and then they would do the welding or grinding or whatever they needed to do. So the point is these steel plates are, they're very, very, very heavy duty and very stiff. They're certainly on the order of

four to six inches thick. So they're quite substantial. We don't think there was any use of the area underneath the steel plates.

The only likely uses for these deep maintenance bays was as part of the use of the steel plates as an equipment gig system. The structures or the space underneath was almost an incidental kind of thing and not related to the activities at these different bays. Page twelve of the Notification and Cleanup Plan shows, again, sampling and removal events between '96 and '06. In fact, not to repeat myself, -- '96, just about every single one of these sites that we're talking about had some sampling that occurred starting back in '96. What's important are these end dates though. We've done sampling all the way up, in some cases, to March of this year. At these bays it was back in '06. There are 111 samples from these five deep maintenance bays. So there's quite a lot of sampling. The maximum remaining concentration -- except for soil, the maximum remaining concentration is 25 milligrams per kilogram. There is some soil that has accumulated in some of these bays, in one of these bays, I believe it's UL08 which is right down here. There's actually some sediment, and that sediment has some PCBs in it, actually the highest concentration in soil, that 380 milligrams per kilogram.

This is a good example of the steel plates. It almost looks like wood in this photo, but they're not, they're very, very, very stiff, very structurally secure steel plates. In this case the steel plates actually cover this area. And these slots right here are actually grooves; if the plate looks like this, the grooves look like this. And what they would do is they would put basically a -- I don't know what they call it, it's not a bolt, but it would be a threaded piece that they would tighten up a bolt up here, it would pull this thing up tight, and it would match and seat against the inside of these grooves. And like I said before, to keep the gig system secure so they could work on equipment.

Then there are shallow machine bays. These things are very different, if you jump to the photographs. Basically the shallow machine bays are open structures, most commonly they're open structures that held a piece of equipment. They're usually only a few feet deep, and they commonly have some kind of pads or bolting systems where they held some kind of a piece of equipment, whether it was a stamping machine or a press of some kind. So these are very different kinds of structures. And most of the problems associated with these shallow machine bays are likely a direct result of the equipment that was bolted on top of or over that bay having PCB oils in it. So some kind of a stamping machine maybe had oil in it for some number of decades, and had PCBs in that oil, and that would be the likely source of the PCBs that we now find in the concrete within that bay. Page 16 of the Notification and Cleanup Plan again shows sampling as recent as 2008. 105 samples collected from these shallow machine bays. There's eighteen of them, maximum remaining concentration is only 29 milligrams per kilogram, and there's a wipe sample of 84 [micrograms per hundred square centimeters]. For those who aren't familiar, this is a unit, micrograms per hundred square centimeters. There's a template that you use to collect wipe samples, and it's basically ten centimeters on the side. And to collect a wipe sample you put that up against the piece of equipment, and then use a certain kind of swab to actually scrub that specific area. And then that sample, that swab would then be sent off to the laboratory for analysis.

So you knew what the area was that was swabbed, and you know the concentrations in the sample, now you know the density or the concentrations in the wipe samples. Wipe samples are used for non-porous surfaces, so metal, glass, steel, those kinds of things. Transformer cabinets, those types of things would most commonly be sampled with a wipe sample. All the other

porous media like soil, concrete, those types of media we wouldn't use a wipe sample for that, we would use a bulk sample which is like collecting a soil sample.

So here are the bays. And again, these things are relatively -- compared to the deep bays, they're relatively small structures. There are some that are relatively large, but they're not very deep. And you can see that there are different supporting structures here, long bolts that sat in here. You can see the evidence of some type of a former small pad. I suspect that a lot of this was affected by the dove bid sale of equipment early on. And this probably -- some of the structures in here may have been removed at the same time. It probably doesn't actually represent the sort of complexity of what was in this thing before the Navy moved out. It's really quite an entertaining building if you had the time. It's really fascinating to go in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If you're allowed in there.

MR. FARLEY: And that's a good point, Myrna. Because when I go in there I'm wearing health and safety gear. So don't go in there, but it is absolutely fascinating.

MR. COFFEY: Thanks.

MR. FARLEY: Sorry.

The elevated transformer platforms. If you want to look at your photograph on the next slide, there are 19 of these. They're basically transformers that are supported up within the superstructure of the building. Again, they're all non-porous materials like steel. There's one -- there was one elevated wood capacitor platform which was removed by the Navy some number of years ago. Again, sampling up through 2004. Because they're non-porous, all the samples -- the transformer platforms are non-porous, the samples collected were wipes, and the maximum remaining concentration is 170 micrograms per hundred square centimeters. Say that ten times real fast.

An example of one of the elevated transformer platforms. All of these things have numbering on them. The "T" is transformer. You'll see in the report that there's a number of samples that have a "T" in it or a "T" and then a series of numbers. This was the system that the Navy used to identify from which transformer the samples were collected. This happens to be UL31, but it's a fairly typical structure. And again, here you can see that there's a cyclone fencing here. And to get up here you have to come up a ladder and then jump across. And this is intended to keep people from getting in there without having some kind of appropriate access locks, keys, that sort of thing. I guess you could parachute in there.

But then there's two electrical utility vaults. They're only accessible by a manhole. If you look on the next photograph you'll see that it's a fairly benign looking structure, and there's just a manhole sitting there. And that's how you get down inside. These are located next to some of the electrical substations that are on the first floor. And what's really important about this is there are live electrical lines, live electrical conduits that are in these vaults and between the vaults and the substation. So you could sort of look at these, these utility vaults as being, for the sake of simplicity, if you had a piece of electrical equipment here and a source of electrical power here, these vaults, the wires run through them and, you know, the cables that are down there are probably an inch and a half or two inches in diameter. So you can imagine the amperage of electricity that flows through those things. They are very much a potential safety hazard. We take it very seriously.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why haven't they been mined already so they are -- for safety?

MR. FARLEY: Well, we did find a few bodies that were -- no, I'm kidding. It's amazing that people haven't been killed out here from that kind of mining of the copper. It's just incredible. It's a good thing, but -- So these vaults have been -- there's sediment that accumulated in these things over time. And so as a result of that, the Navy collected sediment samples from these electrical vaults. And the maximum concentration is 9.7 milligrams per kilogram.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Is the equipment in this building being maintained and managed by Island Energy at all?

MR. FARLEY: Yes, but -- Neal could probably talk to that better than I. Neal, do you want to take that?

MR. SILER: Yeah, Chris. All of those transformers that you saw on those elevated transformer platforms, those are all Island Energy equipment. So they're responsible for the maintenance of that equipment.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Thanks.

MR. FARLEY: And other than the electrical equipment that Neal just mentioned, there aren't any -- I'm not aware of any active pieces of equipment or anything of that sort, it's just -- it's just the electrical system that's being maintained. So here's the UL44, that's the manhole that feeds that. And if you look real close you can see that there's a hint of these wood block floors that surround that manhole. Okay.

So with all of that, what are the proposed remedies? The first floor, which is this large area over here, the yellow, we're going to remove all those wood blocks. So 134,000 square feet of wood blocks are coming out.

MR. COFFEY: And do what with 'em?

MR. FARLEY: They'll all be disposed of properly. We'll have to do some waste characterization testing ahead of time, but they'll all be disposed of properly. There's been lots of discussion about which landfill, can they be used as a -- do they need to go to incinerator, is there any resource value to them? All of those things will be taken care of before that stuff goes off. It's not evaluated at that level of detail in the Notification and Cleanup Plan, but it has to be something that we have to follow all those regulations. And clearly if there's any resource value to be gotten, I think everybody would agree that that's a wise thing to do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sell 'em in the gift shop;

MR. FARLEY: Little trinkets.

MR. COFFEY: Whittle them.

MR. FARLEY: If you want to give it a shot, Myrna. Okay. So we're going to -- let me back up one step here and just -- I don't know how many folks have spent much time looking at various portions of TSCA. Yeah, okay. Well, TSCA -- and I'm going to talk about this in very general terms, and if somebody has a very, very detailed working experience with TSCA, you may grimace at a few things. But in general TSCA is 40 CFR 761. And much of the things that we deal with here are in Subsection .61, so 761.61. And part A of that is what's called the Self-

Implementing Process. And that is the thing that directs us to write a notification. So a lot of the criteria for what needs to be done under certain circumstances, whether it be high occupancy, low occupancy, whether it be an encapsulation area or a capped area, all of those criteria either come out of TSCA or they come out of a document that was negotiated at the time of the transfer which is called the Consent Agreement Final Order.

And so you may hear me talk about the CA/FO as well. And there are different and potentially overlapping requirements and/or pathways, I should say, to get us from where we are to the agency acceptance of the cleanup. So a lot of these criteria, like this 25 milligrams per kilogram, it comes out of one or more of those regulations. We could spend all night talking about that one bullet and which regulation. So my point is that I'm not intending to go into 761.61.A.7 or 40 CFR 8.A.2.I. I could, but I don't think we want to do that tonight.

So the idea is remove the wood blocks from the first floor. We're going to scabble the concrete. Scabbling is where you go in and just basically chip off the surface of the concrete. So if this was the concrete surface, we would come in and use a tool to scabble that and remove a quarter inch or more of that concrete surface. Then we'd go back and collect more samples. We've done a number of sampling activities out here. We've done a little bit of sort of quasi research -- hi, Paula -- where we'll go in and do scabbling to different depths to see what the vertical distribution of the PCBs are. They're most commonly related to oils that leaked onto the ground surface. And what you find is that it's usually very much isolated to the upper half inch or so.

So we're going to remove the concrete around some areas listed here where the concentrations are greater than 25, then we'll come back and we'll collect verification chip samples. And then after all of that is done and we've achieved those goals for those locations that exceed 25 [milligrams per kilogram], we're going to install a four to six inch concrete cap over the entire floor. Not the 135,000 square feet of the wood block, but the entire thing. Then we'll record a Land Use Covenant for the Building 680 footprint that -- it will actually be two different LUC's. One is for the commercial/industrial reuse of the site. That's the IA wide LUC that basically says you can't have sensitive uses out here. You can't have hospitals, you can't have daycare centers, those types of things. And then there will be a separate LUC or Land Use Covenant for the management of the encapsulated surfaces. So this cap will have a separate requirement for managing that surface to make sure that it stays in place and that it does its function. Chris, did you have a question? I can --

MR. COFFEY: Steve, I got one.

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

MR. COFFEY: You were talking about putting the cap over the floor. What about all the bays, are they going to be all filled?

MR. FARLEY: You stole my thunder.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, damn.

MR. FARLEY: So we'll have to do -- the cap will be four to six inches.

MR. COFFEY: So you're going to level the floor?

MR. FARLEY: We're going to level the floor. So basically what we're going to do, those areas that are deeper than six inches below the current grade, they'll be filled and brought back up. So instead of -- so look at it --

MR. COFFEY: Filled with like solid concrete?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: Damn.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you have some magic plan for this building, you know, a dog park or something? Why are you going --

MR. COFFEY: Flea market.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, flea market. Why are you going to be filling those bays when the next user might need those bays? I mean, what would be the point of using that much resource, that much concrete to just go around filling up big old holes?

MR. FARLEY: Because the level of effort to remove the -- all of that -- it's two parts. One is to go in and do sampling in all of these different -- there's about fifty individual locations out there. And you can see the distribution of these little boxes and squares and stuff. If we were to go in and to try and treat every one of these as an individual site, and to try and clean them all up for a use that has come and gone, these bays are unique structures that the Navy used. If you roll back to some of those photos I showed you before, they have bolts and they have bollards and all kinds of structures in them that make them useful for one purpose. They don't have a general purpose. And the idea is that by having a floor that's a flat floor with a -- with a smooth surface, if you will, with a lot of -- without a lot of ups and downs and holes and bays and such, will actually make the property essentially more functionally valuable.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But is that your purpose for environmental cleanup is to make the building more functionally usable? I mean how is that --

MR. FARLEY: Whenever somebody does a cleanup, one of the first things you have to figure out is what will the future use be? How will your future use affect the reuse of the building? And what are the things that control both those uses and cost and the maintenance activities. And there's lots and lots and lots of variables. And yes, Myrna, one of the things that one evaluates is how will the remedy affect -- in fact, we'll see this in the IR-21 presentation -- how will the remedy affect the future use of the property? And the judgment that's been made is that based on the past use of those subsurface structures, and the fact that they're relatively helter skelter, and the deep bays have a very specific kind of past use and a very specific kind of future use that don't -- that aren't likely to be related to the future uses that one could bring to that building, the best approach is to go ahead and end up with a nice flat contiguous surface inside the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. I'll just ask one more question. I'm looking through your previous elements of your presentation and I guess I'm a little confused about why you would be capping the floor because you didn't show us that there was any need to cap the floor in any of these really low numbers that you told us about.

MR. FARLEY: 40 CFR 761.61 A, B, and C, and the CA/FO paragraph seven and eight all define the concentration criteria and the uses associated with those criteria that require certain activities be done. So, for example, if you have a structure that has, or a surface that has greater than 25 milligrams per kilogram in it, and it's a high occupancy area, which this building will be, then you must remove that or you have to define it as a low occupancy area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, that's understandable. But I guess I'm just looking at everything you've shown us so far and it's -- up until right now it's, everything sounds like it was a good to go as you went along. So I'm just surprised that all the sudden now, oh, gee --

MR. FARLEY: It is good to go.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- we are going to have to actually cap the entire two football fields.

MR. FARLEY: That's right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And it's confusing.

MR. FARLEY: Well, what's good about it is the concentrations aren't that high. They require certain actions be taken, but they're not that high. They're higher than would -- for example, they're higher than you could leave in a high occupancy, even in a commercial industrial area. They're higher than you could leave in a commercial area without some kind of controls. So, for example --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, well, you didn't say that. Up until now you've said everything was good, everything was below, blah, blah, blah, blah. So I'm just confused, but now I guess I won't be. We better go on or we'll never get this through.

MR. FARLEY: The mezzanine level there are these three substations. We had this 330 [milligrams per kilogram] in this one, we're going to go in and double wash the floor. Then we'll put an epoxy coating on top of it. Record an LUC for the encapsulating surface. In Substation A-2, the maximum concentration in concrete was 12 [milligrams per kilogram]. That allows for no action beyond the recordation of low occupancy LUC. Remember this is a substation so low occupancy LUC is an appropriate measure. Substation A-3, again the concentrations are on the ordinary of 30 and 11 [micrograms per square centimeter] in the wipe samples. And we'll record a low occupancy LUC for that area as well.

We will do some work on the staircase. Another thing is that the 40 CFR also has some requirements for signage. If you ever go out to a PCB site and you see this big yellow and black sign that says PCBs and caution, that signage is actually what's called the ML mark, it's required under 40 CFR. The fifth floor is the former work area, the machine shop area. The maximum concentrations up there, as I mentioned before, were -- was 0.74 [milligrams per kilogram], so no cleanup actions are necessary.

This -- the samples at this location meet the commercial industrial number. The deep maintenance bays. The only thing that needs to be done there, except for putting a cap over 'em, is we have to remove some sediment in soil in a particular portion of that where the concentrations exceed a hundred. So we're going to go in, remove some sediment, pump the water from the bays. And then we'll record an LUC for management of that encapsulating surface. Shallow bays we're going to have to remove some concrete where the concentrations exceed 25 [milligrams per kilogram]. There's some debris and some other stuff in there that we have to remove in order to build the cap. And again, we'll record an LUC for the management of the encapsulating surface.

The elevated transformer platforms. Again, these are steel structures so we're going to go in and do some double wash and then rinse them off and collect some verification samples. And when that's all done we believe we'll be done as long as there's a commercial/industrial LUC on it. And

then these electrical vaults that I mentioned before, the two of them, there's some sediment in there that needs to be removed, we'll go in and remove that.

So jumping sort of fast forward to one other thing. Over the course of the last few years we've collected thirteen indoor air samples. And some of these have been collected at our initiation, and some have been done at the request of DTSC and USEPA and so we've gone ahead and collected those samples. And I think I mentioned early on the maximum concentration in the indoor air was 19 nanograms per cubic meter, which is below the industrial RSL of 22. So no further sampling of the indoor air is proposed.

The schedule for this. We submitted the Notification and Cleanup Plan, which I mentioned earlier was over in the JFK Library, back on the 22nd of May. We had an agency briefing and site walk on June 2nd. We got USEPA's comments on the 10th, which we very much appreciate. And from DTSC we received comments on the 23rd. We're expecting some additional comments from HERD, which is their risk assessment group over in Sacramento. Those are pending, but we actually expect those tomorrow.

We'll prepare responses to those comments sometime in early July. Hope to get the document -- a final review and approval of the final document in July -- late July. Mobilize sometime in the fall. And hopefully the work will be continued and -- completed by sometime in the spring of 2010. So that's the big picture for Building 680. I encourage you to grab the Notification and the Cleanup Plan, they are actually two separate documents. One has -- and Myrna, I think you've raised some good questions tonight. The Notification process is focused on the USEPA PCB requirements. The Cleanup Plan which we've prepared for DTSC for the same site focuses on DTSC's process for closure of site. So there's overlap between those, but they address very distinctively different purposes and regulatory criteria. So yes, in the back.

MR. FARNELL: You mentioned about there being a live power under the floor there. Did someone from Island Energy was there with you to put meters on it saying about how much or --

MR. FARLEY: No, we haven't gotten to the point of determining exactly what the voltage or amperages are. What we know is there's live -- there are live conduits through that building. Before we do anything all of that stuff will be, you know, confirmed and power shut off, that sort of thing. Neal may have some additional information on that. But I don't -- I didn't mean to imply that we had any kind of discrete measurements of that, we just know that there are some live wires in there, and when we're working inside that building we're very, very cautious.

MR. FARNELL: I was just also going to ask for the group here, is Island Energy the sole company responsible for power on the whole island, or is there anyone else?

MR. RASMUSSEN: No, they're it.

MR. FARNELL: Okay. I presume they are copied on some of our paperworks and reports? Cause sooner or later some of their cables are going to go near our areas that we're digging.

MR. FARLEY: You know, I have to be honest with you, it's interesting because I was actually looking through the CC list today and there, I think we had -- how many folks did we put on the CC list for the RAB or for the public meeting last night? There were nine hundred people, I think, or something like that. And so I don't -- to be honest with you, I don't know what the

notification process is for the environmental documents to Island Energy. What we do know is anytime we work around any of their equipment, anytime, they're the first folks we call.

MR. FARNELL: Okay. That's basically what I just wanted was a better understanding. Thank you. Russ Farnell, Iowa group.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I only have one question and that's on the mezzanine level, your proposed remedy. You say you're going to double wash and rinse the exposed concrete. Would you just explain how you do that?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, it's -- am I there? Where am I? Okay. This is -- Myrna, you have a knack at pulling the question from the deepest portions of the well. And that's a compliment as much as it is, "Oh, why did she ask that?"

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, if it's any help, the reason I want to know is because we have a bomb magazine that needs a floor wash, so I thought maybe if you could figure -- you knew how to do it here, you could send your team down there.

MR. FARLEY: And I -- call me. So here's the way this works. 40 CFR 761.61 -- yeah, well now you know how I feel. Myrna, write down the following, Supart S. Okay. There's a very specific protocol for -- Janet, are you aware of this one? Yeah. Supart S is a very prescriptive protocol for washing surfaces. And you literally are required to use a certain kind of scrubbing system, a certain kind of agent, like Hexane, and you have to scrub each square foot for one minute. Then you have to rinse it. Then you have to scrub that one square foot again for one minute. There is no requirement to collect confirmation samples after that, but you have to follow that protocol for every single square foot. And the -- the Supart S requirement is really something that's intended for concrete that hasn't lost its useful life, and so -- and that's the case here that the floors are still good, the mezzanine level or these substations are still there, they're still active or they have the potential to be active, and so we're going to go in and do that Supart S washing. So the short answer is Supart S.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then is that material collected into a tank or --

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, all of those kinds of things are -- they have to be handled according to code.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay. And then I see that your encapsulation, you have a LUC on that so that if it starts to wear.

MR. FARLEY: That's right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it a two color deal?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, exactly. Two coats of contrasting color, epoxy coats. So if one -- let's say they're blue and yellow or something. If the blue one wears out, you know that it's wearing out when you start seeing the yellow pop up and you know that the surface is wearing out, and that's a really good example of some of the LUC's that, the elements of the LUC that would have to be written for these encapsulated sites.

MR. KARR: The floor areas that have the wood floor, the ingrained timbers, what's below that, is that concrete?

MR. FARLEY: Concrete. Yeah, it's all concrete.

MR. KARR: And do you have it in your plan once you remove all of that wood to then test the concrete?

MR. FARLEY: In some areas -- in the areas where we're going to remove the concrete, yes. But in the areas where we're removing the wood block floor, no. And that's completely consistent with requirements of 761.61. So --

MR. KARR: So only in those areas where you have a problem with the wood now?

MR. FARLEY: Exactly. In fact, that's the way to look at it. In those areas where we have problems in the wood surface, we're going to go in and fix the wood surface by removing it, and then doing some work in the concrete, and then testing that. In the places where the concentrations in the wood, where the oils spill directly out of the equipment, where those levels are high enough that something has to be done, but not too high or above the level that they can be capped, then we won't do any sampling there. Does that make sense? There's a threshold basically that says, if I am above this level to that level, anywhere in here, those concentration ranges I can cap. That's an acceptable remedy. If I'm above -- if I'm below this I don't have to do anything. If I'm above this level I have to do something else to get me down to here, or something else to get me in this range, and then I would install a cap.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And concrete cap is considered sufficient?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, it has to be. It has to have a certain thickness, but a concrete cap is, it's completely suitable and acceptable, yeah.

MR. KARR: Well, the --

MR. FARLEY: And so if we don't -- sorry, Jerry. This is a good example of where the differences are between a concrete cap and an encapsulating surface. A concrete cap has a certain kind of design criteria. And an encapsulating surface, like the epoxy paint that Myrna was pointing out, has a different kind of criteria. And what you can do in areas to encapsulate is different than what you can do in areas that you cap. And it's a very intertwined kind of thing, and it's very -- I won't say it's complicated, but there's lots of different things that you have to look at and be very careful about not missing something on, so --

MR. KARR: Well, the only concern I have is that in the wood floor area, as old as that building is, there's a -- I think there's a potential that there could have been previous spills and wood was replaced and it's not obvious. Because I know intimately how lackadaisical we treated transformer oil and Aroclor forty years ago when we were just so happy with how well it waterproofed our boots and kept our hands soft. So, you know, there's plenty of potentials there, and this might be one of those unknown unknowns that we need to take another look at.

MR. FARLEY: What we've -- the thing that we focused on tonight, just for the sake of the sort of timeframe, is to look at the data quite simplistically. If you look at all of the data for the wood block flooring you only have a few areas where you have an indication of a serious problem. Now, there are levels clearly that are above the levels that I can just say I don't have to do anything at, but there don't appear to be any monstrous areas, or there don't appear to be areas where you had, if you're looking down on it, in the floor where you have concentrations that are relatively low and then some location -- or maybe relatively high, and then some location that may represent a floor that was removed where all of the sudden the concentrations take a nose-dive.

We don't find those. In other words, we don't find step functions in the data except in areas where we see that there's some kind of a significant surface staining. The other thing is that we focused on the maximums, but the data, I hate to use the word compositing but that's kind of what it is. We've worked with DTSC very closely to make sure that the way we're handling the data is also suitable for the kind of evaluations that we're doing. And so looking at the data on a point by point basis isn't what the regulations intend, it's what I presented tonight for the sake of getting through this. The point is that we're looking at all of the concentrations to make sure that we don't have any unacceptable concentrations in the wood block that would keep us from putting the concrete cap on. Anything else?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Steve. Why don't you stay up there and go into your second presentation on IR Site 21 update?

III. PRESENTATION: *Installation Restoration (IR) Site 21 Update*
Presentation by Mr. Steve Farley, CH2MHill

MR. FARLEY: Okay. So IR-21 is an area within a building, we'll get to a map here in a -- in fact, let's go to the third slide there, Kenn, or the second slide. Yeah, go to the third slide. Let's see here. Yeah. Let's go to the fourth slide, and we'll kind of work backwards. What I'm trying to lay out is there are three large buildings and we've got some photographs in here. There's three large buildings on the scale of Building 680 that are side by side, 386, 388, and 390. IR-21 is within a portion of Building 386.

So as we go through this discussion I'm just going to refer to it as IR-21 for the sake of simplicity, but recognize that the actual site, there are actually two sites, there's the Building 386, 388, 390 area, which is a Group II/ III Site defined by the Navy, and there's an IR-21 area which is the Group I Site. And what we're going to talk about here tonight is the Draft Feasibility Study Remedial Action Workplan, the FS/RAW. And this is something that we're doing, Myrna, in response to your request from the last RAB meeting. We gave a presentation on this back in March, but because we have a public comment period coming up, Myrna wanted to have us do this tonight so that everybody knew what the current conditions were, and that might help folks get through the FS/RAW. So we're going to go through the site features. We're going to talk about the RAB presentation real quickly in March. Summarize the environmental issues, the remedies considered, why it was chosen, and the timeframe for implementation of the remedy. And maybe, more importantly, the opportunity for folks to provide some public input. So here's Building 386, 388, 390. This is, I believe, the northeast corner of the building. XKT is in this corner; is that right, Neal?

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: This is in the middle of IA-C2. So this is C-2. The dry docks sit in here. Building 680 is right in here. So Building 680 -- or Building 386 is behind 680 in that photograph over there. If you go to the next slide, this is IR-21 right here. This is called the quench tank area. The rest of this area is Buildings 386, 388, and 390. So you can see IR-21 is very much a small portion of this overall area that's being evaluated.

This area here you're looking basically down in this direction to the south. You're looking basically to the southwest here. This is a good example of some of the heavy industrial structures and pieces of equipment inside the building. There's a dirt floor area. All of this is

dirt floor. I don't know why the Navy had dirt floor in some areas, concrete in others, wood block floor in others, but I suspect it had to do with the kinds of heavy industry. I can imagine that if they had a bunch of, you know, open hearth furnaces and other things that created lots of sparks they wouldn't really want to have wood block flooring with oil sitting on top of them. That's -- is that -- am I close?

MR. FARNELL: Yes.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, okay. And then the other thing is this area over here called the steel grate area. So within this large superstructure there's quite varied kinds of historical and current uses. XKT is occupying at least these portions of the three buildings. Back in March we gave a presentation on this site. At that time we were preparing a document referred to as a Feasibility Study, Remedial Action Plan or an FS/RAP. And I'll get to what's important about that in a moment. That document was submitted to the agencies in early February of '09. As I mentioned before, this site is a former metal working facility. It was constructed in the twenties, which is actually before Building 680. And in that March presentation we went through all of these details, the nature and extent of contamination, all the human health and eco risk issues, cleanup goals, schedule and path forward, all of those details were in that previous investigation. This is a summary of those details.

We've got separate phase hydrocarbons, separate phase petroleum hydrocarbons in the subsurface in some of the trenches and borings. We have Aroclor 1254 and Endrin. Endrin is one of the organochlorine pesticides. They were detected in but one groundwater sample from two wells. Those results are actually below the reporting limits. So if the laboratory reporting limits were here at some concentration X, the detected concentrations in those samples were actually down here. So the labs are required to report those numbers as being estimated, so they indicate that there was something there but the concentrations are really uncertain. But maybe more importantly, these samples, there were only one groundwater sample from two wells that had these constituents in them.

Total petroleum hydrocarbons is diesel and motor oil, in the downgradient areas are below Tier II levels. And downgradient is to the east towards Mare Island Strait.

Soil gas results. There was soil gas that was done out here, and all those results are below screening levels. And then we did a human health and an eco risk assessment. And the human health side of things and the eco side of things treat things very, very differently. Human health is a very quantitative kind of process, potential excess lifetime cancer risks within the risk management range. Non-cancer hazard indices below or within the range. The point is that this is a very quantitative kind of thing. And what we found here was that all the cancer risks, all the excess lifetime cancer risks are within the risk management range.

So to go back to what Myrna said before, what that means is that there's not an unacceptable level of constituents in the soil and groundwater at this site. It's protective of human health. For non-cancer constituents, they look at a number called a hazard index. And in this case all the hazard indices are below one, which is where you want it to be. So human health, quantitatively human health is okay. Eco side of things really treats things very qualitatively. And most importantly they look at is there any viable habitat. Well, because this area is completely covered over with pavement, asphalt, building structure, there are no risks to terrestrial receptors because there's no habitat. In the case of potential impacts to groundwater on aquatic organisms, it's too far from the strait to be considered of concern. So eco risk assessment said there's no

unacceptable impacts to aquatic -- or excuse me -- ecological or risk ecological receptors and human health. The quantitative number showed it's not a problem. Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: You have except construction worker and utility worker. Why are they excepted?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, let's go back to that. There are three or four different remedies -- not remedies, but there are three different pathways that are evaluated. There's the commercial industrial worker, and that's really what I was focused on. That's somebody who works out there 40 hours a week, you know, 250 days a year, etcetera. And in that case these are well within the risk management range. The construction and utility worker, that's evaluated based on a different number of square inches of contact area, and they have a different kind of contact with the soil and groundwater. Human health doesn't consider drinking water cause there's no drinking water out here. But the construction worker, it's assumed that that person's hands will be down in that water for eight hours a day or something on that order. So it actually has a higher contact time, but it has a lower number of days per year, and so it actually, in this case it's -- in many cases it's the most rigorous exposure scenario. So for the human health risk assessment, the only issues are for the non-carcinogenic exposures to the construction worker, not to the commercial industrial worker. But I'm glad you pointed that out.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I was just wondering why they were excepted.

MR. FARLEY: Well, we actually have to do something because of that, so watch what happens next. Now, partially in response to the community co-chair's comments at a public meeting last night, we wanted to make sure --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I noticed.

MR. FARLEY: -- that all, all of the remedies considered were highlighted. So there are five on this and there are four more on this page. So in total there are nine remedies. Did I get the math right?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, eight.

MR. FARLEY: I was asking because I knew there was only seven, but there's a 5A and a 5B, and so --

MR. COFFEY: There's a hidden element, it's an unknown unknown.

MR. FARLEY: So, in all of these feasibility studies, one must include the No Action Alternative. I don't know of any feasibility studies that selected the No Action Alternative, but it has to be included. So if you look at these different alternatives, they build upon one another. So the No Action Alternative doesn't have any Land Use Convenants, doesn't have any groundwater monitoring, or any of those kinds of things.

The Alternative 2 has implementation of an LUC, meaning they're going to restrict it from sensitive uses, and a long-term groundwater monitoring program. Now, just to make a point here, the long term groundwater monitoring component of these different alternatives is really something that is to be determined. In most cases we include those costs in a remedy, but the actual scope of the groundwater monitoring program that may need to be implemented, really in part depends on what we find and what we remove, what the final concentrations in the soil are, etcetera. But we've included it here, but just recognize this is something we have to negotiate with the agencies before we get to closure. So they all have a component of groundwater

monitoring. They all have an LUC. And what they build on is excavation in some places, encapsulation in other places. And if you go through this process, each one builds on the next. The final -- the final remedy or the final alternative that was evaluated is basically to get rid of it all, dig it all up and haul all of it off-site. So Alternative 1 was do nothing, and Alternative 7 was to dig it all up. And so the stuff in between are the other evaluations that we've done by tweaking certain kinds of assumptions and certain types of activities. And what we settled on, considering all of the factors -- and these are the criteria that were used.

Myrna also was pointing out that she wanted to know what the technical rationale was for making decisions. The information on this slide shows all the technical rationale that was used. And so based on all of that information, cost, implementability, and we also have to even consider, well, how many truckloads are you going to haul out of here, and what's the increased probability of a car accident because you have so many truckloads going in and out. All of those kinds of criteria are to be evaluated. And what we settled on, considering all of those criteria, was Alternative 5B. You have a map -- if I can just grab this -- it's figure 10-4. And 10-4 shows the -- essentially the areas that are going to be excavated or encapsulated as part of the alternative. So first of all we're going to excavate and dispose off-site soil containing diesel and motor oil and lead in the 386 area above the cleanup goals in the following areas; The quench tank area, which is the area up in the upper left corner where it says IR-21. In fact, if you look at the legend you'll see that there's a color that relates to excavation. It's the -- I think it's the blue line, yeah, I think sort of a light blue line. So the excavation is going to occur in these areas. Or look on the map, it's the areas that are outlined in blue. Excavate that area. In other areas we're going to encapsulate the existing contamination. And those are the areas that are shown with the red outline.

Once all of that is done -- and there's a lot of detail here, encapsulate the existing floor in 382, 388, 390; address TPH motor oil. The point is that you'll see on the map where we're going to excavate and where we're going to encapsulate. And then once that is all done, we'll have an LUC that will prohibit the sensitive land uses like hospital, daycare center for kids. And another LUC that will control activities that may disturb the cap.

The last component is the long term groundwater monitoring. That may or may not be necessary based on the results of the confirmation sampling that we do once the work is completed. So again, that will be something we negotiate with the agencies. Here are all of the criteria. These are the seven criteria. Is it protective of human health and the environment? Is it compliant with ARARs, Applicable, Relevant, and Appropriate Requirements? Does it have short term effectiveness? Does it have long-term effectiveness? Is it effective in reducing the toxicity mobility? All of these criteria were evaluated. And based on all of these criteria, the conclusions at the end were that it's the most cost effective and suitable remedy for the site. Okay. So the FS/RAP went in in February.

We received agency comments in May. And one of the major things that they suggested to us based on the cost was that this document should not be a RAP but it should be a RAW, so a Feasibility Study/ Removal Action Workplan. It provides the same -- it's the same basic tool, but there are a few little subtle differences. The public comment period for this -- or excuse me. We expect to submit the draft final document to the agencies at the end of June, so sometime in the next few days or so. So we're going to -- we did submit an FS/RAP, we're going to submit an FS/RAW at the end of June. Get public comments in early July. Hopefully submit the final

FS/RAW in September. Begin the work in the winter of '09. And then the implementation report in 2010.

Okay. So again, the primary purpose of tonight's presentation is to give you sort of an overview of what the document that is in public review or will shortly be in public review, what it says, so as you grab that and review it you have basically a sense for what it already says. Sort of an executive summary of the document that is in public review. Okay. Any questions on that? Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Steve. We're going to go into our first public comment period. Yes, Wally.

MR. NEVILLE: I'm going to give my two cents worth on wood block floors as I know it because I spent many, many hours in the shop. Those floors were primarily a safety feature because the end block would soak up the oil and catch the chips, which were very dangerous on concrete floors if you didn't. And then when the blocks no longer provided that safety feature and they got soaked and filled with chips, they would replace them. And they did on a regular basis. I doubt that there was any week that you couldn't go down to that shop where the machine shop is and not find them replacing wood blocks. So as Jerry was asking, they were replaced often, and there were always new blocks there. And every place on the yard that had machining processes where chips were scattered and oil was there had wood block floors. Other buildings besides that one if you probably have been there have found wood block floors. And that's what the primary purpose of that was. And as I said, they were often replaced and regularly.

MR. FARLEY: So it's more a function of --

MR. NEVILLE: Safety.

MR. FARLEY: -- of the -- it's not a function of the safety for the equipment or keeping from damaging the equipment, it was for humans.

MR. NEVILLE: For the workers. Especially in high traffic areas, because it could be very slick and dangerous otherwise. So that's why they were wood block, end grain, and replaced often.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Is there any other public comment.

MR. STEVENS: I've heard reference to a public meeting that was held yesterday or last night. Was there a public comment period?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, you're within the public comment period.

MR. STEVENS: But last night was there a meeting?

MR. FARLEY: And there was a meeting last night.

MR. STEVENS: And that meeting was on the Triangle Area?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. STEVENS: Okay. We were not notified, and we're Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific Square, we have the largest single contingent that you have at every meeting every month here. We spent over \$110,000 on pro bono services engineering that pier for the Iowa, and we're a

little miffed that we weren't. And we spent -- I lost \$400 or \$500 last week in delayed airplane flights for technical staff to try to attend a meeting that was supposed to happen. And we were completely ignored in this process. I'm concerned about the communication patterns and the -- actually the public comment section if you're excluding one of your largest contingents who continues to show up here. So I really want a review on what happened and who you're notifying. And we did, we reached out, we were talking with people trying to get a bead on the -- last month's comment or declaration that there was going to be a public comment period. We were reaching out to you guys, and we never heard back. And we lost money and we lost time and resources, and we missed that meeting last night.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually, you did hear back from me. You did -- I did forward your request regarding what date that meeting would be held to Neal Siler at Lennar, and he did respond to us that it was a bit of a moving target. But maybe he could follow up on -- I hoped that they were going to, you were going to be on the mailing list, and I am not a part of the public -- of that process, that's outside of the Restoration Advisory Board, so I was acting as the messenger. And if you fell through the cracks, I personally apologize. I wasn't aware of the meeting date either until I -- I mean several of our RAB members weren't until they got a notice from the county supervisor who was on the list, some of the RAB members weren't. So there's a little bit of confusion about the quality of that list.

MR. STEVENS: Yeah, there's a degree of confusion. Bill Stevens, Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific square.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Neal's here, and I bet you he's going to follow up on your concerns.

MR. SILER: Yeah. And I've had some communication today with the staff, and we apologize for that, somehow you got left off. My understanding was from DTSC and the public participation people that you were on there, but somehow it slipped through the cracks. Now, what I've done is I've offered to actually have you guys come into the office where I can go ahead and we can go through that with you on a very, very face-to-face and talk about it. But we've done some things. I've notified some people today about updating the mailing list. We're going to have to go back over and take a look at that mailing list. There have been a lot of changes over the last year, and we're going to have to take a look at not only the residential people, but probably some of the tenants and some of the other people. And I apologize for that. And we're going to do everything in our power to make sure it doesn't happen in the future.

MR. STEVENS: I appreciate that, Neal. Thank you. We're going to take Neal up on that. We're boarding over 40 people in two weeks from the state of Iowa, from the State of California, also from Lennar, and we want to be -- and they're going to be visiting the pier site too, okay. So they're seeing the ship and they're seeing the whole package. The state of Iowa passed a resolution supporting the Iowa's berth and location at Mare Island, and you have representatives coming forward. I want to make sure that I'm up to speed and up to date on this because it affects what we're doing, it affects our budget line, it affects our timelines, it affects everything. So I need to be articulate with people of very credible substance. That's one of my main concerns. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You are getting the Navy mailings?

MR. STEVENS: Yes.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yes. Okay. Yes. Any other public comment?

MR. FARNELL: Russ Farnell, Iowa group. First, I would like to express my gratitude to the person who took roll last May meeting. You got my name on there as being one of the persons here. I want to thank you for thinking I should be here even though my body wasn't, but thank you very much. On the lighter side. The next side is we'll all recall, I'm sure, a couple of months ago we had Marie in front of us talking to us and telling us that they've been taking soundings out there in the Bay. And they had nice pictures and the whole works. And of course we, myself and Myrna, followed up quite well in blasting poor Marie with saying she didn't have very few details. And that she said maybe next month or for sure this month she'd tell us a little more. Well, I'm disappointed she's not here, and I'm just curious, I'd like to address the group, has anyone heard how they're doing or if they are progressing on this in bringing something to us before October?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, we have our contract let to do the remedial investigation for the Offshore Area. And we had some discussion about presenting some of the data or all of the data before that time. But our consultant who is working that is going through all that as we speak. I mean, all the data from previous and the data that we just collected in 2008 and January, February of this year. So if we can do it prior to that time we definitely will. But for us to come back last month or even this month, that consultant isn't -- we wouldn't be ready to do that as well as you would like. So that's why.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. So is there a guesstimate as to before October, like Marie was saying she'd have all the stuff by then.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, that's when the -- that's when the document is supposed to come out October 15th, and so hopefully we would see it in September before then, because obviously we would like to see it. And then obviously if we can do it before then we would.

MR. FARLEY: That's basically my question this time. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You bet. Any other public comment? Okay. Why don't we go ahead and take a break, and then we'll come back and get into the third presentation -- yeah, a short break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. PRESENTATION: *Time Critical Removal Action for Paint Waste Area (Draft Action Memorandum/ Interim Remedial Action Plan Amendment) Update*
Presentation by Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, everybody, we'll go ahead and get started. Our third presentation is going to be on the Time Critical Removal Action for the Paint Waste Area. We have an Action Memo and an Interim Remedial Action Plan combined document out. It's an amendment, but we're going to give an update on the site. It will be given by Dwight Gemar with Weston as some of the folks that were going to be giving it are not here, and Dwight is here. And so take it away, Dwight.

MR. GEMAR: As a proud member of the B team I'll be giving it -- actually I'd hoped to have Bob O'Brien here, one of our nuclear engineers and an ex-Mare Islander for about thirty years, but he couldn't make it so I'm going to soldier on or sailor on as the case may be. This is an aerial view of the Paint Waste Area. Maybe first I'll just mention that this is how it looks currently. It's just a flat area, just some grass and some coyote bush presently on the site. And

this is an aerial view. The circular area here is a little upland area about two and a half acres, that's the Paint Waste Area site. This location there was some paint cans and other paint related debris that was stumbled upon literally back in about 2002. And the Navy did a removal action of the paint in 2004, I believe. And then subsequent to that they also did some sampling. And they determined that the levels of some of the chemicals that were remaining in the soil were of a level that were high enough to pose a risk to ecological receptors, or basically to non-human critters. And so this site was included as part of a Time Critical Removal Action back in 2007. It was one of four sites that was included. Also by way of history, this area was marshland at one point. This kind of somewhat diagonal small road between Azuar and Building 505 was basically the shoreline in the early 1930s, and there was basically dredge deposition further out to build this property, and further out to the west. Again, this is Azuar Drive here, and then this is G Street.

So if you're coming down G Street and you hit the dead-end of Azuar, and you look straight ahead of you to the west, that's basically where the site is. So there was chemicals in the soil that were the primary reason for the removal action; however, as I'll get into in the rest of the presentation, we did encounter radiological contamination, and also some munitions items that are indicative of what we often find on Mare Island at outfalls where they deposited dredge sediments. So let me summarize that for you real quick. And this was briefed, I think, back in May of last year, I think it was, when we gave a little update on the Time Critical Removal Action. So some of this is going to look familiar hopefully. But when we did a pre-radiological survey of the site before we started the excavation work, we actually started running into elevated levels on our detectors. And subsequently we found, quite near the surface, within the top foot, 133 radiological items or items that had elevated levels of radiation. Most of those were these luminescent deck markers that they had on board ships. But there was also some other miscellaneous items, and I have some other photographs on the next slide. And here's just a photograph of the technician that very slowly basically scans the surface with a detector, and based on the reading they can tell if there's an item out there. It's kind of similar to a metal detector, except it's looking for higher levels of radiation than the surrounding area. And then here is, in the lower left is a sampling of some of the munitions related items that were removed, including one live item. And this was removed from practically the first scoop, if you will, of the excavation when we thought we had removed all the radiological items, and we were starting to do the removal in the areas with the elevated chemical contaminants, and we started, and we ran into these munitions items. At that point we definitely had to stop and regroup and do some things to continue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Are those handcuffs?

MR. GEMAR: I don't even want to look at that photo. Technicians are getting out of control.

Here are some photographs of some of the items that were removed from the Paint Waste Area. And I mentioned that one of these luminescent dials, this is a smaller one, a three-quarter inch diameter that they kind of commonly refer to apparently as cat eyes. And I think these were, some of you ship guys could tell me, I'm sure, but these I think were placed near telephones or other strategic communication devices or whatever that would glow in the dark basically if it lost power. But also there is other items of various shapes and things that also were radioactive. And some of these items it's not clear to me what their purpose was, but they definitely do have a certain amount of radium, and we do have an instrument that can tell what type of radionuclei is present in all of these items that have been recovered at the Paint Waste Area are Radium 226.

And as you can see from this slide, the locations of the items that were recovered for the radiological items are pretty much scattered around the site, a little bit of extra concentration up here near the corner, but otherwise pretty much scattered about. And we did find that one munitions item, however, way down here in the corner. And our guess is that we will find more munitions items and more radiological items on this site.

So here's a point by point summary of how we intend to do the cleanup for the radiological items. The first step is to take that radiation detector that I mentioned and scan the surface of the soil. And basically determine if there are any items that we can detect that are above our investigation limit. And then we'll, of course, if we find those items we'll remove those items, double bag 'em, photograph 'em. Also if there's any soil, occasionally we detect an increase in radiation and we can't find a discrete item, it's just dirt, and a lot of times what that is is most likely flakes of radium containing paint that are just too small to be visible, but they are nevertheless -- they give off enough radiation to -- for the detectors to see 'em basically. So we collect that soil, and then we check the surrounding soil to make sure that the levels are back down to essentially background. And so we've collected some soil as well as discrete items. Then we also -- and I should mention that we also analyze soil samples as well for radium specifically. And we do this first four steps for each one foot interval as we excavate the site. And again, we're basically going to be chasing this outfall dredge debris from the surface down to as deep as it goes.

We think it may be six feet, but it could be deeper. And the reason we only do one foot at a time is because the detectors can only detect these radiological items down to about twelve to eighteen inches. That's because the soil itself provides shielding. If you remember anything from your chemistry classes that you might have had to suffer through in your educational process, the radiation is basically attenuated by the soil, so the deeper you go the less radiation you see at the surface. So we only go one foot at a time. It's slow, but it nevertheless is what we have to do to see the items. And we try to pick 'em out obviously before we move the dirt. And then we also -- when we get to the bottom of what looks like the dredge debris, then we will also be collecting samples for radium as well as for the chemical constituents as well that we're looking for. And the final site has to be less than background plus one picocurie of radiation, radium basically. And a picocurie is one trillionth of a curie. And a curie is essentially the amount of radiation equivalent to one gram of Radium 226. So it's a very small amount of material that's allowed to remain behind that you can statistically even see from -- compared to background.

And this is obviously a wrong slide. But so the contamination or the discrete items -- the discrete items will be stored in a locked magazine located in the Western Magazine Area. And you might ask where. I'm glad someone asked that because this contaminated soil itself will be -

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We have the corrected version.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. All right. Again, I'll have to talk to the A team, I'm only the B team. But so the soil will be in locked bins, and then the Navy, once we're done removing the items and the soil from the site, will have a separate contractor come in and dispose of the contamination. And I think I have one more of those. Yep, there it is.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But we don't.

MR. GEMAR: I apologize for that. At least you have the corrected copies. So now I'm going to move into the other part of the cleanup which is the munitions removal. And up until now I've been strictly focused on the radiological items removal, but we also expect to encounter munitions items. And so the first thing we do is establish a safety zone around the excavation. And that particular safety zone in this case based on the maximum, or the largest item that we think is credible, is a three inch diameter fifty caliber round, and that safety zone is 300 feet or about the length of a football field. So when we're excavating we'll be monitoring the surrounding area and verifying that no unauthorized personnel are within that radius. Once we've excavated the soil. And again, the soil will first be scanned for the radiological items. We'll take that soil to an area to mechanically sift it, basically through a screen device. And we'll do that west of this site. And I'll show you a map on the next slide where that is. And then we will temporarily store any remaining -- or any recovered munitions items, and we will destroy those later by using a detonation which we've done here on Mare Island before. And then finally when we get done excavating the site we will do a geophysical survey, which is basically using metal detectors that are fairly sophisticated, and we'll check the bottom of the excavation for any remaining metal. And if there is any remaining metal we'll excavate those areas, and then do a final check to make sure that everything has been removed. And I'm almost afraid to hit the next button.

Where is this haul route? Well, I'm glad somebody asked that. Again, here is the Paint Waste Area, and this is the 300 foot exclusion zone. So once the soil has been checked for radioactive contaminants, and those items have been removed or that soil has been removed, the soil will be hauled out to an area out here to the west and will be sifted in this area, and then the soil that has been sifted will then be placed within this area called the H1 Containment Area where, pending sample results, it will be placed for disposal. Now, in the unlikely event that the soil exceeds two picocuries per gram of radium, then that soil cannot be left in the containment area, it will have to go to an off-island disposal area or disposal site. And this is just a photograph of some typical soil sifting equipment.

You might recognize the Marine Corps barracks in the background. We use this to kind of set up when we sifted soil from the former outfall known as Dredge Outfall 4 South near the Marine Corps Firing Range here on Mare Island. And during this particular work I think we ended up with about 1,900 munitions items that we had removed from that outfall area. And this sifting plant works both by magnets, which collect any ferrous items and kick 'em off to the side. And there's also a vibratory screen on this end that screens the soil down to three-quarter inch or less. And three-quarter inch is the smallest size of the typical munitions items that you can find on Mare Island which is a 20 millimeter anti-aircraft projectile. And you can see here the sifted soil coming off the end. And then we also did a quality control check of the sifted soil with magnetometers and verify that we don't have anything of any significance that could have gotten through the screens. And this is the transportation route for the sifted material -- or excuse me -- for any munitions items that are recovered, and for that matter, any RAD items.

We'll take one of the levee roads back over to the Western Magazine Area, and there is a building that we use for storing munitions items, and then there is a separate building that we use for storing radiological items, And, of course, the UXO technicians get to have some fun at the end of the job by blowing up these items. And this is done at a remote site that's permitted for this purpose at the southwest corner of Mare Island. And they basically take the various and sundry munitions items a few at a time and wrap them with donor explosives and set them off.

And, of course, they cover it with several feet of sand also before they do the detonation. So what you see here is not smoke or whatever, it's actually sand primarily being kicked up that they used to cover the material. And the sand also helps to deaden the sound so that we don't excite too many people in the neighborhood, especially Chris who lives on the island.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Actually, I think we could use some excitement around here.

MR. GEMAR: You don't want to give the UXO techs an opportunity, they will take it.

MS. TYGIELSKI: July 4th is coming up soon, you could put on a show.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And we don't have any fireworks this year.

MR. GEMAR: Oh, well. I don't think we'll be quite ready for you by then. Actually we just did some detonation back -- excuse me -- in June.

But this particular schedule, we first got approval from a group within the Navy called NOSSA. And they gave us final approval to an addendum back in -- actually this month, earlier this month. And actually today the final amendment -- addendum, I should say, to the work plan is being shipped out. So all the regulators should see a package on their desk tomorrow that I'm sure they're waiting for. It's basically already been reviewed, so hopefully this is a formality to get that.

And then, as Michael mentioned, there is one more approval that we're going to be needing, and that is the Amendment to the Action Memorandum and the Interim Remedial Action Plan that was originally approved in 2007. But because we ran into these new contaminants, the radiological and munitions, this was amended, and that went to the regulators in early June. And we're hoping that we'll get approval sometime in July so that we can get started in the field work. And we think that the field work would continue through October of this year. And I think that's it. So I'll be happy to try to answer any questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Dwight, just a couple. How does this site compare in size, this outfall site, to -- say -- the 4S Outfall, which I thought was one of your largest sites?

MR. GEMAR: Yes, 4-South was the mother of all outfalls on Mare Island. I think we pulled out about, close to a thousand items. But so far Paint Waste Area I think is running number two. So it's kind of unusual because we didn't obviously know it was there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And well, my second is actually a comment, and it has to do with it not being there and then it was. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was supposed to have acquired this property from the U.S. Navy to be used as the headquarters and surrounding property for the San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge. A few of us have put in thousands of hours towards that, and it was nixed by the Navy by, maybe it was the past administration, whatever. And it was a technicality, and it had to do with the lawyers for the Navy concluding that they could kind of sneak around CERCLA and the requirement to clean up on a fed to fed transfer because it wasn't a fee title transfer. And so what happened here is the Fish and Wildlife Service staff, I think, found this Paint Waste Site. And if they had acquired this property as the Navy intended, as is, and now they actually have a more Draconian measure in the BRAC '05 round of requiring the federal agency to actually pay fair market value for the property and take it as is.

But if the agency had taken this property, it would have inherited -- as the nation's keeper of natural resources and wildlife areas, it would have inherited this rather large, and I suppose expensive cleanup, and it would have been on their dime. And not with the sophistication that --

I mean they would have had to have hired Weston or, you know, some other good contractor. But it would have literally broken that agency, and it would have been a complete catastrophe. And I think that this -- and what's happened, so we lost the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and their ability to manage these, the endangered species on -- properties that the Navy had so carefully managed for the last how many years on the -- a large portion of Mare Island. So it's a tremendous disappointment.

While I'm very excited that this was found, and that you're going to be doing this cleanup, and it's an example of the true unknown unknowns that are out there, and will be in perpetuity, and I guess it will give the opportunity for a lot of citizen science as people go around with metal detectors, and now maybe RAD detectors on Mare Island to find other such sites. But it's very, very tragic that this community lost a national wildlife refuge headquarters because of what I feel was completely unprofessional and unthinkable behavior by the U.S. Navy. And what has happened at Skaggs Island, Mare Island and Skaggs were the two cases that set in motion the new BRAC '05 guidance. What has happened at Skaggs is that because of a tremendous amount of political sophistication, shoulder to the wheel by a whole bunch of Congressional representatives, particularly Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey and her staffer Tom Roth, the U.S. Navy was forced to the table with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and I'm very proud to announce that in June of this -- this month, just recently, the Navy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did come to an agreement on the Navy's remediation of the buildings on Skaggs as well as any associated environmental contaminants, and that work is expected to take place in the next, I think it's eighteen months or something like that, and transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service within 60 days after the completion of that work. So if there is enough political will and enough commitment on the part of a community, they can override the Draconian sort of misbehaving of the Navy.

And you know, I'm friends of the Navy, and I don't want you to think that you don't do good work, but I think this was a tragedy for this community, and it's something that's going to stick in my craw personally for a long time since it was our community who was able to get 2.4 million into the federal budget for Building 505 to have been converted to the headquarters, and we lost that. And from '00 to '03 we should have spent that money. And kudos to the Fish and Wildlife Service staff who accidentally found this, and happy to see that it's making some progress since it seemed to have been stuck on stupid for a while and not getting this work done recently.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Any other questions? Okay. Thanks, Dwight. We'll go into our administrative business and announcements. I would say if you have any comments on the May minutes, please get them to myself or Myrna. Myrna, any other announcements on that? Okay. We'll go into our focus group reports. Wendell is not here for the community focus group. So we'll go to natural resources, Jerry. And welcome back, Jerry.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

MR. KARR: Thank you. Thank you very much, and thanks to everyone who sent a lot of good vibrations and prayers and everything else my way in my life's work of battling this cancer to the mat. But we're getting there, and thanks everybody, I'm glad to be back. During that recovery

period I was recently reading the newspaper, and there was an article with a positive comment in it in the Times Herald. And when I caught my breath and recovered, I continued to read the article on Weston and their cleanup efforts as a corporation and their employees at the south end of the island. And I'm sure Myrna will go into some more detail, but I'd just like to add my thanks as a community member to a corporation that believes in putting back to the community. The company I retired from we did a lot of the same kind of things. And more and more responsible corporations are recognizing their benefit to communities and really make time for their people to give back. So I appreciate that very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Jerry.Paula, technical.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: Thank you, Dwight, for your team B presentation. It was very good. And you can tell Bob O'Brien from team A that we missed him.

MR. GEMAR: Okay.

MS. TYGIELSKI: And I have nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just want to follow up one thing. The Navy did \$130 million worth of surveying and sampling for radiological contamination in the years '94 to '96 before the base closed, and the commitment on the part of the Navy was that they would leave this island RAD-free, and we are very proud of that. I'm curious, I just forgot to ask you one thing. But since Paula brought up your great presentation, Dwight, I note that you now have a -- looks like a different arrangement than the Navy had at that time. The commander told us at the closure ceremony in '96 that there was no radiological material left behind, and now I see you have background plus one picocurie. Why not just non-detect, which is what it used to be?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, the background plus one picocurie per gram is what is the standard now for the Navy at military facilities in California. However, as part of our work plan, the Navy did agree to do a post removal statistical evaluation of the remaining materials, and we are pretty confident that we'll be at background. However, the site cleanup criteria is actually background plus one picocurie. But since we're going after all of this debris it will be, in my opinion, based on my experience on Mare Island, we'll be down to the Bay mud, and I would be very surprised if we don't get to the same end, even though the standard may be slightly different.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next is City report, Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Lennar update, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: I have a handout. We start with photographs. The ones on the left are a demo of the IR-03 Aboveground Storage Tank Pads. They are now gone. They're just down south of 742, or excuse me, 461. In the upper right, Building 742, it's one of our other PCB sites. This is not nearly as large as Building 680, but it gives you a good feeling for how large the inside of some of these buildings are. In the lower left corner some of the new documents in review, etcetera. The main ones for documents in review are the Building 680 work plan and notification that we talked about tonight, and the building -- or excuse me -- the Draft Final

FS/RAW for Building 461. So those along with the IR-15 FS/RAP, those are important documents, those are major documents, and I encourage you if you have an interest in any of those sites that you grab those. If you can't find them, let me know, although they should be at the library.

Significant upcoming documents. The new one there is the draft final IA-C2 RAP. That's another major document covering a large area of EETP. And in the lower left corner there, the upcoming public comment period, the same set of documents are in there.

There are several important public comment periods coming up. We talked about the one that -- the public meeting that occurred last night for the BGM and the Triangle Area. And there are other public comment periods that we're either into or will be soon. Site closure status. Two additional PCB sites and three additional Fuel Oil Pipeline sites have recently been closed by the agencies. I won't go through all the details of the central portion of the handout.

The purpose of the various labels and such are to identify those sites that we're currently working at, or as are shown on this slide tonight, the number of sites that Lennar is also working on, and those include Building 455 and 803 which are in IA-B, the sort of light green area. And then several sites in IA-C3 which is along the waterfront and also in the greenish color. And those are Buildings 854, 1302, 1304, 1342, and then two areas within the Triangle Area, the Building 144 Oil Water Separator, and then the Former Paint Shop/Varnish Plant. So those are some of the highlights. A lot going on. Some construction work. A lot of important major documents that are working their way through reviews and public comment periods and public meetings, etcetera. So with that I'll thank you. And I apologize for dragging on long tonight, I didn't realize I was going that long, so forgive me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'd like to go on the record with, again, asking that the Crane Test Area be one of your topics for the next meeting.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Next is the Weston update. Cris.

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks, Michael. Since we're running late I will not go through the list of documents status items, you can read those for yourself.

Next up would be the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall Update. And at the request of DTSC, Weston is going to perform some step-out sampling at an initial thirteen locations in the vicinity of the outfall. And it's going to be near sample locations that previously exhibited elevated concentrations of mercury. And we're going to do this to see if we can attempt to complete the characterization of the site regarding mercury contamination. And we're going to be doing this sampling in early July depending on the tide cycles since the area we're going to have to access has very shallow mud flats west of the outfall location.

Next up is an update on IR-05 soil excavation. And we are hopeful that the Fish and Wildlife Service is going to issue the biological opinion towards the end of this month which would allow us to proceed with excavation of the remaining hot spot soil within the pickleweed portion of the site. And we're anticipating this excavation will be able to begin in early July, and we're looking at probably two to three weeks to complete the excavation activities.

And then finally wrapping up with a couple of notes on Investigation Area H1. We completed the quarterly groundwater monitoring event, which we were sampling 30 feet wells this month.

And also earlier this month we completed demolishing the utility corridors of the eastern boundary of area H1. And we cut and capped these utilities with concrete to eliminate the potential for preferential pathways of mitigation for contamination, and that was required by the area H1 remedial design plan. And the photo on the bottom right-hand corner there shows some of that activity going on. Also the area H1 containment area perimeter groundwater extraction system, that's continuing to operate as we designed it. You may note that about 75 percent of the containment area is now capped with the cap, which means that it's no longer able to receive recharge from rainfall events.

That means that the available water that's reaching the extraction trench is going to decrease, which is how we had designed the system. And this year we're looking at about an average of only three gallons a minute of groundwater collecting from the 7,200 linear feet of trench. And hopefully we will complete the cap this year, and that will eventually go down to essentially nothing. And on that same vein we are anticipating that the remaining eighteen acres that require capping within the 72 acre containment area will be completed by November of this year.

And other than that, the only other significant field activity that are required to complete the remediation of area H1 is to place and seed two feet of cover soil in upland portions of the areas outside the containment area. And the purpose of that cover soil is just to further reduce the ecological risk to the calculated no effective concentration levels. And that's it for our update. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Cris. We'll go into our regulatory agency update. And Janet with DTSC.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito, John Kaiser, Carolyn D'Almeida)

MS. NAITO: Hi. I'm going to make this quick. I brought handouts in case anybody cares about our EnviroStor database. I had mentioned it at the focus group, so in case you want to see what it looks like, I did bring handouts. That's it.

MR. KAISER: Yeah. And then on behalf of the Water Board staff, I'm here substituting for Paisha who works in my section. One thing he did accomplish since the last meeting, I see here for Lennar Mare Island he completed his review of the draft IR-15 Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Plan. He submitted those in June, early June. For the Navy he reviewed five UST closure requests. While the reports had been completed as far as reviews, you should be getting - the Navy should be getting comments within the next week or two.

What was interesting to me as a supervisor, I notice in the last ten days it's almost like a football game, I guess, in the score here. Paisha received three letters or technical memos specifically from the Navy, in addition to five reports. As far as Lennar is concerned he received two letters or memo in addition to five formal reports. For both parties he will be initiating the review process probably on his return next week. That's it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, John. Okay. We'll go into co-chairs' report. Myrna.

VII. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Quickly, Building 680, by the way, was the location of one of the most disastrous accidents in World War II when a gas line blew up there and just wreaked havoc. But luckily it was early in the morning, and I think only one person was killed.

I want to thank Weston, as Jerry did, for a tremendous day, "Make a Difference Day" in the preserve. And like 200 people out doing all kinds of stuff, grave stone rubbings, painted the fence. Gil, it was your suggestion, put together picnic tables and benches and signs and -- incredible. You got to come out the second Saturday, July 11, we'll be open, and you can check it out for yourself. And I want to thank the City too, Gil and a group of his colleagues who made the permit happen and got us all lined up with that permission.

So thank you Cris and Dwight on your team from all over the country. And if anybody wants some tips on how to do that type of thing at the preserve or someplace else here on the island, I'm sure Weston and I will be happy to give you some tips. And if you'd like to make your own contribution to the Shoreline Heritage Preserve, the Mare Faire is coming up August 8 and 9, Saturday and Sunday. The ninth is the 65th anniversary of the Port Chicago mutiny, we'll be doing a commemoration. That did take place in Vallejo while the men were under the charge of the Mare Island Naval Ammunition Depot. And you are welcome to sponsor, give in-kind. We already have a sponsorship from CS Marine Constructors on Mare Island, they just let us know today. And volunteer. And I think that's it for me.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Myrna. The Navy's update. Everybody should have a handout. We completed backfilling activities at the Horse Stables Area, there is a couple of pictures of that on the right-hand side, on June 15th. There were 45 truckloads of soil that was previously approved from pond 4S that we used for backfilling. And it was spread out in twelve inch lifts, and then compacted per the design requirements. That was pretty much all the field work that we had going on this last month.

We did have a RAB focus group that was held on June 9th where there were, let's see, Michael was there, Kenn, Myrna, and Cris and DTSC and Neal and the Navy, and we sat down and discussed community relations involvement and outreach, and got a lot of suggestions and ideas on how to better improve that outreach. We are in the process of reviewing all that and will be developing a plan to move forward. And we'll be coming forward to present that and to hear from everybody what they think about it. As John mentioned, we submitted a bunch of documents, ten all told last month. I won't really wander through them, but there were ten documents. Folks can read through this. And we received comments, four sets from DTSC, one from the Water Board before Paisha left, and then four also from EPA. And that's it for the Navy report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can I just follow up on that focus group meeting? Neal let me know last night, Neal and Steve, from Lennar and CH, that they already followed up on one of our recommendations from that focus group, and I just want to thank you both on updating some of their documents and some of the reports that they give us here at the RAB, sending those over to Weston to upload on the Mareisland.org website, so it will be a more complete website. And please go to that website for information about environmental cleanup issues.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, folks, we'll go to our second public comment period. Any public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. With that, we will adjourn. Thank you everybody.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:24 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Summary of Notification/ Cleanup Plan for PCB Sites Associate with Building 680 – CH2MHill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – RAB Update Draft Feasibility Study/ Removal Action Workplan for IR21 and the Building 386, 388, and 390 Area – CH2MHill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Parcel XVI Paint Waste Area (PWA) Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) – Navy
- Features within the EETP – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update June 2009 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard June 2009
- EnviroStor – Mare Island Naval Shipyard