

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES  
Held May 25, 2000**

**Welcome and Introductions:**

The May 2000 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Myrna Hayes, Community Co-chair and representative of Save San Pablo Baylands. Fourteen (14) RAB members, twenty-four (24) guests and community members, two (2) RAB support and community relations staff from Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI), and one (1) recorder were present. The following RAB members were in attendance:

- Ms. Myrna Hayes
- Mr. Ken Barden
- Mr. Ken Kloc
- Mr. Jerry Dunaway
- Ms. Cynthia arquez
- Mr. Ken Browne
- Ms. Diana Krevsky
- Mr. John Cerini
- Mr. Chip Gribble
- Mr. Adam Chavez
- Ms. Paula Tygielski
- Mr. James O'Loughlin
- Mr. Rob Schonholtz
- Mr. Jerry Karr

Recorder: Ms. Kathy Langstaff

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Good evening. My name is Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair for the Restoration Advisory Board for Mare Island. I congratulated all of us last month for being at this arduous task for six years, and this is my six-year anniversary as the community co-chair, so you can boo or you can take my place.

(The RAB and community members introduced themselves.)

**Public Meeting: Areas E and A1 Remedial Action Plans**

Mr. Chip Gribble - Good evening. My name is Chip Gribble, the project manager for California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), overseeing environmental restoration at Mare Island. I want to thank all of you for coming tonight, and I am grateful for your efforts to help insure that I and my agency do our job to protect public health and the environment.

This first part of this meeting tonight is a public meeting to discuss the environmental investigations, conclusions, and draft remedial action plans for two areas on Mare Island: Investigation Area E, located on the hill in the southern end of the island, and Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, located at the northern part of Mare Island.

For environmental-management purposes, Kelly Ryan from Tetra Tech is going to help me with the presentation. And by the way, the fact sheet and the presentation tonight were prepared with the help of Tetra Tech, and we appreciate the help.

Here's a map of the investigation areas. For environmental-management purposes, Mare Island has been geographically subdivided into about 15 investigation areas, which you can see from this map, and you should have a handout with the slides and the overheads that we're going to use tonight. We often use the acronym IA for the words investigation area.

At this point, I'd like to go over the agenda briefly. First, I'd like to give a brief overview of the RAP/ROD process, our environmental cleanup process, and then move on to a presentation on the Investigation Area E remedial action plan, followed by questions and comments. Depending on the time, we could take a break at that point, and then proceed to do the same for Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, with a presentation followed by discussion and comments. At the end of that, another break, and then we will continue on with the abbreviated RAB meeting for the Restoration Advisory Board.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Does that sound agreeable? Would anybody rather have a different order?

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - No.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Okay. Please feel free to ask questions throughout the presentation. Next presentation slide. Here's a map of the two areas we're going to discuss for the remedial action plans tonight: at the southern end of the island, the hill, which is Investigation Area E, and highlighted at the top is Investigation Area A1, clean parcels.

Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, is a subset of Investigation Area A1. What we have done is carve out some of the contaminated areas in A1 and left those aside so we can move forward with the remainder of Investigation Area 1, which we think is clean and suitable for no further action.

I would like to walk you through the regulatory process to allow you to participate more effectively in this whole process by having a basic understanding of the process. In general, we start with what is called preliminary assessment, where we review records. We gather information that's available in our files. We sometimes talk to former shipyard workers or former workers at a particular site and gather all the available, easily obtainable information on the site so that we have an idea of the history and the possible issues.

We can follow that up with an SI (site inspection), where we typically take a limited number of samples to get a further refined idea of what the issues are that we need to address. That generally isn't enough to characterize the site. That gives us a clue as to what we need to do and look further for. So then we'll follow on with a more intensive investigation, which is called a remedial investigation.

By the way, the acronym is PASI, which is a federal term, and the state term is a PEA, preliminary environmental assessment. They're essentially equivalent, but they're different acronyms for the state equivalent and the federal equivalent.

The next step of the process is the remedial investigation, which generally involves extensive sampling and data analysis to evaluate quantitatively the risk posed by the contamination of the site, assuming that we have contamination and get that far. At the point where we've characterized the site in terms of the extent of contamination, the levels of contamination, and the risk that follows from that, we then consider a number of possible remedies to address that risk, reduce the risk, or mitigate the risk. We call that a feasibility study. We evaluate a number of different remedial options.

Following that, we get to where we are tonight on two areas, which is the remedial action plan, or RAP, and the federal equivalent term is Record of Decision (ROD). At this point, it's a draft document. We put that in front of the public. We're required to submit that to the public for a 30-day comment period and hold a public meeting to give the public an opportunity to comment and hear what we have to say about those documents.

The 30-day comment period on these documents started on May 10 and will end on June 10. All the comments we receive, by the way, we will respond to in writing. They will be part of the record, and following that comment period, we will make a determination on whether or not we go forward and approve those documents as final or make changes based on what has transpired in the public-comment period.

Following the remedial action plan, we don't necessarily have the remediation addressed. Sometimes the remedial action plan typically says that certain actions need to be taken to clean up the site, and at that point we move into a remedial design and remediation phase, which is followed by long-term monitoring. Once all the remedial actions have been taken as specified in the remedial action plan, we certify that all remedial actions have been taken, and from our perspective, at that point the property is eligible for transfer.

The Navy will generate a document called a FOST (Finding of Suitability for Transfer), where we will review that document, and if it says what we think is appropriate, we would concur or approve of that FOST, and then, by the Navy's process, they would then be able to transfer the property.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Are there any questions on the basic process?

(No questions were asked.)

Mr. Chip Gribble - Okay. Let's move on to the Investigation Area E presentation. The draft remedial action plan that we put out says that we think we've addressed all the environmental issues. There is one issue on the hill which we think calls for a remedy - a

limitation on the use of the property for the original nine-hole course. That's what we're proposing for the remedy for Investigation Area E.

The Navy has done a lot of work, and we've done a lot of work with the Navy, to get to the point where we've drawn that conclusion. The Navy investigated Investigation Area E, the hill, for unexploded ordnance, as I think we all know we have been talking about that a long time here. Unexploded ordnance is a big issue at Mare Island. The Navy's been working for several years on this project. This was a question for Investigation Area E.

The Navy did a survey, which included a site walk, geophysical surveys, and excavation of all the anomalies they identified in the surveys. What they found was that there were no unexploded ordnance items found in the hill through the site walk. There were several anomalies that were identified. Those were all excavated, and none of those were determined to be unexploded ordnance or ordnance-related type of material.

In addition, there was an ordnance reservoir on top of the hill. It was not a place where ordnance was stored, despite the name. It was a place where the Navy stored water to fight fires, but the term that is often used is ordnance reservoir. That ordnance reservoir was drained. It was mucked out with the thought that there might be some ordnance or explosive waste or some evidence of that history at the bottom of that reservoir. None of that was found in the bottom of the ordnance reservoir. I think a bicycle was found, a cigarette machine, and three or four spent bullets.

So the conclusion was that there was no ordnance on the hill. Based on the history of the site, the geology of the site, and other factors, we conclude that there is no residual concern from unexploded ordnance on the hill. This will be in contrast to what we will eventually say at some point about the lowlands, and particularly the dredge ponds or other areas with a history of unexploded ordnance.

We think this is different in that there is no residual risk, that the soil coverup there is a very thin and underlain with weathered bedrock, and for the Navy to have disposed of any ordnance up there, they would have thrown it over the side of a truck. It would have been found on the surface. None of that was found. Or they would have had to excavate or dig through this weathered bedrock to make a pit in which this material could be disposed, and none of that was found in our surveys.

Further, when the Navy did want to dispose of ordnance, they would likely have just gone to the water's edge and thrown it over the water's edge or disposed of it in one of the low-lying areas where stuff was disposed of. It would have been unusual for somebody to go to the length of digging a hole on the hill to dispose of the stuff when they had so many easy opportunities at low-lying areas. So we think the probability of unexploded ordnance being found up on the hill is essentially nonexistent or no different than we would find anywhere else in the City of Vallejo or any other community.

So from our perspective, we don't think there is any residual risk or residual concern from unexploded ordnance on the hill.

*Polychlorinated biphenyls, PCB* – the Navy had a program to investigate sites throughout Mare Island where, based on the historical use of materials or electrical equipment, there was some possibility of PCB contamination. This includes, for the most part, electrical substations, transformers, and other electrical equipment.

The Navy submitted reports on that, and we have evaluated them and concluded that there is no risk from residual PCBs up in Area E. There was one outdoor transformer site which did have a PCB-leakage problem. The Navy decontaminated the equipment up there. The concrete pad that it sat on was also decontaminated. Typically what the Navy does for the concrete slabs is to scabble or remove the surface layer of concrete down to a point where chip samples indicate that there's no residual PCB in the concrete slab.

In addition, at this particular site, soil was excavated around the perimeter because PCBs have run off the top of the slab, and the PCBs were found to extend about two feet out from the slab and some number of feet down. So there was basically a trench excavated around the perimeter of this transformer site, and the PCB-contaminated material was removed. A fairly limited site in terms of extent.

The radiological surveys for the shipyard, most of that work is already completed, but tonight we're just talking about Investigation Area E and part of A1. The radiological series that the Navy did were very extensive and involved a significant amount of sampling and surveying for every possible question that they could come up with and that we could generate as well, and in our team of regulators doing the oversight for that program, we had several agencies involved, Department of Health Services, the U.S. EPA and our agency, and we feel that the Navy did an excellent job. There was no contamination found in Investigation Area E in all those surveys.

The surveys did extend to the possibility that material may have leaked onto roadways off trucks passing in and out of the shipyard. Nothing like that was found. Sewers were also sampled, as well as all the buildings and structures in areas where we could identify as having any radiological history.

And by the way, I'd like to identify one person in the audience who played a significant role in that. Steve Dean from the U.S. EPA, stand up and let yourself be known. Steve played a major role in that and in our efforts to oversee the Navy's radiological surveys.

Another program that the Navy had to address was for underground storage tanks. For the most part, the underground storage tanks and petroleum hydrocarbon issues focused on five sites identified in a database generated over the years, which was a collection of all the sites mentioned in any previous report or sites with known underground storage tanks.

Many sites listed in this database are phantom sites generated from contradictory reports, mistakes in previous reports of titling various sites. So a number of sites listed in there are actually duplicates of other sites, and some sites that are phantom sites.

In Investigation Area E there were five listings. One of those was a 500-gallon heating-oil tank, which was removed. By the way, all the tanks on Mare Island that have been identified have been removed. Another was the lighthouse, which the Navy investigated and was not able to locate any UST in that location. A number of the structures that used to be in that part of Investigation Area E have long since been removed, and trying to find some of these possible USTs is a difficult task.

There was another tank, No. 658, which was removed, and that was a 100-gallon diesel tank determined by the Water Board as a low-risk site, and then there was one other tank site that we determined to be a phantom site, and one more which was nothing but a former water cistern that was not used to store hydrocarbon at a later date. So all the UST issues in Investigation Area 11 E were resolved.

The next item is lead in soil from lead-based paint. This has been a difficult issue between the agencies and the Navy or DoD in general where we think that this is an issue that needs to be addressed, and the Navy hasn't always agreed with us. However, for some parts of the island, EPA had a contractor at the time, which was Weston, who was a contractor to EPA at the time, who went out and did a study and an evaluation in some parts of Mare Island, including Investigation Area E, and several structures in Area E and A1 were sampled and evaluated for possible lead contamination in soil from lead-based paint.

In Investigation Area E, two buildings were found to have significant lead contamination. Kelly, is there a photograph of the water tanks?

Ms. Kelly Ryan - Yes. Do you want to skip ahead to that? It's 2 R.

Mr. Chip Gribble - The photograph there, yes. Significant lead contamination was found in the soil surrounding these two tanks, and unlike some other areas at Mare Island where we have had our struggles with the Navy over this issue in particular, the Navy did do a soil removal around these two structures to remove the contaminated soil. And the residual levels were, on average - somewhere in the neighborhood of 350 parts per million - below our general screening level of 400 parts per million. We think that's an acceptable residual contamination for unrestricted use.

At the last RAB meeting, I talked about the Navy's different sites and categories. Initially the Navy had 24 IR sites, which we later called our Group 1 sights, and subsequently, we did other rounds of site identification, and we called those Group 2 and Group 3 sites.

In Investigation Area E, there is one Group 1 site called IR 22, which consists of two ordnance storage bunkers in the hill. The site was identified as an IR site because at one point somebody identified white powdery substance on the floor inside the bunker. The material was sampled and removed and thought to be a pesticide material. The concrete floor was chip-sampled subsequently, and some low levels of pesticides were found in the concrete. Since the floor was cleaned, that white powdery substance was removed, and the residual contamination of pesticides was very low, we felt that was the end of that concern.

However, it was brought to our attention that outside the bunker lead tags were found in the soil, and these were presumably from seal tags used on ordnance storage boxes that ripped off or fell off and were found in the drainage ditches outside these two bunkers in particular and possibly some of the other bunkers up in the hill. The soil outside these two bunkers was removed down to an underlying asphaltic pavement, and we concluded that that problem was eliminated. The Navy also did sampling for lead in the drainage ditches elsewhere in the hill, did find lead contamination, but below the screening levels that we have already discussed.

The golf course was an unusual site. The Navy did some sampling at the golf course with the understanding that pesticides had historically been used at the golf course, and this is a place where we would likely find pesticide residual contamination. We did some limited sampling up there. Most of the samples were found to show very low levels of pesticide contamination or negligible contamination, except one where we found significantly high concentrations of arsenic from an arsenical pesticide. And the peak concentration was 541 parts per million.

That particular contaminated location was excavated, and that contaminated soil was removed. It was found to extend down to about two-plus feet, and I think the excavation hole was about 20 foot by 20 foot, and the residual levels were consistent with other parts of the golf course, where we found no or marginal contamination, close to our ambient concentration of 16.

Because of the way pesticides were used on the hill and the very localized nature of this particular deposit, there is a reasonable probability that the arsenic-contamination locations exist on the original nine-hole course, but that the extent of these peak-concentration areas is so limited that, to find them we would have to grid off the entire original nine-hole course on a square-foot basis to have a reasonable assurance that we would have identified all those locations.

That being what we felt was unrealistic and also what we felt was a reasonable probability that there are other limited locations on the golf course that have that kind of concentration of arsenic, which we think is acceptable for the intended use of the golf course or that kind of a type of a public use, but not acceptable for unrestricted use – because of that, we're proposing, in our remedial action plan, a land-use covenant which would limit the use of

the original nine-hole course to prohibit residential development and other sensitive uses, such as daycare centers and schools. That remedy extends only to the original nine-hole course and for the only contaminant of consequence, which is arsenic.

So with that residual risk from arsenic, several alternatives were evaluated. One was no action, which obviously is not acceptable because of the risk posed by that contamination of arsenic for unrestricted use. We also considered capping the original nine-hole course. I think there's a practical and cost-limitation factor there which was a consideration.

And another one was an excavation, which would also be expensive and somewhat impractical to excavate the top level of soil throughout the nine-hole course. And that's how we concluded that an appropriate remedy for this is the land-use covenant to limit the future use of the golf course.

That's my presentation for Area E, and hopefully we'll have some questions from the audience. Give me one question. Give me a hard question.

- Q. Mr. Dennis English- I have a question. You mentioned earlier that you have a hesitance. Did you do a preliminary endangerment assessment?
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Because of the way a lot of this work was done when the shipyard was going through closure, the shipyard at the time had roughly 3,000 employees. The number was going down all the time. The Navy was trying to keep them busy and productive, and some of the ways in which they wanted to do that was to use them in the radiological surveys and the unexploded ordnance work and the PCB-program work and the underground storage program, and we thought that was a good way to go.

We agreed that if we worked with the Navy and their resources or the skills that the remaining workforce had, that we could benefit greatly. So what we did was organize what you would ordinarily find as a PASI document, a Preliminary Assessment Site Inspection, or the state equivalent of a PEA document. Instead of having one nice, neatly packaged document with all those issues in it as a PEA or a PASI, we have several reports from each of these programs addressing the issues dealt with in that program.

If you take this collection of miscellaneous documents and put them all together, you will have the equivalent of a PEA or PASI document, and in some cases the equivalent of an RI document depending on what levels of work was done to address the question at that particular location. For example, IR 22 was more of a PEA evaluation.

Mr. Dennis English - According to the state's preliminary endangerment process assessment, there's accountability to that study, so that a person who has done the study is held accountable for any problems that may occur in the future. So it's just a suggestion - if you go for the State's way of doing things, but I guess you already went ahead and did it a

different way, which hopefully there still is accountability for those who did the surveys, which are severe if you don't do it properly.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Can you expand on your point of accountability?

A. Mr. Dennis English - Accountability would be if studies were done improperly, or I believe the county EPA people know what I'm talking about, and also the Department of Toxic Substance Control. They have rigid guidelines on how to do these assessments, and if it was a consulting firm or even public officials or a staff doing the work, they have to be certified in certain areas, they have to stand by their work, and the work has to be evaluated. And if there are some problems found through certain discrepancies or whatever, there are criminal and civil penalties. So I'm just trying to find out if that was what you did, but --

C. Mr. Chip Gribble - A good point. By the way, I work for Department of Toxic Substance -

Mr. Dennis English- Oh, great.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I wish the Navy were giving this presentation. As far as accountability goes, some of those requirements, such as people doing radiological surveys or radiological work in the State of California or - if I may speak for DHS - I shouldn't speak for DHS, but my understanding is that Department of Health Services requires that those people or firms be registered or licensed with Department of Health Services of the State of California.

The Navy's radiological workers and their radiological team were not certified. They were not required to be certified because - if I understand this correctly - they are federal employees on the federal property on a military site, and that registration or legal requirement didn't apply to Mare Island.

As I understand it, those people who used to work in that program, who have now moved on to civilian sector and are now private contractors working on other military sites, are now required to be certified with Department of Health Services, but the essence of that requirement and those types of requirements is really to help ensure that the people doing that work are qualified. And in this case, we felt that they were extremely well qualified.

I would say that also for the unexploded ordnance program. These people were specialists. Their professional career for the most part was in military service dealing with ordnance. I can't come close to that kind of qualification myself. In some areas, the PCB program in particular, and the UST program, many of the people who were working in those programs were Navy people or former Naval shipyard employees who had gone through retraining programs and had some ability to do that work, or shall we say people within their program had the ability to do that work as other people were learning on the job.

So to the extent that we've approved this work, we think it was done in some cases excellently and other cases satisfactorily. I wouldn't say excellent for everything. I don't think you would say excellent about my work for everything either, but we are comfortable in our conclusion. Any other? Ken?

- Q. Mr. Ken Kloc - A couple of questions. In the upland magazine area, are those bunkers going to be demolished?
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Well, I don't know officially. The developer who will get that property eventually, the golf course specifically, will keep some, if not all, of them. And I don't know what he plans to do with them. I think some of them he is using for storage right now, but my understanding is that he is not going to be tearing them down. But that's really not for me to say. I don't know that for certain.
- Q. Mr. Ken Kloc - And were there any lead-based-paint issues at those bunker structures?
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - For the most part, the bunkers are concrete and were buried in the hillside, or they were dug out of the hillside and then with a soil crown on top of it. So most of them have very little exposed concrete surface and paint surface.
- Q. Mr. Ken Kloc - And one last question. In the negative declaration, it says that the environmental, or ecological-risk, assessment for the upland magazine area revealed potential ecological risks due to lead, and then it says DTSC considered several other factors and concluded that there was no significant ecological risk. And I was wondering if you could explain what those other factors were.
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Jim Polisini is an eco-toxicologist from our department, and I'd like to refer that question to Jim, please.
- A. Mr. Jim Polisini - I worked on the eco-risk assessment, the review of it anyway. Basically, what we looked at was the area at the top of the hill. The source of lead appeared to be those tags Chip mentioned that were apparently torn off the bags or fell off the bags when the bags were taken out at the ammunition-storage area.

So what we looked at was, number one, what's the distribution of lead tags? And as Chip said, a lot of that soil was taken out. There was still some lead in the soil, but the distribution of lead concentrations was fairly spotty. I don't know how statistical you want to get about this, but there were some high areas and some low areas. And basically any ecological receptor, if it's like a mouse or something like that, is not going to stay in one place for its whole life. So it's going to move around. Even if it stays in the area of the ammunition, it's going to move around that. Its exposure averaged out over that area would be less than the maximum obviously.

The other thing we looked at was bioavailability in that those tags would be elemental lead, which is not as highly available as the lead used in toxicity experiments. Even if, over a period of time, it weathered and became more bioavailable, it's not going to be as toxic as the lead used in the experiments in the ecological-risk assessment.

Given those factors, we thought the bioavailability, the patchiness of lead concentration, and the removal action were sufficient in terms of eco risk. Also, the habitat surrounding those areas is of a higher quality than the habitat right by the bunkers.

Q. Mr. Jim Polisini - Does that answer your question?

A. Mr. Ken Kloc - Yeah. Thank you.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Along in the same area, there was mentioned some other chemicals of potential concern in the uplands magazine area, and there is a whole list of them in the report, and then it just kind of disappears. I wonder what happened. Are they not of any concern at all? I can list the ones that are down here. I don't even know what they are.

Q. Mr. Jim Polisini - Is that for the eco-risk assessment?

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - This is the remedial action plan, the RAP.

A. Mr. Jim Polisini - Yes, but there's a section for the human-risk assessment and a section for the eco-risk assessment.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - This is for chemicals of potential concerns. Is that your area?

A. Mr. Jim Polisini - Well, it would depend on which sections. Basically I can tell you --

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Development of remedial goals. Does that help?

A. Mr. Jim Polisini - I'd have to get the documents and look at it. And basically I can tell you that, for the eco-risk assessment, the major component of concern was lead.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Okay. And I guess I'm not just staying with a eco-risk assessment, but just in general, there was a reference to these chemicals in the upland magazine as potential concern, but then nothing that refers to it thereafter. So I'm wondering if they weren't of any concern after all upon consideration.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Diana, could you read that part so that I can --

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Okay. So, you don't know it by heart?

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - So I know what I wrote.

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - If anybody has the report, it's page 19, and it's under Development of Remedial Goals, and then under Selection of Chemicals of Potential Concern. Selection of --

(Ms. Diana Krevsky reads:) Some are based on analytical data obtained during July 1996 with the sampling in this area, and then you go through the process of -- but based on the above process, chemicals were retained as COPCs, chemicals of potential concerns, for the upland at magazine area and golf course area. Seven metals were identified for the upland magazine area. And it's antimony, chromium, lead, manganese, tin, titanium, and zinc. And then the COPCs for the golf course area were identified as arsenic, and then a whole group of unpronounceable ones. So identification and selection for the upland magazine and golf course areas was based on a comprehensive remedial investigation and environmental evaluation process in conjunction with the closure.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - And it goes on and doesn't say what happens with those concerns.

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - What I'm getting from you is that the discussion in the RAP doesn't sufficiently explain how we dispensed with those chemicals --

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yeah.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - -- concerned? I can't tell you offhand. Mike, do you recall that? That's probably not a document you read before you came to this meeting to refresh your memory.

A. Mr. Mike Wade - I did look at one of the documents for Area E awhile ago, and I think there were a number of compounds, but when you looked at the levels they were present at, they really weren't of concern for the kind of exposures we were expecting.

C. Mr. Chip Gribble - We can look at that further and get back to you later. We'll probably have to go back and look at the document closely and see what we did with those chemicals.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Basically the question was, were there any other chemicals that --  
Mr. Chip Gribble - -- that generated a risk?

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes.

A. Mr. Jim Polisini - I can tell you that, for the eco risk, which is the part that I worked on, that lead was the big driver there, and we thought that was taken care of. There's a whole process you go through where you look at what all the potential contaminants are and which ones might be of most concern, and then you winnow them down to the ones that are the most important, and lead was the big driver.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Okay.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I apologize that we can't answer the question any better than that, but if I can just give a little perspective. There's a lot of paperwork that's been generated on these sites over the years, and to put that all in our head for a meeting is quite a challenge. So some of the questions that you give us we're not prepared to respond sufficiently at a meeting like this, but we will go back and look at that and provide you with a response.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Thank you.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Jim.

Mr. James O'Loughlin - I have a one-page comment I want to submit now, and I want to reserve the right to submit further written comments between now and June 10, the end of the written comment period.

There's basically three comments. First, a lot of the pages at the beginning of the initial study aren't numbered, the ones that cover the project background, so it's hard to refer to them when you want to comment on the documents used in the background of the report.

Secondly, the initial study checklist, there are items that have been gone through, and all of them have been checked "no impact," often in conflict with the preliminary documents and other documents, such as the onshore and offshore ecological-risk assessments.

And lastly, on the initial study, page 3, it mentions the risk from the rodenticide that contains arsenic, and the risks are glossed over, and it should be reexamined. Secondly, if there is a significant rodenticide there should also be considered to have an effect on four different habitats or a fate in four different habitats, such as air on page 8; page 9, surface and groundwater; 8 and page 11, animal life; and page 20, public health and safety. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and holding the public meeting.

- Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Jim, as I understand it, you're commenting on the CEQA package, which is the initial study essentially. Is that correct?  
A. Mr. James O'Loughlin - That's correct.

Mr. Chip Gribble - The purpose of the initial study is to evaluate whether or not the project we are undertaking has a significant effect on the environment. The project that we're undertaking in this case is whether the proposed remedy is a land-use covenant or effectively a deed restriction to limit future use of the golf course. In other words, the initial study is an assessment or analysis to evaluate this land-use covenant that we're proposing. Does this proposed remedy have a significant effect on the environment? Our view is that the act of imposing that land-use covenant does not.

The issue about whether or not the environmental investigation and that remedy is adequate for the contamination at the site, we would address those questions in our investigation documents, and the remedial action plan. So I don't know if that helps at all. Is that --

Mr. James O'Loughlin - No. Well, this is part of the state CEQA guidelines that comments on the draft initial study should be responded to after the written comment period.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Oh, we'll respond to your comments absolutely.

Mr. James O'Loughlin - Okay.

Mr. Chip Gribble - We are obligated to do that. I'm not sure how else to respond at this point. We'll look at your letter and try to provide a written response to that. Any other comments?

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Chip, can you briefly tell us how the land-use covenant is going to work, what the mechanism will be to . . .

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - I'm not an attorney, but my understanding is that the way the property is recorded at the county assessor's office, the Navy cannot enter into that covenant with the State of California, and so in order to - Dan's looking at me quizzically. Maybe I got that wrong. Please correct me if I don't have it correct. So, in order to effect the remedy, we will enter into a memorandum of agreement with the City of Vallejo saying that, when the City of Vallejo receives title to the property, they will enact this land-use covenant.

So, at that point, with that memorandum of agreement in place with the City, that effectively acts as a remedy where we can then say all remedial actions have been taken. At that point, we could approve a FOST, assuming the FOST has been found appropriate,

approve the FOST (Finding of Suitability to Transfer) that the Navy puts out, which will put the Navy in a position to be able to transfer the property to the City. Once the City gets the property, they are legally bound to implement the land-use covenant, which would run with the land, and that limitation would be in effect undoable without the approval of the California Department of Toxics. Did I get that right, Dan? Dan's nodding his head.

- Q. Mr. Ken Barden - Will the proposed land-use covenant cover the second nine holes also?  
A. Mr. Chip Gribble - No, it would not. Because the pesticide issue of arsenic never extended beyond the original nine-hole course. The implication was that the arsenic comes from an arsenical pesticide application at the golf course. I don't think it's likely to figure that the Navy was applying that in general up on the hill. I couldn't imagine any purpose that they would have found in applying the pesticide elsewhere on the hill outside of the golf course.

So we think that the concern extends to the limits of the original nine-hole course, even though a larger property is going to go to that golf course developer, that we don't want to unnecessarily broaden the limitation on the property for no valid reason. However, when somebody has a golf course and they propose to redevelop that someday for townhouses or residential developments or school property or something else, that, to the extent that I understand real estate, other forces that would come into play that would obligate a further investigation into the suitability of that property for that other use. We wouldn't necessarily be involved in that as a matter of course, but I think that would happen.

Any other questions on Investigation Area E? I suggest that we take a ten-minute break.

(There was a recess from 8:08 p.m. until 8:20 p.m.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Welcome you back to the public meeting. Welcome, Kay Woodson, from State Senator Wesley Chesbro's office. Thank you for being here. Our presenter is disappearing on us, so I'll conduct the meeting. Jerry and I have made a commitment to ourselves and to you that we really do want to get out of here by 9:00 because we've held you over a couple of other evenings. So we may dispense with the focus group reports and just do our co-chair reports after this Area 1 presentation and questions, because the commitment I made to DTSC was I'd rather have this public meeting here and sacrifice our regular schedule than do it on another night. Okay. Chip, here you go.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I'll try to move a little faster. By the way, people can make written comments and submit them to us tonight or through the mail. People can make verbal comments tonight. We will consider verbal comments, the written comments, and any way that you want to communicate to us your comments or questions, we will respond to them and we welcome them, particularly comments to the extent that our documents are not clear, that they don't make sense, or that the conclusions we reached are not supported in the text, like Diana's comment about the different chemicals of potential concern.

We will make changes to these documents to try to improve the readability and to strengthen our conclusions so that, as you read it, you can follow how we got to our end point and hopefully that you would then agree with us. All comments are welcome, by the way.

Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, is a subset of Investigation Area A1. In Investigation Area A1, there are two IR sites with considerable contamination that we carved out of the Investigation Area A1, clean parcels. They are boundary concerns, and what we did to make sure that the influence of those sites didn't cross over to A1, clean parcels, was a number of things, in particular a groundwater-plume analysis where we tried to delineate and project the extent of contamination from those sites over so many years.

And we also extended that line to include a buffer for an extra margin of safety so that we would not have to be concerned with contamination coming from those two sites. Specifically, right here on the map is IR 17, a former paint-manufacturing facility. Significant contamination there.

By the way, the Navy has done a soil removal action, which has reduced the contamination. I don't believe that is fully remedied, but the Navy has made progress in getting to the end point there. There is some groundwater contamination from that site extending some distances away from it, and we think that the extent of the A1, clean parcels, provides a sufficient buffer zone and distance from that contamination at IR 17 so that the A1, clean parcels, will not be impacted.

The other site that has contamination is IR Site A. It's a site with lead oxide contamination from a lot of spent batteries that were dumped out there. The Navy also has done an extensive removal action out there. The Navy thinks that probably is an adequate cleanup for final remedy, but we're certainly not at that point in agreement with them. We may someday, we may not, but that's still an open question in our minds, and so we've carved out those two areas in particular from the area we're talking about today.

A third area or source of contamination is here, which is a former gas station, Building 99 -- UST Tank 993. There are four USTs, underground storage tanks, in that location, and there is soil contamination at that location from the underground storage tanks. We have not finished characterizing that site, but we have added a buffer distance between that and Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, which we think is adequate so contamination doesn't cross over within a reasonable period of time. And our projected time frame is five years.

*Unexploded ordnance.* This area also was evaluated for unexploded ordnance in the broad sense of the term. There were two shooting ranges in this general area of the shipyard that in many years past were a small-arms range and a skeet range. The small-arms range backstop existed outside of Investigation Area 1. The place where they shot from is still in Investigation Area A1.

*The unexploded ordnance program* -- people did investigate that looking for evidence of bullets and did some soil sampling, particularly out here at the backstop. Lead contamination was found, but that's for a different discussion since it's outside of Area A1, clean parcels. We think the issue is no longer a concern for Investigation Area A1, clean parcels.

*Group 2 and 3 sites.* As I said earlier, initially we had 24 IR sites for Mare Island. We call those the Group 1 sites. Later we went through subsequent rounds of site identification, and the sites identified in those phases were called Group 2 and Group 3 sites. In the A1, clean parcels, we have no Group 1 IR sites. We do have two outside, which I already discussed.

For the two Group 2 and 3 sites, there were two that were identified, domestic sewage pumping stations, Dom 1 and Dom 2. In other investigations we've done on the shipyard for utility systems, we found that the pumping stations are the most likely parts of those systems where we're likely to find contamination, as opposed to the runs or the utility lines themselves.

For the pumping stations, it effectively is a sink or a low spot in the system, and if you were to find contamination anywhere in the system, it's most likely to be at domestic pumping stations. Both of these locations were found to have some contamination. We concluded that it was very limited contamination, and the extent of concentrations was not a concern.

Kelly, the next one, please. Again, the radiological surveys were done in this area. I believe there was one where there was radiological contamination in Building 655, which is that big gray block up there. Thank you, Wally Neville.

Here's Building 655. To my recollection, there was radium contamination in part of this building. I think it was in this corner of the building. Our agreements with the Navy call for cleanup or removal of radium contamination down to levels that were indistinguishable with background. Radium is a naturally occurring radioisotope. Radium is naturally found, and it's radioactive. So in soil outside and in an uncontaminated location, there will be radium 226, which is a radioactive isotope.

However, it's also a nonnaturally occurring radioisotope, and it can be in levels that are above natural levels and represent contamination. So there was contamination at this location. The Navy, in every instance where radium contamination was found, the radium was removed so that the residual concentrations were indistinguishable from background. We can say that with certainty in the areas where they did have contamination because, in order to make that determination as indistinguishable from background, that required statistical analysis, which required a significant number of samples in order to do the

statistical analysis. So that in itself requires a significant survey and sampling of the site to verify that it's indistinguishable from background.

**The PCB program:** there were a number of sites that were evaluated in this Investigation Area A1, clean parcels also. Some of these PCB contamination was found. In general, the sites where we found PCB contamination were limited in extent, and the Navy cleaned them up or did the abatement to levels that were below 1 part per million. The PRG, by the way, for PCBs is less than 1 part per million. It is .2 parts per million.

You may be wondering why we didn't clean up to less than 2 parts per million, we're saying it's okay. The Navy's cleanup goal was less than 1 part per million, and many of these are so limited in extent that they don't represent a consequential risk at that concentration. So the risk is really dependent on not just the concentration, but also the extent of contamination.

**Underground storage tank (UST) program.** In the UST program database, there are four listings of sites within Investigation Area A1, clean parcels. Two of the sites were not located. One of the USTs was removed. That was a 2,000-gallon waste-oil tank, which we determined was not problematic. Another one, called UST Site 999, was a 6,000-gallon diesel-fuel tank which the Water Board and we also concluded was not an issue.

However, in reevaluating these, the two tank sites, 655 and 655-1, these two tanks -- in additional site inspections we found evidence that a tank may have been or was likely to have been located in that area. The Navy went back for it, which was the third time to look for a possible UST in that vicinity, and was not able to find a UST once again.

However, on the third go-round, petroleum hydrocarbon contamination was found. It doesn't appear to be significant. The contamination is hydrocarbon only. And by the way, if we have hydrocarbon-only contamination, that does not fall under our regulatory authority, and that has been turned over to the Water Board, for final determination. Our determination is that that site is a hydrocarbon-only contamination site, and we are not regulating that particular site. The presence of hydrocarbon-only contamination does not preclude transfer in this case.

**Lead in soil from lead-based paint.** Again, there are a limited number of structures in Investigation Area A1. Because of our disagreement with the Navy about how to handle this issue in particular, or regulatory authority over this issue, the EPA in this case, instead of the Navy, they had their contractor at the time, Weston, go out and sample a number of the buildings in this area that we felt were representative of the most likely places to find lead contamination in soil from lead-based paint. Our conclusion was that that is no longer an issue for Investigation Area A1.

I don't think this is adequately discussed in the RAP. Also, that report by EPA and the EPA's contractor, Weston, talks about one building in particular. And now my numbers are fading in my head. This building right here.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - 571?

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Building 571. And the average concentration of lead from the samples around that building is something in the neighborhood of 850, and that's considerably over our screening level. We have written to the Navy saying that one was unacceptable and they need to go remediate that, and the Navy came back to us and said, "Mr. Chip Gribble, that's not soil - it's asphalt."

And we went back, and with further inspection, we agreed with the Navy that most of the surrounding area by that building is basically an uncompacted and weathered asphalt material, and what EPA's contractor had sampled was the dirt and the gravel coming off of the uncompacted asphalt. So the lead contamination is not in soil, but it's on the asphalt material that surrounds the building, which is a different issue and no longer considered a concern by us.

Two other buildings had average concentrations at greater than 400 parts per million. I can't remember the building names, but there should be two U-shaped buildings. There's the other one right there.

Both of those had average concentrations greater than 400 parts per million; and that was brought to my attention the other day. I don't think that's adequately discussed in the RAP, and we're going to try to add some more discussion to the RAP to clarify that. The concentrations there, see 400 parts per million, there is soil around most of those buildings, but not all the way around them. When you get some distance away from the building, there is pavement around most of those buildings.

So when we look at the asphalt pavement, we conclude that under the asphalt pavement there is no lead contamination, that asphalt pavement was acting as the barrier. And if we remove the asphalt pavement and took samples at a distance, which effectively is a mid-yard sample, what we call a mid-yard sample, and average those out, that the more representative concentration of lead around those two structures falls well below 400 parts per million.

We don't have the data point to make that average, but we reasoned that that is the case, that the representative concentration would fall below 400. And the way that we are sampling for lead around buildings currently is to sample at every six feet along the side of the building, composite that sample, and then average the concentrations to look for averages that are below 400 parts per million.

That sampling strategy removes our ability to see high concentrations or peak concentrations, but it does give us what is a much more representative concentration of the general lead levels in that particular vicinity around that building. And so what we're looking for now is an average of those composites and looking for levels that are below 400 for our screening level.

So if we were to do that at these particular buildings, samples at drip line, then composite it, and then samples also at the mid area and composite it, and averaging those together, we can reasonably conclude that the average would be below 400. That was the basis for our determination at those particular sites.

If you'll go back to the impacts from nearby groundwater. I already went over that when we talked about the two IR sites that are outside of Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, but that have groundwater issues, and that we did an analysis to make sure that we had a comfortable distance between those sources and the extent of contamination and the line that we've established for this parcel that we're discussing tonight.

*Greensand.* This is an interesting one. The Navy did sandblasting for many years down at the south end of the island using material which was a nickel-sand material, and it has a very characteristic green look to it. Greensand is the common term. This material was disposed of out at that site, which is out at the south end of Mare Island, and that's another site called IR 4, green sandy beach. I think the developer wants to call it Emerald Bay.

And the material was disposed at that site. It was also disposed of at the landfill, which is another site that we're evaluating, IR 1. The material was also disposed of to some extent as a backfill in utility lines. The Navy has made a case, which we think is a reasonable argument, that this material was used as a backfill in utility trenches for utility repairs, and based on our review of what the Navy has found to date, that our expectation of this greensand in utility trenches, we expect that it is located in discrete locations and in a limited number of concentrations throughout parts of Mare Island and utility systems. With the expectation that these are localized, limited deposits and few deposits, we feel that that presents an acceptable risk or not an unacceptable risk for unrestricted use.

And by the way, as the developers go in and develop these areas, we will know over time if our conceptual model isn't correct, and if that comes to be, that will be considered new information and we will go back to the Navy and say that determination is no longer valid because the developers and what we found subsequently is no longer consistent with our expectation, or if it is consistent with our expectation, then, obviously, we have no change.

*Ambient concentrations of metals in the fill.* This comes from the many decades of the Navy operating and generating hazardous waste and materials on the shipyard and with uncontrolled releases to the straits over the decades. This sediment that collects in the strait was then routinely dredged and pumped out to the dredge ponds or the western side of the

island, and a large part of Mare Island has been created through these dredging operations in Mare Island strait.

There were these releases out to the strait into the sediment of contaminants and then this contaminated material was dredged up and pumped out to the western side of the island. The question then is, in the fill material which composes most of the lowland area of Mare Island, is that, the fill material, in general contaminated ubiquitously, or the ambient concentrations of these metals in this fill material, did they represent contamination or are these ambient concentrations consistent with background or naturally occurring concentrations?

And the conclusion of the study we worked through with the Navy was that the ambient concentrations are consistent with levels that do not represent contamination. That's not to say we don't have contamination pockets, but the fill does not represent contaminated fill.

So, for Investigation Area A1, our proposal is for no further action in Investigation Area A1, clean parcels, that we think that what's there now is acceptable for unlimited use, unrestricted use, and that we do not propose any additional cleanup or limitation on the future use of that property. And that's the end of the presentation, and let's go to questions. Questions? Ken?

- Q. Mr. Ken Kloc - With regard to the ambient levels of arsenic, I recognize that you can't dig up the whole island and that those ambient levels are probably going to have to stay there, but nonetheless, that ambient level of arsenic is above the normal risk criterion, and so I'm wondering is there some way that there could be at least some sort of notification to people who are going to be using the land in the future? I'm not sure if you can do that in the CERCLA process. Or maybe there's some other way of doing it. I would imagine maybe if there was some mechanism in the EIS/EIR process, perhaps in mitigation.
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - That's a good question. I don't have an answer for that. Mike?
- A. Mr. Mike Wade - In general, arsenic, all over the state of California, is higher than the one-in-a-million risk level. For the Bay Area, I see numbers that are usually around 10. So maybe it's a little elevated over parts of the Bay Area, but there's parts down in Southern California where it's higher. So even though it's over that risk level, I don't think it's an unusual amount for some parts of California.
- C. Mr. Chip Gribble - In a lot of these inorganic materials, there's a continuum or a range of concentrations where you can go from naturally occurring levels that are benign that are well within any risk numbers, and then there are other locations where basically they have monetary value as an ore body. And I'm out of my ability to speak on that as to how to handle those kind of situations where you have concentrations that are naturally occurring that represent significant risks and everything in between, from marginal risks to significant risks and how do we as a department handle or respond to that? Another question is, how do we as a society deal with that or respond to that? Steve?

C. Mr. Steve Dean - Chip, I was going to point out that arsenic is the one heavy metal that has a very similar risk assessment anomaly that radium does, and that radium 226, the typical background level for radium exceeds the upper end of our risk range. So we're more or less we're obliged to clean up radium to indistinguishable from background because we can't go any lower, even though the risk would want you to if it were possible.

So arsenic has a similar problem in that just naturally occurring levels of the arsenic are very high on our risk range. So it's an artifact we have to live with in North America, or on the planet itself, so it's a very difficult question to grapple with, but we've had to with radiation - radium. I don't know if that helped or not.

Q. Mr. Steve Dean - Confused you all the more?

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - No.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I'll certainly explore the options, when I get back to the office, with other people in my agency. I don't know if it's appropriate for us to pursue some type of notification or not, but I'll look into that. Any other questions?

Mr. Chip Gribble - Diana?

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - You said it was okay for unrestricted use. Does that include residential?

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Unrestricted use is residential.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Okay.

C. Mr. Chip Gribble - Anything goes. We're saying we don't believe that any limitation on the property is not necessary. Okay, Paula?

Q. Ms. Paula Tygielski - My question's about the buildings with the lead around them, and the lead levels are -- in one case it's a matter of averaging it out. But those are unrestricted? Because in some of the other buildings, you put restrictions, like you shouldn't vegetable garden around the buildings.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I think you're referring to the CCC . . .

Ms. Paula Tygielski - The CCC.

Mr. Chip Gribble - -- down by the southern end of the island.

Mr. John Cerini - Building H-1.

A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Building H-1? The California Conservation Corps has leased the building down in the southern end of the island, and they haven't purchased it or they don't own the property. That's a lease arrangement. They're subleasing from the city, who leases from the Navy, and that lease agreement, we put in limitations to prohibit growing vegetables for the people that were living there. That's a residential-lease property.

That limitation in the lease terms does not necessarily represent a final determination on my agency's part as to whether or not we think that's suitable for unlimited use or unrestricted use or that we think there should be some limitation there. We're just saying, for the

purposes of this lease, you're not allowed to grow any vegetables. We haven't made a determination that the lead concentrations in that particular location are unacceptable or acceptable either way for unlimited use.

- Q. Ms. Paula Tygielski - These buildings in A1, they won't need a similar type of thing?
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - No. And best as I can recall from the CCC lease time, we were uncomfortable with our understanding of lead concentrations in that location, and rather than go to the effort to develop a more complete understanding of the lead exposures possible down there, we just wanted to put in that prohibition against growing vegetables.
- Q. Ms. Paula Tygielski - And as a quick question, is the problem getting lead into the food supply, or is the problem with the person working the soil coming in contact with the lead that way?
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - Gee, I think it's . . .
- C. Ms. Paula Tygielski - Or both.
- A. Mr. Chip Gribble - I think it's both, but Mike Wade, do you want to add to that?
- A. Mr. Mike Wade - Well, in our lead-exposure model, generally the garden adds insignificant amounts. So it's primarily the food, people consuming the produce, as opposed to gardening. Although, you know, that's going to add to your exposure as well, but it's primarily the food.
- C. Ms. Paula Tygielski - Okay.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Okay. These documents are available for review at the information repository here at the library. That information repository is right across the hallway here, and I believe you just check at the reference desk. The close of the comment period will be June 10th. We will prepare a response-to-comments document, and each commenter will receive a copy of this document and a copy will be placed in the information repository. That set of responses will be part of the record as we make our determination on the RAP. Dan?

Mr. Dan Murphy - I know there was one gentleman here earlier tonight who made a comment, and he's now left. And for anybody else who has made comments, I think that nearly everybody will recognize comments from this group, but I don't know who he was. And if anybody can tell us his name so that we can, A, make sure that the comments are properly attributed to him when they're responded to and, B, that he gets a copy of this, and for anybody else who isn't sure we know what their comment was, the same thing goes.

Mr. Chip Gribble - And this is the fact sheet we've put out covering these documents. I don't know if everybody got one or if anybody would like one. They're over on the sign-in table. So if you want to pick up one of the fact sheets, which gives a fairly concise overview of what we've discussed here tonight, please help yourself.

Any further questions? Again, I want to thank everybody for coming tonight to this meeting and taking time to provide us with your feedback and comments and be a part of the presentation here and helping us do our job. Thank you.

### **Administrative Business:**

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, Chip. I know we have limited time. What I want to do is go through my co-chair's report quickly. And I have some handouts for the board members, and there's some handouts going out to the audience also. Just going quickly through my handouts, I have my information on the front page there: E-mail address, U.S. mail address, phone numbers, and a list of acronyms for all the acronyms I'll be using today. Before I jump into that, Myrna just reminded me we need to conduct our normal business. If we have comments to the March 30 RAB meeting, two months ago, please submit those. Otherwise, we'll make those final after this meeting.

### **Reports:**

#### *Navy Co-chair*

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Back into my co-chair's report, the BCT report, basically, what the BRAC cleanup team has done in the last month. We had a meeting on April 5th, and we have meeting minutes for that. And, Maria, could you pass them out . . .

Ms. Maria Villafuerte- Sure.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - for the board members. There's some extra ones if the audience would like to get a copy of those. We held a teleconference on May 15th, a couple weeks ago, primarily talking about the parcels and FOST (Finding of Suitability to Transfer), and that's a subset of the Area E investigation that Chip talked about in the first part of his presentation. Future EPA participation, we also talked about that at length. Essentially we have resolved the apparent deficiency of EPA not participating in Mare Island's program. They will participate. Bonnie's not here tonight, but we have resolved the difference in budgeting between DoD and EPA. They will, however, potentially have a gap in coverage between now and the end of the fiscal year, September 30.

However, we will have someone from EPA permanently by October 1, 2000. We have an RPM meeting scheduled for June 13, and the tentative location is at DTSC. I think that is to be convenient for all the parties that are attending. This is open to the public. We're going to discuss briefs from regulatory agencies and from Navy RPMs. And the conversion management team meetings for May and June have been canceled. The City is not holding those. Jumping on to the second page, program status, what we're doing on the base.

*The ordnance program.* The ordnance Tiger Team, a process improvement team with a variety of players from the various organizations, met May 8 through May 12. They did a

policy review, and they're reviewing model ordnance sites up and down the West Coast. Mare Island is a primary model site. It was attended by the Army Corps, Chief of Naval operations, NAVFAC headquarter staff, as well as Southwest Division staff. They did a tour of Mare Island and a program review on May 11 and 12, and the Tiger recommendations are forthcoming. They will be addressing further work at Mare Island.

Early transfer meeting was held on May 17, and that was a kickoff meeting. We talked a bit about early transfer over the last few months. I have some booklets that help describe the process of early transfer, and if I can have those passed around to the RAB members. They are helpful to get a preliminary understanding. Actually, the cover there shows the naval hospital in Long Beach. I spent several days there as a child, living in the Los Angeles area, and it's now a shopping center, and it's a testimony to what transfer can do.

A draft FOST for Parcel 15 -- that's the clean parcels Chip just talked about -- that is going to be open for public review starting in June, so look out for that. We are currently in the public-review period for the Parcel 10 FOST -- the golf course, a subset of Area E -- and those comments from the public are welcome at this point. The public-comment period ends May 31, and for the RAB, I had mentioned some suggestions on how to get your comments. We want to hear from the RAB, and we want those comments. We can take them verbally, my E-mail address is on the front, or general U.S. mail.

If I can skip to the next page, just some details. I list the environmental media, very similar to what the RAP states about Area E. These are the media that we studied for the golf course. And the second slide for that is a list of what resulted as the notifications of this FOST for this golf course transfer. The significant difference is that we added two notifications to address historic structures.

Ken, to get back to your question, the bunkers are considered contributing historic structures, and they are subject to the memorandum of agreement with the state historic preservation officer. And two of those are currently being used as stormwater detention basins. The other ones that I'm not sure what the developer wants to do with those, or what the city plans to do with them, but I do believe they want to use them in a historic context.

Moving on to the fourth page, RAB support. We're proposing a tour on Friday, June 30, as well as Saturday, July 1. Both those are identical tours, and it's just two of them to offer flexibility for the RAB members for their ability to attend. RAB web site development. I list a web page here. If you go to that web page, you can click on support teams and click on environmental, and you'll see where we have web pages for various RAB sites. All the ones in Southern California are on there and fully developed. We're working to get all the Northern California RABs into that web page. Right now Hunters Point is in there. We'll get Mare Island in there within the next month.

**RAB support.** Starting next month, we had some discussions about tracking attendance of RAB members for purposes of insuring we have consistent participation. Next month we'll start with a checklist for RAB members to check off to validate their attendance.

**Information exchange.** I had a couple of E-mails go out this past month, and for those who don't have E-mail, I made some hard copies here, and I'll pass them around for those who need them. And that's it. I have just a few items there for RAB presentations, and the TAPP Application No. 2 is in here for review. Let me pass it on to Myrna.

### **Community Co-chair**

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I've just got a few items here. First, one of the decisions we made at the last RAB meeting was that I would prepare a letter to go to the Navy, the US EPA, expressing our serious concern about the budget snafu that occurred that caused Bonnie to transfer out. So Paula wrote her own letter, and that is here, and then there are hard copies of my letter. I want to acknowledge Rob Schonholtz, Diana Krevsky, and Ken Kloc for making significant contributions and deletions from my original draft that improved that letter immensely.

I attended a meeting yesterday that Lennar put on for the Mare Island tenants, and I do have one copy of their land-use plan on a map if anybody wants to take a look at it.

Going back to the funding issue, Bonnie has prepared a statement which she'd like me to read into the record, concerning that funding issue, and it says, "The EPA will continue to provide regulatory oversight alongside the State of California for Mare Island. A new representative will be starting on the project in June. Navy headquarters has promised continued funding for fiscal year 2001. That's October of this year through September of 2001. There still is a high degree of uncertainty from the oversight budget starting in October 2001. At that time, our budget agreement expires. It is unclear if the agreement will extend for Mare Island and for the other military bases in EPA Region 9. Good luck, and I have enjoyed working with you."

Concerning the FOST, I want to alert the RAB members that, when you're looking at the January FOST versus the current FOST that's out for the golf course, it's really important that you note that the Navy has significantly altered their plan to assure that the golf course is not used for residential or other restrictive land uses. In other words, they removed all reference to their own initial commitment to making their own land-use covenant in their transfer from the Navy to the City, even though they note as a supporting document, from a final technical memorandum, that they can't assure that people would not be exposed to undue risk.

It's really important that you note in your comments that they've made that significant change and that's not acceptable to you. That's what my recommendation would be, because in their original document they did say they would pursue a land-use covenant to

insure that the golf course is not used for residential or less restrictive uses in the future, and they had also committed to not only a land-use covenant but also a notification and a quitclaim deed, which they have also chosen not to pursue, or there's no evidence of it anyway. So I just wanted to alert you to that particular issue.

Ken is probably running out of money for the wonderful goodies he's been bringing. If you want to put money in this cup as you go out, that would be great, because the Navy does not provide food for us normally. And if anyone wants a copy of "Western Stakeholders Forum of Land Use Control Federal Facilities Summary," I'll make you a copy. It was an interesting presentation that I had a chance to moderate a panel on a few months ago, and this is just two or three pages. It also has a web site if you want to write that down.

C. Mr. John Cerini - I have just one comment, since it may resolve before the next meeting. It's possible that the demolition of the residential units west of Tisdale may be approved before the next meeting. So I want to make sure and convey that.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Something else that you might want to let us know about is, that in two or three weeks, the gate may not have a guard.

Mr. John Cerini - Well, the cameras will be installed within two or three weeks. We still have some signage that has to be put up, and then the gates will be removed from the guards during the daytime period, back at six at night, and there over the nighttime period.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - One other issue along those lines, John. There are some new RAB members who do not have one of those red stickers you handed out that gives them some access to the island. Would they contact you?

A. Mr. John Cerini - Just tell me how many you need. I'll bring them to the next meeting.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Okay. Maybe people would need one -- I see Chip raising his hand.

Mr. John Cerini - Except for DTSC. I will get Chip one for sure.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - And I wanted to comment on the potential tour date, Jerry, and that is that that even though July 4th is on Tuesday, quite a few people may take that whole weekend off. So we may want to reconsider that date. Is there a show of hands of people who could not make that tour date? Well, we'll talk about that via E-mail.

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - We'll try another day.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - All right. Thank you to everyone, including Dan Murphy, who came out this evening, and we'll see you next month.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.)