

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
Held June 29, 2000**

Welcome and Introductions:

The June 2000 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was called to order at 7:12 p.m. by Myrna Hayes, Community Co-chair and representative of Save San Pablo Baylands. Ten (10) RAB members, fifteen (15) guests and community members, three (3) 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. Jerry Dunaway
- Ms. Diana Krevsky
- Mr. Al Iliff
- Mr. Ken Barden
- Ms. Paula Tygielski
- Mr. Chip Gribble
- Mr. Ken Kloc
- Mr. John Cerini
- Mr. Rob Schonholtz

Recorder: Ms. Kathy Langstaff

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Good evening. An intimate group this evening. I had five phone calls from people who said they were going to be away on holiday. My name is Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair for the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board, and I'd like to welcome you this evening

(The RAB and community members introduced themselves.)

Administrative Business:

Ms. Myrna Hayes: Moving on to administrative business, as noted on the agenda, is an opportunity to accept the minutes of the April meeting. Any corrections? We had an opportunity last meeting for that, so we'll accept the minutes of the April meeting.

Reports:

Navy Co-chair

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, Myrna. I'm going to give the Navy co-chair report now, and let me hand out some copies of the handout from which I will be speaking. We'll have some extra copies so we can pass them out to the audience. To start, I will give my report on the BRAC cleanup team activities for the past month and the activities that

occurred at a meeting we held—let me back up. One of the changes coming up for next month—and we agreed to this across the BCT—is that the next RAB meeting is being moved to July 20, and I wanted to make you all aware of that. We normally have this meeting on the last Thursday of the month, but we moved it up because of some absentees for the last Thursday of next month.

We held a remedial project manager's meeting on June 13, and that included a project status review of the work being conducted at Mare Island, and we also addressed some outstanding issues. Meeting minutes are currently being circulated across the BRAC cleanup team, and once they are finalized, those minutes will be made available to the RAB, most likely at the next RAB meeting.

The next remedial project manager's meeting is scheduled for July 19, and that meeting is open to RAB members and others who are interested in hearing details of the specific environmental projects occurring on Mare Island.

In addition to the RPM meeting, we held a BRAC cleanup team teleconference on June 20, and that covered two topics of current interest – the status of the current remedial action plans that are just about to be finalized. That is for Investigation Areas A1, clean parcels, and Investigation Area E.

We also talked at some length about the community relations plan update project, and we'll talk more about that in the second half of today's meeting. We awarded a contract within the last month to do an update to the community relations plan, and that contract allows us not only to do that but also to address some other requests that DTSC and the RAB assembled and submitted in January of this year.

For program status, I wanted to touch on a couple of brief items. Instead of going to any length, these two items are of current interest because they are in the works and ready to be finalized. The first item is the public review of the Parcel 10 Draft Final Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). The public review of that document concluded within the last month, and we received comments that include, one, concerning the cleanup authority of the lead and soil cleanup at the water tanks up near the golf course. They are numbered 188 A and 188 B. The concern was that we did that work as a maintenance action, and there was some criticism that the Navy did not do this work under CERCLA. That most likely will become a comment that we cannot address. The work has been done. It's hard for us to go back and redo that, so it will most likely be an appendix to the final FOST as an unresolved comment.

We also received two comments concerning the removal of the residential land-use restriction, and that is due to the pesticides at the golf course, the original nine-hole golf course. The Navy removed that restriction in the Draft Final FOST. It was originally included in the Draft FOST, and our legal counsel is currently responding to that comment.

One is from EPA, and that comment is in more detail from a legal context, and so our counsel is working on that. And that has delayed the ability for us to finalize that FOST, and so we're not looking to do that until July.

Another big topic in the program is the three separate early-transfer initiatives. We had a status meeting on June 14, and I wanted to inform the RAB about that. We're not talking about transferring everything on the island. So I've labeled the three separate early-transfer parcels, and there's a map attached or on the back of one of the sheets. It shows the three areas, which are a significant part of Mare Island, but there are certainly other areas where the Navy will maintain ownership until we finish the cleanup work.

Just to summarize early transfer and the benefits it provides: it is a method to better assure funding for the cleanup. It includes a shorter cleanup schedule and provides for a direct conversion from cleanup to redevelopment. During our status meeting on June 14, the discussion of how the RAB fits into the early transfer was made, and I've received comments from the City and from the three separate early transfer parties to the City that they will maintain the RAB if and when early transfer happens.

That is a positive note because the Navy wasn't sure where that issue set. Early transfer is a way for the City to get this property early. It starts from the City, and they make the effort to request early transfer. Without going into more detail about their plans, they offered an invitation to the city council study session, currently scheduled for the evening of July 25.

Outside of the early-transfer RAB discussion, the Navy's RAB support, we have a couple of items on our agenda that we're hoping to execute here soon, and one is the RAB-member tour. We have a couple of dates that we revised since last month. The July 15 and 16 dates were not good. Chip from DTSC couldn't attend, and we think he is a key player for the tour, so we changed that to July 21 and 22. And we'll have, again, the Navy and DTSC. Hopefully, the new EPA representative, Emily Roth, will be able to attend, as well as our contractors Tetra Tech, Weston, and ECC. Myrna, I'll work with you on getting that developed. A question I have is if both days are needed. If you could inquire across the RAB, maybe we would settle on a date, or we'll just go with both dates.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - 21 and 22 is what you scheduled?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes. And I reported last month that we are currently updating our web site at Southwest Division in San Diego for the RABs in the Southern California area. We've acquired the Central California BRAC bases, and we're trying to get those web sites developed for those specific bases, including Mare Island. We have not gotten that up to speed yet. The web address is there on the sheet, but we are working to get that there. If you like, go ahead and look at the site, take a look at what the other RAB sites have, what they show: meeting minutes, fact sheet, photos, and informational stuff on the web site. And we're looking to get that done hopefully before the next RAB meeting.

That's it for my meeting. There were some people from last month who did not receive meeting minutes from the BRAC cleanup team meeting on 5 April 2000. I have some extra copies and I'll circulate them. I know, Chip, you didn't get one from last month. And I'll leave some copies with you, Myrna.

Community Co-chair

Ms. Myrna Hayes - First, I want to offer a kudo to Ken Barden, who just became a member of the Senior Assembly. And you want to tell us just for a second what that is, Ken, so that maybe we can offer you some help?

Mr. Ken Barden - The California Senior Legislature was established 20 years ago by the regular legislature. They decided that, because of the burgeoning senior population in California, they needed help on legislation relating to seniors. We meet every October, for a week, with the regular legislature and help develop bills relating to seniors.

California Senior Legislature is composed of 40 senior senators and 80 senior assemblymen, so it mirrors the same number as in the regular legislature. Because Napa and Solano counties are small, they are allowed one senior senator and one senior assemblyman. I am the senior assemblyman elected last month.

(applause)

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - And I'm sure contributing to that election was your faithful attendance and participation on the RAB.

A. Mr. Ken Barden - It was on my resume.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - It's definitely on my resume, too. Thanks, Ken. First of all, I wrote a letter on behalf of the community members of the RAB to the State Lands commissioners in support of the Mare Island transfer and exchange agreement that the commissioners would have approved this Tuesday in L.A. I've made some copies of the letter. If there aren't enough copies, I'd be happy to make more.

Basically, it says that we support that exchange, which includes the regional park being exchanged for some property on the north end of Mare Island, and it has a number of other components. It also urges the State Lands Commission, in their lease arrangement with the City of Vallejo, to ensure that the park resources are protected, including the cemetery, the natural resources, geological and botanical, the art tribute, the archeological resources that we encouraged them, or I did on your behalf, to look at some type of citizen advisory committee, as well as technical advisory committee, to ensure that those resources are maintained and that the park is indeed actually ever opened to the public. So that has been about six years in the making, and so it is a significant milestone that complements some of the other actions taking place around that hill and also the northern end of the island.

In response to one person's attendance at our last meeting at the remedial action plan presentation, this individual sent me several copies of a special report by the University of California entitled "Background Concentrations of Trace and Major Elements in California Soils." Here are extra copies if someone wants to take these or have it as a RAB resource.

I attended my first-ever remedial project manager's meeting. That was a grueling event. I was lucky enough to have Karen Hack attend for me, and I think Ken attended for a while when they used to be held on a regular basis. But it was very informative, and I took lots of notes which I'm not going read.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Do we receive meeting minutes of that meeting at some point?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes. They are currently in review across the regulators and the team. They will be finalized by next month.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Okay. A lot of updates on where contractors or regulators were in the Navy in terms of cleanup. And one overriding sense I had was that it sounded like the Navy and their contractors were holding their breath to see what would happen with early transfers, and I just wanted to encourage you to keep on doing the work you are doing that you have contracts for. That's UXO and I don't know what all you have out there. Sounded like a long list. I think the American people, while you're waiting for some other goodies to happen, really do expect you—and I know the local community does—to keep on moving.

One other comment is that there were these mystery IR sites identified, IR 28, IR 26. I have never heard of those before, and if I have not, I don't know if any other RAB members have heard of any IR sites past 24?

So maybe for an agenda topic, we've always heard of IR 1 through 24 and then go to Group II and Group III sites. So if anybody could tell us what those are or why you decided to choose those numbers, or give a presentation about them in the future, so that we're up to speed—I see Chip grabbing his microphone, Jerry.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Chip certainly has more history on this, but my understanding is that we got to IR 24 and went to create some more IR sites, and there were decisions made within the Navy at that time that they did not want to designate them as IR sites for one reason or another, and so they were called Group PASI sites, or they might be called Group II, Group III sites. And Chip, you could offer more detail, but that's my understanding. So the Navy had some numbers in mind. Internally we kept those numbers as a reference, but in fact they are more officially known as other types of sites.

C. Mr. Chip Gribble - Yes, it's a complicated history. We have officially 24 IR sites, and IR is a Navy term: installation restoration. It has no standing with CERCLA or RCRA or the State of California process, so it's a Navy term which translates into a contaminated site or a site that needs some evaluation from our perspective.

Subsequent to the identification of those 24 sites, several other sets of sites were identified and put on the table for study and possible remediation, and those sites never got an IR designation. I'm sure the Navy had some reasoning at the time, some of which I can guess at, some of which I can't. From their perspective, I think they feel that they have to do a ROD on a site that has an IR designation, and if a site doesn't have an IR designation, they don't need a ROD. So not calling something an IR site gives them some flexibility.

From our perspective, it doesn't matter whether it has an IR designation or not. It's a CERCLA site or potential CERCLA site. So we had these names of sites such as Building 213 area or Building 513 area, and we never called them by an IR site X. The Navy, also in an interim time, used the designation SWMU, S-W-M-U, which was an RCRA term, and they were using it incorrectly, and it was confusing things. It was not intentional.

For some internal reason of their own, they started calling these sites by a SWMU number, and you'll see that every now and then, and those numbers shouldn't have been used. In the meanwhile, the Navy has started to use IR No. 25, 26, etc., for some of these additional sites, but they have done that unilaterally without sitting down with the agencies to say that we want to officially title this site by IR 25, for example.

It's something that should be done at some point; if you want to start calling things by IR 25, 26, 27, et cetera, et cetera, we should do that in some RPM meeting where we've got some official designation. Otherwise, we have this confusion that exists today with some people not understanding what you're talking about, myself included.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I know that the one comment you made, that IR sites need to have a ROD—we don't have that understanding. An IR site, if it doesn't require further action at the remedial investigation or prior to the remedial investigation stage, can very well be dropped as a CERCLA action site, and therefore not require a ROD. So I'm not sure that was the reasoning. This was all done prior to Southwest Division taking on the programs, but I can look at the reasoning for why we are still calling them these IR sites. Maybe we need to put another name to them, or if we really want to call them IR sites, we'll designate them as IR sites and discuss that at the BCT level. So I'll go ahead and take that up.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Thank you. Ken Barden has written me a note, and it's actually about something Jerry, GPI, and I have been talking about, and that is that we keep these little cheat-sheet attendance records for the RAB members. And I really appreciate getting phone calls, as I've said to you many times. I got five between yesterday and today from folks who said they would be away on the Fourth of July holiday, which is why we postponed the first planned tour.

The reason we keep these is just to give us a feel for people's commitment. That's the way we translate attendance at the monthly meeting, is commitment, unless things come up in your work or in your health or family life that makes it impossible for you to occasionally

not attend. There's really a lot of effort that goes into putting this meeting together, and I really appreciate and know the Navy and the regulators really appreciate the effort that so many people have made sometimes for many years to be here on a regular basis. I've counted six people who have not attended this year at all, and that tells me those are folks who probably for various reasons in their life are not going to be able to be RAB members.

I would like to propose that we ask the Navy to put out a notice requesting RAB-member applications again and make a date by which we want those. We've had a policy of accepting and considering RAB applications on an ongoing basis, and occasionally I know you remember us bringing a name or two to you. So let's make a big push to get the word out, and that doesn't mean just the Navy putting a formal ad in the paper.

If you could make some type of an ad available to us along with the one-page application or a cover letter, we can distribute those to folks who we know or places where we think the application would be picked up, because as Ken notes, we have a number of members of our community, ethnic members or organizations, who are not reflected on the RAB, and it would be nice to have a RAB as reflective of the community as possible. Let's go to some focus group reports. Diana? I know the community outreach focus group did meet.

Focus group reports:

Community

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes. And we were very productive. We covered several items, and first, I'll start with the letter we put together, a letter—and I gave a copy to Jerry— that addresses our proposed community public relations plan that is going to be discussed later. We took Chip Gribble's comments and piggybacked our responses to those and put it in this letter, and then we made some more additions.

One of the issues worth mentioning now is that we are requesting that the RAB continue in its advisory capacity as long as the Navy has jurisdiction over any area of Mare Island and such properties transferred to other entities but still have unresolved environmental issues. And we would like to see the RAB active on those situations and not put by the wayside.

There are some other issues. I'll circulate some copies. We also wanted to include our survey as part of the community relations plan, so I attached that in Jerry's copy. And everybody has been inundated with that survey, but just in case there was somebody who missed it, I gave them a copy.

We decided on a new project, and we are proposing to do a community town hall meeting or forum for September 28 in place of a RAB meeting. We tentatively plan to call it "Environmental cleanup of Mare Island, where are we now?" I also have a rough draft of our proposed plan. So any suggestions are welcome. It is still a working draft and an idea

that needs to be refined. The idea is to have a panel-discussion format, have presenters do short presentations. They may or may not be part of the panel, we haven't decided, but possibly have a format where there is presentation, discussion, and a question-and-answer session afterwards, and fit it within the two-hour framework.

The suggested topics would be of two parts: the status of the Mare Island cleanup, which could be divided into past, current, and future challenges; community concerns, which would be lead, early transfer, workers' and public health and safety, public access, and deed restrictions, and the State Lands agreement. We hope that we can go through that and have support of the Navy and regulators, and anybody who is willing to help organize it would be great.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Have I left anything out?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Diana. I did mention earlier that the City and their developers have committed to maintaining the RAB, and in addition we talked about asking them to do a presentation, maybe not on early transfers specifically, but just on how we would collaborate together in maintaining the RAB or maybe discussions on some topics you suggested on those sites where early transfer would transfer those to other parts outside the Navy and how they plan to do those cleanups.

And after that study session, they felt that was immediate that they should advise city council on their progress with early transfer, but after that, possibly August, September, they could come to the RAB meeting and do a presentation. I think that they have demonstrated a commitment to maintaining this RAB, and it is a good thing for us.

The public affairs officer, Lee Saunders, is our PAO in the Southwest Division, I'll hand out his information, E-mail address, telephone number, mailing address with an E-mail to the members, and I'll also include that in my next month's co-chair report.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Does he have a local number?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I do not think so. I'll ask him if he has a toll-free number. He may have one of those, but definitely the E-mail access is hopefully not too expensive.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Just to respond to that, I was the one who suggested that the PAO be available to us. E-mail really does not do any good, and it is not a matter of cost for a news reporter, and I end up being a PAO. And we've talked about that before with Larry Douchand, and nothing ever was responded to on that. It's a really important issue for us.

Mare Island and the Navy's cleanup activity are not getting the public-information access they really deserve. I've just looked at the list of who you send the agendas to. It's a moving target, but three out of the five are obsolete for the press. Actually, I don't know who two of the people are. So the two people you have for the press are no longer appropriate. We really need a good working relationship with whoever this person is, so we don't bear the burden of communicating about cleanup issues for Mare Island.

And that reminds me that this RAB packet somehow did not include this date change for our next RAB meeting, July 20, and I know we had made that decision before we made the agenda. I think that was an oversight, but in the future, if we make a change, it needs to be noted as colorfully as the transition group cover sheet is. And one way that would also help people know about the upcoming date is to add the upcoming date for the next RAB at the bottom of the agenda so that, if someone were trying to figure out the date, all they would have to do is go to their old agenda.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Easy enough to do, Myrna. We'll do that. GPI wasn't aware of the date change, and I failed to notify them and wanted to report it here, but certainly we can put that out.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, reporting here is a good idea, but as you can see, not very many people are here. So the more we do, the better.

Natural Resources

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Natural resources, Jerry's not here, so we won't hear a report — and that focus group doesn't seem to ever meet. We might consider whether we want to continue that focus group. But if we get some new members, maybe we'll get new energy in that group.

Technical

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Paula, the technical focus group?

A. Ms. Paula Tygielski - We did not actually meet. However, Ken Kloc has some issues he wants to talk about, so I'll pass the microphone to him.

Mr. Ken Kloc - Okay, a couple of technical items I have been working on over the last month. The first thing is that Jerry had requested that someone from the RAB, and probably someone from the technical group, give him a short summary of the first TAPP grant, which was for the Arc View training. I did that and sent that to him a few days ago.

And people in the community RAB section should have been receiving E-mails from me which contained comments. I've been sending several sets of comments over the last

month. I'm going to continue doing that as I create comments, and if you would like not to receive the comments because they're cluttering up your mailbox, just tell me, and I'll take you off that list. And if there are people who don't have E-mail, I can also make it a point to send you a hard copy. So I think—I don't have Ken's E-mail address, so—

Mr. Ken Barden - I don't have one.

Mr. Ken Kloc - Okay. I can send you a hard copy, or I'll give you a hard copy.

Mr. Ken Barden - Thank you.

Mr. Ken Kloc - Over the last month, I was able to focus on a couple of issues revolving around lead. First, I was able to review the draft final remedial investigation for Installation Restoration Site No. 8. In order to refresh your memory, IR 8 was a lead acid battery storage site, and I had made comments on the draft version, and Mary Masters of the TOSC group had made comments on the draft version. So the draft final version came out several months back, and the regulatory agencies have been taking a little extra time to get their comments in, and the EPA had just recently gotten its comments in. DTSC is planning on getting its comments in, so I took the opportunity to get my comments in just before DTSC.

I had one page of comments. I won't review those tonight. If you receive the E-mail and have any questions, feel free to give me a call. I also took a look at the FOST for Parcel X, and thanks, Jerry, for bringing up one of the comments that I made on the FOST, and that was the comment about ARC Ecology feels that the Navy should be treating lead-based paint in soil as a CERCLA release, and both the DTSC and the EPA have made statements that they consider lead-based paint in soils to be a CERCLA release. So we support them in their determination, and that was the gist of my comment.

I also had a chance to look at the draft remedial action plan and negative declaration for Area E at Mare Island, as well as Area A1, and I had a number of comments. And Chip has been communicating with me. I'm fairly confident that he will address most of those. I just wanted to give a description of one of the more significant comments.

One of the problems that I found when I was going over both the FOST for the golf course area, as well as the remedial action plan for that area, was the removal action for lead-based paint at those water tanks. There had been some problems with the initial assessment of lead in soil around that tank. The problem was that the Navy did not carry out its step-out assessment far enough in order to be able to say with certainty that it had met a remedial goal of 400 parts per million (ppm).

In other words, in the assessment what happened was, is, you take soil samples close to the tank, and you step out. And if the soil samples are above 400 ppm, then you step out, and you step out until you get to the point where you're clear that it is below 400 ppm. And that hadn't been done in the initial assessment of the soils at least one of the tanks, and so in reviewing some of the documentation, I happened to catch it at the eleventh hour when I

was looking through the remedial action plan that the DTSC prepared.

At that point I spoke with Chip, and he immediately went out there and actually took more samples to verify what the case was, so I think that deserves a kudo for being responsive to a very late-hour comment.

But in any case, what I would like to point out is that the reason I didn't know that there had been this problem with the assessment at those tanks was that the Tetra Tech

presentation given to us did not point out that there was a problem. And so I wanted to make a criticism of that presentation. They had the opportunity to tell us, "Hey, we had this problem with the assessment," but that was never pointed out to the RAB. So the RAB couldn't take that under consideration and make recommendations at that point, and so it came down to this eleventh-hour motion on my part.

So that's what I've done over the last month. If you have any questions about the details of any of this, please speak with me or E-mail me.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, I think Ken deserves kudos for going through those documents on our behalf, on behalf of ARC Ecology. That is techy stuff. And I will absolutely support you about the level of completeness of that report from Tetra Tech. I know that your contractor does not always have a lot of time to prepare after we make an agenda item, and you go out and say, "Can you pull this together," and I know you are also trying to make presentations that are digestible, if you will, by the public, but we need to work on a format that insures that the information for the RAB to actually make a contribution for a decision is in each presentation.

Maybe we should make a formula and have ten questions that that presenter needs to address or to be able to answer. We should get together so that we have some consistency so those kinds of glitches don't happen and there are not bad feelings or scrambling to try to make things right at the last minute for whatever reason. If we had some kind of a checklist or mechanism, maybe we could prevent that in the future.

And that brings up the fact that there is a purpose for the RAB, and that's so that you can give us information and we can hopefully understand it and digest it and give you relevant comments or express our concerns either to the regulators or to the Navy and hopefully influence in some way or give our blessing to the actions you're taking for the cleanup. It really is the spirit of the RAB, not just for us to be entertained and for you to go to a lot of trouble and make these presentations.

And that reminds me that I made comments on the FOST for Area 10 in the context of the RAB at the last meeting, and I hope you took those seriously. We've had some almost heated discussion about whether what the RAB says in a RAB meeting is something that should be considered relevant to a document, and I continue to say there's no point in us being here if what we have to say is not taken seriously verbally as well as in writing. So you have some similar comments, mine not being quite as complete maybe as an EPA's about the FOST for Area X and the fact that it left out or radically changed from the draft.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I understand the concerns that have been submitted and Chip also forwarded, although we're not responsible for that remedial action plan. I did discuss this with Chip and then followed up with Tetra Tech, and it was not an oversight. We had some site conditions, basically some grading and contours that were a basis for us not to do that

step-out sample. It was an asphalt road at the top of a hill above this tank, and there was some professional judgment there that indicated we did not need to sample on the other side of the road. I believe that was the reasoning for not doing the step-out. I don't know all the details. I wasn't here at the time of the cleanup, but I believe the additional samples confirmed we did not have an issue on the other side of the road.

As for the verbal comment you made on the draft final FOST, yes, we are addressing the EPA comment, and that will be a response that will go to others who had the same comments about removing that restriction due to the pesticides. By the next RAB meeting, I should have that response formalized. I can equally respond in the context of the RAB meeting to your comment and have that available. It will also be provided in written form to those who provided written comments.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - You also said, in an E-mail or verbally, that you were going to treat verbal comments the same as written comments and that you would respond in writing.

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - We can do that. Yes, the response to you will be in writing, but I'll also verbalize at the next RAB meeting.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I just want to codify that because sometimes some people are verbal. Some people do not prefer to write. I have a hand injury. I don't really like to sit down at the computer and write, but if I do review documents on occasion, or part of them, it is because I thought it was really important to share both with the RAB and also to make a formal comment. And since we do have court-reported minutes, I think that what is said here can be accurately responded to because it is quite accurately recorded.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I request, for the RAB members that make comments, that you state that this is a formal comment to a specific issue. As you know, our meeting minutes are lengthy, and going through pages of minutes to find a comment that may be buried in there is sometimes difficult, and I would not want to miss the comment because we did not have it at any point. So if you could in the future, thank you.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - And if you don't happen to note that for the record, usually we go off of an agenda, and it's pretty easy when you have something like a FOST presentation and you know that you're looking for public comments on something, an action like that, that you just go to the minutes and look under that section of the minutes, not peruse the whole 25 pages, but target that section. That's why we have an agenda, isn't it?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I understand.

Transition Reuse & City Report

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Okay. Quickly, the transition reuse group did not meet due to Cynthia's illness. John Cerini is not here to give the City report, and he is also not going to be

available I assume for his presentation on the caretaker cooperative agreement. So that will save us a little time. Chip, do you have a regulator's report?

Regulatory Agency Update

Mr. Chip Gribble - I'll make it short, because we're running kind of late. Emily Roth, who is the EPA representative replacing Bonnie Arthur on the project from EPA, called me this afternoon and said that she had complications which prevented her from making this meeting, and she apologized, but she will be here for the next RAB meeting. The point here is that even though I work with the State of California, there is an EPA person who is assigned to the project and is working on the project, and that's Emily Roth. We have been working together already, and she has been participating in meetings, and she will be at the next RAB meeting. And her number is at the bottom of the RAB agenda, so you can reach her that way if you would like.

In the last month, we had the two remedial action plans and two draft remedial action plans out for public comment. We processed the comments, and we have been busy preparing responses and finalizing those. And we did get some challenging comments, in particular on the lead issue, and I believe that we have adequate responses to address those concerns. And those responses do not require us to change the remedial action plans. And if I have time, I can get into a short version of the responses, if you would like, but we think that there is a satisfactory explanation to address those concerns.

As of today, the two remedial action plans were approved by my agency, and so we consider them final. And I hope that everybody is happy with that, as opposed to being unhappy because they haven't seen the responses to comments yet. The responses to comments will be distributed and made available, and copies will be sent in particular to people who submitted comments. But I don't have all the reproducing done this evening.

It is FOSET season. That's the early transfer process. So we're beginning to shift gears with the Navy to gear up to process these early transfer proposals. However, as Myrna was saying, that in keeping with the City's perspectives as to the extent that we can—which is to say that the City's priority is to get the north end of the island, which is north of the causeway, transferred as soon as possible—we will continue to work on drafting some technical documents to finish off the environmental work for the north end of the island.

And that relates to site IR 8, IR 17 site, and Investigation Area A-2. And that's the short of it. If I have time, I can get into the responses a little on the lead issue.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Two or three minutes?

Mr. Chip Gribble - Okay. Ken's comment about the two water tanks in Area E was that we didn't have adequate characterization of the extent of lead contamination. Jerry commented tonight that it is the Navy's perspective that it was professional judgment and that it wasn't

an incomplete characterization. That may have been the case. I'm not going to disagree with Jerry. However, it's fair to point out that at a minimum that wasn't presented in the document. The document was not complete insofar as it didn't give that perspective that we didn't feel the need to continue the sampling because professional judgment, or whatever the rationale was, that we felt the Navy felt that the contamination was bound. And so to the extent that that was not in the report, that's the minimum shortcoming of the report, and aside from going beyond that, we could agree that the characterization was not complete.

But all that notwithstanding, at the point when we received the comment, we felt obliged to do something. We were uncomfortable moving forward with our decision with the data that were available, so we did go out and take additional sampling to check that the data that we got back from those additional samples were consistent with our conclusion that the overall sitewide average is below 400 ppm and there are no individual sites or samples or areas that have values that exceed 1,000 ppm. Those are the two main criteria in defining our 400 ppm screening level, although we recognize and acknowledge that there is considerable residual lead contamination there and the screening level could reasonably and very possibly be exceeded once that tank is demolished.

By the way, the tank is scheduled for demolition sometime later this summer. With that concern, we inserted language where we were going to require additional sampling for lead in that area following demolition of the tank to see what the situation is or the case may be after demolition. The other comments that came out on lead related to—I'm doing the short version. This is not the full breadth of the comment, but the essence, if you will, the hard part. They were related to the RAP for Investigation Area A1 clean parcels.

The comment, in so many words, was that the EPA had sampled for lead in a number of buildings in the north end of the island. Three of those exceeded the 400 ppm average, and that was problematic. And we acknowledged that your ability to understand or to reach the conclusion that we did was limited or not possible because you didn't have some of the information that we had available to us. One of the buildings, the average was 800 and something, almost 900 ppm around the perimeter.

What we had done—and this goes back some time—was notify the Navy that that was unacceptable and that the Navy had to do some lead cleanup there, and the Navy responded by saying that the building was surrounded mostly by asphalt—I mentioned this a little bit last week [sic] in the presentation—and that upon further inspection, we agreed and that number of 800-some ppm did was not representative of soil contamination in the perimeter around that building, so that we felt that that met our screening criteria even though the average of the data for that particular site exceeded 400 ppm.

Our screening criteria is not 400 ppm of the average of the data. It is 400 ppm of the average at-site conditions that represent the site conditions. I'm not trying to split hairs. I hope that is not the way it came across, but there is more technical depth to that.

At the other two buildings where the averages exceeded 400 ppm, the data did exceed 400 ppm on an average; however, upon further inspection of those two buildings, we found that a considerable part of the area surrounding those buildings is paved and that the two averages between 400 and 450 ppm, and that all of the data values that comprised those two averages, were taken right up against the foundation or within two feet of the foundation. Therefore, that represented the worst value, and in this case our 400 ppm average or sitewide average is based on an average of an average, if you will, an average of a value at the drip line, which is the drip line of a roof or near the foundation, and an average in between that value and a mid-yard sample.

We reasonably conclude that the mid-yard sample—we didn't have any data for mid-yard samples and that much of the venue was paved, and therefore we could reasonably conclude that the mid-yard sample would have a value that would be well below 400. Taking those two numbers together, we can reasonably conclude that the average would be well below 400 ppm, and that is how we reached our decision on that as well.

That's the short part, and I can get into it more in depth later or we can discuss this specifically in the response to comments, but I've taken up all the time I have.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you. We have on the agenda a presentation from John Cerini, and we skipped over the City report. I'm not sure if you came prepared. You had some things going on. You've been busy.

Mr. John Cerini - Burglary.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - But if you're available, maybe you can do a quick City report and a quick presentation, if we can reduce it to five or ten minutes.

City Report

Mr. John Cerini - Sure. There's no significant changes since the last meeting. The City's still continuing to negotiate with the Navy, and there may have been some conversation on that at the meeting about the possibility of early transfer. The tank project and the other significant projects going on on the base are progressing with no problems. That is about it as far as the City report. Do you want the presentation now?

(Mr. Jerry Dunaway nodded.)

Presentation: Caretaker Cooperative Agreement

Mr. John Cerini - I apologize for being late, but one of the responsibilities I have is security and police services, and we had a burglary in progress just about the time I was getting ready to come to the meeting. Vallejo police did very good. They captured two guys stealing electrical tape from the buildings.

I'm going to give you a very brief explanation of the cooperative agreement and what it means to the City and how it relates to you. Most of you know that the base closed in April 1996, and after base closure, the Navy continued to do maintenance and operation of the base through a number of different areas. They utilized Public Work Center, San Francisco Bay, J.A. Jones Management Company, and they used SSPTS, which, as most of you know, do the maintenance of the base. And that was from April 1 to September 30, 1996.

From September 30, 1996, they entered into an agreement with the City called a cooperative agreement, and at that time we assumed some of the responsibilities for maintenance of some of the facilities and activities on Mare Island. They still continued to share responsibilities. They continued to use SSPTS and J.A. Jones to do some of that maintenance until September 30, 1998.

The cooperative agreement continued to evolve, and in the following page you'll see the financial evolution of it. And in October 1998, the City assumed most of the operation and maintenance responsibilities, no responsibilities for cleanup. And basically the agreement is a responsibility where the City has to provide maintenance and preservation and security for the inactive facilities on the base, and inactive relates to the facilities that are inactive in the eyes of the Navy. When the facility is leased out by the City, then we no longer provide maintenance support to those facilities through the cooperative agreement. That is assumed by the tenant.

The initial budget was for \$3.4 million, and that was for one year beginning in 1996. The second year, some increase in some functions, that essentially went to \$4.2 million. In the third year, in 1998 and 1999, the budget went to \$7 million. Our current year the budget is \$6 million, and we expect next year to be another \$6 million.

And briefly, to tell you some of the functions we handle, in the handout that the people on the Restoration Advisory Board—we initially started with just providing administrative services, police services, operation of the bridge, maintenance of the roads, and maintenance of the water, sewer, and storm system. During the evolution in 1997-1998, we assumed some additional responsibilities: security, equipment maintenance, and mosquito abatement services. And the following year, 1998-1999, we assumed the rest of the responsibilities, which included fire services, security services, ground maintenance, waterfront structures, with all the drydocks, railroad trackage, refuse collection, the management of all the historical files. The original drawings for all the base are now managed through our office. And then we also were made responsible for paying all the utility bills for everything that a tenant doesn't consume.

So, briefly, that's what the cooperative agreement is about, and that's what we're doing. The Navy has really made an extra effort to support us, and their support has been excellent. They've funded special projects for repairing some major pump stations for the

sewer system and aided the City in keeping the base functioning at a good level. Are there any questions?

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - John, I have a quick question. I noticed that you're doing some digging or trenching around some lights. Streetlights are beginning to come back on. Are those related to tenant agreements, or are they related to the cooperative agreement?

A. Mr. John Cerini - We have a responsibility to provide streetlight services, and there is a liability if you have a streetlight not operating. But we are also looking at development, so we are not doing anything associated with a streetlight that will likely be changed in the redevelopment, but those that should be operating and we can restore, we're restoring.

The problem is that the Navy ran all of the electrical power to the streetlights from buildings, and so sometimes the streetlight is actually operating off of a tenant facility, so we reroute the wire so it is actually coming off of the electrical service in town.

Q. Unidentified male audience member - Rebuilding or dry rot replacement at the bandstand, was that one of the projects, or was that handled by somebody else?

A. Mr. John Cerini - That's a prime example of the Navy's support of the cooperative agreement. That was paid for by the Navy. It was about \$8,000. And we have a responsibility to maintain the historic facilities, and that was covered under the cooperative agreement.

Q. Mr. Ken Kloc - John, your budget, where does most of the funding come from?

A. Mr. John Cerini - The cooperative agreement is a grant fund, in essence, from the Navy. Currently, the way it's structured in the EDC, we are required to pay that money back to the Navy from proceeds of the sale and development of the base. There is legislation that allows for a no-cost EDC, although we have not gone forward and taken action to take a no-cost EDC because there are other things that go with it. So it's basically paid for by the Navy right now, grants. Thank you.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, John.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - John, one more question. It looks like you are doing the same thing you were doing in 1998-1999. Why did you have a million more to do it with that year?

A. Mr. John Cerini - The way the cooperative agreement works is that, when a facility is not leased out, we maintain it, which includes grounds, the physical structure of the building, and associated utilities. When a building is leased out, we no longer maintain it, and those responsibilities transfer to the tenant.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - And quickly, if we can entertain any public comment. We have a microphone in the center of the audience if anybody would care to make a comment or if any RAB members want to comment on any reports presented thus far. If not, why don't we go into Oh, excuse me, Diana.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Actually it's a question for John. I wondered whether the agreement covering security, if there's a mechanism in place to enforce deed restrictions about property that should be either under institutional control or off limits. Is that part of the agreement? Is there something built into it?

A. Mr. John Cerini - There isn't anything that specifically talks about a specific site in this installation restoration area, but those areas that are fenced off, security will continue to notify police or me if there is something unusual going on. A lot of the IR sites are not fenced-off areas. A lot of the IR issues are underground, and you can actually walk through the area and not be exposed to any hazards, so some of the IR sites do not require any controls to walk in the vicinity. A prime example would be IR 3, which has fuel oil underground, but we still are able to walk and work in the area.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - How are you going to be able to enforce deed restrictions since some of the people who are leasing the property and have the rules not to do this or dig there or —is there anyone to oversee that?

A. Mr. John Cerini - Well, there are various things that go on. There is what they call destruction notice, so if there is any excavation by a tenant or by anybody on the base, then they're required to fill out a destruction notice. That goes through the Navy. The Navy reviews its impact if it is being exposed to an IR site. That is one of the ways that they do control.

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - Jerry, who at the Navy is reviewing those destruction notices?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Our caretaker site office staff reviews destruction notices.

C. Mr. John Cerini - Then Dave Godsey reviews the environmental aspect of it.

C. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - And Dave is in the back row. Any other comments on any other issues? If not, let's we take a quick five-minute break and return as soon as we can.

(A recess was taken from 8:25 p.m. to 8:32 p.m.)

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Welcome to the second half of the RAB meeting, and I think we have a presentation that will help us progress in our support to the RAB here, as well as to the community outreach for the entire BRAC program at Mare Island.

As I mentioned earlier, within the last month we awarded a contract for the updating of the community relations plan, and that also provides a mechanism for us to address what have been identified as deficiencies in implementing the existing community relations plan, and so we are going forward with several different things under this contract. One is that we are going to take care of these deficiencies been identified from DTSC that Chip outlined back in January, and we are going to do that much sooner than the update to the plan. And then we are also going to update the community relations plan, and included in that are interviews for requesting additional RAB members. And that is timely because we are going to have some absentees on the board, and hopefully we will be able to beef up the membership here.

Marie Rainwater from Tetra Tech is handling the project, and she will present both those segments of this project. Thank you, Marie.

Presentation: Community Relations Plan Review

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Thank you very much. My name is Marie Rainwater. I'm the project manager for the community relations plan or, as we like to call it, the CRP. And as Jerry said, that will be expanded to also address the concerns raised by Chip and the RAB, and I'm going to go over both of those items tonight. I'm going to be assisted by Kelly Ryan. I'm sure most of you know her.

Ms. Kelly Ryan - Kelly Ryan with Tetra Tech. I'll be manning the pen.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Because this is going to be a two-way presentation, first I want to present things, and then we want to get more feedback from you. And there are two basic things. I want to talk about the CRP and how we want the RAB to support us in developing a community relations plan that targets the general community around Mare Island. Secondly, we want to present to you, item by item, what the Navy wants to do in response to the concerns that you brought up with Chip; and if I had to pick one word to summarize those responses, it's "yes." In other words, the Navy is going to do what is on that list in some form, and we are going to go over the details of that today. There are also places where we want to get more information about that item, more suggestions from the RAB so that we can most effectively implement that particular item. Okay?

Hopefully, everybody has received a handout titled "Community Relations Presentation." If you will go to page 2, or I guess 3, at the top it says "Community Relations, Proposed Community Relations Activities and Navy Responses." I will go through these first, and then we will talk about the CRP and the Navy's invitation for RAB involvement in developing that plan. Okay?

The first request made was to require continual updating of the mailing list and annual reissuing of the mailing list and making that available to the regulatory agencies, and the Navy wants to let you know that GPI is currently contracted to do that and that will happen. It will happen annually, and the regulators will have access to the mailing list.

The second request is to require two factsheets per year, and the Navy is willing to do that. We want to get more feedback as to what you think are important topics for the next two fact sheets we do. We have a suggestion based on one of your comments, which is to use the first one to do an overview of the RAB and a solicitation for new members, and that's something we could do right away. It could dovetail with some of the efforts you have already mentioned tonight, and the RAB could give you that as a tool to get it out to your constituents, the people you interact with, and use it as a tool to promote new members.

So at this time I want to ask if you have other suggestions for fact sheet topics, and if you agree with the RAB solicitation fact sheet and what you see as following ideas?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I also wanted to mention that the second fact sheet we think will probably be around early 2001, and that may be in good timing with some of the early-transfer initiatives currently in the works. That is something we think would be a good topic for that fact sheet. And so that's thinking ahead, of course, but feel free to make comments on the one we want to prepare sooner than that.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Do you folks agree about using it as a RAB-membership solicitation tool?

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Yes, as long as at least the community outreach focus group is involved in the development of it or reviews it, because we have seen some major glitches at other bases where people actually on the grounds didn't review it. And the other thing that is not clear on the response, too, that you plan to produce two fact sheets in the coming year. Is that in the fiscal year? By year end? In 2001, 2002? What's coming?

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - My understanding, it was a year from now.

C. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes, I don't think we could do two fact sheets within this coming fiscal year, even within the coming calendar year. So within the 12 months from today, we're thinking two fact sheets are very doable.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay? So is there anybody who is not comfortable with using the first fact sheet to solicit new RAB members and having the subcommittee at least in that review group? Okay. Are there additional suggestions for the next fact sheet?

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - So you're proposing just one topic? We did a RAB newsletter years ago, and we covered a lot of topics. I hope you have some copies.

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Yeah. You'd like—

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - But—I'd like to. . . .

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - So multiple topics?

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yeah, talk more about it, because we're quite able to furnish some information you might want.

C. Mr. Dunaway - I think what we're saying is that the theme of the fact sheet would facilitate membership invitation, and it would include various topics to that theme and not be just a single topic.

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - So it could be a typical fact sheet size but cover many things, summary updates, that kind of thing, whatever you all think are important issues and you hear from your constituents they want to hear about.

C: Ms. Diana Krevsky - Okay.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - And that's not something that definitely needs to be answered to the end all tonight, but rather we thought we'd start that discussion. Chip?

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - I don't mean to undermine what we are trying to do here right now, but some of the fact sheets that the Navy will be putting out will be requirement driven, milestone driven, which is more than just an elective idea that we can come up with at this forum. And I'm thinking of a couple of things. One is not a milestone in our standard definition of milestones, but I would say by any interpretation it should be considered a milestone, which is all these FOSETs.

Now, as I understand it, the timing of all these is supposed to be this fall, and that is about the time of the next fact sheet. Is that what you said? Coming out when? You were thinking of a fact sheet coming out—

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - No, I mentioned earlier about early transfer as a singular topic that could be included in the next fact sheet around the 2001 time frame, possibly winter, spring, and after we would be certain that early transfer has happened. I'm not sure we want to start writing about early transfer now for this upcoming fact sheet.

C. Mr. Chip Gribble - Well, if all comes together as some people are hoping it will, the Navy will be coming out with three proposed early transfer packages this fall. I think that's a good time to have a fact sheet come out to elaborate on those proposals, just like when we come out with a milestone in our cleanup world, such as an IR report or a proposed RAP, we don't come up with a fact sheet after a RAP has gone final, but we come out with one in the beginning or early in that phase so that the public could have an enhanced opportunity to follow what's going on and participate if they choose. So a fact sheet might be appropriate early in the Navy's launching of these FOSETs.

C. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - There is a level of risk that we would take to talk about it, but we certainly could include it as a column in the fact sheet. But I'm not sure we want to wait until fall, because we want to solicit for membership prior to fall, or as soon as possible.

Q: Mr. Chip Gribble - Well, you could come out with a FOSET fact sheet earlier, with your new-member fact sheet, as one and the same. I'm not sure, are we trying to define what these next fact sheets will be, or are we just trying to solicit input?

A. Ms. Kelly Ryan - Just input, and we have it up here.

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Yeah, I have a suggestion that we just take ideas on what we can do, just compile that, and if you think of something in the future, you can contact Jerry, let him know, and we can add it to the list. Maybe another time, when we are working with the subcommittee, we could narrow that list and make decisions. I don't want to bog down the discussion. We've got a lot of stuff to cover. This was just a cursory asking. So we've got those recorded, and we will make sure we keep this information, and we can augment it.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Just to underline that whatever topics we do choose should be educational in nature to inform the public in a layperson grasp of the issues so that we can be more informed when early transfer does occur and can make some decisions.

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - I totally agree. I think we are doing that sort of broad outreach you need to start so that everybody understands, and we can build on that.

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Maybe I missed something here, but I thought these were responses to comments or concerns about this sort of interim getting up to speed on the deficiencies of the current CRP, the Navy's deficiencies in actually accomplishing that. And so to be saying that we only are going to get two facts sheets in a year, and we haven't gotten one in six years, seems like it is not a very speedy way to be getting up to speed on something you are already behind on, to be doing only two in one year.

As Diana said, what is this fact sheet? Is it a two-sided thing? Is it going to be like our previous newsletters, which were pretty comprehensive? If we proceed with this town hall meeting, and hopefully get it televised, a lot of people can say what their concerns are. Right now we don't have a very reflective RAB, and some of us are expressing concerns about issues we know about. But I'm asking about 200 questions here, so specify—

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - I have the answers to every one. My understanding, Jerry, was these fact sheets would be in addition to something that was required, but rather would—

C. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - We're trying to start out with developing some fact sheets, and I'm not trying to fully cover for what deficiencies occurred in the past, but we're trying to make a start, and the two fact sheets per year are a direct response to your request.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. All right. So if there are further comments, you can let Jerry know if you have ideas or other input, and we'll make sure it gets recorded. Okay. The next one was for the Navy to semiannually solicit new RAB members, and as Jerry has already said, he will support that effort. One of his suggestions was using the fact sheet, and there will also be newspaper ads, and we are also having somebody find out about the cost for the local cable access and getting some kind of advertisement on there to solicit members. And the question again is, are there any other ideas that folks have? And they don't have to be exhausted tonight. If you think of something after tonight, you can—

Q. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Can you put this on your proposed web site for us? And, also, one of the most effective ways to communicate with this community is through the city council community forum.

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Right.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - And if you want to work with one or some of us on that, we can help you do that.

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Great. Good ideas, Myrna. Anybody else?

C. Mr. Ken Barden - Also, I would suggest that in order to get a more diverse representation on the RAB board, you specifically send flyers that would target specific groups such as senior centers, black-neighborhood associations, Filipino-neighborhood associations, Hispanic-neighborhood associations, within the areas that the RAB has jurisdiction, not just Vallejo.

Ms. Marie Rainwater -Okay. The next one was for the Navy to offer semiannual tours. Jerry already mentioned that there is a proposed schedule of July 21 and 22, and those days were originally picked so that it would accommodate different schedules, one being

a weekday and one a weekend morning. And the question we had for the RAB is, if you have ideas about specific information that you would like covered at the tour, you could give us feedback, just make sure that the Navy puts together something that is meeting your needs and interests. Are there any other suggestions?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I want to clarify that we want to try and get a couple of tours a year, but it may slip to be more like a six-month, nine-month frequency just because it does take a while to get the tour dates settled, as we have been trying for the last two or three RAB meetings, and scheduling a date is difficult. So that six-month frequency is just a good start for us. That's what we're targeting.

C. Mr. Rob Schonholtz - In terms of places to cover on those tours, one that will take a little bit of logistical work but I think may be worthwhile, because a lot of people have not seen them and do not know what is out there, would be to either get out to or get someplace where we can overlook some of the dredge ponds, because that seems to be a place where we are going to have some proposals come to us.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. Other suggestions?

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - And I think to just include the areas of concern, like the landfill-dump area, and also to remember that it is an orientation for new members who have never actually been site-specific informed, let's say. So just to keep that in mind.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. So have it targeted toward the new RAB members.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes. And any of the areas that are going to be transferred, so we could just zip by them.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. Transfer. Okay.

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - I don't know if this documentation has faded away with other things, but we already have done a bunch of these tours, and we ought to not reinvent the wheel. Mare Island's Mare Island. IR sites are what they are. Some of them may have fallen off of the list, but, again, either for those of us who have not been out to a site recently or have never been there, a general trip around all the IR sites--or whatever else you are calling them these days--would be useful. I know that Diana and I at least have offered to help plan the tour. I don't know if others would want to chip in.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - If anybody wants to volunteer, you can get in touch with Myrna. The next one is the every-two-year tour or open house, and big community interviews, and also I believe this is the one where—you know what, I realized our word processor did not get the second part. On our original list, we had two number fives, and we were going to combine them into one number five, but there was a second part to that which was to provide new-RAB-member orientation packets and orientation program. So that was part of the five comment.

So the first one is the tour, and the Navy will conduct periodic tours. They are committed to that and open houses, and they will also conduct or have a forum where the community can give feedback about their concerns and priority issues, and those comments will be recorded. And have different presentations, like the Arc View, GIS demonstrations, the historical information and exhibit were popular. So as you said, not reinventing the wheel, but going with what we know works.

And the second part, the RAB orientation packet, will be provided by the Navy. We saw three components as being suitable, the first being summary tables and figures that help people become familiar with the IR sites in a way that is user friendly. The second would be a copy of the RAB guidance, which could present a context, a little orientation about the RAB and the RAB process; and the third would be all the previous fact sheets so they can see some of the progression, some of the issues highlighted in those. If you have additional ideas about what can be included in that packet, we want to hear that. Also, when thinking about it, think about something that wouldn't be as time sensitive so that that packet could be on the shelf and it would be very timely whenever a member joined.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Make sure page 17 in the RAB guidance is in there.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. Make sure it is page 17. I'll go back and read page 17.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - It was missing out of our first one six years ago.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Oh, sorry. Any other comments? Okay. Again, if you have ideas on these and you go home, you look at this, and things come to mind, let us know. One other thing, there is a possibility of doing a collaborative effort with the City and doing a tour at that time. So that's something to consider if that happens.

No. 6, annual training or workshops, and there are some topics like CERCLA process, technical education on risk assessment, those sorts of things. The Navy is ready to do these on an as-need basis, so if there are things you are interested in and that you want to set that up, let us know. We can start coordinating that. And if you have ideas other than the list that you have there that you think would be good to cover, let us know.

Another suggestion we had is that when a technical subcommittee is reviewing a document, we could get together and do a workshop, bring the technical people in, have a roundtable, maybe do a presentation to help folks orient themselves to the document before reviewing it, and answer questions and provide support that way. I don't know if that's been done here, but it has been done at other RABs and it has been very helpful. Okay? So that's an idea.

Required Navy support for outreach focus group efforts. So that when you go out and address your constituents to have some support, they are ready to do that. The first thing

we are going to do is put together a general overview, canned presentation of Mare Island and the status of Mare Island, so that it is a slide show. You can take it out and use it if you're going to address a group. We have poster boards and different materials which many of you have seen in different instances, and if those are available and appropriate for whatever presentation you're doing, you can use those. And lastly, if you have specific requests, the Navy will consider those on an as-needed basis depending on the cost, staffing issues, and that kind of thing.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - So for our public forum, our town hall, you would be prepared to help us with that?

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Let me put a time line to that too. I know Kelly said that she could get together some slides for review to see what you would like to have included in that presentation within the next week or so. And then you could review that, and we could put it out once, and then we could review that and formalize the presentation. So I think it would be done in that time frame. Kelly, I'm speaking for you.

C. Ms. Kelly Ryan - We need existing figures, so they can be put into what we have, just collect them up, see if those things would be useful.

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - But in addition to doing that, we'd like to get this town hall meeting. . . to help organize that, arrange to see if it is possible to do it, and to refine it. It has nothing to do with the photos and your little package thing. That's great, but what we

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Yes, it would certainly probably incorporate both, but what we were thinking on the town hall meeting is that if people cannot go to the island, then the island needs to come to the people. And that has been my line for a long time. Rather than trying to whip up a tour, which is intensive, it might be practical and important for people who watch television to try to get a town-hall-meeting-type thing.

The other thing I wanted to offer is that the community outreach focus group has already prepared a slide-presentation outline that focuses on points that we always thought were important to include, and I think we can probably rustle that up. And we have also already gone through your slides and put little Post-Its on those. So we might be able to - -

Ms. Marie Rainwater - -- streamline that.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Yes.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - So you guys have already been doing your homework.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, six years we have been wanting a slide show, so it's on us.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - That's what we're going to do.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Cool.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - As far as the town hall, Jerry, do you have comments on that?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I just received your proposal, and I'm hoping we can actually work with your focus group and be invited to work with you in a more intimate setting so that we can resolve and plan this out together. And possibly, before the next RAB meeting, you'll invite us and get the group together.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. No. 8, require the Navy to support the RAB office. And there were a few things listed in this comment, so I've broken them out, and I actually have some updates from when this was printed. The first one we said we'll find out about the 911 and the local calling, and I know that's been made available to you since January. So Jerry actually said, right before the meeting, that that has been determined that a local -
- You want to—

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yes, I just got some information. John Cerini helped me out with a point of contact at GST—they are the local phone company on the island—and I talked with a Donna there, and she said they have availability to put in a telephone service for local calling. And I'm sure that will take care of toll-free calls too, if people want to use their calling card. And I just need to work out the details with her, so I think we can do something there. And thanks again, John. Donna was pretty positive about the matter.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Great. And the computer, it was our understanding that the Arc View update was one of the issues, so we want to let you know that that will be updated monthly with all the other ones, I guess the caretaker's site office, when they are updated.

Ms. Kelly Ryan - And it has been updated on a monthly basis for the last two months.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - And then for the file management, there was a question, would you like to have the contractor come in and update the document files? Jerry, you have a—

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yeah, I have just a tiny bit of a history on this. We have a contract with GPI. They're doing our RAB support right now, and one of their subtasks is to help index the library, kind of organize it. And I've heard some rumor to the effect that that wasn't desirable from the RAB members, but I'm not sure where that came from. It was kind of hearsay. So if you're all in support of that, I'd like to actually get that started.

Q. Ms. Marie Rainwater - I'm seeing some heads nod. Is there anybody not in support of that? Not comfortable with the contractor updating your library? So we were erring on the side of caution and asking you first instead of assuming you wanted it.

A. Ms. Myrna Hayes - Actually, when SSPORTS used to help us out as a support, Wally did do a valiant effort at trying to do that. I wouldn't think of any RAB member who would turn down help with that

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. So we're set up to do that. Roof leaks. My understanding is that the roof has been repaired, the leaky toilet has been repaired. So that's good news on that one too. Okay.

The next one is to—again, we're talking about one of the files, the information repository here at the library. And the Southwest Division actually has an administrative record administrator, and that person's task is to make sure the information repository and administrative records are kept up to date. And as you know, there's been a recent transition from EFA West to Southwest Div, and Mare Island is in line to have that person address this library. And Jerry will give you updates as far as the timing and schedule for that. So that is in the works.

Next is—oh, there's a typo there. Sorry. It's the ECMT meetings, and those meetings are no longer being held. So that addresses that. Chip?

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - One thing we're all quite vulnerable on is the accuracy or adequacy of the administrative record in the information repository, and quite candidly, because we don't have any periodic or scheduled reviews or assessments of that, we are kind of playing in the dark here somewhat dangerously. Because of that, my thought was to have a periodic report of the status of that and the changes. And what would constitute a report, I don't know. We would have to think about it. But without some type of documentation or something that said somebody went out there and did this and found this, that we are quite exposed and vulnerable, and I would probably say that to any project or environmental program that has such a requirement, which is virtually all of them.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - I totally understand.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - You and I discussed the information repository in the context of the recent FOST for the golf course, and that is noted here in this in this sheet, that we're using that in the interim to define what we need to fill in what blanks are there. Diane Silva is our administrative record administrator down in Southwest Division, and she's got a staff of folks, and I'm coordinating with her to figure out when she will be able to get up here to Mare Island's information repository. Of course, she has been a little bogged down as we acquired all the Bay Area bases and she does have quite a lot of work to do, but she does have this on her calendar.

Mr. Chip Gribble - So when that time does come when she is available to work on this, I would suggest that we have some kind of discussion to talk about what should be done. And I'll be quite honest in saying my interest is Mare Island and the information repository for Mare Island. My interest does not extend to all the other bases in the United States or in Northern California. I have a responsibility for this one. So as far as I'm concerned, this is the only one that she should be working on right now.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I'll let her know that, Chip.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. And there is one more item regarding the transition coordinator who used to attend the RAB meeting. As you all know, there has been a lot of reorganization and then the transfer to Southwest Div, and that position no longer exists. So things that would normally be addressed by that person will be from now on addressed to Jerry, and he will be the one who is responsible to the RAB.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - On that one, I just want to note that this is a requirement or a strong suggestion in the RAB guidance. That isn't something we just invented. It had nothing to do with the EFA West or Southwest Div or anything. I think it is still important. I support this concern that was prepared, and I still believe it is important that you take a look at what the transition coordinator's role was. A lot of it was reuse, a lot of it was real estate, and it is necessary that you involve your real estate staff and your reuse staff in the RAB. So you are the BEC, but that doesn't mean that you necessarily are up to speed, Jerry, on all those other issues, and that at least we have presentations on a pretty consistent basis from that division of your agency. And I would like to add for the record that the outreach focus group's letter and comments that go along with this be added into your notes, which is the second page that Jerry has.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Also, there's the letter—

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Plus the letter, right, the cover letter.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I know that, just to respond to Myrna's comment and to expand on Marie's statement about our BTC position, the Navy has phased that out, not just here at Mare Island but across our BRAC operations across the country, and in lieu of that, we have a closure business line team leader, and I've discussed possibly having him assist in updating the RAB on a quarterly basis. It may not be every single RAB meeting, but if we can get him to come out every three months, four months, that might help solve some problems there and answer specific questions on that side of the house. Diana?

Ms. Diana Krevsky - I was just going to thank you for your huge effort here. I'm overwhelmed actually. We go through years of doing it on our own. I want to just tell you I appreciate all this support. I'll look forward to seeing it work.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - And kudos to the Navy, too, for being responsive. I think that it's real good at this point.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - So far, yes.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks, Marie. Thanks, Diana. And in the interest of time, I'm not sure if we had a lot left.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - No, there's one more thing, and it will be very quick And that is the community relations plan. And obviously the RAB is probably the most interested in the community. You guys have the most interest in the environmental cleanup because you show up every month and donate your time. So doing the community relations plan, we would benefit from your input and want to involve you in the development of the CRP. We see some key places where that can happen.

What we'd like to do is work with the outreach subcommittee to look at these particular issues and get some input on the interviewee list, on the interview questions, and on the format of the community relations plan. And once we have that data, we can analyze the responses and the interviews, targeted to a spectrum of people in the community, from state and local politicians to heads of organizations, like you mentioned earlier, Kenneth. And we go out and interview them and give them an update on the IR program, ask them what their information needs are, what their interests are, what their concerns are, and based on those responses, plot out a plan to do a community relations effort that targets the general population around Mare Island. Okay?

So we invite you to participate with us, and we have a proposal for having a first meeting in that effort an hour before the next RAB meeting, if you are available at that time. If not, we can consider other dates.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - I'm not prepared to answer that.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - You mean datewise.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes

Q. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Okay. Do you think this would be something the subcommittee would be interested in doing?

A. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes. We have done some of the work already, and it is just to relook at it in the format you're presenting. The survey, for one, we came up with a lot of questions we are hoping you'll take that into consideration. So, yes, we—

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - And it wouldn't be—

C. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yes, it is just, timewise, I'd have to work that out.

C. Ms. Marie Rainwater - And we don't mean to suggest reinventing the wheel. We would have a proposal, and you could read over it and provide comments to refine or supplement it. So we wouldn't ask you to do the work, just give some feedback.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - I have a question about the original agreement, and I wondered if they used any of the interviews done in 1993, 1994. It was extensive and probably will overlap with what is happening now. So how much of that are you using?

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - Well, I think the assumption in asking for a community relations update, the reason the guidance was made or the reason it states do an update is because

there are changes, and there are also changes in the people who live in the area. There are changes in the things going on in the island, and so doing interviews would reflect all those changes.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - But as far as the asking what questions, reinventing-the-wheel kind of thing, they aren't—

A. Ms. Marie Rainwater - No, we have existing materials we will draw on to formulate questions. We do have resources we can use. I appreciate you asking. We want to be efficient. Any other questions or comments?

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble - I think the Navy has done three different sets of interviews over so many years. Kelly, you might know about one of them. The one I know is the first set, which was done to develop this old community relations plan. There was another set done in a radiological program in which, if I recall correctly, something like 450 people were interviewed in that program, and then there was a third set. Kelly, do you remember anything about that?

A. Ms. Kelly Ryan - No. Those are the two that I remember.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Maybe it's only two, but somewhere in the back of my mind I thought there was a third set. Just for information, I guess.

Ms. Marie Rainwater - We can talk more about that if you want. Any other comments or questions? I appreciate your patience and staying over to hear what we have to say.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - And thank you, Marie, and thank you, Kelly. I'm optimistic about doing this update and getting this orientation plan implemented, and I hope others also feel as positive, Myrna. So with that I'd like to close the meeting, except for the final public comment period. So if there is anyone who has a comment on any topic relating to Mare Island, please feel free to step to the microphone. And if there are none, we will conclude the meeting. Thank you, all.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.)