

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES  
Held July 20, 2000**

**Welcome and Introductions:**

The July 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. Twelve (12) RAB members, thirteen (13) 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. Ken Barden      | • Mr. Ken Kloc       |
| • Mr. Jerry Dunaway | • Ms. Paula Tygielski | • Mr. John Cerini    |
| • Ms. Diana Krevsky | • Mr. Chip Gribble    | • Mr. Rob Schonholtz |
| • Mr. Al Iliff      | • Mr. Gerald Karr     | • Ms. Emily Roth     |

Excused Absence: Cynthia Marquez  
Recorder: Ms. Kathy Langstaff

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Good evening. My name is Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair of the RAB for the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board, and I want to welcome you here this evening.

(The RAB and community members introduced themselves.)

**Administrative Business:**

Mr. Jerry Dunaway: The next item on the agenda is to take care of administrative business and discuss and accept the minutes for the April RAB meeting. If there are any comments, we can listen to those. If not, we'll accept those and make the April minutes final.

Before I jump right into the Navy co-chair's report, I want to announce an agenda change. We are not going to be hearing the early transfer presentation scheduled for 8:20 p.m. Instead, I will do an early transfer presentation as part of my co-chair's report right now, and the redevelopment plan presentation will be in the second hour after the break.

Before I do my presentation, I want to introduce the RAB to our new U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) representative, Emily Roth, who is replacing Bonnie Arthur.

Mr. Gerald Karr - Welcome.

Ms. Emily Roth - Thank you.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Also Ms. Carolyn d'Almeida is helping her out in a few different ways. We have a lot of things going on at Mare Island at this time, and they are taking a tag team approach at the different programs we are currently trying to execute.

## Reports:

### *Navy Co-chair*

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Let me go ahead and start with my Navy co-chair's report. There are handouts going around the table, and there should be some for the audience also. I am going to start off with my typical routine, a BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) report.

The BRAC Cleanup Team, for those who don't know, is the team of the Navy, U.S. EPA, and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) also plays a part in representing the state.

On the first slide of my handout, the BCT report, we had three events this past month, since the last meeting. We had the teleconference on July 11<sup>th</sup>, and a lot of that was prepping for our PCB meeting on July 12<sup>th</sup>. And we talked a lot about polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) and the electrical transformer sites, how we addressed those, and hopefully we will make some progress in that program.

We had a Remedial Project Managers (RPM) meeting yesterday that was focused primarily on program status review of all our ongoing projects at Mare Island, with some focused discussion on underground storage tanks (USTs) and PCBs. One notable event that occurred last week was the discovery of a new underground storage tank near the university at Mare Island, and it appears to be a concrete tank that could have had fuel in it. We have pulled some samples out underneath it and come up with not really high--it's not anything to be alarmed about. About 200 parts per million (ppm) was the average, I believe. And we are busy writing the report for that, for the water board and DTSC.

We also issued the RPM meeting minutes for June 13<sup>th</sup>. We have copies here, and we will distribute those to the RAB members. Our next RPM meeting is scheduled for August 30<sup>th</sup>, and it is open to attendance by RAB members and the public at large if you are interested in hearing some of the details we go through.

On the next slide, I am going to give you a status of one of the actions that is ongoing in our cleanup program. This action is the Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) of the golf course parcel, Parcel 10, and I talked about this last month and summarized the comments we have received thus far. With the exception of the EPA comments, we have put together our responses. However, we are still trying to resolve our issue with EPA, so we have not finalized all the response to comments.

We are proposing to meet with the EPA—actually, EPA offered us a meeting next week to try and resolve that, so we want to meet with them and try to resolve our differences and then report our response comments for the FOST. If everything goes well, our scheduled date for finalizing that FOST is July 28<sup>th</sup>.

Now, I would like to go into a program status on the early transfer initiatives in the absence of our presentation this evening. I want to talk about the general initiatives that are being proposed by the City to the Navy in pursuing early transfer of a significant portion of Mare Island, and I will describe the different elements of what makes up an early transfer. There are various documents and such. Then I will give the status on the three different early transfer proposals that are being assembled by the City.

To start with, this map on the wall shows three different areas, and we have named these early transfer parcels by geographic location on the base. We have the western early transfer parcel, and that is this area here to the west, primarily the old dredge ponds that are in the undeveloped part of Mare Island. And that is an offer that the City is entertaining in partnership with Roy F. Weston to operate those dredge ponds as a commercial venture.

The eastern early transfer parcel is in green. It consists of this eastern center part of Mare Island, as well as a small chunk up in the northern area. That is being proposed by the City in partnership with Lennar-Mare Island for general real estate development.

The northern early transfer parcel is the purple area here, and the City is proposing that early transfer parcel in partnership with Legacy Partners, again for general real estate development. The City's partnership with Weston, Lennar, and Legacy is something that they are putting together, and I will refer to this partnership as "the City." When I say "the City," it could be one or a group of the City and/or the three developer partners.

We received the letter of interest in early transfer from the City on April 28<sup>th</sup>, and from that, we began a series of discussions. We had a couple of kickoff meetings on May 17<sup>th</sup> and again on June 14<sup>th</sup>, and our discussions there were generally how to start off this process of proposing an early transfer. In your package, you have a copy of the map that I also distributed last month at the RAB meeting. Again, it just describes the parcels on Mare Island.

Going on to page 3 of the packet, one of the key documents in early transfer is the Covenant Deferral Request (CDR). For Mare Island, because of its non-NPL (National Priorities List) status, we present this document to the governor of California for approval. He makes the ultimate decision, and on an environmental decision, DTSC is his lead advisor. The CDR requests deferral of the Navy's CERCLA covenant until completion of cleanup. That means the CERCLA covenant is the warranty required by the Navy to insure that all response actions are taken prior to transfer.

Early transfer allows the property transfer to happen before all those cleanups, occur, with the agreement that the early transfer recipient does that cleanup work. That is how these early transfers are being structured here at Mare Island.

After the cleanup, the Navy comes back and we insure that all the cleanups were done to what we feel are the appropriate standards, and then we issue the warranty that all cleanup has been completed at Mare Island. But it does not take us out of the loop completely. The Navy will always have responsibilities for any Navy waste that may be discovered in the future. So the CDR is a key element of early transfer, and, again, it goes to the governor for approval, and it gets that type of scrutiny, with the assistance of the environmental agencies, at the state level.

Other elements of the CDR include a statement that property is suitable for the intended reuse by the City and that the intended reuse is consistent with protection of human health and the environment. The Navy retains assurances to conduct remedial actions. If, for any reason, something is not happening to the Navy's satisfaction, we still have the right to take response actions. It requires public notice at least 30 days prior to the transfer, and it requires that there is no substantial delay in cleanup effort from a schedule standpoint. It cannot take longer to clean up than what the Navy plan would have taken.

Documents other than the CDR include three general documents that reflect the environmental issues in early transfer. The Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) summarizes the current condition of the property, particularly contamination that we know of and are transferring to others to clean up. The FOSET includes the interim restrictions necessary to ensure the protection of human health and the environment from known contaminated sites.

In addition to the FOSET, there is the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) that is an agreement between the Navy and the City for completion of remaining cleanup. This ESCA can describe cleanup responsibilities outside a parcel boundary, and that is the case for these three early transfer parcels. For instance, if we have an Installation Restoration (IR) site in the corner on a boundary to these parcels, they may have responsibility to insure the cleanup if they go outside that boundary onto another parcel whether it be early transfer or non-early transfer. And that is the geographic difference between the ESCA and the actual parcel.

The consent agreement (CA), an agreement between the City and the State, the State being DTSC, is a consent agreement that also makes up the basis for how the cleanup will be conducted per the State requirements. And the Navy is not a party to that.

In the ESCA, the Navy is making agreements with the City on doing cleanup, and we pay for that cleanup. The City does not pay for the cleanup. The developers do not pay for the cleanup. The federal government is still paying for the cleanup, and the Navy negotiates with our remediation contractors the total cost for cleanup to remedy the site.

Funding is reserved through a federal grant, and that gives us a lot of assurances of the ability to get that funding and is typically less subject to budget cuts. The Navy allocates

funding each fiscal year to complete each ESCA, and it is part of our budget process. Again, it does have better assurances for funding versus if we were to do it ourselves without this early transfer. Initial funding of start-up costs are provided at the beginning of each project, or each early transfer, and the remaining funding is provided as work progresses through the completion of the ESCA.

So, that is the framework for early transfer, but what documents are needed to get prepared to make early transfer happen? I would like to present a status on the three different parcels that I described.

*The western early transfer, the dredge ponds:* The Navy is currently negotiating the ESCA costs with the City, and we are fairly close to complete with this parcel. The City is negotiating with the State Lands Commission due to the State reversionary parcel. Most of the dredge pond area and all the way out into San Pablo Bay that is under the control of the Navy right now is reversionary land, which means that the State owns it. The Navy is kind of leasing it at no cost, and it requires that the Navy return it to the State after we are done with it. In this case, the City is working a deal so that once the State gets it, they will have a lease with the State Lands Commission, and they will use it for their purposes.

The Navy is also drafting the FOSET and the ESCA documents in cooperation with—well, at this point, the City hasn't really gotten involved on these two documents. I believe DTSC and the City are collaborating on developing the CA. Are you doing that?

(Mr. Chip Gribble nodded.)

Q. Mr. Rob Schonholtz – I'm going to ask a question on this particular one while you are doing its status. The northern and eastern parcels' boundary seem to be tied into the area in which the two developers are interested, and in contrast, the western one is very extensive. It goes way beyond the dredge ponds that Weston is interested in making use of. Is there a reason why that early transfer area is not more compact and limited to Weston's area, leaving the remainder of it available for transfer to other entities?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway – I'm not exactly sure of the details of why they proposed the large area. It may be because this whole area is described as one parcel. The actual land stops somewhere halfway through this parcel on this shoreline here, but this part is San Pablo Bay and really is not usable for anything like a dredge pond.

I would have to defer to the City to describe that more. I do not think John [Cerini] is the right person to answer that, but the City is planning presentations for the public, as well as the RAB, for next month—

C. Ms. Myrna Hayes – I might be able to explain that a little--because the settlement agreement and land exchange agreement between the State Lands Commission and the City of Vallejo and then a separate agreement that was come to for the reversionary lands with the U.S. Navy follows what is called the Joy survey line, and everything west of the Joy survey line is considered reversionary lands for the State of California.

So that is why you see such a big parcel. I don't believe that it means that Weston was requesting that entire area, because I know that Fish and Wildlife Service is requesting a couple thousand acres of that submerged land, as well as the strip tidal marsh along the western shore, outward of the levees on the dredge ponds. Plus, the three northern ponds, there is an agreement for those to go to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as well.

Mr. Chip Gribble – There are a couple of considerations here. One is that the Navy is interested in getting rid of the property at Mare Island as soon as possible. That has always been their interest, as I understand it. Number 2, the City feels that all this environmental remediation work will go faster if it is done in hands other the Navy's, such as through these early transfer proponents.

So the idea then, given those two interests, would be to take as much of Mare Island and process it through early transfer rather than leaving it to be processed through a regular FOST process transfer, and that means that you try to make these early transfer packages more extensive rather than less extensive.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Thank you, Chip. If there is concern that this whole area may become a dredge pond, I know for a fact that's not the case. I believe that the only dredge ponds being considered for operation are these center ponds around this area roughly. Again, the City would be a better source of information. And the other areas of this parcel are not being proposed for a dredge pond.

C. Mr. Rob Schonholtz – Jerry, that was not my concern. I'm among the people who would like to see that land transferred to the refuge at the earliest practical date, and I don't know that seeing it all within the western early transfer parcels gets in the way of that or helps it, or what, but the difference between them is striking, and it raises the question, is this helping or hindering getting that land into the refuge?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Yes, I couldn't answer that question. I think the City would be a better source for that information.

Mr. Chip Gribble – Again, that whole early transfer proposal package is actually an early transfer to the State Lands Commission, which, to the extent I understand it correctly, would lease some of it back to the City, who would then sublease some of it back to Weston for operation of dredge disposal site, and also for Weston to conduct all necessary environmental remediation. So actually, none of it is being transferred to Weston.

Ms. Myrna Hayes – If I could just follow up on Rob's concern, again. Because the land is the people of California's, and it is sovereign land, and it will be in perpetuity, the Navy has to give it back when it ceases military operation. So even though the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service requested 670 acres to be transferred in a federal transfer, they will actually end up in a fed-to-fed transfer with only about 162 acres right around Building 505. The remainder has to come through a State Lands Commission, just like the ponds would have to come through State Lands to the City of Vallejo to Weston.

What some people would say is that by having State Lands consider the entire parcel transfer from the Navy to State Lands, it could expedite the transfer or management of that acreage by the Fish and Wildlife Service, because the State Lands Commission does not manage land for the most part. It seeks other land managers. Already about 13,000 acres on the south outboard side of Highway 37 are managed as a refuge, that is State Lands-leased property to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. So the way I understand it, this is a package to try to get it all in one bulk to State Lands and then parcel it out to the appropriate managers.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Thank you, Myrna. Okay, I'm on to page 5, and the eastern early transfer parcel. That is this green parcel here, with the little bits up in the north. And the Navy is currently negotiating the ESCA, the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, with the City. We are really at the middle stage of that negotiation. The City is currently negotiating also with the State Lands Commission, because there is a part of reversionary land along this strip on Mare Island Strait, and it varies up to 85-90 feet, but they do have some piece of that. The Navy and the City are collaborating on the development of the FOSET and the ESCA, and we are probably furthest along with this parcel for those two documents. DTSC and the City are also collaborating on the consent agreement, and they are just getting that one started.

Now, on to the last and smallest parcel of the three, the northern early transfer parcel that Legacy Partners will be working on. The City is currently developing their proposal for cleanup costs, and we are really not even at the point of negotiating yet. So we are very early on with that. The City, again, is negotiating with State Lands. That same strip of land along the Mare Island Strait belongs to the State or is reversionary lands to the State, and the Navy is currently drafting the FOSET and ESCA for that parcel and really just getting that one started.

On the early transfer initiatives, a few questions come to mind: What does this mean for the cleanup? As I mentioned earlier, it provides greater assurance for funding for cleanup dollars from the federal government. It also shortens the cleanup schedules and provides a more direct conversion opportunity from cleanup directly to redevelopment and reuse of Mare Island.

What happens to the RAB? The RAB is a Department of Defense-required activity for cleanup programs. Under early transfer, there is no requirement for the City to maintain

the RAB, but as I mentioned last month, the City has committed to continuing the RAB with the early transfer partners of theirs. The Navy, because we do have work in many

areas outside of these early transfer parcels, we will be continuing cleanup and continuing the RAB for some time, and the City has agreed to cooperate in maintaining this RAB, also, for their efforts.

In summary, the current assumption that the Navy understands is that there will be one covenant deferral request going to the governor, with three different FOSET packages. That includes the FOSET, the cooperative agreement, and the consent agreement for the three different parcels. The City plans to present this to the city council in a study session scheduled for August 1<sup>st</sup> at 5 o'clock. You should confirm the date and time with the City if you plan to attend. The City does invite RAB members and the public to attend that study session. The City will also be doing a presentation at the August 31<sup>st</sup> RAB meeting.

And that's my pitch on early transfer from the Navy perspective. And I had to put this together quickly because of the recent change in the agenda. Was this helpful? Are there questions about early transfer?

Q. Mr. Gerald Karr – Yeah, Jerry, just a point of clarification. Maybe you could elaborate on how it occurs that the funding for the cleanup is actually better guaranteed under this early transfer process? Could you explain that a little? Is the money allocated for specific goals rather than the Navy's annual budgeting? Could you elaborate?

A. Mr. Jerry Dunaway – I have not done as much research on this, again, because of the short time period, but I have talked with some of the federal contracting officers who administer these grants, and they do provide kind of a contract. When we set a contract, that money is allocated, and it cannot be taken back unless there are severe conditions within the government, and that is how grants operate too. For example, if we budget for next year, FY01, we want to get a \$20-25 million budget so we can do cleanup activities at Mare Island. That can be cut very easily and it happens almost every year, we have some amount taken back. With grants and contracts, that cannot happen as easily. Does that help?

(Mr. Gerald Karr nodded.)

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – Are there any other questions from the RAB or the public?

Q. Mr. Chip Gribble – I have a question about funding. Several years ago, when the State, DTSC, our program was funded here under a small grant from the Department of Defense (DoD), and the funding level initially was very high, and after everything was off the ground, the DoD came back, and, with every subsequent grant cycle, the grant was cut and cut and cut. The Navy's budget for Mare Island, was cut, or not just Mare

Island, but all of the BRAC funding moneys were cut during the Persian Gulf War, when moneys were diverted to that, as we were told.

The Navy's budget on Mare Island was also reduced during some of the economic slow periods that we've experienced over the last so many years, and also the political shifts in D.C., we've been told, were another reason for some of the cuts in the Navy's budget for Mare Island over the years.

So, although I am glad to hear that under the early transfer scenario there would be greater assurances of funding, I am interested in hearing more about what does that really mean and what are these assurances and how strong are they? And I know you probably don't have that level of understanding about the funding process, but perhaps that is something we could get somebody from Washington to come out and talk to us about. How is this whole early transfer process supposed to assure us that we have more secure funding for the environmental work here?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway – That's a good point, and I think that could be discussed at an administrative level, and also I have been suggesting that we should have somebody who can talk in detail about that. In comparison to the DSMOA grant, which I can talk about. I have been working with DSMOA for several years. That is a grant that is negotiated each year, so that grant is subject to change at the beginning of each—I think it is July 1<sup>st</sup> to June 30<sup>th</sup>. The federal government, through the Department of the Army, and with each of the 50 states, negotiates DSMOA, and so each year it has the ability to change. When we negotiate the grants for each of these ESCAs, it's a one-time negotiation. There is no renegotiation, and so I believe there we won't have the same experience in grant cuts as we have seen with DSMOA.

Mr. Chip Gribble - And I hope that's true. I think at this point, personally -- not that I'm the one that makes any decision at my agency -- that we're kind of operating a blind assumption that that is going to be the case under early transfer, that the funding for the environmental cleanup would be more stable. But I personally would feel a lot more comfortable if I knew more of the details of what was behind those simple statements that we would have greater funding assurance.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I'll research that.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Jerry, you and I have had a lot of discussion about this topic, and I know that the RAB itself, particularly the transition and reuse focus group, has requested this topic to be on the agenda for several months. So first of all, I just want to thank you for pinch-hitting on this presentation. It's really more than I expected you to be able to pull together in the short time period since our call this afternoon.

And I do want to go on record as saying that I'm very disappointed that the City of Vallejo, once again -- and I can say this because I live here and because, even though I'm a carpetbagger to this town, I've invested a lot in this community, and I know a lot of the

rest of the people who are directly from Vallejo who serve on the RAB have also -- but on behalf of the people on this RAB from the community who do not live in Vallejo, I want to also say that I think the communities they represent are also being shortchanged

by the City of Vallejo's chicken way they decided not to give a presentation that was agendized, was noticed in the public record through the newspaper. And it's very disappointing to me, because it does not show good faith. And I'm not naming names. I'm not being personal. I'm not looking at John Cerini and saying this was John Cerini's decision. I'm not looking at Bill Moore and saying this is Bill Moore's decision. Bill apparently took the challenge to get out in front and get this information out to the public early and often, as is the spirit of the RAB, the guidance that the DoD and the EPA put together, not us.

We're only trying to implement it. And so I want to honor that they did make the effort and the commitment to give this presentation, and that for whatever political reasons or petty reasons or whatever reasons, the City of Vallejo decided to pull the plug, and I am very upset, and I'm going to give our beloved mayor a call. I want to know whether other RAB members are interested in once again helping me write a little letter to one more politician in the world and let them know this is really important to us as a community and as members of the RAB and that it just screwed up our agenda.

We're on a pretty tight timeline trying to get information out, or from the regulators, from the Navy, from the City, and digest it, and get our important advisory role implemented here, and to have taken an agendized item off the agenda tonight with no explanation, no phone calls made, just, whoop, we don't want you to do it. What are we supposed to do? Just go home and watch television? But we have a lot of other topics we need to discuss that we would have on the agenda if we'd known they were gonna flake on us. So I'm upset about that, and I don't think it's right. If other RAB members want to join me in signing on to a letter or helping me write one, that's my thoughts on that.

In terms of the grant process, I definitely would like to learn more about it. I did have a phone call from Dave Olsen from Paul Yaroshak's office, who I've met with in the past in D.C. He has been here with Paul Yaroshak to talk about DSMOA grants or the lack thereof and the reason why the Navy didn't think those were important to fund to California, but he did explain quite a bit to me about the early transfer process in Charleston. So there are people familiar with it who I think could bring you up to speed so you can give a presentation that would convince us hopefully. But we are gun-shy, because when you mention that grants always get funded, my DSMOA ears started going "ooh," because that didn't happen. So I think that the Navy's already sort of wiggled out of a commitment previously in grants, so I'd like to see something in writing as soon as possible and get a good feel for how this process works.

And then I know, Jerry, you and I have talked a lot about your reticence to maybe get out ahead of the City and the developers, because this was really their proposal to the Navy,

and you've also said that in some situations these initiatives haven't been successful. So I think I'd like to know more about the chances of this initiative being successful and what the alternatives are that the Navy has planned for budget, if it is for cleanup at Mare Island, if it isn't successful, when you'll know that, and if you can tell us what were the reasons that those initiatives failed and what you'd do differently, what you're looking for, so that we have a sense of whether this is really going to be a go or whether it just has a very slim chance of succeeding, and then what your other game plan is. Because, again, not to go on and on, but at the last RPM meeting I was at, remember I challenged you at this last meeting to keep on your cleanup track and not hold your breath waiting for this process to take place, that you kind of owe that to the people of this community and of the country.

So those are the things that I have to say. I think you covered some of the other issues that you and I talked about. So hopefully I haven't sideswiped you or whatever.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway: Thanks, Myrna.

Mr. John Cerini - Jerry, if I may interrupt, I'd kind of like to do a quick response to Myrna's frustration.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thanks.

Mr. John Cerini - I understand your frustration, and the only thing I ask is that we don't make the assumption that every action the city takes is to shortchange the RAB. I did bring a letter from Al Da Silva, the community redevelopment director. He's also going to send a letter to each of the RAB members personally inviting them to the study session, which is currently scheduled for 4:30 on the 1st with the city council. So I do have that. I'll pass it around, but I just wanted to make that response.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, John.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Since I publicly made a pretty strong statement, can you tell us generally what old Al has to say for the city?

Mr. John Cerini - I really don't have an answer for you, but I will definitely give you one when I can find out why.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - The letter doesn't say anything? It just invites us --

Mr. John Cerini - The letter says they're going to have a study session, and it's addressing the importance of the RAB to the City and asking them to attend.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Ken?

Mr. Ken Barden - Myrna, if we do write such a letter, or you write such a letter and we all sign it, who specifically does it go to, and who will the cc's be?

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, you are our elder statesman now, Ken, you can give us some advice, but I was going to write it to our goodly mayor and our city manager or cc our city manager. And if I knew how that whole thing over there worked, then I'd know, but you all might know better than me who it should go to. But clearly it was a high-level decision that was made, and it's disappointing. We shouldn't have to be chasing the City.

We should be an entity -- I thought we were an entity of the U.S. Navy, and I thought we had autonomy, and it's really frustrating to always be chasing after that cat.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Any other questions about early transfer? I'll go on through the rest of my co-chair's report. But I will talk with folks out of Dave Olsen and Paul Yaroshak's office and see if they'll commit to coming out during the town hall panel session that was proposed at the last RAB meeting.

The remainder of my presentation is on RAB support, and on the first topic, page 7. The RAB member tours have changed once again. I put out an E-mail. Some people have not gotten it, and I apologize for that, but we have a change now to August 18 and/or August 19. Myrna I believe is getting some help on the RAB to assemble whether we need both those dates or if one date will work.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - This is the sign-up sheet right here.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, Myrna. And it will be hosted by the Navy with DTSC and representatives from our contractors on the cleanup program, Tetra Tech, Weston, and Environmental Chemical Cooperation.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Could we invite Emily?

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Yeah, the offer is out to EPA. I just didn't list them specifically. Emily, sorry.

Also, I just want to give a status on the RAB website development. The RAB website is up and running. Thank you, Lee. And here's the address. It takes you to the Southwest Division home page. If you punch or click on support teams, and then again click on environmental, you will get to the RAB web pages, and that will cover RABs in Northern California as well as Southern California. Currently we have meeting minutes and meeting schedules, as well as agendas for all of this year's meetings. We plan to have fact sheets as well as photos posted, and I know there are some other offers or proposals to have other uses for this RAB website too, and we'll see how far we can get on those.

On the community relations plan update, we proposed last month that we have a project now to update that community relations plan, and for the last three weeks we've been

meeting with our contractor and meeting with the public participation specialists from both EPA as well as DTSC. With Chip and Emily's presence, we have developed an initial schedule on getting that going. We are doing our homework to get things prepared, and we are proposing August 8th or the 10th in the evening to meet with the community focus group and review proposed questionnaires or questions that we want to use and a proposed list of interviewees from around the communities.

We also want to take the opportunity to discuss with community relations with the community focus group the proposed topics for the fact sheet that we're also developing under the same contract, and below we've taken note of some of the proposed or requested topics for this next fact sheet, and you can see a list there. Solicitation for new RAB members, announcing the town hall forum, and early transfer were the three major topics I believe that people wanted on this fact sheet, and then we had a list of less significant topics. Nonetheless, we want to fill up the fact sheet with as much good information as we can. And, again, August 8th or 10th, and because we're looking to Diana to help pick out dates.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Maybe we could find out this evening who from the focus group can attend on those days. Just come up to me and let me know afterwards. The other thing is -- one of the main topics I'd like to add to this is the town forum itself and discussing that as one of the agenda -- well, that's part of the fact sheet, announcing the town forum, and I'd like it to be a topic.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I just want to remind people that anybody is free to join the community focus group. As all our focus groups are, they're members of the RAB plus anybody else from the community. So here's a chance to become a member of the community outreach focus group.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Whoever wants to work on some of these subjects, please attend.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - Thank you, Diana. And on to my last slide, page 8, we had some discussion last month about identifying our public affairs officer for Southwest Division. Since the transition from EFA West, we do have a new public affairs officer specifically on environmental issues for the Navy, and that is Mr. Lee Saunders.

And, Lee, if I could have you stand up and possibly introduce yourself on the mic. Here you have his phone number, E-mail address, and regular mail address. Lee has helped put together the RAB web page and has really taken that one on. I think that's the second one we've developed for our northern BRAC bases here, and it's looking good.

Mr. Lee Saunders - The other one is Hunters Point. Again, I am Lee Saunders, the environmental public affairs officer for Southwest Division. I operate down in San Diego, California. I want to tell you that I am a Northern Californian. I was born and raised in the Bay Area, so I'm very familiar with Mare Island and all the other communities in this

area. This is my home, and my mother and relatives are still in this area. I enjoy coming up here to visit and enjoy the great things that you're doing up here.

As far as points of contact, if you do have some questions and you need to contact me, as the community co-chair, you can give a collect call to me or Jerry, as long as it's official business where we can take those and help you out. And also E-mail, the addresses on there, we'll be glad to help you in any way we can.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Thanks a lot, Lee, for being here. You've been a mystery person, and the PAO office has been a mystery to me for the last four years, so it's really great to have a real person and to know that you have a commitment to the Bay Area.

We're really disappointed to hear that the PAO you had in place and who actually met with us and our community focus group, Lisa Fasano, is already gone to better fishing grounds or whatever, but I hope you'll consider replacing her, partly because, as I've said to Larry Douchand, and I think he didn't quite get it, and also to Jerry, who obviously has by bringing you here tonight, we are a long way from San Diego, but we have a press community who tries to communicate to the general public about issues going on in terms of cleanup at Mare Island, and it's a real disservice for the Navy and also for them and for the community I feel for them to have to get their source only from people like me.

So if you'd like to make yourself available to the local press without them having to call long distance, that was the real point of asking Jerry to have you make some mechanism for --I'd like to be able to communicate with you, but I think most importantly the press needs to have a real live person who knows the issues or can get the gist of it and refer to the appropriate person, and I --

Mr. Lee Saunders - Well, we're dealing with the media up here, and, again, we just got involved with this recently. We had two public affairs officers up here in the Northern California area. Both left within a two-week period. And so there are two public affairs officers down in Southwest Division, and we're supporting not only the Southern California bases but also the Northern California bases too. And I will come here as often as I can, though I will say that Mare Island meets the same night normally that Hunters Point meets. There's a number of RABs that meet the same night, so I can only go to so many at the same nights, but I'll try to come up here as often as I can.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I don't expect you to spend your valuable time doing that. I would just like for you to be up to speed about Mare Island issues and be able to communicate on the Navy's behalf articulately to the press so that I don't have to do all sides for you--

Mr. Lee Saunders - Well, feel free to --

Ms. Myrna Hayes - -- and have them accessible. They don't need to be calling long distance --

Mr. Lee Saunders - Well, the media, they are a for-profit organization, and it's not unusual for them to make calls long distance, so that's something that they normally do. If you have any media that you feel that the Navy needs to talk to, feel free to refer them to us down in San Diego, and we will talk to them.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - That's it for my co-chair's report. Why don't we move into the community co-chair report, and then into the focus group reports.

### *Community Co-chair Report*

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I'm going to make my community co-chair's report real short. That way Jerry can take all my time here. All I'm going to do is pass around a sign-up sheet to follow up on Jerry's recommended new dates for the RAB orientation update tour, and that would be Friday at 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. or Saturday 9:00 a.m. to noon?

(Mr. Dunaway nodded.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - So if you could put down whether you're available one or both of those dates and your name. If Jerry can't figure it out, no one will be able to, but he'll lead the way. And I think that will be enough of a community co-chair's report tonight. Oh, Emily.

Ms. Emily Roth - Is that a site tour? What tour is that?

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Yes. That would be a great tour for you to go on, though you'll probably be all up to speed by then. Yeah, it is a site tour. And we're actually all developing the tour now, but I hope that it would be the IR sites and I don't know.

Anyway, community outreach focus group report? And let's just try to make all of this happen in 10 minutes so that we can take a break and then get on Lennar's presentation.

Ms. Diana Krevsky - This will be very short. We didn't meet, and, basically, Jerry covered the issues of the potential meeting on the 8th or the 10th, so just come to me and tell me which is your preferred date for meeting.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - And would we be meeting at the RAB library, Jerry?

Ms. Diana Krevsky - Yeah, I would hope so. Is there another --

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - We really didn't even discuss those details. As we get further in our finding for this --

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Well, that makes a difference. More people might turn out if you had it at Nation's or something. That's it, Diana, for that?

And I did want to acknowledge that Tetra Tech EMI has put together a draft slide presentation or Power Point or however we're going to use it for the community outreach focus group. We just got it tonight, so we haven't had a chance to look at it, but anybody who would like to take a look at it is welcome to. We can pass these two around just so they get that back to us.

Mr. Karr, natural resources, has that focus group met?

Mr. Gerald Karr - Rob Schonholtz and I were discussing some common issues of the intended reuse of the existing dredge ponds, and Rob would like to say a couple of things.

Mr. Rob Schonholtz - I recently had the western project brought back to my attention. I think many of you may recall a presentation John Randall made a number of months ago in which Weston floated the idea of using some of the dredge ponds to take material that was not clean enough for aquatic disposal but supposedly would not be unduly toxic. So the contact that I received from the Corps of Engineers staff person went along the lines of, "You guys didn't really say that was okay, did you?" knowing that I was on the RAB.

Recently, Weston had a retired general arrange a meeting with the colonel at the Corps of Engineers -- which is a lobbying technique we're all familiar with and we don't care for much and the Army discourages. One of the questions asked at that meeting of Weston was whether there was community support for their proposal. And the answer given, I'm told, was that, "Well, we took it to the RAB," which was a very fine, orderly answer that's not false, but it's certainly misleading.

What was brought to my attention then was that, in that discussion there was considerable question raised as to how clean or dirty the materials to be brought into those ponds would be and the possibility that spoils to be brought into those ponds would be dirty enough that the decant water would not be able to be released into the bay and instead would be left to evaporate and concentrate whatever contaminants are in it even further.

And I certainly am of the opinion that, if Weston wants to bring forth a responsible proposal to use that area and reclaim it, it's a value habitat. That's something this community might support. It brings jobs. It brings the community a good asset in the end. But if what Weston has in mind is simply dump some more toxics in an area that we've spent a lot of time and effort cleaning up, leave it in an economically disadvantaged community, and then walk away from it, that's not a good thing. I'm not sure which of those two poles their proposal is closer to at the moment.

Upcoming things that this group should be watching for -- and I wanted to raise these yellow flags -- is that the corps is soon going to be working on a determination of whether those dredge ponds are abandoned or not in light of the fact that the Navy has allowed its permits and its general use to lapse. That determination will have a lot to do with the level of regulation the corps exerts over Weston's proposal, and I'm told that we might expect to see this come forth in a public notice from the Corps of Engineers sometime in the September time frame. So we should be watching for that.

One thing I don't know -- and I don't know whether John can find this out -- is what kind of CEQA documentation the city is contemplating this way. This is a lease that clearly would have potential to have significant effects on the environment. So I just wanted to raise that yellow flag.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - I'm so glad to hear someone else raise yellow and red flags besides me. I don't feel so bad. And once again, John and Terry bring up some important examples of why we need presentations on early transfer proposals. The regulators know about it, the City knows about it, the Navy knows about it, the proponent knows about it, and the Army Corps knows about it, and we have ears out there. We're not stupid. We pick up the phone. We ask state agencies like State Lands Commission what they're thinking about doing, and why should we be the last to know and the last to be involved when the whole point of the RAB is to be the first to know and the first to be involved? So thank you, Rob.

And there are about 200 other issues that go along with that, whether the landfill is something that they consider taking on and whether that will be management by the Navy, or for the Navy, whether it will be a part of their remediation or their program out there, the whole issue of whether the state wants to take on liability, and lots of other issues that we probably better not go to tonight. But Chip [Gribble] is getting ready to get that microphone out.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I appreciate Rob's comments. That's a dimension that we're not exposed to. As far as the landfill area goes, the Weston proposal includes a transfer of everything you see on the map with the exception of the western part of Investigation Area H. The Weston proposal includes that Weston take over the environmental cleanup or environmental restoration of the western end of Investigation Area H, but that would not be transferred. That's how the proposal is currently crafted. And insofar as that were to happen, it seems as though it would accelerate, where our hope is that it would accelerate and improve our ability to get the environmental restoration work completed.

That's one side of this whole issue as far as the ponds being used for dredge ponds, which is not our business at DTSC. That's a reuse site of the equation for you folks to consider. So we're evaluating it on the strength of its advantages in terms of our environmental restoration work from my agency's perspective.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Which would also include unexploded ordnance and any other environmental work that would be part of that early transfer package.

Mr. Chip Gribble - Yes.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - So, the point is well made that the RAB, ASAP, needs to hear about that proposal. It needs to be in the public on the table, because it does affect cleanup, and as long as the Navy owns it, the RAB should have a role to play in decisions around it.

The technical focus group? Are you on summer vacation?

(Ms. Paula Tygielski nodded.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - The transition reuse group didn't meet because Cynthia wasn't present. John, you have a city report, other than thank you for the letter from AI?

Mr. John Cerini - Just a couple of brief items. First, Touro University has taken over about 40 new residential units, the Q Quarters, and they expect to occupy those by August 1st. So there's a lot of activity in that area. And the deconstruction of the Farragut Village area is finally progressing to the point where it looks like shortly they will be doing the deconstruction project. Lastly, I did bring the packages I agreed to arrange for.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - The regulators.

Mr. Chip Gribble - I just have a couple of things. We've been working on processing these FOSETs, and the other one is that we now have a signed MOA, memorandum of agreement, with the City for Investigation Area E, the original nine-hole golf course, which is a memorandum for agreement between the city and DTSC whereby the City, upon receiving title to that property, will execute a land use covenant, restrictive land use covenant, for the original nine-hole golf course. The Navy -- the City can't do that until they get title to the property, so the memorandum of agreement is a vehicle by which we can get that restrictive covenant established immediately after the property is transferred from the Navy to the City. So that has been signed, and the next step is for the Navy to put out their FOST and move towards transfer.

Ms. Emily Roth - Hi. My name's Emily Roth, and my report is that Carolyn and I have been fast and furiously attending as many meetings as we can on everything from PCBs to the community relations plan to these FOSTs and FOSETs, and we're a little overwhelmed at the moment about the gravity and the depth and the breadth of all the work here at Mare Island, and we're still at the stage of trying to figure out what Carolyn's going to do and what I'm going to do.

I don't have an up-to-date business card that I can hand out to people tonight, but I thought I would give you my phone number in San Francisco, and it's 415/744-2247. And we have an 800 number too. Is it long distance to call from 707 to San Francisco?

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Mm-hm.

Ms. Emily Roth - It is? Then we have an 800 number which is 800/321-7349. And then if you know Carolyn's and/or my last five digits -- so in my case, the last five digits would be 42247 --when you call that 800 number, it kicks you into a voice-mail system, and you can end up leaving us a message, not having to pay for it.

So we will have comments on the offshore ecological risk assessment, and I expect to have comments on that for the Navy by late next week, and hopefully, it won't be too much longer after that. And the various other documents that we're looking at and

participating as much as we can, but just give us a little time here. This is a steep learning curve here at Mare Island, and we're doing the best we can.

As time goes by, we'll both be coming back. We can tell you what we're doing and give a better report in the future. The funding, thanks to you folks and the outcry that was heard when it was known that EPA was not going to participate anymore because this is not an NPL site and we're pretty short-staffed at EPA -- the Navy very generously is supporting both of us for as much as we can work for two years. I happen to have two other sites right now, and Carolyn has other sites, but now that we see exactly how big Mare Island is, I'm going to be lobbying to get rid of at least one of my other sites and be able to spend more time on Mare Island, and I'm sure Carolyn will be doing that too. But we're

free to work on this site in the time that we have that we don't have to work on other sites. So it's great, and we'll have other support people at EPA, our attorney and people like that who can work with us. Thanks. Yeah, question.

Mr. Ken Kloc - You mentioned the offshore ecological risk assessment, and which version are you reviewing?

Ms. Emily Roth - I think it's a March -- maybe it's not recent. We promised our comments in April I know. I think it's this spring. What was the date, Kelly?

Ms. Kelly Ryan - It is the March, and it's the final document.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - All right. For having an item removed from the agenda, we are totally behind. So if we can take a five-minute break. Grab your food, put some money on the table to keep the kitty from starving, and there are drinks in the refrigerator that we can quickly bring out. And then we really want to give Bill Moore and his staff the time to give the presentation on their reuse plan.

(A recess was taken from 8:23 p.m. to 8:31 p.m.)

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Welcome back to the RAB meeting and to a presentation by Lennar. All right, we'll go ahead and introduce Bill Moore, the project manager for Lennar Mare Island, who's graciously offered to come over to give a presentation about the status of their reuse plan.

**Presentation: Redevelopment Plan  
Bill Moore, Lennar Mare Island, LLC**

Mr. Bill Moore - Thank you very much for having us here. We're happy to come and give you an update on where we are with our development plan.

I have a few members of our team here. We have Elizabeth Shreeve, who is with SWA, our urban design consultants. They've been working quite a lot over the past year, and you can see some of the products on the boards here. And also, from CH2M Hill, we have Carla Duncan and Paul Bertucci. Carla is very familiar with all the IR sites on our property, and if you have any questions about the remediation in our areas, she can answer any of those I'm sure.

A lot has happened since Lennar was selected as the master developer in 1997, and a lot has happened since I made a presentation to you about a year ago, I think, because we didn't have a whole lot to report at the time except that we were in progress. And a lot of things have happened since then.

We start everything with this reuse plan, which everyone here is familiar with, and many of you in this room were instrumental in helping put that together on citizens' committees and so forth. Some of the events, since that reuse plan was done, you're familiar with. There was a record of decision (ROD) by the Navy on the EIR, EIS. The City took this reuse plan and converted it into the City's general plan. The City also used this as the basis for their specific plan.

Since I last talked to you, there has been an economic development conveyance between the Navy and the City and a LFOC, lease and furtherance of conveyance, between the two of them. That was October 1999, I believe. And we have negotiated and had approved our acquisition agreement between Lennar and the City for the Lennar parcels.

Also, things that are continuing to go on out on the island, and any of you who go out there very often will notice that the activity has been picking up quite a bit over the past year and especially the last few months. For the interim leasing program that we've had going since we took our program forward in January of 1998, we have now about 42 businesses on the island. These are people who are leasing space, operating businesses, large fabricators like XKT, and we have Touro University which has 44 acres and 500,000 square feet of space out there. There's close to 1,400 jobs out on the island right now, and it continues to grow. It's gotten to the point where we need more buildings renovated and need more space in order to continue the creation of jobs out there.

And if we can have the lights, I'll start what we refer to as our low-tech show here. Most of the slides we'll be using we have exhibits on the boards here. We put this middle one up here because we know you're familiar with the reuse areas and wanted to make sure that you understand that we're continuing those so you can follow what we're doing here.

This is our logo which we created last year, and it appears on our stationary and just about everywhere else. You can see it's a mare in the water.

We know a lot more now than we did when the reuse plan was done. We all do, everyone here knows, and we've learned it together in many ways. We know more about the remediation program. We've had our consultant, CH2M Hill, looking at every IR site out

there. We've done market studies. We know more about what the capability of the market is now, and, of course, it changes continually, and the picture is different every year.

Something else that's happened since the reuse plan was done, and, in fact, since I was here last year talking to you, is that the State Land Settlement Agreement has gone forward and has been approved by the State Lands Commission, and now they're in the process of doing the documentation that finishes it up. And that's a big step.

We've been working on an infrastructure master plan not just for Lennar but also for the entire island. You have to do it for the whole thing in order to know what the picture is for us, so it includes not only our site, but the Legacy parcel as well, and the Army reserve and federal agencies, golf course, the whole thing, regional park.

Another thing that's been going on for about a year here is what we refer to as the Korve Transportation Study. It started out with a grant, a few years back, that George Miller managed to get for the City of Vallejo for what was called a Mare Island access study, and that study has grown in scope so that it covers actually the entire city and links it to Mare Island. And that is almost completed, and that'll be presented to the city council in a week or so. So we are incorporating that into our plans.

We also know more about the historic properties. As you know, there are about 502 historic properties on the island, 50 of which are very important. They're national historic landmarks. We know more about the historic properties than ever before. We've had consultants out there doing analyses of these various properties, trying to determine whether or not they should be kept or whether you can keep them. These are very important — some of them are very important. So they look very, very carefully at all of the properties before they decide to demolish any of them.

Earlier you saw the parcel that was in green that showed our area. It's Reuse Areas 2 through 10. Reuse Area 1 is Legacy, of course, and 11 and 12 are the golf course and the regional park respectively. There are a few basic things that have changed. This is our parcels here, this whole area right here up to the causeway. This is the golf course area, 11, and this is the regional park, which is Area 12 here.

One of the most basic things that has changed since this plan is that Reuse Area 10, shown here as marina housing, it's been determined that it can't be housing because that is part of the land that's being traded to the State Lands Commission. You've already shown this evening the band out here that's reversionary land out here past the Joy line. There's another band that is a trade parcel which Jerry mentioned in his presentation. It goes along the waterfront, and it goes out and lumps in all of Reuse Area 10.

Now, there were 800 housing units on that area, and we have had to rearrange all of these things in order to make the plan work. We've had to rearrange our land uses, and we've had to find areas in Reuse Area 6 and 8, which are currently residential, and they will continue to be residential, but we've had to densify them and find other areas where we can put some residential in order to make up for that.

And there are other rearrangements we have had to do with the land uses, because as we learn more about the IR sites, we need to learn more about areas we can and cannot use for residential. So we've had to dodge around those. And we also had to set up a pattern of which historic buildings we have to keep, and which might potentially be expendable. So we've had to wade through all of those and redo a plan, and this right here is the development plan. You see it up there, and we'll leave it on there.

The development plan is the basis for a specific plan amendment. When we change these land uses around to accommodate the new information we have, it changes it sufficiently that we have to get a specific plan amended, and that's what we're working on now. That's what Elizabeth is doing for us, and I'm going to let her give you a presentation on the planning process we've gone through in order to get where we are right now.

Ms. Elizabeth Shreeve - Consistent with the reuse plan, the intent for the land-use development plan for Mare Island is to create a mixed-use community, provide a major employment center with opportunities for housing, civic uses, habitat conservation, parks, open space, and so forth. The intent is to integrate new development into the fabric of existing buildings and to reuse historic structures where appropriate.

One of the intents of Lennar's approach is to create high-quality environment for these uses, for employment, residential, and other uses. This aerial shows you Mare Island today. There's quite a lot of existing buildings, as you all know. And here is an artist's rendition based on our preliminary land plan that shows an infill respecting the fabric of the existing land-use pattern, roadways, and also adding to additional landscape parks and so forth. You can see what the sort of major employment mixed-use area would look like with this artist's conception.

There's a tremendous quality of historic resources on Mare Island, a lot of existing character, and one of the things we've tried to do in our early design is to reinforce the island's street grid, which is a basic, simple, and very functional interconnected street grid. We've extended it in many locations, where over the years of military use it had been abbreviated, trying to reinforce and reextend the existing street system and provide extensions from the western areas down to the water for views and access to destination points along the waterfront. Here's that example of a roadway that turns into a pedestrian way and then provides access down to the waterfront.

What I'm going to do is run you quickly through the various areas and explain the land-use concept and urban design concept for the various areas, and you'll hear a lot of things that sound just like the reuse plan. Here's the Mare Island causeway. North is to the right in this drawing. G Street: This area is the major mixed-use employment center for Mare Island, with predominantly office, R & D, and light-industrial uses organized along the street grid that we were just talking about.

And these major north-south streets have so much different character. Here's a railroad providing major industrial, employment access. Here's Walnut, which is intended to be a

smaller scale, more pedestrian-oriented roadway, with high landscape and pedestrian quality, and Cedar, which is a larger street than Walnut, larger capacity, provides access to both mixed-use destinations and also to residential areas via this residential parkway, which is a new roadway here.

*Areas 2 and 3.* Here's Area 2. Here's Area 3. We'll start with Area 2. This portion we call the Rodman Town Center area, intended to be the more intense development, with a small, 50,000-square-foot retail reuse of a lot of high-quality existing buildings and an infill that supports this existing street grid. Some apartments here, high-density housing, adjacent to the retail. Other portion of Area 2 was found to be too polluted for residential use, so we've proposed an opportunity for a new office, R & D development to the west.

*Area 3.* This portion of Area 3 is intended as an R & D campus, with reuse of some existing buildings and creation of new buildings, with a strong orientation to the waterfront. Very high-profile site here at this access.

And this portion we call *Area 3B*. Here we have a very careful infill and reuse that will stay with the existing fabric, again with a mixed-use employment orientation. Quickly, here's an aerial looking over that Rodman Town Center area and the future R & D park. Here is a sketch that we prepared to talk to the Landmarks Commission, and it shows the Rodman Town Center. Here's Rodman itself. And you can see that the new buildings respect the type of street frontage and orientation as the existing buildings.

This red area is the historic core, *Area 4*, and here, as you know, there's a concentration of really high-quality, distinctive, existing buildings. Here's an area showing you the wonderful character of Mare Island with that mixture of scales and mixture of uses, and a real working waterfront juxtaposed against this heavily landscaped, mature vegetation.

This drawing is an illustrative showing some of the possibilities for the historic core, the opportunity to have a major public open space with these buildings reused for commercial, civic, office, industrial, again, a mix of land uses, but in the historic core, some of the more tourist- and visitor-oriented, making use of the wonderful views of Mare Island Strait and the city front. Restaurants, water access.

Here's an even more frivolous artist showing features. A lot of people. And the dry docks, you know, just the massive scale, really incredible structures, providing opportunity for interpretive education. Some of these buildings are very handsome, offering opportunity for a waterfront promenade with a backdrop of these historic buildings and the waterfront on the other side. Officers' row, a very distinctive street, and Alden Park, an historic park, part of our overall park and recreation system that we'll talk about a little later.

*Area 5* is a place for heavier industrial uses. If the historic core provides for the public, this is really a working waterfront reusing these very large-scale buildings that are existing. You can see them in this aerial view.

This drawing, also, we prepared for the Landmarks Commission as a study of Area 5, and what we're proposing here is very simple infill of buildings. I think there's one building that's actually new in this drawing. The rest are existing. Infill is proposed to meet the scale and type of function as the existing buildings now provide.

*Area 10*, as Bill mentioned, is not suitable for marina housing, as thought, so this drawing indicates a reuse, heavy- and light-industrial uses in Area 10, reusing existing buildings and possibly adding new streets, laydown space, and maybe some new buildings as well.

*Area 9*, the educational area, is currently being used by Touro University. They have about 680 students at present. It's a school of osteopathic medicine, and they're talking about bringing some other curriculum as well. There, you see an aerial view of that university area.

Residential uses are proposed consistent with the reuse plan primarily in these western areas, Area 6 and Area 8, with orientation to the west. There, you see Area 8. Proximity to the golf course, and nice views towards Mount Tamalpais and the Marin Headlands.

Residential uses encompass quite a range of prototypes. About half the units are proposed single-family detached, about 24 percent for single-family attached, quite a bit of reused residences and reused buildings -- about 14 percent -- and about 10 percent apartments.

We're looking at the existing buildings on the island as models for the architecture of the new residences. Here's what I would call a Spanish eclectic; the classical revival of the officers' row; shingle style. And there's several other existing architectural prototypes on the island that we want to reflect in the residential.

*Some examples.* We've prepared some preliminary guidelines that give an example of the types of architectural treatment that are appropriate for different prototypes: townhouses, mansion townhomes, cluster homes, detached homes. Some of these homes are alley-served. This one is not.

And I apologize, this isn't very legible, but in conjunction with all this, we prepared an open-space plan that proposes a series of interconnected open-space and park uses, both active uses, neighborhood space, community parks with ball fields and so forth to serve the population, reuse and enhancement of historic parts, passive open space, golf course, and so forth that are out of Lennar's property. These are all connected by a series of pathways, multiuse paths, bike lanes, pedestrian routes, and so forth, and also, as we mentioned earlier, along the waterfront the opportunity for a major waterfront promenade that provides public access to as many portions of the waterfront as appropriate, given the industrial nature of some of the waterfront.

Here's a rendering of Alden Park, of the chapel, and the band --

Mr. Bill Moore - Could we go back to the development plan just for a couple of minutes?

Ms. Elizabeth Shreeve - Sure.

Mr. Bill Moore - I wanted to point out just a few more things. It's hard to see at that distance, but when you come up, look at the boards, it is a little more apparent, and also with the open-space linkages.

Something I want to point out here is that we're trying to build a sense of community. You all know Mare Island. You know the sort of magical place it is; and the more we work on it, the more we love it. It's really quite a place. Elizabeth mentioned how we're trying to use some of the architectural themes from what is already out there and bring those into the community.

I'd just like to mention how the residential areas are laid out here. Most of these streets are existing. This is Railroad Avenue. You know that one. This is Walnut, and Cedar. The only real street we've added here is to this residential parkway here, which takes some of the traffic off of this one. We're trying to spread the traffic among these streets going north and south. It goes strictly through the residential area, so it's not very wide. It is very well landscaped.

But in order to get our density we've lost here, we've densified toward the center of things here, and as you get further out, the lighter densities are out there. You notice when you come in here, when you come in there and you've got a view like you can't believe of Mount Tamalpais. It's really nice. When you come in here, you've got open areas that you can see across the open space there. That's a park. When you come into this area, you look across the wetlands out there. As you go through here, you have a park on either side. There's a school there, a park there.

As you come along here, this opens up again to the big vista there, and these are playing fields. When you get here, you've got the Marine Parade Grounds and so on. The idea is to have open spaces between these uses like this. You can see that. And then here you've got the golf course. So the residential areas are in clusters that are with open spaces in between, and all of this links together with pedestrian pathway.

On the residential, this is not going to be a typical subdivision. There's not a lot of room out there, and we're trying to bring the character of the existing areas into some of the areas that are being saved, the buildings that are being saved that are very good character, are near these areas, and we tried to pick up some of the designs from these and carry it into the other areas here. And I'd like to show you just a couple of examples.

Now, this is the Marine Parade Grounds. This is an enormous, beautiful building here, which has this clear view all the way out across the bay. On either side, there ain't much

right now. And I'll just give you an example of how we're using some of these prototypes to the mansion townhouse. This is the kind of buildings we're putting on either side of the Marine Parade Grounds. Now, they look like big mansions, and when you're there, you feel you're in a plaza. You've got these massive buildings on both sides, and then the big marine barracks at the end.

Q. Ms. Diana Krevsky - Are they stucco?

A. Mr. Bill Moore - I think they are. I haven't gotten that far. We're trying to get the massing and the design so that it all fits together. These are four units, and you can see by the garages, you enter from an alley, you park your car in here, the guests park out here and go in the front. So here is one entrance. Here's another entrance. There's a third entrance. Here's a fourth entrance.

Now, this is the kind of thing we're trying to do, and as you saw some of these before, these are single-family houses, but they're done in a cluster. We're trying to find ways to build community and have these in close proximity, walking distance of a lot of things. So that's one way of doing it. We've got single-family detached that are clustered so that they share a courtyard. These are not typical. We've got an alley in the back where you drive your car in the back. That's one of the products.

Here is one that shows almost standard houses except that it's a concept that we're using called architecture forward, where we try to get the garage doors out of your face when you're going down the street, and so that's the intention here. You can see how we're doing it by having little porticoes you drive under, putting the garage on the side like that or in the back like that.

So that's it. But that's the kind of thing we're trying to do, and we're trying to keep some of the character of the old part of it and meld it with the new product that we're putting out there. So that's just an idea of how we're trying to create a community that will be as livable as it ever was on Mare Island before. Happy to answer any of your questions.

Q. Mr. Jerry Dunaway - I have a question, Bill. How will you address the historic cemetery?

A. Mr. Bill Moore - The historic cemetery -- let me point out where that is. It's right in here. It's in a portion of the state park land, and it is an historic cemetery. It's something that would have to be maintained.

Mr. Jerry Dunaway - It looks like you're at least providing additional pedestrian accessways towards --

Mr. Bill Moore - Yes, we are. There's the intention to have a linkage linking up under the bridge here with Legacy's pedestrian way, and you can see this band along here. That's our pedestrian way here. It goes to this plaza. The whole plaza is pedestrian, because

we're closing off California Street here to make this a strictly pedestrian plaza. Everything on this side is fenced off because that's very heavy industry. It's not safe to have pedestrians down there or going through it. So the pathway has to go away from the waterfront for this heavy-industrial area, and it links along through here and, of course, links back and forth all along here.

You can see these areas here where you have access to that pedestrian esplanade right along the front there. These will link then eventually to the regional park with additional linkages. And you can see that here if you walk up and take a look here. The red dots are coming along here. That's the main pedestrian linkage, and it goes down in here, and you have connections to the water every now and then, but this area you have to stay out of because it's the heavy industry. These also link up to the levee area on the outside if there ever need to be a linkage for a regional pathway or anything like that.

Q. Mr. Gerald Karr - Bill, what's your timeline? If everything was signed off tomorrow, remediation, transfer, everything was done to hit the start button, what's the timeline of the project?

A. Mr. Bill Moore - Well, we've done pro formas, which we're following the economic pro formas. A pro forma shows 12 years at buildout, and we're assuming it would be 12 to 15 and maybe some additional things to do toward the end.

Q. Mr. Ken Barden - Give us some sample prices of homes.

A. Mr. Bill Moore - I don't think I can do that at this point. As soon as we get a little closer to having some lots available, I can do that.

Mr. Ken Barden - Okay.

Mr. Bill Moore - Yes, Paula.

Q. Ms. Paula Tygielski - My question's about Area 10. I've heard two different things during the presentation, and one was that it had reverted to State Lands Commission, and the other one was it just wasn't suitable for housing and that it would be light industry instead, but what actually is happening to Area 10?

A. Mr. Bill Moore - Okay. It's part of the land that the city is trading with the State Lands, so it will go to the State Lands. Under the State Lands' ownership, the land uses are restricted so that you cannot have residential on state lands, like the BCDC requirement that you don't have housing in the BCDC setback. But they don't allow housing on their land. It's not a public-trust use, is what they say.

Thank you for having us here. When we get more information, we'll do it again.

Ms. Myrna Hayes - Thank you, Bill. And you'll leave these up for just a few minutes for people to come up and take a close-up look.

I just want to challenge you to wander up to Granville Island in Vancouver, British Columbia, and take a look at the Fraser River on the north side of Vancouver, and take a look all over the world actually at pedestrian use and heavy-industrial area. It's done very nicely there, and I think that a working waterfront is a really important thing for people to be able to bike and walk through. There are ways to address safety issues without cutting off the public from the waterfront. So that's for another night's discussion, but I think that's the best example I know of cement trucks and baby strollers going down the exact same alleyway, and I didn't believe it until I saw it last summer.

Well, you know, we missed a public-comment period at 8 o'clock, so maybe some people saw that on the agenda. If there is anyone who would like to address any issue that is not on the agenda tonight, from the public or from the RAB, this is the opportunity to do that.

With no other comments, the meeting is adjourned to August 31st. Thank you, everyone.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.)