MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2005

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, December 1, 2005, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:06 p.m. and adjourned at 8:58 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance during this month's RAB meeting.

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Kenn Browne (Community Member)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)
- Michael Coffey (Community Member)
- George Leyva (RWQCB)
- Carolyn d'Alemida (EPA)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Jerry Dunaway (Navy Co-Chair)
- Jill Bensen (CH2MHill)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston Solutions)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Jeff Morris (CH2MHill)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Bob Bancroft
- Gary Riley (RWQCB)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Jennifer Emberger (Navy)
- James Porterfield
- Wendell Quigley
- Tommie Jean Damrel

RAB Support from CDM:

- Darlene McCray (CDM)
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Welcome to our Restoration and Advisory Board for November, although it's December 1st. Myrna is not here yet, but I think we'll go ahead and get started. The weather is a little rough out there, hopefully she'll be here in a little bit to join us. My name is Jerry Dunaway. I'm the BRAC environmental coordinator for Mare Island for the Navy, and the Navy co-chair for this Restoration Advisory Board. We have a good agenda tonight. We're going to update you all on something we've been talking about for a couple of years, we've had a couple of snags in the road, and it's looking like we're right on track now to proceed full speed ahead. And that is the early transfer of the remaining economic development conveyance parcels here at Mare Island through the City of Vallejo. Before we get into that, why don't we start with introductions around the room. For those in the audience, you're free to welcome -- introduce yourself to the rest

of the group here, or you don't have to if you don't want to. So again, my name is Jerry Dunaway with the Navy.

(Attendees introduced themselves as requested).

II. PRESENTATION: *Overview of the Economic Development Conveyance Early Transfer Project*

Presentations by Mr. Jerry Dunaway, BRAC Program Management Office and Ms. Jill Bensen, CH2MHill

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, everyone. I am passing around the presentation for tonight. Gil, if you would pass this around. Once everybody gets a copy of the presentation, I will go ahead and get started. Jill Bensen with CH2M Hill will be joining me halfway through the presentation to take on a portion of the discussion of what's left to do for environmental cleanup on these parcels. But I want to start out with describing kind of how this project came about. The City of Vallejo had requested a third early transfer here at Mare Island. As many of you know, we already had completed two other early transfers here at Mare Island, the eastern early transfer parcel, where Lennar is developing the property as we speak. And the western early transfer parcel where a portion of that, Weston Solutions, working with the City of Vallejo, is developing a portion of that. In 2003, a request was received from the City of Vallejo to transfer additional parcels early. And for those who don't know what an early transfer means, it means transferring it early before the Navy completes the cleanup. And in this case, having the cleanup conducted by the parties that will then receive the property.

We got started in 2003 and developed the project. And one of the key items was the Navy would like to see all the remaining economic development conveyance parcels transferred all at one time so we don't have to go through this rather laborious exercise another time in the future. I'll show you what those parcels are in a second here. In 2004 we hit a bit of a hiccup. Some folks back in Washington, D.C. told us we had a bit of a legislative problem and there needed to be a fix there. And that is being taken care of. We were given the green light a couple months ago to proceed with cleanup again, and we're now getting really up to speed to get into negotiations and make this thing happen. You'll hear about the timeframe for this early transfer project through this presentation, and what some of the environmental issues are related to the property being discussed here for early transfer. Are there any general questions anyone has to begin with? If there are any questions, feel free to just jump in and ask, just raise your hand and get my attention. So what we'll be talking about is -- thanks, Wally -- kind of the why and who, what, where, and when of this project.

So, to begin with, why an early transfer and who are the players? The request, as I mentioned earlier, came from the City of Vallejo to the Navy requesting to transfer the balance of the base to Lennar through the City of Vallejo for a couple of things. One, by transferring the cleanup along with the property, Lennar Mare Island, along with Vallejo, can integrate the cleanup along with redevelopment for the Navy to do the cleanup. Usually, redevelopment has to come later, kind of in a series process. In an early transfer, redevelopment and cleanup can happen simultaneously. And what that does is it expedites the economic development and productive reuse of the property. The areas that we are talking about that are the remaining economic development conveyance

parcels, which include these green shaded parcels on Mare Island. The first one is called the north island area. It consists of a couple parcels. It's north of the causeway. And these are the pieces that the Navy has left in this area. The Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office is down in this area, basically right at the intersection of Dump Road and Azuar. And that's really just a corner of this piece. But this whole parcel would go along with that site. The Marine Corps Firing Range is about the middle of the base, or the former base, and it's a site that the Navy is actively doing cleanup work on. And we think that once we finish that field work in the next month or so, the cleanup field work will actually be completed, and we'd just have some paperwork exercises to go through to get to actual closure. Down in the southern part of the island are some of the more challenging sites. The production and manufacturing area can be expanded to be munitions production and manufacturing area. That's what was manufactured down in that area. And so we have some cleanup that is left to do, really to validate some of the excavation and removal work that the Navy had completed back in the late nineties. Adjacent to the production manufacturing area is the south shore area. And although production didn't happen down there, there were storage facilities and some disposal pits where we had also done a significant amount of cleanup back in the nineties.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Jerry, before you leave that slide, can I just clarify that the north area, we do not have an agreement with Lennar to develop that property. So we can't transfer it to Lennar until we have an agreement. And even though Lennar would be the temporary holder of the south shore, they're not the long-term owner of that. They won't develop that. Cause I don't want to read about that in the paper that we're transferring it to Lennar.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you for clarifying. You'll see the schedule later, and these projects take a while, so the actual conveyance here from the Navy would be about a year from now. So hopefully in that amount of time the development agreement with Lennar would get firmed up. And we'll learn more about how the south shore ownership situation would work as we go further into this project. Are there any other questions on the areas subject to this project?

And, of course, when I mentioned expediting the productive reuse or economic redevelopment, this is the land use plan that the city has adopted and Lennar has refined as of recently. And so you can see that here's the north island area. The DRMO parcel is about right here. Marine Corps Firing Range sits about the middle of the site here. And the south shore and production manufacturing areas are down here. And they all are a significant piece of the overall reuse plan here to make the entire redevelopment and productive reuse of the base happen. So they're all very important pieces of the puzzle. So at this point I was going to bring Jill up here and ask her to talk about the environmental sites. And Jill is with CH2M Hill, they are working with Lennar to address environmental issues on the property. Jill will be discussing this because if this project does happen, the Navy won't be doing the cleanup. So she'll be discussing the sites and kind of describing what's left, and maybe a little bit of their strategy to approach those sites since that would be the party doing the cleanup. So Jill, I'll just turn it on over to you.

MS. BENSEN: Thank you, Jerry. I'm Jill Bensen with CH2M Hill as Jerry mentioned. And it's good to be back here at the Mare Island RAB. I was looking for my name tag, but I see it's been taken down. Jerry was teasing me and saying that everyone was calling Steve Jill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, it's not, it's right here.

MS. BENSEN: Oh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jill Benson.

MS. BENSEN: Except it's spelled wrong after all these years.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So was Kenn's all these years.

MS. BENSEN: I was sitting here trying to remember when it was that I first came to this RAB to talk about the first early transfer, and I think it was about six or seven years ago when we had this very same type of discussion back then. And so this should go a little bit smoother today. We want to talk about what work is yet to be performed and who will be performing that work. But before we do, I thought it might be helpful to do a quick cliff notes review of the early transfer process, because I recognize that there are a couple of people in the room that weren't here six or seven years ago when we first talked about this, and it might be helpful because of some of the acronyms that we use.

Early transfer is about the covenant deferral request. And the covenant is the CERCLA covenant that basically warranties that all remedial actions have been completed and the property is suitable for its intended use. Well, if there's an early transfer, and the property is not -- cleanup is not completed, then that warranty can't be issued. And so what happens is DOD submits a request for a covenant deferral request until such time as those conditions are met. So the CDR, covenant deferral request, is prepared by DOD, and it's submitted to the Governor for approval and signature. And in order for the Governor to find that the property is suitable for use by the transferee, and that DOD has to have made certain assurances; and basically those are that all necessary cleanup will be performed and not substantially delayed, number one. And number two, that human health and the environment will be protected during the cleanup process. So there are three documents that support the covenant deferral request. And these are kind of the underpinning justifications or --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Conditions.

MS. BENSEN: -- conditions that would support the findings. The first is the finding of suitability for early transfer. And this document we refer to it as the FOSET. And it defines the title that will be transferred. And it also defines the environmental condition of the property at the time of transfer. It also establishes what safeguards will be in place during the cleanup process until the covenant is issued.

The second document is the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, the ESCA, which defines the scope of the environmental work that's going to be performed by the transferee. It also typically describes the environmental work that will be completed by the DOD. And the last is the consent agreement and regional board order, as appropriate, which define the requirements of the work that need to be completed. And this is one mechanism for also assuring that the work won't be substantially delayed because these agreements will also have schedules and deadlines

embedded in them. And so these three documents once they're compiled basically support the covenant deferral request.

And what we plan to talk a little bit about tonight are what are the environmental work, what environmental work would be performed by the transferee versus completed by the Department of Defense under this early transfer. And so Jerry had already pointed out the areas that we're looking at where the title would be transferred. And this is -- this discussion pertains to the environmental cleanup work. And so for the north island there are just a couple of remaining environmental sites. The former north buildings ways. There's also IR 17, which is a groundwater plume that has been investigated by the Navy, and is currently being studied for what type of remedy would be appropriate. And there are a couple of UST sites and PCB sites. Essentially all of the remaining environmental work on the north island would be transferred under this early transfer, so transferred for Lennar to complete. The Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, the DRMO area. Here there's an ongoing activity going on with the Navy where they're completing a removal action scope of work within the DRMO itself. Co-located and underneath the DRMO is IRL 01 which is the historic landfill area. That area also has a TPH deposit that needs to be investigated and decisions made. And so under the early transfer it's proposed that the Navy would complete its current removal action work at the DRMO, but that work required for regulatory closure of the historic landfill area and the subsurface petroleum would be transferred to the new landowner.

The Marine Corps Firing Range. Again, the Navy is currently conducting a cleanup activity here and they would complete that work. However, the regulatory closure, primarily the paperwork associated with getting regulatory closure, would be transferred to the new landowner, to Lennar. We're still having some discussions whether this would be completed through the Navy or by Lennar. But either way, it would be sorted out in the ESCA process. And a lot of that really depends on when the timing of when the ESCA is actually executed. If the ESCA goes quickly, it might be that the scope of work would get folded into it. If the ESCA gets drawn out and takes a little bit longer, this activity might even be completed before the ESCA is done. The production manufacturing area, which is down along the southern part of the island here, there's some munitions closure and land use control activities. IR 04 which is the green sand pile. There's also a portion of the industrial waste pipeline. And some UST sites and PCB sites. And essentially the proposal here is that all remaining environmental work required for regulatory closure would be transferred to the new landowner.

Similarly at the south shore area, the munitions closure work and land use controls, as well as USTs and PCB sites, still require closure. And this environmental work would also be transferred under the ESCA. Our schedule as it stands today is we're looking to submit an ESCA proposal to the Navy in January of next year, and we hope to have a term sheet level agreement negotiated by March of next year. And we would also get started on the regulatory agreements, drafting of the finding of suitability for early transfer, as well as the ESCA document. And that these final drafts would be done sometime in May. And the target would be to get those out for public review and comment during June. And once we receive comments and respond to those comments, those documents would be finalized, and the covenant deferral request would be submitted to the Governor's office in September. And our target would be to transfer title and sign the ESCA sometime in October. And now I'll hand it back over to Jerry to talk about at that point what would still be left with the Navy.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Jill. I wasn't able to take the time and color in the parcels, so you still see the green early transfer parcels. But what these leaders point to are the areas of the base where the Navy would still have property ownership. And these pieces of the base are not intended to go to the City of Vallejo for economic development, conveyance purposes. Some of it may go to the City of Vallejo through other means, but not necessarily for redevelopment to build homes or to put an office building at. They are areas that still require environmental cleanup work, that's why the Navy still owns them. And starting from the top of the list. Parcel 16 is an open space area that is west of Azuar, and it's primarily wetlands, but there is a building in the middle of the site, building 505. The City of Vallejo has expressed interest in that for their police department to operate as a facility. So we're still working with them to kind of develop that project into something more firm.

Investigation area H1 is a pretty large area where we have a big landfill on the site, for one thing, but some other environmental sites are also on there. We're working with Weston Solutions as part of the western early transfer parcel ESCA, to complete that cleanup. And we're very -- we're moving very well along towards the remedy, hopefully by next year. The elementary school is a fairly small piece right close to the Marine Corps Firing Range in the middle of the eastern early transfer parcel. We don't have anymore environmental cleanup work there, the Navy thinks, and we believe the regulators have given us their informal indication that they're on board with that. We have some documents to publish later this year. And then ultimately we hope to transfer that, actually next year towards the middle of the year.

The Western Magazine area as well as the site IR 05, and that was a munitions treatment area. These two areas are kind of in the same category as H1. We have an agreement in place for the cleanup of those areas. Weston Solutions is conducting that work on our behalf, and we're making fairly good progress just in the last few months to get those remedies off the table and in the ground. And so we still own those and will remain to until we get those sites cleaned up. And then finally the offshore sediments. This is not land, but this is property that we own out towards the middle of the channel along Mare Island Strait towards the City of Vallejo. And then it also curves down around the south end of the island. We have investigation work to do out there to study chemicals or potential for chemicals being elevated out there, as well as some discrete sites where munitions were disposed of offshore. So that's what would be left with the Navy here if this other early transfer did convey. So it -- that project in itself does not mean that the Navy goes away from Mare Island, we still have quite a bit of work left here. So that was a question that was asked earlier this year about this project. I believe at this point we'll open up the floor to questions from Board members or anyone in the audience. Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is this on? My question has to do with the -- I remember an insurance deal being bargained as part of the early transfer process. Will that insurance deal cover the new properties? Or will, if something comes up, the insurance company say, "Uh-oh, we didn't cover that building?"

MS. BENSEN: There is an existing insurance policy on the existing eastern early transfer parcel, and there would be a similar one negotiated for this new early transfer. It may or may not be with

the same insurance carrier, but it would have very similar terms and conditions with respect to liability and unknown contamination, and so that definitely would be part of this negotiation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I usually let other people ask questions, but I'll follow up on what Paula asked about, Jill, on the insurance. The last early transfer your insurance carrier wasn't comfortable with insuring you, was our understanding anyway, on ordnance and radiological issues. So how have you come to -- is that why you're getting a new carrier maybe? Or how have you resolved that issue with the insurance?

MS. BENSEN: There have been some advancements in the insurance industry where there have been a handful of sites -- I'm going to guess four or five in the United States -- that have been underwritten by the insurance carriers for MEC work. Typically for underwriting MEC cleanup activities or MEC clearance activities, they require two things. One, that the site has been adequately characterized so they fully understand the risks involved. And secondly, that the regulatory requirements for closure and clearance are clearly understood as well. We've been working with the Navy and with DTSC on getting closer to determining whether we have enough information to meet those two criteria to get insurance. And if it's possible, we will.

However, what we've come up with and proposed to the Navy as a fallback position, is in the event that we're not able to get insurance for the clearance and cleanup of those two parcels, is we would carve out that discrete piece of work from the insurance policy itself. So we would cover everything but that. And so -- but just for the MEC clearance and cleanup we would ask the Navy to essentially self-insure against that scope of work. So we would define a specific scope of work that would be executed for a fixed price, and in the event the scope of work was different from that, if we discovered something new, the Navy would self-insure for the additional cost to deal with that additional cleanup. And so our first hope is that we have the necessary information to obtain the insurance. But in the event that that's not possible, our fallback position is to ask the Navy to self-insure for that one discrete piece.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: With discrete being the entire PMA and south shore?

MS. BENSEN: Only the cleanup itself. So in paperwork, investigation, those types of activities where they're low risk, would be part of the overall insurance package and scope of work insurance.

MS. TYGIELSKI: So it would just -- it would just be the MEC?

MS. BENSEN: Right.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MS. BENSEN: Yeah. The CERCLA, TPH, PCBs, all of the other what we call traditional contaminants, you can get insurance for those. And so for -- the PMA area also has CERCLA constituents and other constituents, and that would be part of the traditional insurance package. And the traditional ESCA scope of work would do just the MEC cleanup. Other questions? We're not allowed to ask each other questions.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I have a couple of other questions. Can you explain to us -- or would you explain to us why Lennar chose to package the south shore area within this ESCA rather than -- since the Navy is retaining the offshore, partly due to ordnance issues; why Lennar and the city chose to wrap the south shore area into this ESCA rather than doing the offshore -- keeping the offshore with the south shore which would have more similar cleanup issues, I would think. And how are you going to ensure that you have adequate coverage or overlap on those two areas?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Maybe I can start with a couple of comments on that. The offshore parcel -- this parcel nine that wraps around the base and is out in the water, that is a parcel that was not designated for economic development. Obviously you can't really build much out there. Plus, it was not really designated to go to the City of Vallejo. As it stood about a year ago, the Navy considers this and had been planning on reverting ownership back to the State of California once we finished the cleanup. A recent development, I believe, at the beginning of this year --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Wouldn't have anything to do with the water, it's only public trust.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Only the public trust, the Senate bill?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: So I guess --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So you'll still revert. Actually -- yeah. What you'll basically do is you'll just quick claim any rights you might have to that, because they don't believe that you have any rights anyway.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: So basically.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hear. Hear.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Basically it doesn't transfer to the city, it would transfer to the state. And, therefore, it wasn't part of this early transfer package because it wasn't something that the state or the city wanted to take ownership of and conduct the cleanup. Now, as far as performing the cleanup, we had discussed in the past with the city possibly entertaining an idea of including the cleanup cost in the ESCA but not conveying the property. Sediment work and munitions work in sediment or offshore regimes are fairly complicated projects. I'm almost certain that an insurance company has yet to insure that kind of work. But why don't I turn it over to Jill, if you have any additional information about how the south shore got wrapped into this project. And maybe Gil can add to that a little bit too.

MS. BENSEN: Maybe Gil should speak for us.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, I can answer it real quick. The Navy said take all six parcels or none, and that's why we went ahead and took it.

MS. BENSEN: Thank you, Gil.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Does that answer your question, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well then, I'll go back to you, the Navy. Why did you force the City of Vallejo to take all six parcels or none?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: What we had done back in 2002 with the prior two early transfers was conveyed the eastern early transfer parcel that's kind of right in the middle of the developed portion of the island and, of course, the western early transfer parcel. The new request that came in 2003 was to convey the northern area. I believe that was the extent of what was initially requested. But we know that there is interest in the Marine Corps Firing Range. There's interest in the DRMO. There hasn't been any immediate interest for this area -- well actually, that's not true. Weston is interested in doing some work down in the south shore. These early transfers take an awful lot of work. To get the Governor's attention is something that we don't want to try and do every other year either. So we want to just do this one time and one time only. So we asked the city, let's try and package all of this. And so -- yeah, we may be viewed as having forced the city to do this, but I think in the end this will prevent us from having to go through this exercise one more time and eventually get all the property under the economic development conveyance agreement in the city's hands so we don't have to repeat this.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And it really comes down to money, you know. He has to have a huge -- not a huge staff, but a number of people work on it. And I have to have Tetra Tech and lawyers and all these other people working for it. Lennar has to. And then they bring in CH2M Hill. So we have 30 people working on this at any one time. If we went up there and did the north area, and then we went down and did some other area, and some other area, it just compounds that cost. And, you know, it's only logical what they did.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, logical in the terms that you've just presented. But in the second half of my question, you haven't answered what's logical about taking two different -- the exact same type of cleanup and putting -- doing it onshore with one party, and then waiting around to do it offshore with the, at your whim, I guess, or sometime in the future. Isn't there a cost savings to doing it all, you know, to just putting the south shore in with -- or is it just all driven by the EDC?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, the option to include the cost of cleanup in the ESCA for the offshore was put out there for this project. But it, again, is a very complicated, difficult type of cleanup to put a dollar figure on. We have yet to really get a proposal for doing that cleanup. And I'm not sure the city or their developers or cleanup contractors would be able to put together a cost proposal to us that would be certain and really give the Navy some comfort that the work will get done. We're continuing to do the cleanup. We have activities planned for early next year to get out here and do stuff. It was a little bit late this year to get out there with the weather. But we're certainly not just sitting on that property out there doing nothing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you tell us -- one of you tell us -- or would you, a little bit about the production manufacturing area, and I guess the south shore area; what you have in mind in terms of

munitions closures and LUC's on those two areas? Cause as I mentioned -- Jill, you weren't here -- I don't know if you've had a chance to read the minutes. But the land use controls that you're putting in place on the eastern early transfer I think are going to be quite different than what will be necessary for land use controls given that this is ordnance.

MS. BENSEN: Correct. I can't tell you specifically what cleanup is required there or what the LUC's will be. We are in discussions with the Navy and DTSC at this point in time to better understand what those requirements might be, but they haven't been determined at this point in time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, can you give us a flavor of what they will be? I mean you said that you're waiting to hear what DTSC is going to say -- want you to do in terms of cleanup level. Gil, his last word when he gave us a heads-up in, at -- when we met at Holiday Inn, whatever meeting that was -- September -- was that DTSC was going to require a cleanup to twelve feet in the park area. So can you tell us if you have anymore clue besides that? And I don't see a DTSC representative here tonight.

MS. BENSEN: I don't see a DTSC person here tonight. But they have not stated that specifically, and no depth has been identified. There's been discussions about best available technology and site clearance. What might be appropriate depths based on the future reuse. There's also some discussions about existing structures and what should be done underneath those. But no decisions have been made at this point in time. And, in fact, I don't think any specific depths have even been proposed at this time. We've had one meeting with Jim Austreng and the MEC folks with DTSC, with the Navy, and we're planning to have a followup meeting fairly soon to continue that discussion. And I also believe that there's an investigation in the works at the PMA area that you might want to talk a little bit more about.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: What I can describe is kind of the Navy's vision if we were to continue on with the work forward, and we are. We have a work plan currently sitting with the regulatory agencies, and we're very eager to hear their response, particularly DTSC's response to that work plan. Because it will give Jill and her team some indication of what they need to propose on, what kind of dollars they need to apply based on the kind of expectations that DTSC will have on the cleanup there. But in a nutshell, the Navy had put in a ton of effort back in 1997 through 1999 and a little bit into 2000 cleaning up that south shore area and the production manufacturing area. Some one million pounds of material got taken out of there. Only about five percent of that was munitions related, but that was a big cleanup effort.

What the work plan we have in front of the regulatory agencies is all about right now is, let's go back out there and resurvey the work, see if there truly is any residual munitions concerns, do some testing, see if we find anything out there. Once that work is done it will kind of help us figure out what are the potential risks out there still, if any. We think there's some. But some of the basic land use controls that we can envision would be no digging below a certain footage, like maybe below four feet. Or if there is some digging at that depth you would need to have someone who has expertise in identifying munitions items in the event something is discovered. Also having some kind of educational component to the users of the property, whether it's in the regional park or it's in the production manufacturing area where it will be light commercial or light industrial use.

Having some kind of program, kiosk or signage that helps communicate to people with pictures and words what are things that you might come across, if you do come across them, that could pose a hazard? And kind of what not to do; don't pick it up. Don't take it home or put it in your car. But to notify others. Have a phone number for a contact to respond to a discovery like that. But ultimately the regulatory agencies would be working with us to make those decisions on what those final land use controls would be. And we can't predetermine that at this point, but that's kind of just a flavor of what the Navy could anticipate as being the types of land use controls.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't want to take up the whole RAB meeting, but I've been known to on these topics. Jill, you weren't here and I, and it appears that you're on the negotiating team, so I think it's important that I repeat what I have said the last time this topic came up here. And that is that I would highly encourage Lennar -- even though this isn't your favorite thing to do -- to go to seek Weston's advice and counsel. They have been successful with an early transfer of munitions related -- or properties that were contaminated with munitions. It's a very tricky process when you're working also with the State Lands Commission. They have a different set of criteria, and they'll be the ultimate -- at least the land will pass through their hands. I don't know if it's going to become an ownership issue with the city or what you're doing with that. But I would encourage you to open this up to the public, and to the Restoration Advisory Board members, particularly those who have an interest or some long-term experience in the munitions end of it regarding that as it related to that previous early transfer.

We were able to be quite compelling and convincing with the regulatory agencies and benefit the early transferee. If you try to cut us out and go do the typical back room deal, I think this issue is really going to blow up, so to speak, in your face. I would not recommend this. Because this land is -- the PMA is slated to go to Lennar for public trust uses. That is not a private property in that respect, it has a public trust cloud over it regardless of who has ownership. And the regional park is certainly going to be for public uses. Therefore, in this particular part of your ESCA and your negotiations, I would get right on it in involving us, and sucking it up and talking to a previously successful early transferee on this topic.

The next thing that I want to say regarding that issue is this. The land use controls that were found -- envisioned in your eastern early transfer and are now coming to fruition, there was an expectation that the funds in the original, in the ESCA covered the cost of long-term monitoring of those land use controls in the early -- in the eastern early transfer parcel. Those had nothing to do with MEC. Not only am I very disappointed to have learned that, from Lennar's staff that they were considering, are considering, the City of Vallejo is in partnership with them on this, and you can tell me any latest information if you have something different you're planning. But the last word that I had was that the assessees, the Mello Roos district assessees, will be responsible for the cost of the, of long-term monitoring and controls on these land use controls. That is not the impression that we got at the Restoration Advisory Board. And it is a failing of the negotiation, as far as I'm concerned, between the Navy and the early transfer component.

I would not have been supportive if I had -- of the early transfer -- and I was, and you can recall that -- if I had found out that people who are innocent bystanders, people who the city, LMI and Lennar, Mare Island team were all over what a tremendous boon they are to the City of Vallejo at the city council meeting Tuesday night. It is not a boon to a city to burden the future landowners

and assessees with the responsibility that the public thought was being taken care of as part of the ESCA package. So I'm going to be very, very adamant that the park does not have assessees that are even capable of making an income. We may have some because we're going to have to be self-sustaining because we're not included, the park's not included in the current assessment district, it doesn't benefit from it. But not only will I have an expectation that the park will not have to bear a burden of the land use controls in perpetuity on this property. So I'll expect that that money is going to come out of this ESCA for land use controls in perpetuity. And they're going to be much more robust land use controls and the monitoring that will go with it, as Jerry described, because they are MEC. So I know that people are saying to me, well, there's an awful lot of things that are being expected out of this ESCA, that this ESCA should fund; but I'm adamant that the -- that the citizens of this community are not going to bear the brunt of this cleanup going to a private party.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you for your comments, Myrna. Are there other questions? Other issues? People would like to make other comments? Kenn.

MR. BROWN: I have a question about the offshore cleanup and the schedule, or how that relates to Weston's proposals to use piers 34, 35, and their pipeline through that area.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: The schedule for that work kind of got pushed out a little bit. We were hoping to get out there this spring and do some sampling work. DTSC required some other steps for us to do before we can get out there. That spring timeframe was important to us because that's when the extreme low tide hits the area here, and it gives us the ability to do some of that work without having to put on our swimsuits, if you will. We hope to do that next spring. We've done some things. We think we've satisfied DTSC, they currently have that work plan in front of them. And we've gotten some comments from regulatory agencies, including DTSC and EPA. And we expect to be out there next spring, about the April, May timeframe, to start that field work, gather more information about what's out there. As far as a timeframe for completing it, I don't know. It will really depend on what we find out there, that's what these investigations are all about, to help better understand the conditions out there and act on those; put that data out in front of the regulatory agencies, to the Restoration Advisory Board here; and to come to some consensus on what the approach for cleanup would be out there.

Again, it's a very challenging type of environment to do cleanup in, and so we really need to figure out a good plan forward before we try and do something out there that may not be very effective. As far as the question about the south shore area, the question Kenn raises is that there's a pier right here, pier 35, as well as another pier over here that Weston has requested from the Navy to have access to for purposes of the dredge pond's project, dredge material disposal facility that they want to reactivate. And those dredge ponds are over in this area here. We're entertaining that idea, working with them to develop a lease for that. And we're still some months away from doing that, you'll hear more about it in the coming months. But really the essential key condition there is, as part of that lease, the Navy's cleanup activity will take priority over their project. In other words, if they are using an area of this property, maybe their pipeline is running across an area where we need to do some excavation or investigation work, they've agreed with us that they would move their stuff out of the way so that we can do our work. And that's a key condition of the lease, the Navy's cleanup takes priority over that project.

MR. BROWN: So you're saying they're allowed to use that space before it's cleaned up then?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Correct. We feel, and I think working with the regulatory agencies, we get their concurrence that giving them use of that property would be safe and would not cause any harm or hazard to the workers out there.

MR. BROWN: And what about land use guidelines that are in the specific plan that say it's a park?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: As far as being consistent with that land use plan? I believe that's something that we would rely on the city to make sure that they are proposing a use that is consistent with that reuse plan.

MR. BROWN: So if it weren't consistent, then you probably wouldn't allow it?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, from what the Navy has already put into our 1998 environmental impact statement, the dredge ponds project was already something that was envisioned for the reuse plan.

MR. BROWN: But not in the park?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yeah, the plan does not say a dredge pond is in that south shore area. But as far as access for operations to support that project, I don't know the specifics on what that says, but obviously it's something that, again, we would rely on the city to help us understand, is it consistent with that reuse plan? And I can look into it further and get back to you, Kenn, next month to see if we see any problems. But from all the indications I've gotten from our real estate folks, no one's raised that question.

MR. BROWN: Also, would you be -- how would the nesting of the herons and the osprey there affect your cleanup? Would you -- what about impacts to that?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: As with all of our cleanups, we can't just be tunnel visioned and look at cleaning up a site. We are required by law to look at all the other requirements, whether it be the Endangered Species Act, Historic Preservation Act, or a myriad of other environmental statutes, we have to comply with all those laws. And so I don't have a plan for you to tell you how we're going to take care of the blue heron but, you know, we do have to take care of them if they exist there at the time we do the cleanup.

MR. BROWN: As I understand it, their nesting season is basically in the spring when you're planning to do some of your work up there.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: The spring work I mentioned earlier is in the offshore area, I'm not sure if that's the same area you're talking about.

MR. BROWN: It's right below their nests.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. Well it's something then we have to consider and incorporate into our work plans.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Speaking of the historic resources, is that a factor that you're considering in the ESCA, as well that the work that you'll be doing will be in a National Register landmark district?

MS. BENSEN: To the extent that it impacts the actual environmental cleanup, yes, it would be considered.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have one other question. I don't see that you've noted how the RAB will be affected or whether -- I assume you will continue to, you'll continue to hold RAB meetings, the Navy will, for the parcels that you will continue to hold, but what are you -- what is the early transfer proponent considering regarding continued public involvement in the cleanup process?

MS. BENSON: I believe we would continue as we have under the eastern early transfer with participation in the RAB, and community relations and outreach programs the same as we have for the last several years.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: The intent of the last slide saying what will be left with the Navy was to somewhat answer that question you raised, I think last month or two months ago. Because we will have a significant cleanup program remaining even if this project happens and those parcels are transferred. The extent of cleanup that would be remaining still requires us to maintain the Restoration Advisory Board. Any other questions? Well, thank you all for listening and providing comments. We'll certainly consider some of those as we go through this process, and hopefully be able to touch on some of those later in the next coming months as this project progresses. Before we take a break I did want to make a special note. Thank you, Jill, for participating in the presentation. Gary Riley introduced himself earlier as a former Regional Water Quality Control Board member. He's been assigned to Mare Island since 2001, so it's been about four years. And he just surprised us about a month or so ago and said that he's moving on to do bigger and better things. I can't imagine something bigger than Mare Island, but --

MR. COFFEY: Better.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: But hopefully less complicated maybe. Well, in the spirit of the holidays we have a happy holidays cake, but we also want to wish Gary good luck in his future endeavors over at U.S. EPA. So as we take a break here we're going to cut up the cake and celebrate Gary's move to EPA. With that, why don't we take a break and come back in a few minutes.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you for helping me celebrate Gary's success in entering the federal service system.

MR. RILEY: Says one federal employee.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myna Hayes, Jerry Dunaway)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: We have administrative business to go through and then hear focus group reports for the rest of the meeting. I think we can go through those fairly quickly. For the last meeting, October 27th, the meeting minutes are in your packet. If you have any corrections, please pass them on my way. Dwight found an error that we made a correction on. And --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where? Where?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: It was an interesting correction. January's RAB meeting. At the end of the month, the normal last Thursday of the month would be a conflict with the Flyway Festival that same weekend, the following -- I think it starts that night -- so we've moved that meeting up to January 12th.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, tell them the other reason, you're not going to be here.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Oh, yeah, and I'm not going to be here too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Blaming it on me.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yes, I'll be out of the country. We had planned on having that meeting here. If the library is available, I think we'll just go back to the library, at the JFK library in downtown Vallejo here. But we'll put out specifics. I'll send an e-mail out to folks at the beginning of January to let you know what the specifics on that are, if not earlier before Christmas.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community

Moving on to the focus group reports. We are still vacant at our community focus group subcommittee.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

Jerry Karr is not here tonight so we don't have a Natural Resources Subcommittee report.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

Paula, did you have anything?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. So let's move on to the city report. Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you. On the December 13th, the city council will hold a public hearing on the dredge pond environmental impact statement, environmental impact report. And we hope that we will get a project decision from them that night. That will be followed by a January 4th, 2006 planning commission meeting where they will consider the site development plan, the unit plan, and the specific plan amendment for the dredge facility. Then that particular meeting will be followed by action by the city council, but it's not programmed yet, so I don't have a date. That's what's coming up between now and our next meeting. And as always, before the meeting always check with www.ci.vallejo.caus to see if there's been a change in the meeting dates. And that's it.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Gil. Onto the Lennar report. I believe Steve will cover that one.

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Jerry. There's a handout similar to the -- it looks similar to the ones we've done for the past six or eight months or so. They're on the table. A couple of things that I'd like to point out as I have before. The colors, the yellow, green, and blue represent the phases that each of the IA's or investigation areas are going through. You can take a look at that. If you have any questions you can ask questions about it. In terms of the field work. The only major field work that's going on right now is reflected in the two photographs. It's building 516. I reported on 516 last month. This is in the triangle area between dry docks two and -- or one and two. It's a PCB site that we're doing some soil excavation and concrete removal. Probably go on for the next several weeks anyway doing excavation. South of there there's a, sort of an orange box with an X through it, that's a UST site. That's UST site 742. We're almost done with that, we've just got a little bit more excavation to do there, and then we think we'll be done.

We also finished the work at pump station number four which is up at the northern end of the site near the C1 label in IAC-1. So that's the main field work that we have going on. It's kind of going a little bit slower now with the poor weather. In terms of documents in review, we have several documents that relate to land use covenants, implementation reports, those sorts of things for IA's, H2 and D1.2. Those are obviously fairly important documents, and we're working closely with DTSC and U.S. EPA on those documents. Significant upcoming documents is the draft final RAP, remedial action plan for IA C3. We expect to issue that report next week. Upcoming public comment periods. The IA C3 RAP public comment period is expected to start next week. And in terms of environmental site closure status, the only thing that changes there is we achieved closure of seven PCB sites since the last RAB meeting.

And one other thing real quickly. We have a long-term groundwater monitoring program out here that we -- in which we do groundwater monitoring at a number of the wells. We have a round coming up, probably in January, probably the focus of most of that work over the next couple of months will be abandoning wells that are no longer needed because sites have been closed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Steve, I have a few questions for you on the draft remedial action plan for C3. I see that you have the public comment period. Is that starting December 6th, that's what the parentheses stand for, start?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you had hoped that this would -- that we would be able to incorporate a public meeting for that document into this meeting, but we weren't able to make that date. So do you have any timeframe you're looking at for a public meeting on that?

MR. FARLEY: December 13th I'm being told.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And who, you're being -- and where would that be?

MR. FARLEY: Jeff Morris reports it's December 13th.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And where would that be? Check with your sources and get back to us here.

MR. MORRIS: Right now we have targeted December 13th for a public meeting for that. But as Steve mentioned, we're still working on the fact sheet with DTSC and trying to finish that up, and that needs to get in the mail to the mailing list. And so that may end up sliding a few days to later in the week, the start of the public comment period, and then perhaps that would affect the start of the meeting. And we need to work with DTSC to figure out -- we don't want to start the public meeting -- we're sensitive to the fact that it's the end of the year and the holidays, so we don't want to have a public meeting any later in December than that week. So if we can't make it happen by then, we would do it in early January. And I don't know if using a RAB meeting is another possibility since the RAB meeting is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's the 12th, yeah, it may be possible. Well, keep us posted on that, cause I think that would be possible to do that public meeting on the 12th if you end up moving into January on your comment period. Get used to having all these big decision meetings in the wee hours of the waning year, we do that here in Vallejo all the time. Makes it really handy for staff and for the public. The IA -- investigation area D1-2, what does that mean, termination of -- well, I thought that D1-2 and H2 you were quite close to having RAPS on these. What --

MR. MORRIS: Actually for --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But we haven't seen anything. So I don't see anything here exactly.

MR. MORRIS: The RAPs for both of those investigation areas were signed in 2004, so they --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well what else is -- what is the document? Closure?

MR. MORRIS: Closure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Closure action.

MR. MORRIS: Right, the implementation report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

MR. MORRIS: Those two investigation areas are at the point where all of those cleanup work have been completed. And we're asking DTSC to certify that that, in fact, is the case; everything that the remedial action plan said needed to be done is, has been done. That includes the re-creation of the land use covenants. And the other documents that you see in review there are related to those land use covenants and the enforcement implementation of those.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you're going to come back to us with more details of what you're going to do with your land use controls here pretty soon?

MR. MORRIS: The documents that are currently in review, the land use covenant implementation and enforcement plan that's in the library now, describes the land use covenants that exist within the investigation area. It describes the commitments needed to ensure that those restrictions are enforced and maintained in the future. So there is a draft of those documents that are now in review, available as part of that 45 day public comment period.

MR. FARLEY: And those are in the library, right?

MR. MORRIS: Those are in the JFK library, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it's open now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's open?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's open.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It got open. That was my concern about several of your documents, including that MEC cleanup or detonation document, that if the library was closed how can people review the documents. But it's open now, right?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, so are you -- do you need a public meeting for this implementation certification or no?

MR. MORRIS: We do not need one unless one is requested. So we hadn't planned for one during that public comment period --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: -- unless a meeting was requested is the way those requirements are.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Myrna.

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Gary.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Jeff.

MR. COFFEY: Thank you, John Boy.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Onto the Weston report. Cris.

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks, Jerry. We've got two handouts, there should still be copies over on the table. One is our usual monthly report, and another is a mailing that we put out to describe some upcoming actions pertaining to the Marine Corps rifle range MEC removal action. On our regular handout. First off, we've got a couple of documents in the works. We issued the draft final feasibility study to the agencies on November 3rd, and we expect to have comments back on those next Monday. And the feasibility study is there to provide the regulators with information to evaluate the proposed final remedial alternatives. And we will select final remedial alternatives in another document, the remedial action plan, which Dwight has got folks busily speaking on as we speak trying to pull the draft version of that together. Right now our tentative schedule is to get that out to the agencies -- this one.

MR. GEMAR: The RAP?

MR. JESPERSEN: Yeah.

MR. GEMAR: Well, it will be later this month after we get comments on the draft final feasibility study.

MR. JESPERSEN: Get the draft RAP out to the agencies in late December. And our tentative schedule is to get the more final versions of that out for public comment next April. We've also had a meeting with the agencies to discuss scope and some construction details on the proposed H1 landfill cap design. And we've got a followup meeting scheduled for the early part of this month to go over some issues that came out of that first meeting. We did a couple things on the industrial wastewater treatment plant pipeline. We went ahead and inspected and cleaned about 2,100 linear feet of pipeline that used to transport waste materials to the industrial waste treatment plant which was located adjacent to area H1. The Navy had previously done some work on that. We went back in, ran a camera, and inspected the interior of the pipeline visually. The only visual, in fact, we could see was rust and scale. But we did go ahead and pressure wash the interior of that, vacuum up the water. And I think we're still waiting, Dwight, on the results to make sure that there wasn't anything in the rinse water there. And there's two photos there. The one on the top right is the

operator running the camera down the pipeline to be visually inspected. And on the lower left is, you can see the crew working on physically rinsing out, in fact, the rinse water of the pipeline.

We've reported every month on the area H1 containment groundwater sampling and extraction trench. We're in the process of doing our fourth quarter of groundwater monitoring for H1, which includes taking samples out of 31 different wells. In addition, we've continued to operate the groundwater extraction trench around the H1 landfill. And to date we have extracted and discharged 7.2 million gallons. Again, the material is analyzed before it goes to the Vallejo San and Flood District storm sewer. And so far all of the material that has been discharged has met their acceptance criteria. And again, the combined flow rate for the two collection trenches is about five gallons a minute, so that's dropped considerably as we've dumped seven million gallons out of there; although with the rainy season upon us now that may start coming up again.

And finally, Jerry -- and I don't want to steal your thunder since I noticed you were talking about the Marine Corps firing range. But we've been performing a separate removal action with the Navy at the Marine Corps Firing Range. You can see some of the statistics there of the items that we have removed from a large outfall mass there. We've also done some follow-on geophysical surveys and investigated some additional anomalies. We've seen close to a thousand anomalies, and only four twenty millimeter projectiles. So we're relatively close to wrapping that project up.

And the second handout, which is the flyer that has been put out to the RAB mailing list, covers the physical thermal treatment or demolition of the live ordnance items that we had found. Right now we are scheduling to use the OBOD range beginning next week. We haven't done this work here probably for about three or four years, but it has been done a number of times, I think in late 1995. And the physical process of what we do is explained in the handout. Essentially you take the ordnance items, we pack them with some donor explosives, put them about six feet underground, and then set them off. And that thermally destroys the old explosives. And there is some residual scrap that remains there, but nothing that is energetic. And when the final ordnance removal actions are wrapped up on Mare Island, the Navy will go back then and clean out that area, and finally close it out from a regulatory perspective. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Did you want to discuss the most recent outfall mass that was discovered at the Marine Corps Firing Range?

MR. JESPERSEN: Why don't I let Dwight do that since he is working on that?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. Yeah, you want to do that? Why don't you do that? I've got it covered in the Navy update too, but you guys are doing the work for us and you can probably describe it better than I can.

MR. GEMAR: Well, you won't be able to see much from this scale. But this is the rifle range here. And the old historic 4 South outfall was in this area right here just to the south of the rifle range. This is where dredge material from the strait was pumped back in the early 1940s. After this area had been filled in with dredge, this levee was built, and then more dredge material was pumped into this area. So this came -- this dredge material came from these finger piers which were heavily used during World War II and after World War II by combat ships. And a lot of munitions ended

up being dumped into the water, and then were sucked up by the dredge and pumped out to the dredge ponds. So we've been cleaning up this old historic outfall. And we were sampling also for lead contamination in this area due to the small arms from the rifle range and the pistol range. And there was one grid that came back high for lead, and we were excavating it assuming that it was just a pistol range or a rifle range related lead exceedance, and uncovered a new outfall right in this corner. And obviously the concern here is that we're only about five hundred feet from the occupied homes. So we've discussed this with the Navy, and they're currently working on a modification for Weston to remove that outfall as well. It's a pretty good size outfall, but we don't know if it's a fairly discrete item or if it's more expansive. But we'll probably be doing that work, you know, pending this modification and some improvement in the weather too, I hope. But we did pick out some 40 millimeter rounds and 20 millimeter rounds. So it's obviously of a similar nature to the historic 4 South outfall that we just completed.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Dwight.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And was 4 South your largest --

MR. GEMAR: Oh, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- cleanup of an outfall to date?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, 4 South was the mother of all outfalls.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you don't expect this one to be the father or --

MR. GEMAR: Well, it's going to be the son --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The son.

MR. GEMAR: -- because the pipeline -- we did find a historic photograph from 1954 that does show a pipeline that goes to the 4 South area, hangs a right and goes to that location. So it came from the finger piers also. So it's -- and since it's early fifties vintage, mid-fifties, it's probably going to have a lot of MEC. So I think it will be probably number two on the list.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow.

MR. GEMAR: Even though it's small relatively. But it's going to, I think, have a lot of MEC.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I know there's at least one homeowner on -- that lives on Mare Island here tonight, and just what this -- can you tell us briefly what this continued work will involve? I mean will it be several months longer than, or days or weeks longer than you are right now in equipment moving through there?

MR. GEMAR: Well, no, we think that it will take about one month to disassemble. What we do is we dig up this large mass. We have to break it into manageable pieces to move it, but we move it behind the target berm which is a concrete structure where they used to obviously have the targets

for the rifle range. And we'll disassemble it there. So it's -- there's berms on basically the three sides, and there's a concrete structure on the fourth side. So it's pretty well sheltered. And we disassemble the pieces, the bigger chunks into small bite sized pieces so that the UXO techs can go through them piece by piece, they inspect every piece. So it's a lot of laborious effort, but we think about one month should take care of it.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thanks again, Dwight. And yeah, this recent discovery was really a surprise to everyone, I think the Navy in particularly. We hope that this action that Weston is completing at that site will be the final field work. So we're working with them, with this new modification to get that work done, and again hopefully that is the last of our work there. And we'll see really, after Weston starts pulling stuff out of the ground, how big it is. Any other questions for Cris or Dwight? Let's go ahead and move onto the regulatory agency updates. Chip Gribble would normally be here, but he talked to me earlier this week and he couldn't make it tonight.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Carolyn d'Almeida)

So it doesn't look like we have anyone from DTSC, so let's move onto Carolyn from U.S. EPA.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I just got back yesterday from Phoenix from Williams Air Force Base, my new project site. And after spending two days in meetings with the Air Force, I just wanted to say how much I really, really appreciate the Navy.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I mean I had no idea, you guys are wonderful.

MR. COFFEY: You okay?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I have no complaints, but I do have some comments which you may have already gotten. I have brought with me my comments, our collective comments on the ordnance manufacturing area remedial investigation. And you may have already gotten those, Jerry, but I'll pass these around for people who didn't. And that's all I have to report.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, thank you, Carolyn. And yeah, I think that I did get your letter on the geophysical investigation work plan. That comment?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: No, this is actually the ordnance manufacturing area.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And I sent those out on Monday.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, thank you for the kind words, Carolyn.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You heard it here.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yeah, we think the Air Force is difficult too. George, do you have a report for the Water Board?

MR. LEYVA: Yes, I do. Aside from the almost mountain of reports that I inherited to review and comment on, we got help from U.S. EPA to review disposable UST sites. They will -- they are on contract to us, they're in our -- one person is in our office doing this to review USTs that may or may not be closable, but somebody has to review it and nobody has been doing it yet because of priorities. But this person will be with us until March. He'll be working on all closable USTs, but some of the Mare Island USTs are in the package for him to review. And some of them are USTs -

(Thereupon a cell phone began ringing.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it you?

MR. RILEY: No, it's not me.

MR. LEYVA: So I believe that to be a good thing that some of those sites will actually be able to be taken off the books. That means, though, that you might be getting some letters from us asking for more information regarding some of those USTs that were closable, that you thought were closable, but we need some more information on. Otherwise you'll be getting a letter notifying you of a 30 day notice that we're going to be closing the site. The other thing is that we're interviewing staff to backfill for Gary Riley, and we expect to have that filled, hopefully by the end of the year, but it might be shortly thereafter.

V. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you very much, George. Any questions for Carolyn or George? Okay. Let's move on to our co-chair reports. Myrna, do you want to go first?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't have anything specific to report except to remind people that the festival is the last weekend in January, the Flyway Festival. I thank the city for -- and the Navy for helping us out and getting that, the property and the license agreements ready for that.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't think we received our copy back yet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They told me they mailed it.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Our mail's been screwed up. So it could be. It could be.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll follow up.

MR. GEMAR: Is it going to be in 897 again or not?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As long as nobody in this room or anybody you know steals the copper. I'll still be looking for somebody to donate the hauling of a generator and the fueling of a generator.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Myrna. For the Navy report there's a Navy progress report. It looks like many of you have a copy of it. If not, there's copies up at the front table here. And Cris touched -- Cris and Dwight touched on the Marine Corps Firing Range in more detail than I have here, so I won't get into that. On the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office cleanup that the Navy is also conducting, the Navy is happy to report that we're over ninety percent with our excavation of the surface soil there. And we were really focusing on getting that excavation done before the heavy rain season starts, so that's good progress. We still have some additional excavation work for some discrete hot spots, and for some rework in areas that we need to do further excavation at, but we think we can manage that over the next month or so. We are also needing to do screening and obviously characterizing that soil that we have excavated. That work is expected to continue into March, and we think that can be done with little impact from the rains. So that will be something we'll report on for the next few months here.

Onto the back side, the document submittals and progress of regulatory review. We've just gotten a tremendous amount of regulatory correspondence over the past month or so; primarily from DTSC, but both the Water Board and U.S. EPA have been submitting comments to various submittals that they have reviewed. So there's a list of items there for your review if you choose to read that. Also earlier -- actually last month, November 9th, we had a remedial project managers meeting with the regulatory agencies, and provided updates on the Navy's field work, and discussed agency comments and technical issues on other projects. Our next RPM meeting is scheduled for January 12th, the same day of our next RAB meeting. And that's at building 535 here on Mare Island, and starting at 10:00 o'clock. We already touched on the early transfer in great length at -- during the presentation, so I won't get into that. The Restoration Advisory Board schedule, meeting schedule is in the lower right hand box there. So, are there any questions for the Navy?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, on the photo, which is the Pakistani naval vessel?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The little one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes, the Tarawa was the --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: It's called the December 1.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's a strange name.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's usually on the bow.

MR. COFFEY: It's a bigger target that way.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Now the ship off of Mare Island here is the Tripoli?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yes, the Tarawa is still active, it was actually down -- it was home ported or may be home ported at San Diego at 32nd Street. If there are no other questions, no other comments on any topic at Mare Island? Gary.

MR. RILEY: I would just like to thank the RAB for the cake, for one thing, but also just to thank the RAB for being able to work with you and the Navy and all the contractors. It's been fun. As a new transplant to the Bay Area I had never heard of Mare Island before my first day of work at the Water Board when I was trundled on out to building 535 and told to get to work. And I hope I did a reasonably good job of that. But I definitely learned that, you know, Mare Island is a really amazing place in terms of history, and also how many people care about Mare Island and are willing to come out on rainy nights when they have a myriad of better things to do besides listen to technical information. And I'm impressed at how many people care about Mare Island, and not all sites are fortunate like that. So I appreciate the chance to work with all of you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Tell us what you'll be doing.

MR. RILEY: I'm going to be an RPM with EPA working on Superfund sites in the South Bay. Not military sites, much smaller sites, to say the least. Also not with the Air Force though. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wish you well.

MR. RILEY: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yes, good luck, Gary. And yes, it's been great working with you for the past four years. You brought kind of a new look, view of the different issues we have here, and they're all very complicated, not easy ones to tackle, so having a fresh set of eyes look at them has been a treat. So good luck over at EPA. I'm sure we'll probably be running into each other, maybe in the hallways there. But also for the rest of you all, I hope you had a great Thanksgiving last week. And you did not have to go to a RAB meeting after that turkey dinner. And have a safe and great Christmas holiday and Happy New Year. So we'll see you all after the New Year, January 12th.

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Economic Development Conveyance Early Transfer (CH2MHill).
- Weston Solutions Information Sheet on the Operation of the Mare Island Munitions Treatment Facility November 2005
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update November 2005
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update November 2005
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard December 2005

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:58 p.m.)

CDM Transmittal

CDM.

100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 300
Walnut Creek, California 94596
(925) 933-2900
(925) 296-8161

To:	Diane Silva	**From:**	Darlene M. McCray
Organization/ Address:	Navy SWDIV 937 N. Harbor Drive, FISC Building, 3rd floor San Diego, CA 92132 Phone: (619) 532-3676	**Date:**	March 7, 2006

Re: Mare Island Information Repository – Final Minutes for October 2005, November/December 2005, and January 2006 RAB Meetings

Job #:

Via: *Mail:* X *Overnight:* Fedex 2-day *Courier:*

Enclosed please find:

For your information	X	**Approved**	
For your review		**Approved as noted**	
For your signature		**Returned to you for correction**	

- **Message:**

Diane,

Enclosed please find two copies each of the final RAB meeting minutes from the October 2005, November/December 2005, and January 2006 RAB meetings at Mare Island Naval Shipyard for the administration record/information repository. Please call me with any questions

Thank you,

Darlene M. McCray
Project Manager

Darlene M. McCray
Signed