MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD PUBLIC MEETING AND RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES HELD THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2006

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, June 29, 2006 at the J.F.K. Library - Joseph Room, 505 Santa Clara Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 8:38 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the public meeting and the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance:

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Michael Coffey (Community Member)
- Brian Thompson (Water Board)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Wendell Quigley (Community Member)
- David Godsey (Navy Lead RPM)
- Jim O'Loughlin (Community Member)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Carol D'Almeida (EPA)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island)
- Henry Chui ((DTSC)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Bob Bancroft
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- James Porterfield
- Alona Davis (Sul-Tech)

RAB Support from CDM:

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good evening. We always make sure that we don't hold RAB meetings on the Thursday evening before a holiday, so I'm not exactly sure how this one happened. But, welcome.

MR. FARLEY: Seems like it's a good idea not to hold 'em.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, you can see what happens, all the contractors are already gone on vacation. Gil, we're going to do everything we can to get you home before 10:00 o'clock tonight. This is looking good. This is looking good. He's been working lots of evening meetings. And so, welcome. You'll hopefully bear with me because I have had the privilege of working with Jerry for six and a half years, and I decided that after the first six years of being the greeter and the host for the RAB that I would let him do the next six years, and last week was his last time.

MR. GODSEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Dick, my previous co-chair, wasn't really comfortable talking in front of people, so now I have had great experience and practice, and now I'm a little rusty. So let's make this meeting a good meeting and efficient. And I'll start us out by introducing ourselves. And I'm Myrna Hayes, the community co-chair for the Restoration and Advisory Board, and I live here in Vallejo.

Attendees introduce themselves as requested.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Welcome. And I will turn the meeting over to Steve Farley with CH2M Hill. He'll be giving the presentation this evening, and he'll tell you what he's presenting about.

II. PUBLIC PRESENTATION: *Recent Remedial Activities: Building 535, Investigation Area B, Triangle Area, and Investigation Area C3*
Presentation by Mr. Steve Farley, Lennar Mare Island – CH2MHill

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Myrna. Hi everybody. We're going to go through some recent activity, some things that we're doing right now, focusing primarily on the remediation of certain areas within Mare Island. There's two primary areas that I'll be speaking about tonight. One is the building 533 area in investigation or IA, investigation area, IA-B. I mentioned this last time in our normal handout, talked about the demolition of the overlying structure on the loading platform on the east -- or the west side of Building 535. We're now going to look at some current work that we're doing out there. And then we're going to also talk about the triangle area. The triangle area is defined -- and I'll show a map here in a moment -- is defined as the area between dry docks one and two and the Mare Island Strait. So here are the two areas within the EETP -- or eastern early transfer parcel. That's the area that Lennar has responsibility for, and for which we are responsible for doing the cleanup. The Building 535 area is west of Walnut in IA-B. The Triangle Area is, as I mentioned before, between dry docks one and two and Mare Island Strait. And there are three areas that we're going to talk about within the triangle. Those are the Building 108 area, installation restoration site number nine -- IR09 -- and installation restoration site number 12, or IR12.

Let me say I would be happy to take questions along the way. With the small crowd we have we'll probably blast through the meeting, and I'm fine with that. So if there are any questions along the way, don't be shy. The Building 535 area is a PCB site. As I mentioned a moment ago, we talked about this in the May 2006 RAB meeting in our normal handout. We showed some photographs of the work that we had completed. It consists of two areas, the asphalt area shown here in blue. The asphalt area is this area here between Building 535 and Building 669. And the loading platform which is this area right here. It is actually not part of the Building 535 structure, it's actually -- was anyway -- a concrete pad with a temporary or makeshift steel roof over the top of it.

We provided the EPA with a notification of the work we intended to do for this Building 535 area on February 7th of this year. That notification described the site conditions, what contamination was there, and what we intended to do about it. This is a view of the asphalt area looking south between Building 535 on the east, and Building 669 on the west. This area was completely paved down to this point, which is about 200, 225 feet. We have removed all the asphalt in this area

because the asphalt was contaminated with PCB. We then collected some confirmation samples and found that behind this excavator there were a couple areas where we had to do some deeper excavations to chase some additional PCB contamination.

We removed approximately 900 square feet of asphalt -- or excuse me -- 9,000 square feet of asphalt, which corresponds to about 225 feet about 40 feet wide or so. Then we over-excavated soil underneath the asphalt in two areas. Each of those areas were about twenty feet by twenty feet by twenty feet, and one foot deep. So those were each 40 cubic feet -- or excuse me -- 400 cubic feet, which relates to about fifteen cubic yards.

So depending on whether you're an engineer or a geologist or a construction manager, I've tried to give you about all the units you can handle here. So, in addition to the 9,000 square feet of asphalt that was removed, we also removed 400 cubic feet of soil in two locations. That -- all that material, both the asphalt and the soil was sent under a hazardous waste manifest to Kettleman Hills Landfill down near Avenal and Kettleman City. Following the excavation work we collected confirmation samples. And we collected about 25 confirmation samples in the asphalt area.

So what's the status? We're waiting for data. So we believe that we've got it all. We believe that we've cleaned up the asphalt and the soil contamination to levels that meet the required levels as we specified in the notification. But as I said, we're waiting for the data. We should have the data probably within the next week or ten days. In addition to the asphalt area which sits right in here, we also removed the concrete under the former loading platform area. Once we removed the concrete, we then excavated soil beneath that concrete to a depth of about three feet.

This is what the site looks like today. This area in here used to be completely covered with asphalt. And above that was a roof structure -- I don't know how to describe it other than it was a -- it was a permanent roof, steel roof with chain link fence around it. Because this was a loading area, and I presume there were times when material got left out on the loading platform, and it was intended to be a secure area, at least provisionally secure. But all that concrete went away. We then collected confirmation samples. And if you look closely here, you'll see that there are stakes in the ground. These stakes -- there's some out in here. These stakes are placed on a grid, and the grid defines the sampling points.

So after we collected the first round of samples at this level, we found out that we didn't meet the cleanup levels for PCBs at this level in this area, so we went back in and re-excavated this material, but continued excavation down about another three feet. This is a concrete wall on the west side of the former loading platform. This is about three feet high. So this entire area in here was excavated down another three feet. So all the structures and the overlying concrete were removed. There were about 400 tons of concrete that was removed from this entire area. And about 800 tons of soil, including the soil in this area, were then excavated. And all those materials, the concrete and the soil, were then hauled off-site under a manifest to Kettleman Hills. We collected about seventy confirmation samples from this entire area, which includes the -- all the samples in the bottom of the current excavation, and those that were at this level before. And that's the primary reason why there's so many confirmation samples. We're waiting for data. So these two sites -- or these two portions of the Building 535 area, we think we've got it all, but we're still waiting for the data to come back to confirm that we've met the cleanup level criteria. The triangle area is the area, as I

mentioned before, between dry dock number one, dry dock number two, and Mare Island Strait. This is -- in this area there are three installation restoration sites. There's the Building 108 area, the Building 109 area, and the 112 -- or Building IR12 area. So Building 108, IR09, and IR12. And you can see that these areas overlap a little bit. It's not really that important, but just so you know, we recognize that they overlap. Now, in here there are a lot of different historic uses. The building -- I should say Building 108. The Building 108 area was a shipwright shop and an office. This structure was built in 1911, so it's been around a while.

There's some transformer pads located up here, and a grounded rocker arm that's up here. They are not part of tonight's discussion, but they are being handled separately as other PCB sites under a separate work plan. The IR09 area is a former paint shop, it had some USTs, an abandoned oil water separator, paint varnish plant. So a whole host of uses within IR09. And IR12 is the former electrical substation. So within the triangle area there really is quite a wide variety of historic uses that are reflected in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What's an AST farm?

MR. FARLEY: An AST farm is an above ground storage tank farm. An area -- thank you. I try to define these as we go along. But thank you, Myrna, for catching it. But an above ground storage tank farm. An area where there were multiple above ground storage tanks in the past. The real key to showing all of this is just the wide variety of potential contaminants that existed over the years and years and years and decades of activities out here. The scope of work for the cleanup activities in this area are defined by two key documents. The first is the final IA C3 remedial action plan, or RAP, that was finalized in February of this year. And the second document is the final remedial design work plan for the Building 108, IR09, and IR12 area, which is a fairly recent document, May of this year.

Those two documents establish cleanup levels, and what we're going to do about the contamination that's out there, and give us a path forward for how to remediate the site, or actually the sites. Excavation areas in the Building 108 area are shown in this figure. This figure comes out of -- as does the next three figures -- comes out of the remedial action work plan that I mentioned just a moment ago, the May 2006 document. I also have color copies here if anybody wants to look at the data or look at the well or the sampling locations. There are seven areas that are being addressed in the Building 108 area. There is -- there are four sites that are lead only. Let me back up one step.

Within the Building 108 area there are sites that are defined as lead contaminated or petroleum and lead contaminated. In other areas of the triangle there are other sites, there's also PCB contamination, and we'll get to those. But the bottom line here is that lead and petroleum are the only contaminants requiring remediation in the Building 108 area. The excavation 1, 4, 6, and 7-- 1, 4, 6, and 7 are the locations where it's a lead problem only, and excavations 2, 3, and 5 -- 2, 3, and 5, are areas where there's both petroleum and lead that have to be -- it has to be remediated. The status of the work that we're doing out here. Excavation one is the only one that we have completed the work at. So we have gone out, done the excavation that we anticipated needed to be done, collected the confirmation samples, got the data back, and have backfilled that excavation. The others are either just getting started -- such as the sites that are inside this building. It's kind of hard to tell here, but this -- these two areas are inside Building 108. Building 108 is defined right there,

and these two sites are actually inside the building. And what we're doing right now is doing some deconstruction inside the building, getting some things out of the way, ripping up some concrete. And the other sites -- this one and these two, and, in fact, that one, those four there have been some work done. But we have not, either A, either not submitted samples yet, or we've submitted samples and haven't done the data. IR09 is in the central portion of the triangle area. There are six areas within the IR09 site, and they are shown here in these boxes or rectangles. And excavation areas 10 and 12, this is 10 right here, and this is 12 are petroleum only sites.

Sites 9 and 11 are lead only sites. Meaning that the only contaminant requiring any kind of remediation is lead. And two of the sites are actually defined as having lead and petroleum exceeding the cleanup levels and requiring action there. Of these six areas, the only site that has been completed and backfilled is excavation 10. And this excavation was relatively small, about seven feet deep. The most -- and it's right between two buildings. Probably the most interesting thing that happened is we encountered a chain -- a very large chain in the excavation. The links are probably eight to ten inches long. And so we contacted Lennar, and they contacted their archeologist. And we avoided any disturbance or damage to that chain, did the rest of our work, and basically have secured the area so that the archeologists can come out next week, inspect it, and determine if it's an artifact; and, if so, what needs to be done based on the chain. Yes, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Are you going to get to what your parts per million or whatever -- however you determine what these amounts or what the cleanup levels are? Are you going to get to those numbers and tell us what you had there?

MR. FARLEY: I wasn't planning on doing that but I can do that. The reason I didn't do that is because --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You were told not to?

MR. FARLEY: No, not at all. There are, in total for the triangle area, there's about twenty sites. And of those sites, some have lead, some have PCBs, and some have petroleum. There would probably be something on the order of fifty numbers that would have to be presented. So what I was trying to achieve was a basic idea of what the status of the work is. But I'm more than happy to spend time during the break with the maps that I brought that show the data.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, just for the range. I mean very often we're getting now these really nice presentations that don't tell us anything except for, "We're doing some cleanup over here, guys." And so if -- you guys used to sort of build in at least the ranges that you were working on on some of 'em. So that's what I'm looking for.

MR. FARLEY: The range of petroleum and lead in soil in this area. The lead ranges up to thousands of PPM. The TPH ranges up to tens of thousands of PPM -- milligrams per kilogram or PPM.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then what are you shooting for at this site?

MR. FARLEY: This is a commercial and industrial area, and the lead number is down around 200. And the TPH number is anywhere on the order of 500 to a thousand depending on whether it's TPH gas, diesel, or motor oil. Does that help?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Those are residential numbers you just gave; right? Yeah, what we're doing -- they're actually commercial industrial.

MR. CHUI: 750 for lead.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, 750 for lead. The last area is the IR12 area at the southern end of the -- the southern tip of the triangle. And there are three areas here. This one is the only area in which PCBs are an issue. Excavation 16, and the Building 516 area. Excavation 16 is this area up here, and the Building 516 area is down here. Lead is the contaminant in the excavation 15 area. The excavation 16 work has not started, just because of schedule. And the excavation 15 and the Building 516 areas are both completed. This area was relatively shallow, only two feet in depth. This area, though, was quite deep, 15 feet deep is a fairly deep excavation, and was right up against the southern corner of Building 516. There was a lot of structural issues that we had to contend with, and the excavation had to proceed in such a way as to not damage the integrity of the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was that building the building that we saw on the tour, 516?

MR. SILER: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Oh, you weren't on it.

MR. FARLEY: I wasn't on it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But you were.

MR. SILER: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So why did you have to work so hard to protect the integrity of the building when it was going to be torn down? I thought that was the point of the environmental cleanup being linked with the reuse. I think we might have asked you that question but it's come back up now.

MR. SILER: Yeah, I think the reason why the building wasn't torn down is just a scheduling issue, as I mentioned during the RAB tour. As far as you don't want to have the buildings fall over and collapse and become a bigger issue as far as what might come up if we get some of the building itself into the excavation, we don't want that contaminated also.

MR. FARLEY: I think the other thing -- and, Neal, correct me if I'm wrong -- but when the work at building 516 started it wasn't anticipated that it would quite go to the depths and the magnitude that

it did. And so, you know, maybe with hindsight maybe we would have looked at it and said, "It makes more sense to demo the building at that time." I'm not saying we would have but hypothetically. But at the time there wasn't any need to demo the -- there wasn't any recognized need because the magnitude of the excavation wasn't that large, and it wasn't intended that it would be such a big deal relative to the security and structure and integrity of the building. It really became a health and safety issue more than anything else, making sure that the work that was done was done in a safe manner and that nobody was going to get hurt. Okay?

MR. BANCROFT: We were asking the other day --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why don't you come to the microphone? I let Neal get by with it, but --

MR. BANCROFT: I'm Bob Bancroft. I'm a citizen of Vallejo. And we were talking the other day about what it costs per load at Kettleman City, and I was wondering if you knew that right offhand? It's not important, but when we're sitting here saying, you know, okay, if we have to haul this much, and it has to go to Kettleman, I think it's good for people to realize what that, you know, what that costs, just the -- you know -- just the disposal fee.

MR. FARLEY: That's a tough number to come up with. And the reason is that there's a very wide range in the types of waste that go to Kettleman, and whether it has to be stabilized or not, whether it's a RCRA or California hazardous waste. And surprisingly, one of the things that really drives the cost is just how much is there. So the unit cost goes sky high if you've got -- you know -- a wheelbarrow full of this stuff. And if it's a very large quantity, even though the dollar amount -- the total dollar amount goes up, the unit cost drops dramatically when you have a lot of material that needs to be hauled. The other thing that drives cost is whether the material is excavated and stockpiled, and then characterized, and then picked up, put in trucks, and then hauled to the landfill. Or if it's direct loaded. A direct load is where material is dug out of the ground and put right smack dab into dump trucks or to transport trucks directly.

And so there's about four different dimensions to the cost. The bottom line is that every time we look at one of these sites we're always looking for ways to do it the most efficient way. Whether it's to combine different sites within a narrow window so that we can take advantage of that efficiency of having lots of trucks lined up and equipment out there at one time, and avoid multiple modes and de-modes; whether we do pre-characterization of a site to know what the type of waste it's going to be classified as versus excavating the material and stockpiling it.

So -- and I'm not trying to be evasive, it's just that the numbers are very, very wide ranging. But it is always, always a major cost element. Whether it's a lot of stuff and it costs a lot of money, a lot of total dollars, or whether it's a small site but very, very high unit costs, it's always a major consideration.

MR. BANCROFT: Do you have any idea what the range is?

MR. FARLEY: It can be anywhere from 20 or 30 bucks a ton to hundreds of dollars a ton depending on whether it has to be stabilized, for example. So, as I said before, if anybody wants to look at the raw data to get a better idea of what the range of concentrations were, I'd be happy to sit

down. I brought the maps purposely for that reason. I will tell you that these sites are all relatively small sites. The dimensions on these excavations are only on the order of ten of feet. These dimensions -- wrong one --

(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How often does that happen?

MR. FARLEY: The dimension of this excavation, for example, is ten feet by ten feet. This is about twelve by twelve. This is probably on the order of 120 feet or so. This is about ten feet wide and about 80 feet long. So these are not huge excavations. And on top of that, the depths here -- this excavation is about two feet deep. This is about two feet. This is about four feet. And these we haven't gotten the total depth yet. But, in general, the depth of the excavations are relatively shallow, and the horizontal dimensions are also not huge. This is -- I don't know how many folks here remember the 9th and Tisdale site, does that ring a bell with folks? This was an area that was off to the west of the island, and we found some contamination there in -- God -- 2003. And that was a very large excavation. That was 40 something thousand cubic yards, about fifteen or twenty feet deep, and hundreds of feet across. These are -- these really, truly are relatively small excavations. And, in fact, we went out there today, Neal Siler and I and Risgar, Brian, and Bill Kilgore, just did a little informal, "Hey, we're out here, let's take a look at these things." I think it gave them a better sense for what these sites look like, both vertically in the soil columns and horizontally.

Bill made a comment to me that from the maps he got the impression that these were -- these had a significant potential to coalesce, to grow together into one large excavation. And I think after he got out there, got some experience on the ground and such, he realized that it's unlikely they'll end up coalescing. So anyway --

MR. COFFEY: Steve, you got the 15 foot excavation, did you run into groundwater?

MR. FARLEY: Yes, we did.

MR. COFFEY: Did you have to test the groundwater?

MR. FARLEY: Yes, we had to test it.

MR. COFFEY: Waiting on data?

MR. FARLEY: No, actually that's a good point. The work that we did at Building 516, this work was initiated back in 2005 and carried over into 2006. It's been incorporated into the remedial design work plan because the work was initiated before the RAP was finalized, and we wanted to carry that site forward into the remedial design work plan because the cleanup levels were formalized in the RAP. So, yeah, whenever we pull water out of an excavation, it all has to be tested before we can determine where it can or it should be discharged.

In some cases -- in many cases it's clean enough that it can be discharged to the City of Vallejo under a permit, and it goes straight into the sanitary sewer. That's the most common way it's

discharged. Very rarely does it go straight into the storm sewer. 99 -- I shouldn't even put a percentage on it. The vast majority of the times when we encounter water, we containerize it. When all the work is done we collect whatever number of samples we need based on the volume, test it for the constituents of concern, and then contact the City of Vallejo, the sanitation department, and talk to them about whether or not they can accept it in terms of the chemistry, and whether or not we have more quantity than they can handle at one time. And if that's the case, then we just let the material flow on a schedule -- on a schedule that they can handle. It's a very nice system. The city has been very cooperative, very helpful. It works out very, very well. The city makes a little money out of it, and we're able to get rid of the stuff fairly efficiently.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not the city --

MR. COFFEY: Because of the proximity to the strait, do you get -- I mean do you get an accurate reading? Because, I mean, there's got to be a lot of water underneath that little triangle.

MR. FARLEY: The water doesn't flow very fast. The materials out there, you know, the island -- the edge of the island used to be in inland or westward where the quay wall is now. So a lot of the materials that are between the quay wall and the areas that we're talking about here are largely dredge materials that were dug out of the strait and placed on top of the old island surface. So there's not a lot of water. And usually what happens -- and it's actually happening today -- the excavations that we started -- well, earlier this week, let's say, those excavations, over the course of a couple of days -- you can see the water level coming up within -- not when you're standing there. But over the course of a couple of days you could see the water level rise. And an example is this excavation right here, which is one of the closer ones to the Mare Island Strait. That excavation was started earlier this week. The majority of the work was done yesterday. And when I went by there this morning just to kind of look things over, there was hardly any water in the excavation. When I went back out later on this afternoon with Brian and with Neal, I noticed that there was measurably more water in the excavation than there was earlier today or even yesterday.

But that's a very, very slow infiltration rate. And what we'll end up doing is we have a tank on site. We'll end up pumping the water out. We probably won't do anything until we finish, until we get the confirmation samples back. But, once we do, if we have to do more excavation, we'll pump the water out, put it in the tank, continue our excavation, collect additional confirmation samples in areas that we have to over-excavate, and then when we get those data back, hopefully we're done and we can backfill the hole. And, if not, we just have to continue that process, including pumping out water. Usually -- and this is a little bit of a generalization -- but usually the water level in that portion of the island is six or eight feet below ground surface. The excavation that is up at the northern tip -- there's an excavation that is right up here. The cranes sit right along here. Here's dry dock number one. The cranes sit right here, and there's an excavation that we put in right here. The other one I just mentioned is right down here. Well, this excavation is just about as deep, but there's only about two inches of water in the bottom of the excavation. And that's after being open for two days.

The area down here, as I mentioned, has more along the lines of maybe two feet in the bottom of the excavation. Water management is always a major issue. And, as I mentioned to Brian earlier today, when we have -- not large excavations, but when we have a lot of excavations we plan ahead

and put a -- mobilize a tank to the site. And it may be overkill, but it doesn't take -- it doesn't take much water capacity shortage to make life really miserable. Because if you don't have enough capacity to store the water, it really hinders your ability to excavate and load and transport, which goes back to the question asked a few moments ago about the cost of transport and disposal.

If you end up with a simple problem like not enough water storage, and it causes you to slow down your excavation, or have to wait for trucks to return, or to find trucks the next day, it makes it really, really difficult. So it's a cheap -- it's a cheap insurance to have more than you need on site.

MR. COFFEY: But historically do you find anything within that water sample?

MR. FARLEY: Sometimes you do, sometimes you don't. It really depends on the site and the nature of the problem. I'll give you an example. It's probably more common to find petroleum hydrocarbons in the water than it is to find lead. And the reason for that is -- and I'm over-simplifying, but this is fairly accurate. But the petroleum hydrocarbons have a tendency to hold the water, it's a liquid and it moves relatively easily in certain circumstances.

Lead, on the other hand, has to be dissolved from the solid fraction, and that's less common. And, again, I'm oversimplifying it, but TPH is a good example of a constituent where you might find it a little more common. We're always looking for sheen. You know, the little rainbow sheen or other physical evidence of petroleum hydrocarbons on the water surface. And the type of petroleum out here, or at least the type of stuff that enters these excavations is really characteristic. It's like, you know, it's like, you know, Uncle Jed and the Beverly Hillbillies. Just jet black stuff. You don't find -- at least I haven't seen, you know, gasoline, the clear amber colored gasoline. It's just always this jet black oil or fuel oil that's coming into the excavations. So it's very characteristic. It's very easy to see visually. And we have other instruments that we take out into the field with us to make sure that we're not missing anything. But the nose -- the olfactory sense is actually fairly effective at picking up odors of TPH.

I will mention one other thing if that's okay. The other thing we occasionally find out here is green sand. And I think everybody knows what green sand is. Abrasive blast material, green sand. And in one of the excavations -- one down in here -- we found a little bit of green sand right underneath the slab. And so we're on hold with that one until we work on some of the details on the management of that material and such. But I just wanted to make sure that you're aware that we have a management plan in place when we encounter green sand, and we're implementing that now as part of this work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Will you have land use controls on this site when you're done?

MR. FARLEY: Yes. This is a commercial industrial future use area, so there will be land controls.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because -- oh, to restrict uses that are not commercial industrial?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. And the last thing that I'll ask is -- back to your presentation. Just because the question came up from the community regarding the cost of transporting to a hazardous waste landfill, could you also just mention what the word manifest means?

MR. FARLEY: Yes, thank you, Myrna. It's like a toe tag. It's like -- a manifest is a document that -- a manifest is literally a formal document -- and I would suspect it's a legal document, because there are declaratory statements on there -- that tracks soil excavated from some location -- in this case from over at Mare Island. And, in fact, the manifest would say it came from excavation five, within building 108 area, within IAC3, within Lennar Mare Island. And it will -- it would track the quantity of material, the suspected contaminants. It would have data referenced to it for the investigative derived waste characterization. IDW characterization is basically the analytical work that's done, the lab work that's done to establish what contaminants at what levels are in those samples that are being -- are in those trucks that are being shipped off to the landfill. The landfill has certain criteria that they have to meet, and they associate -- this goes back to your question -- they associate cost of that load to the types of contaminants that are in that truck. And so the manifest fundamentally tracks the origin of the soil -- in this case soil -- the origin of the soil, where it came from, who is the landowner, what trucking firm shipped it from point A to the landfill. And those records are kept on file, and copies are sent to the state, etcetera. It's a very, very important document.

You cannot get -- at least that I'm not aware of -- I don't believe you can get soil into a landfill like Kettleman without a manifest. And you have to be very careful about providing 'em with accurate information, because if you don't, and they don't like the way you present that information, they could deny you the option of disposing there. And so it's very, very important. We take it very seriously. It's akin to a chain of custody for a water or soil sample. Does everybody know what a chain of custody is? It's basically the same kind of document where it's signed off on by the person sampling the -- let's say, a water sample -- collecting that water sample. When they hand that sample cooler off to the Fed Ex driver or the laboratory person who picks up the samples, they release it, the other person accepts the sample, we get a copy that shows they signed off on it and accepted the samples, and that happens all the way down the line as the samples change hands each time.

So it's a way of tracking cradle to grave basically. Very important document. It's a good question, Myrna. Anything else? One more thing, we -- I do have the data over here and the maps that support -- that came out of the remedial work plan. If anybody is curious about the kinds of concentrations or how they established those boxes, I'd be happy to walk through it with you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sounds like a lovely little walk. Thank you, Steve. We always offer an opportunity for the public to comment, bring a question to the RAB meeting. Might have nothing to do with the agenda. So if there's anybody in the audience who has a question, has a concern, this is the opportunity to state that concern or buy that here. And you will also have another opportunity an hour from now. But in case you've got to go get your kids at daycare or something, you can speak now too. All right. Then we're right on time for getting Gil out of here before 10:00. Let's go ahead and take a break, and let's get back here by 8:00 o'clock that clock's time -- which isn't quite exactly correct for the Greenwich meantime or whatever, the atomic clock time.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We'll welcome you back to the meeting here. And we're starting the meeting out with not so many RAB members, we've got a darn good turnout. I'd like to introduce Paula Tygielski and -- from Benicia. She's served on the RAB with me and with Chip since April 14, 1994. So welcome. And who else came in? Carolyn d' Almeida from U.S. EPA, welcome. And Brian Thompson from the Water Board.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes)

Okay. Administrative business, if there is anyone who has any changes to make to the June 1st meeting, and that was the -- primarily the public meeting for the H1 landfill, I believe. I haven't checked my minutes, are those also included in our RAB minutes? Yeah. And that was a very ambitious meeting, so be sure and check the minutes and make sure they're up to snuff in terms of what you might have said or what you recall about the meeting. Any changes, you can get those to me. The August RAB meeting. I just want to make a note that our new co-chair, Michael Bloom, I have met him. I recall now that we already met in 2004 at Salt Lake City at the National Marine Corps and Navy RAB co-chairs conference. We had a good conversation there a couple of years ago, so it will be good to work with him. I have met him and some of the others of you have. I think he made a day trip out here. He did. But because he's had some vacation commitments already made, he's not -- he wasn't at our last RAB meeting and he isn't here tonight. He's enjoying time with his family. And he won't be available for the August RAB meeting which we would have kicked up a week earlier because of -- to make sure that it didn't fall on the Thursday before the Labor Day weekend.

So we've chosen -- since he's not going to be available, and that would make him, you know, missing three out of the four RAB meetings of the summer, to move, with your permission, the August RAB meeting to September 7. So if you could just make that calendar change. Unless anybody who's a key player here has any objections to that?

MS. MCCRAY: Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MS. MCCRAY: The meeting will also be at the conference center on Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, will it? This room won't be available in September?

MS. MCCRAY: No.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we'll look forward to that. Let's go along then on the focus group reports.

a) Community (vacant)

The community outreach focus group is -- the chair is vacant. If anybody has any announcements to make regarding community outreach or community involvement, you can -- are welcome to say something.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

Natural resources. I had a meeting and a lunch with Jerry this morning so I'm -- this afternoon, so I'm not sure why he wasn't available, but I can report that he is improved tremendously from his illness, and is looking quite good. He even needed a haircut, so --

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

Paula, do you have anything to report for the technical focus group?

MS. TYGIELSKI: No report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We will be working with or we are working with a potential contractor for the TAPP like money that Lennar had made available, as Weston had, as part of the early transfers, to help us with independent review of environmental documents. And the person who had been made -- who was available to us lived here in town, wasn't available for about a year due to family illness. And she's -- we're working with her to make a -- submit a request to Lennar to begin having her help us with some independent review of your documents. So that is a technical note. And her name is Gayle Edmisten Watkin. And a number of you have met her from a community focus group -- or a focus group meeting that we held about a year ago. City report, Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: There are no environmental reports pending before the city council.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Lennar update. And Steve, you're going to do that?

MR. FARLEY: Yes, thank you, Myrna. There are handouts at the front table. Our normal 11 by 17 handout, and another handout that shows the status of various documents that are coming up or in review by various agencies. So grab one of those before you go. I also have handouts for our presentation tonight at the front table as well. Much of what is included on our monthly hand-out I've already talked about in the presentation earlier. So our Building 535 activities, and the activities in the triangle area are pretty well covered.

In the upper right corner of the handout -- the 11 by 17 handout -- are several photographs of the building 686 area. Building 686 is in IAC2 which is sort of in the lower one-third of the diagram. It will say 686 AL-01. That is the site of the former building. If you look in the photograph on the middle on the right, it's a large concrete slab. Well, that's a slab that's left over from when the

building was demolished, and there's now a quonset hut at the south end of that, which you see in the upper left and lower right of the photographs. And essentially it's a PCB site that we're going out and removing concrete to remove contaminated -- that's been contaminated with PCBs. And the photograph in the upper right that shows -- or upper left that shows the backhoe there, it has a large ram on it, like a hydraulic jackhammer. And we use that to pound on the concrete, break it up, and then we haul it away. We collect the confirmation samplings on a grid pattern. And then, assuming that we've met all the cleanup criteria, we'll backfill the site and cover it back over with concrete as needed. So that's building 686. We talked last time about UST 231 which is the large label sort of in the middle of the diagram. It's in H2. That's a location where we're trying to get out and do some additional soil gas monitoring, but we need the water levels to be a little bit lower than they are right now. So the activity currently is to go out and measure water levels, and monitor those to see if they've reached levels low enough that will make the soil gas monitoring meaningful.

The other two areas, the Building 235 AL-01 and 04 -- about smack dab in the middle of the AL-01 labels -- those are two areas where we're doing some relatively small excavations underneath old transformer pads. So the transformers are gone, rip out the concrete, collect soil samples underneath, make sure that the soils are clean, and then put the con-crete back. So those are relatively small scale sites. The other thing. On the far left-hand side of the diagram you see a couple of guys working with a drill rig and some drums. We're doing some groundwater monitoring. We have an annual groundwater monitoring program that we implement. We're getting ready to start one of those rounds of groundwater monitoring in the month of July. We're also abandoning wells that are no longer needed. And there's a couple of reasons why you might not need a well anymore. One is that the investigation area has been officially closed, and a no further action certification received. In those cases we're anxious to get the wells out of the ground, and properly abandon them so that there's no vandalism that would cause, you know, contamination, unknown contamination to show up at the last minute. So we're anxious to get those out of the ground because they're no longer needed. The IA's are closed. And there's about eight wells that we're currently abandoning. And there's a number of others that we will abandon as we get concurrence from the agencies that the groundwater issues have been addressed and there's no more monitoring needed. So under the groundwater monitoring program we have two things going on; the annual groundwater monitoring event, and the abandoning of certain wells on the site. In terms of the lower left corner of the handout, documents in review, these are essentially the same documents from the last period that have been in review for a few months.

The one major change is that the public comment period for investigation area B RAP has now moved down to the upcoming public comment period. We're not sure exactly when that's going to be, but it is pending. The C2 RAP public comment period will probably be fall of this year. And probably of most interest to everybody here, the very bottom cited document, the public comment period for the interim removal action work plan for indoor PCB sites, that public comment period is going to start on the 5th of July and go through the 4th of August. And the public review version of that report will be in the Vallejo library on -- we're hoping to get it done on Monday, but we need to have it in by Wednesday. So the plan right now is to have it in the library by Wednesday. The only other, I guess, major thing is that we had one additional PCB site closed, and so now we're up to 391 of the 570 PCB sites closed by both DTSC and U.S. EPA. And I think that's all. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that monitoring well you're abandoning behind Marine Corps Firing Range -- or I mean the Marine Corps barracks?

MR. FARLEY: What were you doing out there?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I can see the building.

MR. FARLEY: I thought maybe you saw us. Yes, it is. Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I know these things.

MR. FARLEY: Very good. Very quick eye.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yep. Yep. It's true. Look out. What else can I detect? Weston, Cris Jespersen, otherwise known as Dwight Gemar.

f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

MR. GEMAR: Yes, I'm doing an impersonation of Cris today. Cris is out of town, so I will sit in for him. Hopefully everyone had a chance to pick up an update on the table, it looks like that. Let's see. For investigation area H1. Of course, we had the public meeting on June the 1st. And comments -- the comment period runs through the end of this month. So that's the status there. The -- we also did receive a final biological opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that we've been anticipating for quite a while, and that was a major milestone. A couple other areas that we've been working in June in in addition to H1. Weston has responsibility for the regulatory closure at the Weston magazine area, and at installation and restoration site five, and dredge pond seven south. And if you look on this photo of Mare Island that's up on the wall, on the kind of upper left-hand portion --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Should I give you the pointer here?

MR. GEMAR: The laser work?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't know. Will it work? Steve, is your pen better?

MR. FARLEY: You saw that, huh?

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. GEMAR: You see right there the Western Magazine area. See the two rows of kind of symmetrically spaced buildings next to the tidal marsh? That's the Western Magazine area. For reference, the new homes are in this area. And installation restoration site five is right there next to the Carquinez Strait, and dredge pond seven south is just above it. So those are the additional sites that Weston is involved with with the Navy and city to get closure on those sites. And as a former munitions handling area, of course, one of the primary topics of interest is whether any munitions may remain buried in that area. So Weston recently completed a digital geophysical mapping of

that entire area. And we are currently in the process of returning to areas that we call anomalies, which are basically things that the instrument detected that appear to be metal. And we are digging those locations to determine what type of metal is in the ground. And we've done characterization digs in 38 grids to date, which is over 3,500 individual anomalies. And of those 38 grids, about eighteen have actually produced munition items totaling 190 live items, and roughly 425 inert items. With the exception of one grid, all of these grids where we found munitions were areas where the Navy had previously encountered munitions during removal actions back in the late 1990s. So -- and also, we're typically seeing groups of munitions buried in close proximity to one another -- what I call honey holes.

But basically they're areas where somebody obviously wanted to get rid of a fair amount of material, and so rather than spread it around, they put it in one place. So at least that makes it somewhat easier to locate and hopefully to remove. But nevertheless, we are running into more items than we had hoped to encounter. We also are running into a lot of buried asphalt which has some ferrous components, and that actually causes our instruments to register, which interferes with what we are really looking for which is munitions. Also a lot of concrete rubble with rebar which also is obviously magnetic and interferes with the instruments. And railroad ballast rock which also has a magnetic component. So that is something that we have to kind of sort through in order to try to locate items that we're interested in which are the munitions. In the lower left there's a photograph of some primarily 20 millimeter anti-aircraft munition items that were encountered in the northwest portion of the site, pretty much in the same location. And then in the upper right, in that same location, that northwest portion, we did run into two five inch projectiles. These obviously are quite a bit more of a concern. The twenty millimeter, I believe, has an explosive charge of one one-hundredth of a pound of high explosives. The five inch rounds has about eight pounds of high explosives. So that would ruin your whole day if you didn't handle those appropriately. So they are now safely tucked away in the magazine. So we're continuing to do the work out there. And if we find munitions in the grid, we step out to the next grid and check to make sure or to see if there's any munitions in the next adjacent grid. And we do that systematically in order to try to define the aerial extent, the lateral extent of the emissions. And similarly in installation restoration site five, that was an explosive area in the south end of the island. We've also completed the geophysical survey map. This is a depiction in the lower right of that work as it's being progressed. Basically this is a very high level view. If you zoom in, you can see lots and lots of more anomalies, which basically show up as pink or yellow dots, whereas green indicates typically no metal. But you can pick out the utility lines and things like that, they become readily available -- or apparent based on geophysics.

And also dredge pond seven south which is the area just to the left of the -- that kind of area where we were completing the survey of IR-05. So that work was just recently been completed. And so once we finish up in the Western Magazine area with our characterization there, we're going to continue and move on in IR05. We do anticipate having to go back to certain grids in the western mag that have lots of munition items that were discarded. Probably we'll propose a mechanical sifting type operation, because it's more efficient than trying to get on your hands and knees and go through lots of debris and pick out, you know, relatively small munition items. So that will require an amendment to a document called the "Explosive Safety Submission" which has to go back up through the Navy and the organizations. So that will be something that we'll have to also discuss

with the regulatory agencies, primarily DTSC and EPA, to get their buy-in on that approach. So that's where we're at.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you. And I do want to note that -- I don't know how many of you saw a news piece where a teacher was using a five inch, I believe, projectile --

MR. GEMAR: I thought it was a 40 millimeter.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was it only a 40?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, it was pretty small.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Pretty small. All right. It was probably 5 inches tall.

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Using that as a paperweight on his desk. And he smashed a bug with it while his students were taking a test or something, and he severed much of his hand, got third degree burns on his forearm and his torso. So these are really not things to play with. And he had found it. And I rest my case about the stupid genes. He had found it hunting many years before, his colleague reported to the paper. And just had it there as a souvenir, and used it as a paperweight for his papers and just, you know, that much force.

So I guess for those of us who find this cleanup and the effort that's being made all over the island of interest, if there was a way to make it seem real to the community, you know, not just folks who live on Mare Island, the people who work there, the people who visit, the people who eventually will take advantage of all the great recreational opportunities, this stuff is real. But I don't need to tell this group that.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Henry Chui - DTSC, Brian Thompson – Water Board, Carolyn d'Almeida – EPA)

The next report we have a round from the -- any one of you who wants to go from first from the three regulating folks? Henry from --

MR. CHUI: I have nothing new to bring up other than that the public documents that are going to be public noticed, you can actually view them through the DTSC website, so you don't have to go to the library anymore if you don't want to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And is DTSC's website just like -- can you tell us what it is?

MR. CHUI: Just go to DTSC.CA.GOV, and then it's linked through the envirostore link, so click on that and you should be able to hook up to Mare Island.

MR. THOMPSON: Brian Thompson with the Water Board. Steve, I just wanted to thank you for taking us to investigation area C3 today. It was a great opportunity for getting to look at the Mare

Island investigation to see underneath the surface. And just to reemphasize that I'm available if -- while you're still having excavations that are not backfilled, that if you want to discuss results to kind of see where we're at, I'm more than happy to do that.

MR. FARLEY: Just to give you some feedback, I've already talked to Jeff about it, and he's interested in chatting with you and making sure that there's good coordination between both parties, so --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, the Navy took us on a blackberry picking tour of the ordnance manufacturing area this morning. There were only a few ripe ones though, they're not quite ready yet. In a couple more weeks there should be quite a lot. Actually we were down there to look at some of the buildings that had not been addressed in the draft remedial investigation report. About four years ago I had made a comment, while looking at their sampling plan for the remedial investigation, that there were some 38 buildings out there that just were not being addressed, and was asking why. And the Navy had responded that during their 1995 preliminary assessment base-wide, preliminary assessment where they identified the IR sites, indicated that these buildings that were low priority. And so the remedial investigation only focused on a certain number of the buildings. And we requested that they do some additional sampling out there to make sure that the buildings that they were not including were actually -- really didn't have any problems associated with them. So we were down there. The Navy picked, I think, about 15 buildings where they're going to do some additional sampling just to verify that there are no problems. And I think there were four or five of those that they actually found that the original preliminary assessment did recommend them for further investigation, but for some reason they fell through the tracks -- through the cracks. So it's a good thing that we're doing this just to make sure that it's as clean as they think it is.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: When you say the buildings, is it the interior of the buildings that you're looking for just general contaminants, not ordnance related?

MR. GODSEY: Well, we looked into the interior of all the buildings that weren't included. But we're really looking for things like drains that might lead outside, and for operations that might have resulted in contamination and would have an effect on the groundwater around the site. So we really weren't too interested in what was inside besides the barn owl. And so we can see what's outside.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: When you speak of blackberries, we just have been having a series of meetings, the Regional Park Task Force, that the city council appointed right after the liquified natural gas tanker terminal project ended.

MR. COFFEY: Blew up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, blew up. You see, the city council did not cancel it, actually the proponents canceled it. Anyhow, we met with the city. Some of us serving on the board, Jerry Karr is the chair, Kenn Browne is on it, Diana Krevsky, myself, and lots of other good folks. But we'd like it to be named Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve. So when you mentioned black-

berries, I had already been touting the preserves that we'd be selling, and I never thought about blackberries being there.

MR. COFFEY: I thought you were talking about cell phones.

V. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Next, I guess, would be co-chairs reports. And I don't really think I have anything specific to report on other than, again, I have met with Michael Bloom, the new Navy co-chair. He's very excited about coming on-line with the Mare Island project. He has experience -- a wide variety of experience. And you'll find that he has a little bit different perspective than some of the folks who have been serving in various capacities on this Board in that he comes to us with an undergraduate degree in business administration, and a graduate degree and a Master's degree in public health, focused on environmental safety or, you know, environmental risk. So he also is currently working on Point Molate -- that's the one base he will keep of his suite that he has been working on -- and they are also going through an early transfer process. So I think he's going to be a good addition to our group here, and we'll look forward to meeting up with him at the next meeting the end of July. So in his place, Dave Godsey, the lead RPM for Mare Island -- I don't know what else you do, I don't know exactly what an RPM does -- but, take it away, Dave.

MR. GODSEY: All right. Let me bring you up to date on what the Navy has been trying to accomplish over the last thirty days or so. The field work we've been looking at is the five trenches we installed outside the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, called DRMO. The Navy completed its investigations for MEC in the South Shore Area, SSA, and the production manufacturing area, PMA. The DRMO, the area around it between Azuar and Dump Road, is considered to be heavily contaminated by TPH, and it's not really been defined as to who's responsible for it with respect to DRMO might be potentially a source. We took five trenches along Dump Road parallel to it, and essentially that was under CH2M Hill was doing it, with Steve. And we did visual inspections of the cuts, and we were looking for petroleum products, and then we were also sampling the soil to see what kind of TPH content it had. We'll be coming up with a TM, a technical memorandum, in a few months. That will basically, hopefully shed some light on what the petroleum looks like out there.

On -- in the PMA, the ECC, Environmental Chemical Corporation, was doing our offshore MEC sampling. Basically they were looking at anomalies and excavating those and determining whether they were MEC or whether they were just scrap or some other material. They finished up. And what we did have them do at the very end was we found a section of Mudflats at the beach that had a large number of munitions items, which turned out to be all inert, but they were mostly 40 millimeters, and there's a picture there of about eighty items. And that was at the area where we took EPA and DTSC today. And we still saw a few items, but for the most part it was much cleaner than it was before they left.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And that was the beach down along the southern end?

MR. GODSEY: No, I hate to tell you where just because we don't want people trying to scavenge around down in there. But it was the south Mare Island Strait area, not the south shore area. And

it's just really accessible only at low tides, so you -- under the -- given normal tide conditions you would not be able to see these items. Then we've had Weston working in both the south shore area and the PMA. They've been doing a geophysical survey. They've completed that. And they've given us a target selection document that we would then negotiate with the agencies to determine which of those targets will be excavated to determine what they are within the entire site risk might we have in terms of munitions items. That's probably going to take place over the next thirty days or so. In terms of documents we submitted. Our draft site management plan. And what that is is the Navy's schedule for documents issued over the next fiscal year which starts October 1st.

We submit it to the agencies. They review it and come back in sixty days and give us their comments on it. And then we'll submit a draft final. So that document is out right now for review. And then we had the final site inspection report for the Mare Island elementary school that went final. It was mailed out yesterday. And essentially it says there's no real -- there's no risk at the school site. The last issue we had to resolve was whether or not -- how the rest of the remaining petroleum product, down about ten or fifteen feet below the ground surface, and we're trying to determine whether it's a risk to the environment or any of the receptors on the school site. And the determination is that it does not. So that document is out. And what will lead to that will be a finding of suitability to transfer. This school site is intended to be transferred from the Department of Education, and from the Department of Education to the Vallejo School District, and they will be the ultimate recipients of the school, which they should be. Then we had some comments on the RCRA landfill, 2005 Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report. Like I say, we had received just one comment on the H1 ROD RAP that Weston presented at last month's RAB meeting.

Michael Bloom will probably give us a more detailed listing of what comments we have on that document when he makes his RAB meeting. And that's pretty much it except for the early transfer. We did get an initial schedule from Lennar on the early transfer. We're going to have a kick-off meeting -- we're right now scheduled for July the 12th. And the purpose of that meeting will basically be to go over the process for the early transfer, and then iron out what the real schedule will be. I think right now the schedule shows that the early transfer would occur in early spring of 2007. So if there's no questions? Thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I thought it was interesting that you said that there were no receptors at the school site that would be affected based on your risk analysis. Receptors, I suspect, would be humanoids?

MR. GODSEY: Ecological receptors, not the teachers, administrators.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, my neighbor girl just graduated, so she won't -- will no longer be a potential receptor there. Some other school sites -- schools aren't contaminant free, that's for sure. Okay. Any other questions from the RAB? Comments? Things that you would like to see on an agenda that you'd like to let us know about now? Any-thing from the folks who are here as our guests? All right. Well, it looks to me like, Gil, unless that traffic is real bad, Vacaville will be in your sights.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It was real bad this afternoon.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, let's hope you get there by 9:00 o'clock. Have a great 4th of July everyone. Thank you for attending this evening, and we'll see you next month.

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Remedial Activities at Building 535, Investigation Area B, Triangle Area (Building 108, IR09, and IR12) and Investigation Area C3 (Lennar Mare Island - CH2MHill)
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update June 2006
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update June 2006
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard June 29, 2006
- Lennar Mare Island Document Schedule Forecast, June 2006
- CH2MHill - Lennar Mare Island Deliverable Schedule – June 2006

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:38 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 Building 128 Mail Room 1220 Pacific Highway San Diego, CA 92132 Phone: (619) 532-3676	**Date:**	September 28, 2006

Re: Mare Island Information Repository – Final Meeting Minutes for the June and July, 2006 Mare Island 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 for June and July 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