FINAL
MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

N00221_001979
MARE ISLAND
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A

HELD THURSDAY, July 26, 2012

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 26th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:06 p.m. and adjourned at 9:15 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Paula Tygielski
- Chris Rasmussen
- Maurice Campbell

RAB Navy, Developers, Regulatory and Other Agency Members in attendance:

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Chris Dirscherl
- Heather Wochnick (Navy)
- Kim Ostrowski (Navy)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Greg Peterson (Arcadis)
- Fred Ousey (Envirotech)
- Chris Orland (ALS Environmental Lab)
- John McGuire (Shaw)
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from CDM Smith:

- Teresa Toye (CDM Smith)
- Wally Neville
- Kathleen Soloaga (Stenographer)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Hello everyone. Welcome to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board meeting. We usually start with introductions. I'm Janet Lear. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator with the Navy.

MS. HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the Community Co-Chair of the Restoration Advisory Board, and I live in Vallejo, St. Vincent's Hill neighborhood, if that matters to people. It seems to.

MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen, and I'm a resident of Mare Island.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am Maurice Campbell, community member, Mare Island.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I am Paula Tygielski. I live in Benicia. I'm a community member.

MR. SILER: Neil Siler with Lennar, Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth. I represent the City of Vallejo.

MR. JESPERSEN: Chris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Jeff Porterfield, ex-Mare Islander.

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey, Envirotech Services.

MR. PETERSON: Greg Peterson with Arcadis.

MR. McGUIRE: John McGuire with Shaw Environmental.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MR. ORLAND: Christopher Orland, ALS Environmental.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Chris Dirscherl with the Navy.

MS. WOCHNICK: Heather Wochnick with the Navy.

MS. OSTROWSKI: Kim Ostrowski with the Navy.

MS. TOYE: Teresa Toye, CDM Smith, contractor for the Navy.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. I just wanted to take a moment to introduce you to our newest RPM, Chris Dirscherl.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Hi.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: He is taking over some of Marie Dreyer's projects and whatever else we can get him to take. And also Kim Ostrowski, she is the base closure manager for Mare Island, come up to see all of our lovely faces in action. So, tonight we have three different presentations, and I'm going to change the order up a little bit. Dwight is going to go first to talk about the Western Early Transfer Parcel Second Five-Year Review, as well as the Investigation Area H1 Five-Year Review.

II. PRESENTATION: *Western Early Transfer Parcel (WETP) Second Five-Year Review and Investigation Area (IA) H1 Initial Five-Year Review*
Presentation by Mr. Dwight Gemar (Weston)

MR. GEMAR: Thanks, Janet. To get started, I just want to review, for folks who might not be familiar with what a five-year review is, I put a few bullets on the first slide here. A five-year review is required if a site cannot be released for unrestricted use. And for the area that I am going to be talking about tonight, the Western Early Transfer Parcel, that is the case. There are restrictions on land use, so therefore under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA, a five-year review is required. The purpose of the review, as stated there, is to evaluate the implementation of a selected remedy and make sure that it has been and/or will be protective of human health and the environment, basically make sure it's functioning as designed. And then, again, this presentation is actually the second five-year review. It's hard to believe, but a remedy was selected in 2002 for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, so this is now the second five-year-review period.

So the area that I am going to be referring to is the Western Early Transfer Parcel, which is outlined in this red line, with the exception of these parcels that are denoted as "Exception Parcels," and they are probably easier to see on your handouts. And so generally it involves former dredge ponds, the tidal wetlands on the western shore of Mare Island, and also the submerged lands, or the mud flats, out on the western side of Mare Island. And, again, from a nomenclature standpoint, the dredge ponds are part of Investigation Area I on Mare Island, the tidal areas are referred to in our documents as Investigation Area J, and, of course, the mud flats are referred to as the Western Submerged Lands. There is a total of a little over 2800 acres, and, again, this is all made property, made land. It was created, as I'll explain in a moment, by the deposition of dredge material from the dredging of the Napa River to increase the land mass of Mare Island and to, you know, allow for disposal of the dredge material. In the late 1990's, there was some discovery of munitions and explosives of concern items, munitions items, or MEC, and also some low-level radiological items at the dredge pond outfall locations. Also, based on some sampling, there was some contaminants in the dredge sediment that were slightly above either human health or ecological screening levels, so those were taken into account during the selection of the remedy.

The property was transferred from the Navy to State Lands Commission in 2002. This was done under what's called an early transfer, which, under CERCLA, is allowed if the receiving party is willing to accept it, in this case, the State of California, before the actual clean-up remedy is complete. That's why it's referred to as an early transfer. And that was done to facilitate potential reuse of the dredge ponds. That actually didn't occur, but nevertheless the property did transfer from the Navy back in 2002. And, again, this presentation tonight is going to cover the second five-year period, from 2007 to 2012.

I thought that I would go through the history of how we originally went through the investigation process. So, I thought I'd start out with showing a little network of the former dredge pipe system on Mare Island and how the dredge material from the Napa River was pumped through a series of pipes to bermed areas called "dredge ponds"; and within each dredge pond, basically at the end of the pipe where the mud and water from the dredging activity are discharged, we call that an outfall. And there is, you know, a series of outfalls, at least one for each dredge pond, sometimes more than one, the blue dots there on the map; and so you can see how the mud and sediment from the river was transported through pipes out to the western side of the island to

create the new land mass. During normal maintenance of the dredging activity, one of the shipyard workers found a munition item in what they call the rock box, which is basically a static screen that the dredged material is pumped through before it's transported out to the dredge ponds; so that was their first indication that there could be munitions items out in the dredge pond. And sure enough, after some investigation of the outfall areas, there were quite a number of munitions items recovered.

The source of these munitions items were items that were discarded overboard from the ships when they were berthed at the shipyard, and they were sucked up by the dredge and pumped through the pipe to the outfalls. In addition to munitions items, other things were also discarded: knives and spoons and forks and welding rods, but also some luminescent dials that contain radium and/or strontium, which are, of course, radioactive compounds. They give off basically glow-in-the-dark properties, but because they contain strontium or radium, they are obviously not appropriate to discard in this manner.

And so a series of investigations were done to locate the munitions items from the outfalls, and also a radiation survey was done of the surface. And as you can see there, are a number of items that were recovered in the 1998-to-2001 time frame. And then a more detailed radiological survey was done in 2000/2001, and an additional 32 items were recovered in that survey. And then in addition to the investigation of the outfalls, when Weston become involved in the investigation, we did a digital geophysical mapping survey, a DGM survey of the outfall areas and the levies, and we recovered eight additional munitions items, MEC items, during that survey. So it's not hard to find the outfall mass because this is kind of typically what you find at an outfall. And it looks menacing, but basically what happens is the slurry containing the metal items discharges from the pipe, and it deposits basically in a hole. It scours an area and deposits in the outfall location, and then it, over time, it rusts and congeals together into kind of a big rust ball. It's fairly easily broken up, but within that rust ball there are munitions items embedded in them, in addition to other pieces of trash. So in a big lump of rusted material like this, there might be a dozen or so munitions items that were recovered. The DGM survey that I mentioned, was done by an ATV carrying a little towed array of three electromagnetic sensors and a GPS global positioning transceiver on the top so that every time the sensors detected a piece of buried metal, it would log the exact location, and then our munitions-trained technicians would come back and reacquire that location, dig up the item, and determine if it was indeed a piece of munition or just a piece of metal trash.

So, after all of that work was done and quite a bit of sampling was also done in these areas, a Remedial Action Plan, called a RAP, was approved by DTSC in 2002, and I have listed what the requirements were from the agencies as the result of these investigations. It was determined that institutional controls would be applied at this site, which includes no residences, schools, day-cares, hospitals, no alteration of groundwater and no soil disturbance without DTSC approval. The reason for that is because these geophysical detectors that are used to locate potential munitions items are effective based on the depth of the item; and you can generally detect small things at a shallow depth or bigger things at a deeper depth, but there's no 100 percent certainty that you can detect all items because it varies by the depth. So there was a requirement from DTSC that if we do any excavation, that their approval would be required.

Also, there are some access restrictions that were applied. One is an engineering control. A two-foot buffer of soil was placed on the eastern-most facing side of the levies, the dredge ponds, and that's the side that is closest to the residential areas, just to provide an additional buffer in case

some kids decided to go out there and do a little excavating themselves, which is actually pretty hard to do, because those of you that are familiar with the clay on Mare Island, especially in the summer months, it turns to concrete when it dries out, so I think after a few inches they would give up. I know I would. Also, we put up some boundary signage, "No Trespassing," and also to indicate what the institutional controls are; and then an engineered trail was also part of the remedy, which I will speak to in a moment, as well. And then, finally, there was some ongoing monitoring that was required. This small area out here, this was a discharge location for a sanitary sewage treatment plant that used to be on the H1 parcel, and that discharged out into the bay. And there was some contaminated sediment associated with that discharge, and so that sediment was deemed to be too high to be left behind. So, part of the remedy was to remove it by dredging it. Also, annual sampling of the sediment and quarterly inspection of the levies, and the trail and the signage was also part of the remedy.

So, before I mention the second five years, I thought I would just review what was accomplished in the first five years. Of course, the quarterly inspections were performed. We did locate, by these visual surveys, one additional MEC item that was on the levy between the Dredge Pond Four Middle and Four North. That was located in an area that was used as a sorting area by the munition technicians to investigate or locate the munitions item within the outfall debris, and it looked like this item got left behind and probably got covered up by some dirt and was later just exposed by some truck traffic, or whatever. So, that item was found in 2003. No other items have been found since. Signage is inspected. Sampling has been performed. During the first five-year period we didn't see any trends up or down really in the contaminant levels in the dredge ponds. And as I mentioned and as shown in this photograph, a two-foot buffer layer of soil was placed over the eastern-facing levies, and that was also done in that first five years.

So, now we come to the second five-year period, which is really the focus of this talk.– The quarterly inspections continued, and we haven't found any munitions or radiological items in that five-year period. We have continued to sample the dredge ponds and see no trends in the contaminant levels there. We completed the dredging out at the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall. We also completed a trail, and the purpose of the trail is to provide safe access for personnel out to enjoy the views from the western levies on Mare Island. And for those of you that haven't been out on the trail, I highly recommend that you do because it's a nice view. You can see here, this is one of the overlooks from the western levy, and we have some interpretive panels that are very nice, and you can see some nice views of Mt. Tamalpais and the surrounding counties. So, that's a nice amenity, and it allows people to enjoy the area without giving them a reason to basically trail-blaze and pick whatever path they wish, so this allows them to do that. Here is an overview of the trail. The trailhead is in the lower right corner there, and the yellow is the trail. There's a long out and back that's about four miles round trip and then some shorter loops if you don't care to hoof it quite out to the south end there.

So a report is being prepared that will describe what activities have been occurring over the last five years and what our conclusions are from those activities, and we will be putting in a public notice into some local newspapers to announce to the public that there is a five-year review being initiated for the Western Early Transfer Parcel. I made some copies, in case folks would like to get one, of what that notification will look like, but, again, it will be in the Fairfield, Vallejo, and Benicia papers. And what we're looking for now is input from interested members of the public, including, of course, the RAB, as to whether they concur with our initial findings or wish to provide some other input as to whether any other considerations need to be taken into account.

But based on what we have observed so far, the remedy is functioning as intended, which is one of the objectives of a five-year review, to evaluate whether that is the case. As I mentioned, we did complete the dredging of the sediment of the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall, and we did receive a no-further-action determination from DTSC and so there is no further activity required there. And the property, which is only a 500-by-500 foot area, was transferred from the Navy this year. Congratulations.

Again, we don't see any increasing trend in contaminant concentrations in the dredge ponds or at the outlet weir locations. Based on our observation so far, the trail is providing safe public access to visit the area, and at least we haven't observed any trail-blazing, so the trail is operating as intended. And, the quarterly inspections of the levy tops and the outfalls have not encountered munitions or radiological items, and there's been no real physical changes, no land-use changes or other changes in our exposure assumptions that would impact the remedial action objectives for this site.

We are making some recommendations for the third five-year period, and that's where we are looking for input from the public, specifically. One would be that because we haven't seen any change in the sediment concentrations and there's no mechanism that we're aware of that would really impact the sediment concentrations, we're proposing that we discontinue sampling and analyzing the sediment in the dredge ponds, based on ten years' worth of data. The other recommendation is to reduce the frequency of the levy and outfall inspections to once every five years or after a heavy rainfall event, as indicated on this slide, or if we have any erosion noted in our trail. And the rationale for this reduction in frequency is that we have encountered only one MEC item and that was back in 2003, so it's been nine years since we have located any item. Also, most of the levies in the outfall have heavy vegetation, which is a good thing because it reduces erosion and it also restricts unauthorized access. Most people who have been out to Mare Island know -- and we have signs that warn people -- that if you get off the trail into the grass, you could end up with a lot more friends coming out with you in the form of ticks, so we think that that is somewhat of a deterrent right there. Plus, it's grass and the weeds get pretty tall on the levies, so we think that’s a deterrent for people to not be accessing these former outfall areas because it's much more pleasant to walk on the trail.

So those are the recommendations for the third 5-year review, and, again, we'll be posting a notice in the paper, we will be putting this presentation on our Mare Island Web site, and we'll be looking for and will be preparing a report that will go through this information in more detail, and all of you will get a letter when that report is available for your review. So, we're hoping that you will take a look at it and provide us feedback, and especially on these items or any other items that you have a concern with, so looking forward to that feedback. So, Janet, you want to entertain some questions on the WETP before I hop over to IA-H1?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Certainly, if anyone has any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What's the status of the disking to keep the pickleweed from materializing there in the dredge pond bottoms?

MR. GEMAR: Well, we're not currently doing any disking, and we don't anticipate doing any disking. The purpose of disking the ponds initially was to keep the dredge ponds free of vegetation, specifically pickleweed, which can be used for the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse as habitat; but the original thought was we were going to attempt to reuse the dredge ponds as a commercial upland disposal area for dredge material, but that didn't unfold. So, basically, there

is only very limited ecological risk associated with the former sediments; disking ponds were actually not part of the remedy. It was just something that was being done to facilitate reuse of the dredge ponds. And because that effort was discontinued, there is no plan, currently, to do any more disking.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: On page 9 on your slides, you indicate "No alteration of groundwater." What does that mean?

MR. GEMAR: Basically, you can't go out there and pump groundwater. There's very little chance of that anyway because the formation -- the clay is so tight that you can't really get much out of these wells, other than a gallon a minute or so, but nevertheless that was a requirement.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, just to follow up on my question, it didn't relate to environmental clean-up issues as much as it did reuse and endangered species, mitigation that had been done prior to the base transfer, that if the City wanted to keep the option open for the reuse of the ponds or creating some type of mitigation bank, or whatever it was, they were required to keep those disked or lose that endangered species, you know, advantage from disking. So, it sounds like the City's just walking away totally from commercial use.

MR. GEMAR: You could still get some potential enhancement credits. The one thing about the dredge ponds is that they are considered wetlands because they do hold water in the winter and provide habitat, but the vegetation is pretty poor out there. It's actually more of the tumbleweed vegetation in the bottoms of the dredge ponds versus pickleweed. So, if someone wanted to try to develop a bank, you could get potentially some enhancement credits by improving the quality of the habitat and, therefore, get some credits that way, so I think the door is still open, but it probably would be a challenge from an economic standpoint. Okay. Anything else on WETP? Okay.

I'll switch gears now. The first five-year review is due now for Investigation Area H1, which is in that same general vicinity that I showed. This is the outline of the area, and it includes what is now referred to as the Containment Area, which is a 72-acre area that I'll describe in a moment, and then Upland Areas next to that shown in green, and then beyond that, pretty much just all non-tidal wetlands within the rest of the property. So the H1 area includes 230 acres. There are human health and ecological concerns due to the former historic waste disposal activity there. And during the selection of the remedy, we grouped the activities into three locations. We drew a line essentially around this 72-acre area that contains the former facility landfill on Mare Island. It also incorporates an area called the waste oil sumps, and then there is also some industrial wastewater treatment that was done on the island in that area. So, that encirclement of that area is called the Containment Area. That's about 72 acres. And then adjacent to that, there is additional Upland Areas where other waste activities were performed but not as intensive as the landfill, and we just refer to that as Upland Areas, about 30 acres; and then the rest of the H1 area is non-tidal wetlands, and the property is currently owned by the Navy.

There were a few initial activities recently done. One was a demolition of the above-ground facilities for the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant, which I mentioned earlier, and also an adjacent Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant. And then also in that same time frame, a decision was made to do a Time-Critical Removal Action to put in a subsurface groundwater barrier around the Containment Area. The barrier is soil/bentonite, which is a clay material slurry

wall; that slurry wall basically prevents, or certainly mitigates, the potential lateral movement of groundwater from the landfill area. And then we put in a groundwater collection trench next to that, which acts as a French drain. So the final remedy that was selected in 2006 for the Containment Area was a multi-layer variable cap, and I will describe that in a moment; groundwater containment, which was already in place from previous work in 2003/2004; and then gas monitoring and institutional controls for that Containment Area.

In the Upland Area, there were a number of hot spot soil removal areas. These are areas where the soil concentrations were high enough to either pose a human health or an ecological risk, and so those areas were removed and placed within the Containment Area before the cap was installed. In addition to that, once those contaminated hot spots were removed, a two-foot soil cover was placed over that area. Groundwater monitoring will continue, as well as institutional controls for that area; and the remedy for the non-tidal wetland areas also included a hot spot soil removal, monitoring, and institutional controls. So this covers not exactly five years, but basically from early 2007 through mid this year, and that is the area that we're including in the first five-year report.

This is a cross-section of what the remedy entails for the Containment Area. We depicted this as our landfill mass over here. Around the perimeter, we have this soil/bentonite slurry wall, which is keyed into the young bay mud so groundwater can't get through this layer, and is stopped by this barrier. And then about 30 feet inside of that perimeter slurry wall is this groundwater containment trench, and we collect and pump groundwater or leachate coming from the landfill mass from those trenches. What this does is depicted here: it depresses the groundwater level here so that it is less than the level out there; so not only does the slurry wall prevent movement, but it also makes the gradient inward toward the landfill rather than outward. Then there's also a geomembrane, which is a high-density polyethylene material that is placed on top of the landfill, which prevents groundwater from infiltrating into the landfill, and then there's a two-foot soil cover on top of that. There is some methane generation in the landfill, not very much because there wasn't a whole lot of garbage-type material placed in the landfill, it was mostly more industrial-type materials, abrasive blast material, asbestos, concrete rubble, those kind of things. To allow for a way for that methane to escape so that it doesn't build up pressure underneath the cap, there are some gas vents. Also, there is perimeter fencing around the entire Containment Area. That Containment Area is shown in blue on this slide, the areas in red were the contaminated soil hot spots that were excavated before it was capped, and then the green areas are the new wetlands that were created to replace the fall wetlands within the Containment Area that had to be eliminated as part of the cap.

So during this first five-year period, the remedy was being implemented and we continued to operate the groundwater collection system. The groundwater collection system has been operating continuously since February of 2005, and we have recovered over 30 million gallons of groundwater and I think about 15,000 gallons of oil. We completed the excavation of hot spots and confirmed through sampling that those materials were removed satisfactorily. We then completed the backfill of those hot-spot excavations and installed a two-foot cap over that entire, roughly, 30-acre area. We created eight acres of new non-tidal wetland areas and conducted annual monitoring and then we completed the cap of the Containment Area over 72 acres in size. We continued to perform groundwater monitoring outside the Containment Area. Since completion of the cap, the soil gas has been monitored, and we continue to inspect the

Containment Area and the Upland Area soil covers. We have collected elevation measurements from the Containment Area to evaluate how much settlement is occurring within that area.

We have completed two significant documents to summarize all the work that was done. One is the final IA-H1 Containment Area RCRA Certification Closure, and then the CERCLA Remedial Action Completion Report, which describes all of the other remedies that were implemented during that time frame; and those documents were just recently approved with a couple changes.

These are a couple of representative photographs, depending on the season. If you go out there in the spring, the grass is nice and green. If you go out there now, it's nice and brown. And on the lower right, you can see part of the walking trail that goes around the perimeter of the landfill next to Wetland B there, which has almost always got migratory and some shore birds lounging. And as I mentioned, there is quite a bit of monitoring that goes on with this area. The leachate and groundwater collection system itself is sampled quarterly, and the flow is monitored. We have a Web site that you can pull up and see what the flow rate is at any given time. The groundwater is sampled semi-annually now. The soil covers are inspected for erosion or burrowing animals. We do methane monitoring at the perimeter fence line; and then, of course, there are land-use controls that prevent anyone from building a hospital or day-care or school; and then we generate a myriad of reports that go along with all of those monitoring activities.

And the good news, from our perspective, is that the remedy is functioning as intended. I think it's exceeded my expectations even. The groundwater collection system is working well, and all of our groundwater has met the acceptance criteria for the Vallejo Sanitary and Flood Control District, so that's good. And based on the elevations of the groundwater that we measure, the inward gradient that I mentioned earlier is definitely established. The cap is also effective in excluding rainwater from infiltrating into the landfill, so the landfill mass is gradually being desiccated, which is what you want - you want to remove the water, which eliminates the mobility of the contaminants. We haven't seen any significant erosion in the soil cover areas, and we have a number of erosion monuments that we measure for that. We've done anywhere from four to two years of monitoring, depending on when the various phases of the cap were installed, and so far the cumulative settlement that we have measured has ranged from as little as an inch within that time period to seven-and-a-half inches, the most that we have encountered at any one location - so very little settlement is occurring out at the landfill area, which is good. And the landfill gas vents are operating as designed. We measure the flow rate of the amount of air and/or methane gas that's emitted from the landfill vents, and whirlybirds are checked for operation to make sure that we maintain a draft on those vents. And there have been no physical changes in our land-use changes that would impact the remedy selection.

So here is an illustration of the cumulative amount of groundwater that has been extracted, on the left, which is starting to taper off, and on the right-hand side, you see the flow rate of groundwater extracted is going down. That's illustrative of the fact that the cap now excludes rainwater from getting into the landfill and recharging the landfill mass, so we're starting, as expected, to see the amount of groundwater we can collect gradually dissipate. Also, the one monitoring well we have within the Containment Area, the highest point of groundwater, is gradually coming down. And that's good too, because that reduces the hydrostatic head in the landfill mass, which minimizes the amount of pressure that could force contaminants downward. So, that's all looking real good.

The second five-year report would cover the next five years, from July of this year through June of next year; and, really, the only thing we'd recommend, which is currently a requirement, is just to continue the operation, maintenance, and postclosure care as required under our Postclosure Care Plan. That plan is still being looked at by the Navy and the agencies, just to make sure, if there is any minor changes that might need to be made. But that plan should be finalized in the next few months, so in the meantime that will continue to occur. Happy to entertain any questions. And here is a list of acronyms that might be useful if you need to refer to that. Yes, Maurice?

MR. CAMPBELL: Fast question. On your gas vent that's venting from the cap or underneath the cap, methane tends to carry any other type of substance out into the atmosphere like a Muni transportation system. If you have something there, it'll take it out to the atmosphere. Has any gas monitoring been done on that?

MR. GEMAR: We only monitor for methane currently.

MR. CAMPBELL: Only methane.

MR. GEMAR: Correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: So if anything else is going out into the atmosphere, you don't know.

MR. GEMAR: That's correct. We don't currently have a requirement to analyze for other things.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you.

MR. GEMAR: Any other questions on H1? Again, there will be an opportunity, once the report has been prepared, to comment on that or anything else that might be of a concern, and I look forward to your input and we'll take that into consideration and then finalize that report and have that available for public review, and I am sure we will mention when that is available during the subsequent RAB meetings.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Another good report, Mr. Gemar.

MR. GEMAR: Thank you very much.

III. PRESENTATION: *Interim Results of Data Gap Investigation, Building 207 and Buildings 85/89/271 Areas, Investigation Area (IA) C1*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, Dwight. Okay. So our next presentation will be by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island. He is going to give us the results of the Data Gap Investigation for Building 207, Buildings 85/89/271 Areas and Investigation Area (IA) C1.

MR. SILER: Before we start, you should have a copy of the presentation with you, and what you will also need are these 11-by-17 figures. There should be two of them. They are stapled together. The reason I did that was because it didn't import over very well into the presentation, so you are going to need this to have an idea of exactly what's on the figure as we move along here. So, we last talked about this site in January of 2012, and what we talked about were the proposed investigations at the Building 207, Building 85/87/89/91/271 area, which will heretofore be referred to as the Building 85 Complex.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you.

MR. SILER: We actually implemented those investigations in April and May of 2012. We have received the draft report, we have looked at that material, and right now, it's being prepared to be released to the regulatory agencies within the next few weeks. So what we're going to talk about here is the results that we have at this time. What I'm going to do is go back over the description and background of the two areas, Building 207 and the Building 85 Complex. I'm going to talk about the investigations that took place and the results of those investigations, give you an idea of what the next steps are going to be, and then take any questions after that.

The Building 207 and Building 85 Complex cover an area of about 5.5 acres in a portion of the island that has been historically used for industrial/commercial purposes and their planned reuse is for industrial and commercial purposes. These buildings are at least a hundred years old and older than that, so they have historic significance, the oldest one being constructed in 1858. They were used as part of the ship-making operations here on Mare Island, as a foundry, a boiler and machine shop, a warehouse and storage operations. Now, as part of those operations, they predominantly needed fuel, especially in the boiler shop and the foundry, and one of the ways that they transported fuel around the island was through the fuel oil pipeline system or FOPL system as I will refer to it from this time forward. This FOPL system was quite extensive. It covered approximately 51,000 linear feet on the island, and leaks in the FOPL system are believed to be the source of the petroleum hydrocarbon issues that we're seeing in this area. In addition, we're seeing some issues with lead mainly in the form of black granular material, which was used as fill at various portions of the island. And then for some reason we're also seeing some chlorinated VOCs, volatile organic compounds, and mineral spirits that we're not sure exactly what the source is, but usually if you have something like a metal-working operation somewhere, they usually have like pickling liquor or some sort of solvent to clean it, and they commonly use chlorinated solvents or mineral spirits. Mineral spirits are commonly called "Stoddard solvent," after its inventor W.J. Stoddard, who formulated it in 1928 to replace or become the predominant dry-cleaning solvent. It was used extensively in the 1950's, when it was replaced by chlorinated VOCs, and now it's back in vogue, being used again as the predominant dry cleaner. At my laundry, they always brag about using a petroleum distillate, and so they are using Stoddard solvent again.

Moving right along, there are ten fuel-oil pipeline or FOPL segments that are associated with the Building 207 area. Five of these are closed. I am not going to go over each of them but just remind you about the naming system of the fuel-oil pipelines. The name usually has something like a "G1" on it. The area is gridded on a map. The letters are the columns, the numbers are the rows. So, if you see something that says "G1," it tells you that you are in that grid section G1. The next number is the diameter of the fuel-oil pipeline. You can see there, the one that has "G1/2," so it's a two-inch pipeline. If it has an "X," it means it's unknown. Sometimes you will see something that says "VAR." That means it's variable, so it changes diameter as you go through it. Then the last number and letters is some sort of a monument or building that it's associated with. So, in this case, these have Building 207 behind them, so they are associated with Building 207.

Again, five of these are closed, so no additional investigations or remediation are required, but five are open and they require some additional work. Now, four of these segments have additional characterizations, so we didn't do anything as part of this data-gap investigation. That doesn't mean that at some point in the future we're not going to go out and have to do some remediation at those pipelines, just they weren't part of this investigation.

So, the one segment that we needed to do additional work on was H1/X/B207S. We needed to refine and define some soil impacts and confirm that there were no groundwater impacts downgradient. There were four monitoring wells that are downgradient of this site, and the last time that they were monitored was in the second quarter of 2009. We wanted to see if there was any change in the groundwater regime up to the current time period, so we advanced eight soil borings along this pipeline to get further definition of the contamination. We wanted to make sure one was to the north of the pipeline because we didn't have definition in that compass direction. We had it pretty much defined to the east, west, and south, but not the north. In addition, we collected samples from three different depth levels, 3 feet, 7 feet, and 10 feet. Three feet was the base of the fuel-oil pipeline, and because we had done some trenching in the area, we wanted to see if there was any deeper contamination, and 7 and 10 feet was in some places where they saw potentially some deeper contamination. We also collected groundwater samples from the downgradient groundwater monitoring wells.

If you take a look on the 11-by-17 figure in either one, you see the hot spots which are these colored areas. The reddish color is tetrachloroethene, or PCE; the brown color here, on the north end of the FOPL Segment H1/X/V207S, that's TCE; the kind of orange or goldenrod color, that is mineral spirits; and the blue is 1,1,1-Trichloroethane, or TCA. So, we knew that there was potentially some soil-gas issue here, so we went out and took a different type of soil-gas sample because the original soil gas samples that we took were done with what is called a Gore-Sorber. It just has a little filament, and they put it in the ground and they weigh it; and then when they come back, after they've let it lay in the ground for a while, they weigh it again, and if they measure the weight and there's a difference, then they say, well, there's something there. And we can tell you what it is, but we can't tell you anything about the concentrations, so we need to go back and get some true concentration data. So, as far as the results are concerned, this map shows the soil-boring locations, and you can see the groundwater-monitoring locations, which are in the wells that are downgradient, which are these. There's one right there, one right there, one there. And there's one right down there. And then the yellow areas here are where we took soil borings.

There's the soil-gas data that we got right there. The results that are in yellow, shaded in yellow, those are results that we found that were above the Tier 2 screening levels, and we'll have to go back in and take a look at those and do some sort of additional actions there. The one that you can't see on the map is – but you can see it on the other map is the one that's just right to the north of here, and that did not detect anything that was above the Tier 2 screening levels. So, we've got this bound. We are confident that we're not seeing any groundwater impacts downgradient, but we do know there will be some additional work in the near future. This slide right there just kind of tells you what we found. We found total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel and motor oil. And the polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, Benzo(a)pyrene, at concentrations above the Tier 2 screening levels, that appeared to be limited to the upper 3 feet, except for one instance where we found Benzo(a)pyrene at 7 feet in one soil-boring location. We found nothing at 10 feet, so it looks like it's confined to the upper 3 feet. Groundwater samples, again, have nothing above the Tier 2 screening levels, and that soil-vapor sample that we collected where we found trichloroethylene before, we found some constituents but we didn't find trichloroethylene, and nothing was above an environmental screening level or a California human health screening level.

So, moving on to the Building 85 Complex, the predominate facilities are the fuel-oil pipeline, the sections, there are seven of them. There's one that's closed, and six that are open, and two, those two, Navy 1 and Navy 2, suspected from a 1911 map we didn't know very much about. In addition, there were some other environmental issues. Again, we had found those hot spots inside the building complex. We found 1,1,1-trichloroethylene, or TCA; we found tetrachloroethylene, PCE, mineral spirits; and TCE, trichloroethylene in the building. In addition, we found black granular material. We knew that, so we were looking for it whenever we did any of the subsurface investigations.

So, we wanted to look at four pipeline sections where we had done additional investigations. Plus, we wanted to look at those two new FOPL sections that we found on the 1911 Navy map. We wanted to characterize the conditions at the locations that we knew about and at the suspected Navy locations, verify the soil impacts, characterize groundwater conditions and characterize the soil vapor conditions because we didn't have any kind of a handle on the concentration on the soil vapor. We knew that there was something there, and we were trying to find out exactly what it was. So we advanced five soil borings for soil sampling at three FOPL segments. We collected samples at 2.5 feet, which was the suspected depth of the FOPL segments, and at 5 and 12 feet which were conditions of the Fuel-Oil Pipeline Work Plan, that's why we looked at those depths. We looked at different depths at the other area, 3, 7, and 10 feet, because we had an idea of where we were at those locations, but since we didn't know much about those locations, we wanted to take a look in accordance with the Fuel-Oil Pipeline Work Plan.

We installed two new groundwater monitoring wells. We monitored the existing wells and the new wells because we didn't have any data from the existing wells except from the first or second quarter of 2009, so we wanted to verify the conditions now. We also collected nine soil-vapor samples at the hot-spot locations inside the building, analyzed the samples for petroleum hydrocarbons, motor oil, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, chlorinated volatile organic compounds in the soil vapor and groundwater only, and mineral spirits in the soil vapor and groundwater only. So, this map kind of shows you the totality of what was done inside the Building 85 Complex, and the next figures and slides will tell you a little bit about what we found in those areas.

For three FOPL segments where we actually did some soil borings and collected soil samples, we did not find Benzo(a)pyrene or total petroleum hydrocarbons as motor oil or diesel above the Tier 2 screening levels. This H1/6/B85 north pipeline, formerly, supposedly, wasn't located, but they did find it eventually. They closed it in place - they cleaned it out, drained the oil out, flushed it and capped it and left it in place and then did a vacuum test on it; but the vacuum test failed, so we knew somewhere along the line it wasn't competent and we needed to find something. We did find one location with some Benzo(a)pyrene above the Tier 2 screening level, and that will probably have to be removed at some point. But we wanted to see at one end if there was any other indication of Benzo(a)pyrene contamination, and luckily there wasn't, nothing above the Tier 2 screening level.

At the two Navy FOPL segments, Navy 1 and Navy 2, we tested for petroleum hydrocarbons and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, found nothing above the Tier 2 screening levels. We tried to do two soil borings at this Navy 2, but – this kind of illustrates the complexity of the subsurface environment in Building 271, as it goes off into that building, there are areas in the building where there is more than 12 feet of concrete that you would have to get through. At this

location, we went through one foot of concrete at the top, encountered about one foot of soil. After that, we found another one foot of concrete, found another foot of soil, and from four feet all the way down to 12 feet, it was solid concrete, so we didn't collect any samples out of that.

And so it's just really kind of interesting the variability in some of these buildings as you start doing subsurface work in it. And, again, we didn't encounter any black granular material in any of the soil borings.

So, what this slide shows is basically what I have told you about. It shows the locations of the samples, gives you an idea of the concentrations at each of those samples, and this corresponds to your Figure 1 on the 11-by-17 handout. It's really hard to see on this, and the resolution didn't come out very well when I transferred it over, so I apologize for that.

So, moving along to the soil vapor characterization results. Preliminary data that we got from this passive technique told us that we had encountered some chlorinated volatile organic compounds and then the Stoddard solvent inside the building, but we had no way to quantify that as a concentration. So, we went back in, did another technique so we could quantify that concentration to see if we really had an issue or not. So, we collected soil-vapor samples for concentration and risk-evaluation purposes. At one location, we did find tetrachloroethene, or PCE, below the environmental screening level but above the California human health screening level. And, again, at one location inside the building, we found trichloroethylene that was below the environmental screening level but above the California human health screening level. We did not find any 1,1,1-TCA, or 1,1,1-trichloroethane above the ESL or the CHHSL, and we did not find mineral spirits anywhere inside the building, and that includes in the soil vapor and also in the groundwater samples that we took and analyzed for Stoddard solvent or mineral spirits.

So again, that figure shows you where we took these samples, points out the hot spots. And, again, the concentrations that have the yellow shading, those are the ones that are above the Tier 2 screening levels.

So the last thing we looked at was groundwater. We needed to characterize groundwater downgradient of H1/6/B85. We installed a new well and monitored that well and the existing wells. We also looked and installed a new well inside Building 271. This well is installed inside Building 85. And we also looked at an existing well that was to the north of this area, where we didn't, again, have any data except back from 2009. We wanted to verify conditions today. So, at none of these locations did we find petroleum hydrocarbons, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, chlorinated volatile organic compounds, or mineral spirits at levels above the Tier 2 screening levels. Again, this figure shows you where these existing wells are. That's the one associated with Building 89, 271, and there's 85 right there.

So, the next steps. We're at a position where we can formulate remediation options for Building 207; but for Building 85 Complex, we want to take a look at those two spots where we did find something above the California human health screening levels and see, are we on the edge of it? Are we in the middle of it? So we can get a better idea of what that footprint looks like, so we're going to do that next. We can bound those PCE and TCE detections that we found. We're going to continue groundwater monitoring of the new wells. We have three more quarters of sampling to do. They will do the next sampling event next month, so we'll start doing the second event then; and then we can go ahead and formulate remedial options for that. So, that's the end of my presentation. If you have any questions, I can answer them right now, and then, on the last page, I have included the acronyms.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Neil.

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Well, I have consulted with Community Co-Chair. In the interest of time, I am going to cover the important points in my Environmental Program Update during the Navy Co-Chair Report, so we are then at the first public comment period. Do we have any public comments?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. We have a ten-minute break, and there's some cookies over there.

(Recess taken from 8:16 p.m. to 8:33 p.m.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Let's get started up again. So we are at administrative business. As always, if you have any comments on the meeting minutes, get those to Myrna or myself. Myrna, did you have any other administrative business?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are at the Focus Group Reports. Community, Wendell is not here tonight. Natural Resources, whose group leader is also not here tonight, so we'll start with Technical.

a) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: And I have nothing to report.

b) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: City report?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: City has nothing to report.

c) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. SILER: I have nothing to report. Just kidding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's not a very good joke.

(Laughter.)

MR. SILER: Okay. You should all have the 11-by-17 handout that has our update on it, and we have been doing a lot of work out in the Building 637 area; and if you look at the two pictures in the upper right-hand corner, that shows excavation that's going on at the former railroad turntable portion of Building 637. And then in conjunction with that work, we have also been trying to get rid of some of the stockpiles of soil we have on the property, so we started to get rid of Stockpile Number 7. In the upper left-hand corner, you can see the work that has been going on to reduce that stockpile. We still have more work to do at both sites and so we're re-evaluating that right now and trying to move forward with that work.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: This isn't contaminated soil that you have? It's clean fill?

MR. SILER: Yeah, it's clean fill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How deep were those pits? And you have confirmed that you got to clean?

MR. SILER: No, we haven't got to clean on all four sides yet of the pits. They are about eight feet deep. They go down to groundwater. And so we just got the results back today for the soil confirmation samples that we took, and we still have to do some additional excavations around that area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But in some holes, you were able to refill fully?

MR. SILER: We haven't refilled any of those holes. We haven't backfilled --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So where are your trucks going with this soil?

MR. SILER: That truck there is going to a Class 2 landfill. It's going to Hay Road landfill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So this removal of soil at Stockpile Number 7, but you said that's clean fill?

MR. SILER: No, I said that's clean soil.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Clean soil. Well --

MR. SILER: But I have no -- I have nowhere to use it on the island.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, so you wouldn't refill the holes --

MR. SILER: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- you just dug?

MR. SILER: No, because this soil at Stockpile 7, while it's appropriate for commercial/industrial reuse, it's not appropriate for residential reuse, which is what the Building 637 area is slated for.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, so you've just found a home recently for Stockpile Number 7.

MR. SILER: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: These are unrelated pictures.

MR. SILER: They're the same operation, or the same contractor is doing the work at both places in conjunction, together, but we're not taking the soil from Stockpile 7 and using it as fill for the Building 637 excavation. We're actually using other soil on the site, which is from Stockpile 13 and 18, which have been characterized for unrestricted land use, and we're going to be using those as backfill at the Building 637 site. And that actually goes back into some of the fieldwork that we have been doing.

The completed fieldwork, we completed the Second Quarter 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Event. We did the characterization work at four PCB sites in Building 742. We installed a temporary well and did sampling at Building 144 oil/water separator, and we also characterized those two stockpiles I talked about, 13 and additional fieldwork we have under implementation is Building 69, two PCB sites there. We actually scabbled the floor. We got positive confirmation results that met the commercial/industrial cleanup level in 18 out of the 20 grids. We have two grids we have to go back in and do some additional scabbling, so we'll be doing that work next month. In addition, we're also doing work at another fuel-oil pipeline site that is on the southern

portion of the XKT property, south end of Building 386, 88, and 390, and that work will start up again next month. In addition, we've got the remedial work that we're doing at Building 637.

Upcoming fieldwork, we're going to be doing a third injection event at IR15. We hope to do that potentially in September. We have a Third Quarter 2002 Groundwater Monitoring Event which we hope to do in September. We're also going to be doing a petroleum hydrocarbon investigation at Building 121 in the interior of the building, and then we hope to implement or initiate remedial actions at those four PCB sites in Building 742. Now, we were able, with the Agency's help, to close four sites in the last time period. We closed the Historic Independence Wharf Site, Building 854 and 1304 PCB sites, and also USTs 231-1 and -2 for petroleum hydrocarbon issues IA H2.

So, that's the work that we've been working on. We have submitted a number of documents that are in review, and we've got some that are coming up in the near future, and we just are planning on keeping moving forward. Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Two questions: Can you give me an example of what you do when you say that you are working in the southern area of XKT? What's your policy or how do you work with a property lessee who is, you know, currently using that property? What are your terms? How do you work with them? Do you have a project plan that you work with them on, you know, sit down and negotiate?

MR. SILER: Yeah, we actually discuss the work that's going on with the tenant. There's a Cooperation Agreement in their lease.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ahh.

MR. SILER: That when we do environmental work that they need to cooperate with us, but we try to work around them as best we can and not impact their operation as much as possible, but in some cases it just can't be helped. There's probably one job that we're going to be doing later in the year where we have a tenant that is inside a building where we're going to have to be doing some work in some pits, and they've basically been storing equipment in there since the dawn of time; and so we're going to have to move the equipment, probably work on weekends or at nights and then move it back so that – or at least get it into a situation where if they need to work on it in the day or during the week, they can get to it. So, there's a number of things that we do. We do try to cooperate. We do try to minimize the impacts that we have with our tenants, but we need to get this work done to be able to close out the site, and that's better for everybody, as a whole, tenants included.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure. You've showed us quite a bit of that in the past in that same complex there, just interested to hear how you handle that because I think that could be instructive to others working on environmental cleanup on the island. Certainly could be to me. Could you tell us about your $8 million agreement that you're working on?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's actually part of my discussion a little bit later.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. I didn't know. It wasn't clear at the City Council meeting, when I heard about it, but it hadn't ever been brought here, so in the spirit of early and often communication, I thought I'd ask you.

MR. SILER: Certainly. And so when we get to Janet's presentation, she'll talk about it. And if you have any questions for me, please feel free to ask me about it at that time, also.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SILER: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that would be an example of something that -- I'll just say to you and then I'll say to the Navy the same: When they give the presentation, that it should have come in, in my opinion, as the Co-Chair of the RAB, before the RAB, at least for – as information. Eight million dollars is quite a bit of money, and we would like to have known what it was for, why, when, in the spirit of the Restoration Advisory Board law. Thank you.

d) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update?

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks. We also have handouts here, and Dwight has actually done most of the heavy lifting on this by including a good chunk of what's on the handout in his presentation, but I will briefly review the document status. We've gotten a couple of documents in for Navy review in the last month or so, and two of the documents Dwight already mentioned, that would be the Western Early Transfer Parcel Second Five-Year Review and the Investigation Area H1, First Five-Year Review. We've also submitted a Draft Feasibility Study for IR Site 05 along with Dredge Pond 7 South of the Western Magazine Area. We're also working on addressing Navy and/or Agency comments on two other documents, and those are the Draft Final Remedial Investigation Report, or IR 05, Dredge Pond 7 South in the Western Magazine Area, and also the Draft Investigation Area H1 Postclosure Care Plan. And finally, we've got two documents that were recently approved by the regulatory agencies, and those are the final Investigation Area H1 CERCLA Remedial Action Completion Report in the Final Investigation Area H1 Containment Area, Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act, Closure Certification Report. That's a mouthful. And in the interest of getting back on schedule here, I think Dwight pretty much covered Five-year Public Review Notice, the Installation Area H1 Groundwater Perimeter Groundwater Leachate Collection System Status, as well as some of the maintenance activities and even included the photo in his presentation. So, if there are no other questions, I will pass it back to you, Janet.

e) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito, Elizabeth Wells, Carolyn D'Almeida)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Regulatory Update.

MS. WELLS: Okay. This is the Water Board. Janet wrote it down for me and I lost it. Here it is. So, we concurred with the closure request for Underground Storage Tank 231 site and also the no further action request for the Historic Independence Wharf, so those two sites are done. And then I'm working on transferring some of the sites to our new project manager working with Lennar Mare Island, Adriana Constantinescu, and I have a few more sites where I need to do the transfer still. And then I've been talking with the Navy about petroleum hydrocarbon screening levels.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito, DTSC, Department of Toxic Substances Control. I think everybody has pretty much seen everything that I have been working on for the past month or two in everybody else's regulatory updates. We continue to focus on those activities to help get people out in the field doing work, and I think that's it.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So for the Navy Co-Chair Update, first off, I just want to refer you all to the presentation packet Navy Environmental Program Update. About once a year, we provide a list of documents, fieldwork that we've done in the past year and then our plan for the future. Last time I gave this presentation, I was told that you really didn't want me to get up in front and read all of the titles of these documents to you, so I'm not going to do that, and I know we have some other things to cover tonight. So, I am going to jump to the last few pages to cover the topic that Myrna just brought up. So, let's start with page 25, which is titled "Environmental Program Funding Update." So just a summary, the 2010 Annual Report to Congress reported that $247 million have been spent on environmental cleanup at Mare Island by the Department of the Navy. This amount includes the funding for the early transfers. The Eastern Early Transfer had a negotiated cost of $78.4 million and the Western Early Transfer was $54.9 million. Both of those early transfers shifted environmental cleanup responsibility, excluding certain Navy-retained conditions, from the Navy to the City in an Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement. So, the funding that I mentioned, the $78 million and the $54 million, that was provided by the Department of the Navy to assist in that cleanup.

As we have discussed over the past couple of years, due to the budget situation in Washington, environmental funding for this site and all of the other DOD environmental cleanup program sites continues to decline, so we're working with that the best way we can. And the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, as I mentioned, the Navy provided $78.4 million in grant funding and then the responsibility was transferred. However, as a condition of that agreement, remediation of known conditions would then revert to become a Navy-retained condition when the cost to clean up those known conditions exceeded $114.3 million. So, the Navy has acknowledged, after a pretty thorough audit, that this condition has been met; therefore, the known conditions at Mare Island are now considered a Navy-retained condition. To address, or at least partially address the situation, a first amendment to that ESCA has been executed, and as part of that first amendment, the Navy placed an additional $8 million of grant funding into a trust account. There are pre-approved payments for administration of the grant funding regulatory oversight and some additional past costs. The remaining funds remain in that trust account and are available to the City to support environmental services once the first amendment requirements are met. So, I am open to take questions on that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where did that additional $8 million come from if you -- I think your last number that you gave us was funding was at something like $5.1 or $5.9 million for this last year, so where did you get another -- for environmental work at Mare Island for the Navy, so where did that $8 million come from?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I know it came out of our budget, but I can't remember the fiscal year. Can you answer that question?

MS. WOCHNICK: It was 2012. It was this year. We ended up getting a little bit more money after the original budget was set. So, we ended up getting more money after the original budget was set from the presentation provided previously.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you haven't told us that either?

MS. WOCHNICK: Well, we're not --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you got like how much more than $8 million?

MS. WOCHNICK: Well, we're not really supposed to divulge every cent that we get. When it's reported to Congress, that's when it becomes public record, so unfortunately most of the numbers are two years in the past. So, the number that's public is the annual report to Congress, which is the number that Janet provided. Because our funding can be taken away at any time, based on execution or other basic needs, we usually don't divulge the exact funding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Except for you did, in some presentation, tell us that you went from $21 million something, to $11 million something the next year, to this last year of $5.9 million, but then -- so you did make that public to the Restoration Advisory Board. And I think the -- I don't know, we could go and haggle over what the Restoration Advisory Board law, you know, really covers, but, you know, $8 million is kind of a lot more money. So, is there actually $32 million that is sitting there?

MS. WOCHNICK: No, it's not $32 million, but it was funding from other bases that they couldn't use, so we were able to use it for this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because BRAC funds are kind of a slushy fund that you can move around or...

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not really, but sort of.

MS. NAITO: If work gets delayed on somebody else's project or -- I would imagine, it could be like our funding, where we can move funds around from different projects. If there's a delay in one or something happens on one and we can't fund it that year, we can move money around.

MS. WOCHNICK: But we can't just take it. We can't just tell some other base, "Oh, you are going to delay your project because we need $30 million." We can't say that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So, I mean, because this never got discussed prior to this agreement, I guess we can discuss it now, and so I hope you don't mind if I ask a couple of more questions. Where does this get you in terms of what you need to do to move on or complete your work?

MR. SILER: And you're talking to me, Myrna; is that correct?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah. I'm looking at you and I'm kind of going like that, but why don't I say, "Neil Siler, Lennar Mare Island, where does this get you"? I mean, it's -- obviously, I could ask Gil, or I could ask the Navy, or I could ask you, or I could ask all of you, but you could be a good place to start, Neil.

MR. SILER: Well, just to be accurate, is that the ESCA amendment is actually between the Navy and the City of Vallejo.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm.

MR. SILER: It's not between the Navy and Lennar Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. SILER: Now, the City passes on the obligations and rights of the ESCA amendment to Lennar Mare Island through a MIRA amendment, and that has been executed, also. So, what we're doing right now is we are trying to get another contractor on board to complete the known scope of work, because the $114.3 million covers only the known scope of work that was in the ESCA. So, to complete that scope of work, we have RFPs on the street right now, and we're hoping to get responses back by the 15th of August from contractors who could complete that

scope of work, so that's where we are right now with that. As far as where it will get us, we're hoping it's going to get us to completion. I don't know if it will. We'll have to evaluate that when we get those proposals and bids back, but that's our hope right now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well, all I can say is that I hope that you will come and at least give us an update. You know, RAB law states "early and often communication" about environmental cleanup issues, and certainly funding is one, so "early and often" would be the operative here I would like to see in the future. And I think you might have heard that a time or two from me in the past, so let's stick with that. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: I do have some questions.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Certainly.

MR. CAMPBELL: As I'm hearing this discussion, a couple things come to mind. The known scope of work and there's an RFP going out, what can you tell me about MBE, WBE in regards to what's taking place at Mare Island? And while we're at it, I understand that we don't have a CIP, but do we have a CRP?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, let's get the acronyms out of here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Community relations plan, community involvement plan.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yes, we have a community relations plan. It hasn't been updated.

MR. CAMPBELL: When last was it updated?

MS. WOCHNICK: I want to say 2005?

MR. CAMPBELL: Because what I'm hearing, there's a breakdown in communications.

MS. WOCHNICK: Well, actually, Maurice, we tried to update it a couple years ago, and the RAB was not interested in using the funding to just produce another report that was going to sit on the shelf, so we repurposed the funding to do munitions awareness; and we haven't produced all of the documents for that, but the funding was repurposed because we were told by the RAB that they didn't want --

MR. CAMPBELL: I wasn't here for historic conditions, so I have to pass it on to --

MS. WOCHNICK: No, I understand.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It was 2001 --

MR. CAMPBELL: 2001, okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- when it was last updated.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. All right. The other question was --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could I just follow up on that? That's a long time ago. And I don't remember that we wanted to -- I mean, you would have to go back to minutes of meetings and special meetings where I don't know that you produced minutes, but I don't remember that we wanted one thing and not the other. I thought that CERCLA requires a Community Relations Plan. Somewhere along the line I would think that your agency, Janet, would have just required something, but where are those munition information materials today?

MS. WOCHNICK: We are working on it and --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Eleven years ago?

MS. WOCHNICK: Eleven years ago, I haven't been on this base for 11 years.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you said 2001.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's when the last CRP was updated.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, so ...

MS. WOCHNICK: And then in 2009, we put out a proposal to produce another Community Involvement Plan, which is the CIP that Maurice was talking about, and we brought the presentation to the RAB and we were told by the RAB that they didn't want a CIP. So, yes, we are still working on the munitions awareness documentation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you might be done by the time you get it done. What about that? I mean, well, okay. So it looks like this needs to be an agenda item two months from now, if you wouldn't mind, because I am confused where DTSC comes in and I'm confused. I didn't know that the Restoration Advisory Board could influence in such a powerful way, you know, what the Navy accomplishes in terms of community. Yeah, especially since we don't, and maybe you could bring us the minutes and all of that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We certainly can. We have the minutes.

MS. WOCHNICK: We have the meeting minutes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And we probably said, yeah, why make another document if you don't have basic information out for the public to use, but the DTSC might have some other conditions, so ...

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The DTSC was at the meeting, as well.

MS. NAITO: We were at that meeting, and I believe, if -- okay, two years is a long time, and I'm going by memory. It was my understanding that we were still following the general substance of our Community Relations Plan, and it was generally working, having a lot of communications focused through the Restoration Advisory Board. We also talked about supplemental things the Navy could do during that for community updates. I can't remember who it was, said attending various different functions out here and having a booth so that the Navy could continue to tell people about the munitions -- I think our communications focused around munitions awareness at that time, though. And so the idea was that the Navy could have a booth to keep people -- or to remind people that there were -- there was the potential for encountering munitions out here, but I will go back and take a look, as well.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That one fact sheet, Myrna, that I gave you copies of was a --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This one?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- result of those discussions, yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm. Well, Mike Coffey, you know, was there, and he's not here; Ken Brown was there, and now he lives in New York; Jerry Carr was there, and now he's ill; but I know Paula and I were there. I don't know if you were there three years ago, Chris. I remember the meeting well, but I don't think that we could have imagined that you weren't going to do -- I mean, you're saying you are still working, three years later, on some munition display or material or something, and in the meantime, you know, we're doing a good job for you. So,

somewhere along the line, I guess, things just sort of slipped through the cracks, and maybe we could re-energize that, but I don't know that we finished answering. You had two parts to your question, and I know I interrupted you, I just did. I know I did.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I was trying to get an understanding of that. That was one. And, you know, I heard the word "scope of work" and RFP, and I wondered about MBE, Minority Business Enterprise, Women's Business Enterprise, I wondered what the scope was for Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: To be clear, Maurice, that RFP was issued by Lennar, Mare Island. It was not a Navy RFP. If Neil has information to provide on that.

MR. SILER: Yeah, and what we have in there is we have the conditions, because Lennar is a publicly-traded company that transfers securities on an open exchange, we are subject to Sarbanes-Oxley, and so those rules are the ones that apply to our -- any kind of request for proposal out there, so...That's what we've done. We've complied with those rules.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Also, what is the Navy's MBE/WBE here on Mare Island?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I think what we had talked about, Maurice, is having somebody from the business line team lead that knows the ins and outs of the contract details --

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- give a presentation maybe at the next RAB.

MR. CAMPBELL: Excellent. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, just so we're clear, I think that whether we have a meeting outside of the Restoration Advisory Board, like that previous meeting, which I actually -- I don't know, I don't remember seeing minutes to, but it was a long time ago, as Janet says. We either need to do that as a committee meeting, or we need to hold an additional RAB meeting, or we need to fit that in along with what you just said as a topic. I want to be clear that it's time, given Maurice's question here and our questioning, to have the Navy give an update on -- and DTSC, or whatever, on what you have accomplished. And I know there was a long wish list generated, but I don't know that you have been attending public venues like -- I know it was mentioned the farmer's market. I don't know how many of those you have attended with your munition information booth, you know, so maybe you can give us an update on all of that. I don't know -- I am not aware of your activities, so...

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We can provide a summary of the discussions and the meeting minutes, and we have not done anything except issue that fact sheet and do our normal Flyway Festivals and RAB tours. And as I mentioned, we can talk about that meeting. However, at this point in time, we do not have a contract in place to do a CRP or a CIP. So, if that is something that we want to discuss whether we need that, we can certainly do that, but it's not something we can initiate at this time because we will have to put a contract in place and provide the funding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, then we could – you know, at least we could give you some direction --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- in the spirit of early and often communication. Obviously, you know, Maurice brings it up and it's worthy of conversation.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And we'll give you another opportunity, I would like to ask whether you can give a demo, like you did last year, during the Mare Fair, which is coming up Saturday the 11th and Sunday the 12th of August regarding your munitions cleanup activities at the South Shore and Production Manufacturing Area.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So I'm going to go through the Navy Progress Report at this point. So during this last month, we have continued the fieldwork at the Production Manufacturing Area/South Shore Area. We have also done fieldwork at the Paint Waste Area and Buildings A-149 and M-160. The intrusive investigation work supporting the munitions non-time-critical removal action in the PMA/SSA, we have investigated over 5,000 anomalies. Among these anomalies, 19 munitions and explosives of concern have been found, along with 640 munitions documented as safe, and then we also found 50 small arms ammunition.

At the PWA, the Paint Waste Area, we picked back up on the time-critical removal action step-out excavation; that fieldwork had been on hold for a while because we needed to get a screening plant back out there. There was a lot of debris that we weren't expecting in that particular step-out, and it was just too difficult to sort manually so we got the screen plant back out there and finished up the excavation. We believe that we are complete, but we still have to wait for the chemical sample results to see if we met our metals concentrations. We did find 36 munitions -- 36 MEC items, 7 MDAS items and 23 RAD items in this step-out area north of the original excavation.

Also, during this past month, we continued radiological surveys of three buildings. There was Building A149, which we had been using the past several years to store any radiological items that were encountered or found during our removal actions; and that building is on Parcel X-B3, which we would like to transfer, and that building was the only thing that was holding that up. So we're moving those items to a different building, the one down in the South Shore Area, but in order to make that move, we have to survey the building that it's going to and then we also have to survey the building that it's leaving, so both those surveys are ongoing. The A161 report is being submitted shortly, and the last part of the survey work at A149 will be done in the next few weeks. We also had another Building M160 that had been used at one point to store RAD items that were found during the removal action. That also is being surveyed in order to support unrestricted use.

So, during the reporting period, the Navy submitted two documents, Installation Restoration Site 17, Final Work Plan for the Upland Chlorinated Solvent Investigation and also the Draft RA Work Plan for Unexploded Ordinance Site 3, out at the Dredge Pond 3E. We received comments or concurrence from Department of Toxic Substances Control on one document, the Investigation Area (IA) K results for the Sonar Survey. We had our BCT meeting today, as we do every RAB meeting, we have one earlier in the day.

And then I wanted to bring your attention to the next several meeting dates: September 27th is our next RAB meeting date, but in November we will be having one on the last Thursday of the month. Usually we push that one out because it usually falls on Thanksgiving, but this year it does not, so we will go ahead and have the regular last Thursday of the month for a RAB meeting. It was put in incorrectly in the last Navy Monthly Progress Reports, so I wanted to make sure I brought that to your attention. I also, once again, brought a fieldwork schedule, it was over on the table, just listing projected start dates for our upcoming field activities.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I actually had a question regarding whether you were going to investigate the outfalls and ditches in the northern part of the island, and I see that you have this Draft RI work plan for Dredge Pond 3E in the Northern Marine Corps Firing Range. Can you plan to give us some presentation about that at some point?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It looks like we may need a marathon RAB meeting or an additional RAB meeting because I know that the ditches continue to concern me, and this was the first that I knew of this work plan going out, and I am curious about why it was just 3E and not – I think you have some other outfalls at other areas in the north, so I would like to have an update on that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's all I have, so...

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I'll be quick. The Mare Fair, as I've mentioned, is August -- Friday, August 10, Saturday 11, and Sunday the 12th. And I want to thank the Navy for making it possible for us to give an outing to the Western Magazine. A walk is scheduled on Saturday morning the 11th to the Western Magazine Area. That's normally only opened or has been recently only open during the Flyway Festival, so this was in trade for not being able to be out at the South Shore Area. And we made this agreement several months ago, so I really appreciate you coming through with that because it's important for people and the public to understand that the land that you are cleaning up is actually slated to become transferred to the State of California and then on to the grant with the City and a lot of it planned for park land, so I really appreciate that. Be sure and come out on that morning and show your support for public access to those areas.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we're at our last public comment period. Are there any other comments?

(No response.)

MR. PETERSON: I have a question. Are you going to have a RAB tour this year?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yes, it has not been scheduled yet, but we will have one. It's usually in November.

MR. PETERSON: Great.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I suppose everybody gathered that these items that are here on the table, maybe Janet wants to tell us what they are.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I actually mentioned them earlier, but probably everybody was talking and eating cookies. Yeah, these items were all found by Weston during the Removal Action down in the South Shore Area. One of the metal items is a scale, and I can't remember the name that's on it, but that company was started in 1905, I believe it was, and some of the other bottles there are interesting, as well. They have some information, different company names on it that we Googled earlier. I don't know if you guys remember the details.

MS. OSTROWSKI: The beer bottle was late 1800's, and the others were, I think, early 1900's.

MS. WOCHNICK: And the beer bottle is cool because it was Vallejo, California.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So thanks everyone for coming, and we'll see you next time.

(Whereupon, at 9:15 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – 2010 Western Early Transfer Parcel (WETP) Second Five-Year Review and Investigation Area (IA) H1 Initial Five-Year Review – Weston Solutions
- Presentation Handout – Interim Results of Data Gap Investigation, Building 207 and Buildings 85/89/271 Areas, Investigation Area (AI) C1 – Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Navy Environmental Cleanup Program Update – Navy
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 26, 2012
- Public Notice Start of Five-Year Reviews for two Sites at the Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard
- Mare Island Draft Navy Field Schedule
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update