

**Mare Island Naval Shipyard  
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting  
Mare Island Conference Center,  
375 G Street, Vallejo, California  
September 26, 2013**

**This packet contains the following list of items:**

- September 26, 2013 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Notice.
- Agenda for September 26, 2013 RAB Meeting.
- Draft Minutes from the July 25, 2013 RAB Meeting.
- Comments or Corrections to the Draft Meeting Minutes Form: Please complete this form and return to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes at the conclusion of the RAB meeting. All corrections will be included in the draft final copy of the minutes, which will be located in the RAB library for review and comment.
- RAB Meeting Agenda Request/Comments Form: Please complete this form and return to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes.

**NOTE: Minutes from previous meetings that are to be finalized this month will only be sent to the information repository for review. Past RAB meeting minutes can be viewed on the following website: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>**

Future Mare Island RAB meetings are listed below:

December 5, 2013  
January 30, 2014  
March 27, 2014



**PUBLIC MEETING**  
**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)**  
**September 2013 MEETING**



**The Department of Navy (DON) invites interested members of the public to attend updates and presentations with members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) made up of representatives from the local community, Navy, Federal and State regulatory agencies. The DON encourages the public to keep informed about the environmental cleanup at former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY), Vallejo, California.**

**September 2013 Featured Topics**

**Crane Test Area North and Defense Reutilization  
and Marketing Office South  
Preliminary Assessment / Site Investigation Results  
and Remedial Investigation Field Work Overview**

**Building 637 Remedial Action Status Update**



**Date: Thursday, September 26, 2013**

**Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

**Location: Mare Island Conference Center  
375 G St., Vallejo, CA**

**Ask questions and voice your concerns. You Can Make a Difference!**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:**

**Janet Lear, (619) 532-0976 or Myrna Hayes, (707) 249-9633**

Navy BRAC Web Page: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>

Mare Island Environmental Web Page: <http://www.mareisland.org>



# AGENDA

## MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD

### Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting No. 201

September 26, 2013 – Mare Island Conference Center  
375 G Street, Vallejo, CA

7:00 p.m.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> (Janet Lear, Myrna Hayes)	5 mins.
7:05	<b>Presentation:</b> <i>Crane Test Area North and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South Preliminary Assessment / Site Investigation Results and Remedial Investigation Field Work Overview</i> Mr. Christopher Dirscherl, Navy	25 mins.
	<i>Discussion</i>	5 mins.
7:35	<b>Presentation:</b> <i>Building 637 Remedial Action Status Update</i> Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island	25 mins.
	<i>Discussion</i>	5 mins.
8:05	<b>Public Comment Period</b>	5 mins.
8:10	<b>10-minute break</b>	10 mins.
8:20	<b>Administrative Business and Announcements</b> (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear)	
	a) July 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes	5 mins.
8:25	<b>Focus Group Reports/Discussion</b>	20 mins.
	a) Community (to be determined)	
	b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)	
	c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)	
	d) City Report (Mark O'Brien)	
	e) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)	
	f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)	
	g) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito/Carolyn d'Almeida/ Elizabeth Wells)	
8:45	<b>Co-chairs' Report</b> (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear)	10 mins.
8:55	<b>Public Comment Period</b>	5 mins.
9:00	<b>Adjourn</b>	

THE NEXT RAB MEETING WILL BE HELD December 5, 2013

***For more information concerning environmental restoration at Mare Island, contact:***

Janet Lear, BRAC Environmental Coordinator & Navy Co-chair (619) 532-0976;

Myrna Hayes, RAB Community Co-chair (707) 249-9633

Janet Naito, Department of Toxic Substances Control (510) 540-3833; Carolyn d'Almeida, US EPA (415) 972-3150;

Elizabeth Wells, Regional Water Quality Control Board, (510) 622-2440;

RAB Support Contractor: Jessica W. Cooper, Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC (415) 321-1782

Navy BRAC Web Page: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil>

Mare Island Environmental Web Page: <http://www.mareisland.org>

# **DRAFT**

## **MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD**

### **Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes**

**HELD THURSDAY, July 25, 2013**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 25<sup>th</sup>, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 9:34 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)
- Maurice Campbell
- Paula Tygielski
- Michael Coffey

**RAB Navy, Developers, Regulatory, and Other Agency Members in Attendance:**

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Carolyn D’Almeida (U.S. EPA)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Dan Marks (Economic Development Director – City of Vallejo)
- Brooks Pauly (Navy)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board)

**Community Guests in Attendance:**

- Mike Chamberlain
- Diana Dowling
- James DuCharme
- Jim Durkin
- Rick Pasterchik
- Mark O’Brien

**RAB Support from Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC:**

- Jessica W. Cooper (Sullivan International Group, Inc.)
- Wally Neville
- Kathleen Soloaga (Stenographer)

## I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

(Ms. D'Almeida is not present.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Welcome, everyone. Welcome to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board. We usually start with introductions. My name is Janet Lear. I am the Navy co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair, and I live in Vallejo.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, community member.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski –

MR. MARKS: Hold on a second.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski, community member from Benicia.

MR. MARKS: Dan Marks, and I'm the economic development director for the City of Vallejo.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, RAB member from American Canyon.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MS. COOPER: Jessica Cooper with Sullivan International Group.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston.

MS. PAULY: Brooks Pauly, support to the Navy.

MR. DuCHARME: James DuCharme. I am a resident on Mare Island.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain, Trihydro.

MR. DURKIN: Jim Durkin. I am a member of the public from El Cerrito.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mark O'Brien, support of the City.

MS. DOWLING: Diana Dowling, commissioner with the Economic Vitality Commission.

(Reporter requests clarification.)

MR. PASTERCHIK: I'm Rick Pasterchik, and I live in Glen Cove.

(Discussion held off the record.)

MS. DOWLING: Oh, my name? Diana Dowling.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Thanks, everyone.

## II. PRESENTATION: *Production Manufacturing Area/South Shore Area Munitions Non-Time-Critical Removal Action Fieldwork Summary* **Presentation by Ms. Brooks Pauly (Navy)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Let's go ahead and get started with our first presentation. This will be the Production Manufacturing Area, South Shore Area Munitions Non-Time-Critical Removal Action Fieldwork Summary; and Brooks Pauly, Navy RPM, will be presenting.

MS. PAULY: Good evening, everybody. Let's see. Now, how do we get this started? Oops. Which one is it? And then just – okay. Pardon the technical difficulties. There we go.

All right. So, okay. So as Janet mentioned, we'll be talking about the Production Manufacturing Area, South Shore Area Munitions Non-Time-Critical Removal Action, or something that we call the NTCRA, fieldwork, which was just completed; and so thank you for joining us tonight as we talk about this. All right.

So tonight I will give a brief history of the site usage, as I have in the past, especially for folks that are not familiar with the – what we call the PMA and the SSA, previous actions at the site and how those have shaped the conceptual site model, or CSM, relating to munitions at the two sites. So this conceptual site model has led us to the removal action which was described in the CERCLA decision document called the Action Memorandum, or AM. And now concepts are great, they are a great starting point, but when you get in the field, of course, you find additional information, and I will also talk about additional removals that we conducted in addition to what was scoped in the AM, so spoiler alert, obviously we removed a bit more. And then, finally, I will talk about potential future actions and questions if anyone has them. Okay.

So to start off, our site locations are the PMA, which is right here on the southeastern portion of the island, and then the SSA. The PMA was primarily, as its name implies, a production manufacturing area, and it was used for munitions production from 1857 up until the early '70s. South Shore Area was distinguished from the PMA in that it was a storage location and handling and support of the PMA, and so that was a little bit later. It started in the '30s and, of course, ended in the – '70s, as well. In the '80s and '90s, there were many emergency removals, so primarily removing munitions from the surface area of those two locations; and then once those were completed, the Navy started looking into subsurface munitions items through geophysical surveys, and those surveys – in particular, between 2003 and 2006, revealed over 30,000 metallic anomalies.

(Carolyn d'Almeida enters the meeting.)

MS. PAULY: So those are the two areas, and it's important to note that these areas were not used as firing ranges, so all munitions found in the past removals have been what we call discarded military munitions, or DMM. This is significant for our conceptual site model because DMM is typically much less dangerous than the alternative, which is unexploded ordnance, or UXO; and UXO, to get a little technical, is the term for munitions that have already been fired. And the reasons that munitions generally trigger are in – in like a two-step process, and so UXO, which has been fired, the first step of that process has already been overcome, so it triggers the mechanism and arms the munition, if you will. And then, of course, the second step is generally an impact, which then lets the munition explode. So DMM, again, has not been fired and, therefore, the trigger mechanism – isn't armed, and so it's generally considered less dangerous. And in many of the items we found, even the trigger mechanism was completely missing. And we found far, far less munitions and explosives of concern, or MEC items or DMM, than we found MDAS, which is munitions documented as safe.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Materiel.

MS. PAULY: Sorry. I'm sorry.

Materiel documented as safe.

Thank you, Janet.

And so generally these are pieces of munitions items that are not complete items, so they don't have the explosive munitions' constituents within them. Anyway, moving right along. So, again, we have talked about the PMA area, and the processes in this area were things like projectile and rocket warhead assembly and breakdown, propellant loading, powder bags, and cartridge cases, refurbishment, some storage, but as you can see in the photo here, handling along the piers, and so that loading and unloading history contributed to our conceptual site model having the expectation that more munitions would be found near the shoreline of these areas. And so in the pictures here, you can see the projectile refurbishment in particular. We haven't found any of the big ones like you see on the right there, but we have found some –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually, that's not so.

MS. PAULY: Oh, I'm sorry. During this – during this removal, we have not found any of the larger ones like you see in the – the gentleman to the right, but we have found some 5-inch rounds, like those shown on the left. Excuse me. Sadly, when we find them, they don't look as nice as they do in the photos here. So moving on to the South Shore Area, again this was more of a storage facility. It was created in the southern portion of the island from fill, and there was some loading that occurred down here. So, again, we would expect that these areas that our conceptual site model would – would indicate to us that munitions would be found along the shoreline areas in the south shore.

So this all led us to our conceptual site model; and, to recap, we expect that we'd find munitions near buildings where they were manufactured in the PMA and along the shoreline. We expect they would be primarily, from the previous removals that had been conducted, in the top 4 feet below ground surface. Again, from the previous removals, we did expect that they would be found in clusters, and we had supposed that they might be – might have been disposed of under buildings that had accessible crawl spaces, of which there were 15, and so we did investigate those areas, as well. And so we – you'll see in the next slide that we categorized the areas, for instance, here shown in the PMA, in two different categories, so we had Category A sectors and Category B sectors. Category A were the areas where we would more likely find munitions, – we would most likely expect that they would be there around the buildings, the shoreline, and where previous – as you can see in this slide here, where previous removals – okay, maybe not, but – I will walk over here. You can see these – the dots show where previous removals had been found, and it's quite hard to read on this screen but maybe you can see it on your slides there. In the category B area, the green areas on this slide, we wouldn't expect to find as many things.

And so, as always, the goal for our action memorandum, our decision document, was to reduce the hazards associated with munitions at both the PMA and the SSA. So the next slide here is the SSA. And you can see that the category A sectors were located along the shorelines, because that's where most of the storage was and also the loading and unloading, and that the previous removals, indicated by the dots on the figure there, show that that's where a lot of items had been found. So during this NTCRA, we were very fortunate to be able to go a little bit further and also investigate into the mudflats, which you will see a little bit more clearly on slide 12 with our results, along the shoreline and get even more munitions out of the area. So our scope of removal, as I had indicated or alluded to before, is that we would do a hundred percent investigation of anomalies that had been detected during the previous geotechnical surveys in the category A areas, 20 percent investigation of the anomalies in the category B areas, the locations were chosen such that they would be focused on areas with higher-density anomalies because of the idea and the conceptual site model that the munitions were found in clusters, and so that

biased our locations that we looked at in the category B areas to make sure that we were able to detect any munitions that were there. We did mostly find just metal debris and other scrap.

Continuing on with our site model, we did a hundred percent investigation under the buildings, so all of the anomalies that were detected under the buildings. And let's see, so to complete this fieldwork, we performed extensive biological monitoring and avoidance and controlled access to the area so the public was not exposed to the explosive safety exclusion zones, sometimes called EZ's or explosive arcs. And the subsurface anomalies that we did find during our investigation, we would do anomaly reacquisition, so you need to actually go back and find the anomalies that were detected in the previous surveys, so they would reacquire those anomalies and excavate them, down to 4 feet, and within a 2-foot radius of that original location or signal that they would reacquire.

And because our interest is to reduce the hazard, if we found items in these locations, we would follow that excavation laterally until it was cleared of munitions; and then sometimes we would actually go quite a bit deeper, when we found larger pits of munitions items, and we'll get to those photos later – or I should say figures later, and so those – those excavations actually went up to about 12 feet deep. And so this process would also involve what we call step out. So, if we found munitions items within category B areas, the areas where we thought it was much less likely to find munitions, we would then investigate in all the anomalies within 25-foot area of radius of that particular anomaly where we found the munitions. We would continue to step out if we continued to find munitions. And the idea is – was – to, again, reduce the hazard as much as possible by following this step-by-step process.

And so our completed removal action, we were happy to confirm our conceptual site model, and you will see that in the later slides. You will also see in the later slides that the site has been gridded, so when I refer to, for instance, grid AF-11, that's what I am talking about, is the grids that the whole sites have been segmented into. And so we completed the scoped anomaly investigations in the PMA, as well as the SSA, except for one – one pit in grid AF-11 in the SSA where we just – we ran out of – unfortunately, we ran out of funding. But before we actually found that pit, we were able to do additional area removals, like I had mentioned earlier, along the mudflats and in areas that had been restricted from the geophysical surveys from the 2003 to 2006 surveys. There were areas that had vegetation, other debris, and the Weston folks, in particular, were very good about helping us remove those obstacles so that we could get to those areas because they were along the shoreline, which was our category A areas.

And so you get to see our results. So, in this slide, you can see that the MEC, and I should say that's munitions and explosives of concern, as well as the MDAS, materiel documented as safe, but materiel documented as safe are also items that were identified as previously munitions, or parts of munitions, so they're not just scrap metal or other things like that. And you can see that they are mostly clustered along the shoreline. It's a little hard to see in this slide, but maybe you can see it a little better on your slide – in your handouts that the category A areas are in the red boundary lines. And so those are mostly along the shoreline.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you orient us to where the former pier was that went out into the river? Is this adjacent to that area?

MS. PAULY: I'm afraid I am not sure which pier. There were several piers.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well –

MS. PAULY: And are you –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but there are no visible piers now, no operating piers, but can you tell us whether these high concentrations were found at the footings or the anchorage of piers –

MS. PAULY: That's –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – or former piers.

MS. PAULY: That's a good question. I would need to go back and take a look at the other figures that we have that showed the piers and connect that up. Since we –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Connect the dots, maybe.

MS. PAULY: Exactly. Exactly.

MR. COFFEY: It looks very much like your picture.

MS. PAULY: Dwight, do you – are you –

MR. GEMAR: If you refer to the 11 by 17 –

MS. PAULY: Can you see it?

MR. GEMAR: – the old piers used to be in grid –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Use your microphone.

MR. GEMAR: Oh, sorry. In grid AH-23 and AJ-24, there were two piers that kind of went out in a kind of a triangular fashion.

MS. PAULY: Right. So right here.

MR. GEMAR: And so that was where we found the predominance of MDAS and MEC in the PMA, was, yeah, in those areas where there used to be piers going out into the river.

MS. PAULY: Thank you, Dwight. I was pretty sure that was the case, but without an actual map in front of me, I didn't want to make that assertion. All right. And so you can see that those are fairly well clustered, as well, and that the – only the occasional MDAS item is found in what we had termed the Category B areas. Similarly, in the SSA, you can see that the munitions were primarily found along the shoreline and in the category A areas. There were just so many that were found in that cluster there. But this is actually where I wanted to point out, too, that we did additional removals out into the mudflats. Again, the mudflats were excluded from our action – the scope of our action originally, but we were able to, through taking advantage of the low tides, access more anomalies and we did find, as you can see with the red dots here, some DMM in those locations. So we were happy to get that out of there. Moving right along. Speaking of the additional investigations and removals, – as we said, the 2003 and 2006 surveys were unable to reach certain areas because of obstacles, and we were able to remove some of those obstacles, including debris and vegetation, to survey certain areas that were beyond the scope of the AM. We were able to do that, to geophysically survey those areas. They did have anomalies, many of those were in the category A areas, and so we were able to do a hundred percent removal in those areas and then, again, access the mudflats at low tide. We did have increases in the estimated number of removals versus the actual completed removals towards the end, specifically, for example, the number of anomalies under the buildings had increased from what we had estimated from our initial scans and surveys of a couple three buildings which we thought were

representative. Um, we had estimated about 2,000 anomalies that went up to about 18,500, a little bit more than that, actually. And so we did a hundred percent removal.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is there a page where those numbers are shown in a grid or in a ...

MS. PAULY: I believe I did summarize a lot of this on slide – the removal statistics slide, 19.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you. I didn't want to try to take notes if you had already prepared a slide.

MS. PAULY: Oh, yeah. No worries. And I am jumping ahead a little bit, but it's just that I'm so excited. Okay. So we did anticipate that the munitions would be found in clusters, and, accordingly, the site provided us with nine pits that we found. And so, again, rather than just clear these pits to 4 feet, which is what was scoped in the decision document, we wanted to try to get as much materiel removed from the site as possible to reduce the hazard at the site as much as possible, and so, again, some of these pits were excavated down to 12 feet below ground surface. And so you will see in the figure here that we also found things like underground storage tanks in the South Shore Area. We also found some clusters of drums, which were interesting discoveries.

MR. PASTERCHIK: What was in the tanks; anybody know?

MS. PAULY: These tanks, in particular, appeared to be just water infiltration. They were all linked together, and they just had holes in them, so ...

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Water infiltration –

MS. PAULY: Storm water.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – was that from holes – it – purposely put in them, I mean –

MS. PAULY: It did – yes, it looked like they were designed that way.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay, just – yeah, 'cause the last time we had a presentation about those, you didn't really have a clue what they might have been used for, so ...

MS. PAULY: You are exactly right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As much as possible in your presentation, if you can – I know you are kind of excited, like you said, 'cause this seems like this is maybe the end of at least this phase, but, you know, just try to pace yourself here, because we are interested and I think the public will be concerned, and in going back to minutes and things like that in the future, I just want to have as much complete information as possible and in as serious a way as possible, like, you know, to you guys, this – these tanks meant kind of, "Oh, well, huh-uh, they just had water in them," but try to tell us as much as possible what – about these items as you are going through, just expecting that we never have seen any of this site at all.

MS. PAULY: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be great.

MS. PAULY: And I did want to point out, too, that with respect to the tanks, we – in addition to when we uncovered them and were able to see the predetermined – pre-made holes in them, we did go ahead and sample the soil underneath the tanks in order to confirm that there was no other impacts that might have come from the tanks or any surface run-off.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then the same with the drums, do you have any idea what the drums might have represented or did you – I am sure – I'm sure you sampled for that.

MS. PAULY: We did, and, unfortunately, they were so corroded that there weren't any labels on them. Many of them had corrosion holes in them and also purposeful holes in them. And we did sample under the – under the drums and did not find any impact, so – but that's a – that's a good point to make. And so you will be able to see in the next slide here, in the PMA, the additional survey areas. So these are just some examples of the survey areas. My pointer is working here. These areas in green are the category B additional areas; and category A, all right, in this slide, are shown in blue; and these were areas that had been previously unable to be surveyed because of various obstacles, and so we were able to go ahead and go into all of these areas and survey them and then remove the anomalies within them, accordingly. You see similar areas of additional survey done in the – in the SSA. Again, these are – you can see that in addition to these sort of more land-side areas, we – and as you could see on slide 12, as I mentioned before, we were able to go far into these grids, so like AH-10 and AG-9, to investigate anomalies that were in the mudflats areas, as well.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How did you decide to go into those mudflat areas? It looks like you went rather extensively. Did you throw more money at the job, or did the contractor just get eager, like it sounds like you are, enthusiastic and they couldn't stop or –

MS. PAULY: Well, no, it certainly – it certainly wasn't –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I am being a little bit facetious, but tell us how you got to that – what your process was, your thought process and your decision-making process, regarding expanding into those areas, because it seems like it paid off.

MS. PAULY: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There is some pretty high concentrations of munition items or actually munitions and explosives of concern.

MS. PAULY: Absolutely, and the thought process just goes back to the conceptual site model, so once we started finding munitions at the shoreline, we knew that it was likely there would be munitions at the shoreline, and we were able – again, previously we couldn't access those areas. We were able to amend the contract with a little bit more money to try to access those areas, and so – and that's exactly how we – we came to that, and then it did pay off. All right. So just some more –

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And I just have to say that Weston was quite enthusiastic.

MR. GEMAR: And probably one clarification. As enthusiastic as we were, the original site boundary was estimated from basically tide charts to determine what the, quote, unquote, walkable or accessible area was, but during the summer months especially, we determined that you could actually walk, you know, further out into the channel at low tide; and so after consultation with the Navy, you know, they agreed that we should investigate those areas because you could access those areas at low tide, and that's how the boundary essentially was expanded to capture those areas. And we were excited.

MS. PAULY: Exactly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I might note that unfortunately, I – it sounds, in the end, like that was a good idea, given that the other people that could easily access those areas were copper thieves. I

do remember that that was one of their main entry points to the South Shore Area by land and by sea, but they had gotten particularly skilled at using that low tide to move in, from what I have heard, PVC pipe-type sleds where they then raided copper off the buildings along there. So if we're attempting to protect the public without prejudice, that was worthy of you to go out there and retrieve.

MS. PAULY: That's a good point. So in the next slide, example photographs; – for instance, on the left, we have one of the pits in the SSA where we found quite a lot of materiel all clustered together and very deep, and then a photo of some of the drums that were found in the SSA. And on the next two slides, you will see again the drums and disposal pits that we found. In particular, the PMA, we were happy to see that there were far less disposal and drums that were in the PMA, so that kind of went along with our conceptual site model that the PMA was manufacturing and that a lot of the storage and/or potentially disposal was in the SSA, and you definitely do see more of those in the SSA in the next slide here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I hate to keep interrupting you, but I have a question for you. You know how we had, in other parts of the island, dredge outfall pipe areas with high concentration of munition items? I am just curious whether you ever found any site that appeared to be a dredge – possibly a dredge pipe outfall – because I had some firsthand account of piping that was put up – set up after World War II that went around the end of the – end of the island, and I'm not sure where it ended up, but I was just wondering if you found anything that looked like that.

MS. PAULY: Well, there's different – during this particular investigation, we did see some piping but it was determined to be storm-drain piping.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I am not talking about piping, I just said outfall.

MS. PAULY: Oh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We found an outfall site or more than one outfall site.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You mean, are you talking about the outfall masses that we found?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah –

maybe not the, you know, those dinosaur-dropping things, those pounded masses, 'cause this wouldn't have been used over a long period of time necessarily. But if you found, you know, any kind of mixed debris in a – in a pretty, you know, concentrated area that could have been – would that have had similar characteristics to time periods in which the dredge ponds were used?

MS. PAULY: We did find one small mass similar to those found at outfalls, but it looked like it had been moved to the shoreline riprap area, possibly as a way to stabilize the shoreline.

MS. PAULY: And so in this figure, you can definitely see that we had quite a few pits. Just for clarification on your handouts there, the numbers in parentheses are the numbers of either the pits, drums, items that we – that we found in that location. And let me just point out, too, while I'm mentioning it, AF-11 was one of the last pits we were trying to go after and complete. It just happened to be – it's actually right here, and there were two pits in AF-11. We got one of them, but the second pit that we found through a step-out just was a lot deeper and wider than we could handle with our current funding and in this current funding environment, so that was the one that got away this time. All right. So moving along.

Some removal statistics, and this is the slide I had mentioned earlier for you, Myrna, of the approximately 20,000 scoped locations in the open-area locations, so not under buildings, we actually ended up with about 26,000-plus locations that we investigated primarily because of the additional areas we were able to survey and then access into the mudflats, specifically. Within those open areas, we found a thousand and ten MEC items, so that's actually a pretty small percentage, I think that comes out to around 2 percent of the holes that we investigated. The underbuildings, as I was mentioning earlier, we had estimated approximately 2,000 anomalies under those 15 buildings, and we ended up finding 18,000-plus and removing a hundred percent of those. Within that 18,000, we only found 113 munitions items, so that was good.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you tell us what these munition items were under the buildings?

MS. PAULY: I do have that in another table, but I don't have that with me. So we – I know we had found some 20 millimeter, in particular I believe we found a 4-inch round, a lot of grains, so things like that, and some small arms.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Would it be counted in that number?

MS. PAULY: No. Sorry. The small arms would not be counted.

MR. GEMAR: A lot of fuses.

MS. PAULY: A lot of fuses.

MS. PAULY: So those are the stats, and as you can see, – the photo on the lower left is the gentleman working under one of the building locations and then on the right is one of the open-area locations that was not a pit. And continuing on with our removal statistics, of which there are many, we were happy to find 11,000-plus MDAS items, materiel documented as safe. Over 32,000 small arms. We did about 3,000 step-outs, so when we found munitions item within a category B area, we would step out. There were over 6,000 total category B locations that were investigated, about 18,000 that existed in the whole of the category B area that was out there. And so as our – our target for our removal action was 20 percent in the category B, to confirm our conceptual site model. We ended up with over 35 percent, actually. So – and then it –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And why did you – can you, again, for the record – you tell us why you went from 20 to 35?

MS. PAULY: Absolutely. It was because that – our goal was to reduce the hazard as much as possible. We had the concept in the category B area that we would be less likely to find a munition, but if we found a munition, especially a lot of these were found at the edges of category A areas, then we would step out the 25 feet, do a hundred percent investigation of all the anomalies within that 25 feet and then do further removals if we found more munitions. If we didn't find more munitions, we would just stop, but that's exactly why. And so we did find over 800 tons of non-munitions debris, so construction debris, railroad ties, nails, rebar, things like that. And that was also removed from the site and recycled.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that was not just metallic debris.

MS. PAULY: That's correct, it's not just metallic debris. Included within that were things like – struggling with the word – timbers is what I am thinking of, so wood, a lot of wood debris, as well as other things.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you have a breakout of what – that’s a massive, humongous number, and I would expect that, given the huge piles we did see, but do you have an idea of what percentage was metallic debris, since that’s what you were actually going after?

MS. PAULY: Correct, and it was primarily metallic. I don’t have the exact percentage, but I could try to look that up. So do you have any sense of that at this point, it’s –

MR. GEMAR: It was almost all metallic, I mean –there was some treated wood disposal, tires.

MS. PAULY: The tires, that was the other thing.

MR. GEMAR: Junk. But mostly metallic debris.

MS. PAULY: Okay. We found over four tons of munitions debris, as well. An important point to point out on the statistics is that, while we were surveying, or I should say scanning, for radiologicals, because in the past removals, there had been one radiological deck marker that had been found in the SSA through this entire process, the entire scope of the work, we scanned for the safety of the workers and also to make sure that we found anything if there was anything there in the PMA and the SSA, and we found zero radiological items. As I mentioned earlier, the underground storage tanks, we found those three that were clustered together in the south shore, and then, of course, the nine disposal pits of which we got 8 and then the 42 drums. So we – as I mentioned earlier or alluded to earlier, as we investigated this area and did the removals and while this removal action is complete, there were discoveries during the fieldwork which will require future action. These areas, as I mentioned before, are the pit at AF-11 which is a little bigger than we had anticipated, and then the area along the shoreline west of the SSA, which you can see in this figure, and especially in the – what we’re calling the Z grids here where we found some shell casings and that mass that Myrna asked about earlier, was right here. It does look like an outfall mass, but it doesn’t look like this is an outfall area. It looks like that mass was placed within the riprap. Okay. See if we can make this work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: One other thing, future area, maybe I’m – so all of this future area work, am I wrong, it would all be in the south shore, it would be – you are not recommending any in the PMA?

MS. PAULY: That’s correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what about the Pier 35 area, is that, as far as you’re concerned, complete?

MS. PAULY: On the land side?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, on the pier itself.

MS. PAULY: Yeah, that’s – that is my understanding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On the roadway or on its banks or ...

MS. PAULY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That’s a yes to two different things.

MS. PAULY: The roadway and the banks, my understanding is those have been surveyed and cleared.

MR. GEMAR: Yes. On – yeah, out to Pier 35, that area was surveyed and removal done. Out under the pier, for example, that is always under water. So that would be IA K.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, so we didn't go there, obviously, but ...

MS. PAULY: Is that – did I answer your question, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MS. PAULY: Okay. So hoping this will work, guys. I was saying that the NTCRA project ended with a controlled bang, which you will see here. Well, apparently I'm not going to see it. How about this. Ah, there it is, hiding there. Is the video not on there? Oh, there it is. Yeah, that's good.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, we'll wait.

MS. PAULY: Okay, well –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This is the best part.

MS. PAULY: After all this, do we have the sound? As you can see, this was our demolition at what we call the – the OBOD range, or the open burn/open detonation range.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, definitely play it again. Does it have the sound up?

MS. PAULY: Do we have the sound?

MS. COOPER: (Nodding head.)

MS. PAULY: Sorry I didn't bring bigger speakers.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You might want to elaborate on what everyone is seeing here.

MS. PAULY: Exactly. So what you are seeing here is that the MEC items, the discarded military munition items, were demolished using an explosive detonator charge at our – what we call the OBOD range.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do it again. Do it again.

MR. MARKS: Put the microphone on it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did you hear it? "Fire in the hole." Gotta hear that part.

MR. COFFEY: Looks like a geyser.

MS. PAULY: It's a little – and, of course, you see it before the sound gets there, which is kind of cool.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Many, many years ago, I took a class, a whole training, that's when they used to give us those kinds of things, on munitions. And Doug Murray, I've mentioned his name many times, he had inserted his video and, for the first time, technology, he could do that, um, maybe it was actually at the RAB in Denver, – RAB co-chairs' conference, and we just asked him to play it over and over again. The whole room said, "Play it again! Play it again!" 'cause it was a lot of – I don't know why, it was a lot of fun.

MS. PAULY: It is a lot of fun.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually, in his case, the demo he was showing was Soviet tanks being blown up.

MR. COFFEY: Well, no, that's more cool.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was very cool, and how easy it was to do. I don't know what that's like.

MS. PAULY: All right. So let's see if I can get it to – oh, no, now we're on the video, aren't we? Here we go. Okay. So just – nope, still on the – all right.

So just as a cap, our updated project schedule, we have completed the field operations, like I said, as of this week; and then the draft removal action completion reports will be in September.. Are there any other questions? Well, just to give credit where credit is due, this is the Weston team in the wetlands areas with the silt fence up for protection of the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse. Thank you guys very much. Oh, and acronyms at the end if you need them.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And I just want to take the opportunity to really thank Weston for a really great job.

MS. PAULY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, and they are not very often at our Restoration Advisory Board but Battelle was your other contractor, and I imagine you have other subs on that project; and I am equally thankful to Weston for the effort you've made, since you have been the sole contractor, along with the Navy, both parties for working with the Shoreline Heritage Preserve to ensure public access on a regular basis. It's made all the difference. Friday, we had a couple come for their like 23rd or 29th anniversary, who's counting, – picnic, I mean. He just got up in the morning in Lodi, they run an 85-horse, you know, horse-ranch thing, you know, rental thing, or whatever that is called, where the horses stay there and they get paid money for it, and they were kind of like over the – sick and tired of some horse owners. And he just said, "Let's go to the coast." The coast was too far for the amount of time they could be away, and so he found the preserve and showed up with a giant picnic lunch and lots of surprises to, you know, amaze and amuse his wife and their dogs and all of that. But that would have been a tremendous disappointment if, like the summer before, people arrived and the gate was locked and there was no alternative. So it's made all the difference in the world to have a contractor and the Navy working closely with us rather than just letting us hang out there, so I thank you very much for that.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Recent Site Investigation Activities and Results Summary, Buildings 116 and 386, Investigation Area C2, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel***  
**Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So now we have Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island, give our second presentation, recent site investigation activities at Building 116 and 386.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't think you can top this presentation. Neal, do you have videos?

MR. SILER: Nope, no videos.

MR. COFFEY: No blowing up things? Some buildings that should be blown up?

MR. SILER: I will bring something the next time to blow up.

MR. GEMAR: Probably have some buildings that should be blown up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They've done enough already. Don't go there.

MR. SILER: Okay. So what I am going to talk about are some recent investigations –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Microphone, please.

MR. SILER: – that we've performed –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Please, please.

MR. SILER: – in Investigation Area C2, which is one of the most heavily industrialized areas of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel; and the way I'm going to do that is I'm going to talk about – just like I usually do, I'm going to give you a description of the site, each of the sites. I'm going to give you some background information on how we got here at this place in time. I'm going to discuss those recent investigations and the results of those investigations and then give you an idea of the path forward; and if you have any questions after that, please feel free to ask them or you can ask them during the presentation as we move along.

So the first site is Building 116, which is located in the northwestern portion of investigation area C2. The building was constructed in 1905. It covers an area of about 61,600 square feet. It's a two-story building constructed of wood and steel with a concrete foundation. The vast majority of the floor itself is covered with wood blocks, about 90 percent of it is covered with wood blocks. There's about 10 percent that's covered with asphalt and concrete and a couple other areas where there is actually some asbestos tiles, and I will show you those as we move along during the presentation. So the next slide – the first slide you saw, you saw the outside of the building. This shows you the inside of the building. It doesn't show up real well here because the lights are a little bright, but –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hint. Because the photos are a little dark.

MR. SILER: Yeah, this portion right here is the main bay. You are looking actually to the west of the building in here. This is one of the ancillary portions of it. This was called the tool-crib area located on the south side of the building, and then you can see the wood blocks in the floor right here, this area right here. So, this slide kind of goes over what I talked about when I was describing the building. It was used as a production shop from 1905 to 1973. It had a sheet metal operation, including a welding shop, but with the construction of Building 1310, which is located a little bit farther to the west of this – southwest of this facility, they moved the main production shop, the metal – sheet-metal operation to that, and they kept Building 116 as an auxiliary sheet-metal shop until the base closed in 1996. And as I had mentioned, this area was a heavily industrialized portion of Mare Island, and the future land use will continue that industrial commercial character.

So how did we get here?

A lot of the investigations that were performed in this building were performed in 1995. In March 1995, the Navy collected about 90 solid media and wipe samples from the first floor of the building, and mainly that was wood-block, wood-chip samples. When they did that sampling, though, it's kind of interesting, I'm going to move a little bit forward here on a couple of the slides, and this actually is a representation of that sampling. While they did a lot of sampling, it's hard to correlate what they did because a lot of the information was lost. A lot of times there'll be a location, but it won't have a concentration. A lot of times there will be a concentration, but they can't tell you exactly what media they took it in. Sometimes there is a location but there's no data. It just says we took a sample here, but we're not exactly sure what media we took it of and what the concentration was. So to be able to come up with some sort of a plan to remediate this building, and we knew there were PCBs in here, in fact, the highest concentration of PCBs

was collected right here at this site called 5060-0066, and they had a solid media sample of 62.6 milligrams per kilogram of polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs, in the wood-block floor. Now, our commercial industrial cleanup standard is 0.74 milligrams per kilogram. In addition, one of the things the Navy did in here was, instead of taking solid media samples – and you will see a lot of these NDs here – they took wipe samples, and that’s probably not really appropriate when you are trying to characterize a site to figure out exactly what you have to do to clean it up. So we have to go back in and take solid media samples at this site.

In addition to that, we wanted to see, because there’s both a – what’s called a Toxic Substance Control Act portion of this work that U.S. EPA oversees, and there’s a CERCLA, or the Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act [sic], that DTSC oversees as part of the PCB program, needed to make sure we characterized whatever we had in the media in the floor both inside the building and outside the building. Myrna, you have a question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, did this, then, end up – did you take this information collected at face value when you were putting together your original proposal for the eastern early transfer, or did you end up with this being unknown?

MR. SILER: It’s a little bit of both. It’s really kind of interesting, because this was designated to be a site where the presumed remedy was to actually use the foundation of the floor as a cap. Now, to do that, you have to know what the concentrations are in that material in the floor itself and to see if anything got out of the floor.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm.

MR. SILER: Well, they really didn’t have enough information to tell you to do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm.

MR. SILER: And then, on top of that, in 2004, there was some additional sampling done that was done in this tool-crib area because when the Navy did this work – and I don’t know why this was the way it was, they said that this area was locked, but it was their property in 1995. So we had to go in here and take a look, and some additional samples were collected in here in 2004, all solid media samples, and all had PCBs in the wood block.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm.

MR. SILER: And then we also wanted to make sure that we were being able to get a real good idea of what was going on in this site. So what we did was we grid the floor – sorry?

MR. CAMPBELL: Neal, I was going to ask you, a grid wasn’t done before at all?

MR. SILER: No, no. In fact, it’s real interesting, because what they did was... Sometimes it was a sample of an oil generator, an oil – it was an oil sample and you report oil in milligrams per kilogram, just like you do a solid media sample.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. SILER: So sometimes, I couldn’t tell you if – it said I had a milligram-per-kilogram result, but I couldn’t tell you – I couldn’t tell you because they couldn’t tell me what media they took it out of and where it was, if it was oil or if it was solid media. So it was hard to tell, so I couldn’t trust the data.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure.

MR. SILER: And what they did was they just looked at oil-stained areas. They didn't look at any areas outside of the oil-stained areas. And if you look at the samples – let's go back one more time here. I mean, it said these things were specific oil-stained areas. This looks like the entire floor was one big oil-stained area.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mm-hmm.

MR. SILER: And so it's just kind of interesting how they did this. Now, they did some cleanup actions, too, and that was all done based on this one sample of 62.6 milligrams per kilogram. They believe that the source of that was an oil-filled generator that was sitting right on top of this area, so they actually removed that oil-filled generator, decontaminated it, and took it offsite; and then they came back and they actually did some washing of that area where they found the 62.6 milligrams per kilogram. And after they washed that area, they came back and took another sample and they came up with 21 milligrams per kilogram. So, I mean, again, they were trying to clean some stuff up, but that doesn't meet our needs today where we have to be able to meet the 0.74-milligram-per-kilogram standard that we need to be able to put this building back into commercial/industrial reuse.

MR. PASTERCHIK: Where did all of that PCB come from?

MR. SILER: It's in the oil that they use, and they use a lot of waste oil. They just recycled a lot of oil.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's – and it's just – the oil is for cooling equipment?

MR. SILER: Equipment for cooling, yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cooling the oil that –

MR. SILER: It's cooling the oil, probably for a lot of lubrication. If they had oil, they just used it. So, what we needed to do was come up with a plan to characterize both the wood blocks, the concrete underneath the wood block, some of the asphalt areas that were in the surface, some of the concrete areas in the surface. So what we did was we came up with a 40- by 40-foot grid along the entire building; collected about 33 wood block, asphalt, concrete surface samples; collected samples of the concrete subfloor underneath it where that was appropriate; and where it was appropriate, we actually drilled through the concrete floor and took soil samples underneath that. So the next few slides will show you what we did. Here they are doing the concrete flooring up here – whoops, sorry, in the upper left. There they are actually collecting a soil sample in the middle, and they are documenting the soil sample they took in the lower right-hand corner. So now the next like four or five slides show you the information that we were able to collect, and this is the wood-block floor right here. As you can see, a large portion of the wood-block floor does contain polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs, above the cleanup level. The highest concentration we got was this right here, was about 207.4 milligrams per kilogram, right in this corner. So pretty much this entire floor is contaminated with PCBs.

MR. PASTERCHIK: Were there a lot of ailments and injuries or sicknesses of the people working in there with this PCB?

MR. SILER: That, I really don't know, sir, if there was or not. I really don't have any of the kind of health statistics. So this right here is the concrete and asphalt subfloor beneath the wood block and, as you can see, it's a much smaller area that would require anything to be done. It's very – just some sporadic areas. You can see back in here you've got some areas, and then this was the

highest concentration in the wood block. This, again, is the highest concentration in the subfloor. This is 19.32 milligrams per kilogram. So there's going to be some areas here that are going to require some additional cleanup in the subfloor. And then the one slide that is missing here, just so you know, and I will just describe it to you, and the reason we didn't prepare it was because there's really nothing to show you, and that is the soil underneath it. Every sample of the soil underneath it was either non-detect or it was a very low level, and the highest concentration we got in the soil underneath the slab floor was 0.132 milligrams per kilogram. And just so you know, the unrestricted or residential land use cleanup level is 0.22 milligrams per kilogram. So that's the good news.

The soil really doesn't have anything as far as PCBs in it, so we really don't have to look at that in the future. But because we knew we had – these were spills from oil, we wanted to take some petroleum hydrocarbon, and the TPH just means total petroleum hydrocarbon results. So this, again, is the concrete subfloor, and you can see there's very, very small areas that we're going to have to look at in the concrete subfloor. We got just one right there, actually. It's kind of interesting that this is the area where we had the highest PCBs. We didn't see anything there, but we got one right there. It was the high spot. So it's very, very few areas that we're going to have to look at in the concrete subfloor. And then we also wanted to look – I'm sorry. That's the concrete subfloor. You can see there's more than one area, there's a few areas we had to look at. And then just in the soil itself, there was only one area that we had to look at. Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, before you jump to your next building, 'cause I jumped ahead here, can you just tell us a path forward for –

MR. SILER: That's coming – that's coming at the end.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, at the end? We have to wait? Okay.

MR. SILER: You will have to wait. I know you are excited. I know –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's the theme of the night, the theme of the night, for sure.

MR. SILER: But I will get there, don't worry. So those were results when we did the characterization of Building 116.

So what I'm going to talk about now is Building 386, and Building 386, again, is in the south-central portion of investigation area C-2. It is a very large industrial building made out of concrete and steel, superstructure, having a dirt, gravel, concrete, and asphalt foundation or floor in the building itself. This building was constructed in 1919, and it was used as a forge shop and a metal operation, metal – sheet-metal operation in the building up until the time that the Navy left. And as the Navy left, this – this entire complex, this is part of what is called Building 386, 388, and 390, was taken over by another metal-working private entity called XKT, and they are actually using this building right now for storage. So –

MS. TYGIELSKI: What did you say before sheet metal?

MR. SILER: Forge shop. Forge. So they had – they had forge, forges in there. Smelting metal. It's too bad you can't see these up on the – on the facility, but this is what the building looked like, the layout looked like, before we – removing equipment and did any remediation, but there's a huge furnace sitting right there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What did you do with the furnace?

MR. SILER: Furnace was – we tested all of the materials in the furnace and all of the material that was in the building. We made sure it didn't have any lead-based paints, any PCBs on it, any oil. Anything that did have that, we decontaminated and it was actually recycled at Alcoa Metals. You can't see it here, but right behind this furnace, there is an old steel press, and that steel press was steam-driven. Believe it or not, it was driven by steam. So this is what the building looked like when we were doing the remediation. This is the actually southern dirt – it's called the southern dirt area. We stayed up many hours o' night to come up with these names for these certain areas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: ASDA.

MR. SILER: We actually, you know, really had to use our imagination for this one. But this is what it looked like when we were doing the remediation and they're excavating materials out, and you can see all these concrete blocks that we come across when we were doing that or some piece of equipment sat on while this building was in operation. It's the foundation for it.

And then that's what the building looked like after we removed all of the equipment and performed this main remediation in the building. This next slide just tells you what I talked about. Again, this building is going to be used for an industrial purpose in the future. So how we got here was that this building contains the normal constituents of concern on the eastern early transfer parcel that make up what I call the "devil's food cake mix" of the island. That's petroleum hydrocarbons; PCBs; and metal, mainly lead.

In 2010, our contractor performed a major remediation of a number of areas in the building; and, again, the sources of these constituents came from the operation of itself. We had a lot of heavy equipment in there. There was a 2,000-ton press in there. There was a number of 550-ton presses in there, a number of forges, a number of furnaces. So the whole metal – sheet-metal operation, the metal-working operation that was going on in there contributed to that. We only had one polychlorinated biphenyls site in the building. That was actually in the pit for the 2,000-ton hydraulic press that was remediated in 2010. We couldn't find any underground storage tanks in the building.

But we knew there was what's called a fuel oil pipeline system or what we called the FOPL system in the building, but the only FOPL that shows up on any of the Navy drawings is aboveground. In fact, if you look at the drawings, what it looks like, it has big expansion loops in it, so you know it's aboveground; and then there was a report done back in 2001 that confirmed that the fuel oil pipeline system only was aboveground and fed into all the equipment from an aboveground system.

But as you come to work on Mare Island, you find out that anytime you put a shovel in the ground here, you can and probably will find anything and everything. So what we found when we were actually doing these excavations – I will show you where the excavations were and show you how we found this in a minute – we found six pipelines that appeared to be additional underground fuel oil pipelines. So as we did this remediation and we buttoned everything up, the regulatory agencies asked us to go back and take a look at these fuel oil pipelines that we had no idea were in the building before we actually did the remediation. So what we did – and this slide here shows you the actual extent of the 2010 removal activities, these areas that are outlined in blue. This is the southern dirt-floor area, this is the northern dirt-floor area, and this is the former quench-tank area up in here. That's where the major excavations occurred in the building, in Building 386. And then what this slide shows you right here, if you look at any of these areas,

again, this is the southern dirt-floor area, this is the northern dirt-floor area, and this is the quench-tank area, you can see where these oil pipelines were found in the building itself. There's a number right here, there was a couple in this little removal area, too, right here. Luckily enough, we didn't find anything in this area, and then we found another one that went through the northern portion of the former quench-tank area.

MR. CAMPBELL: Neal, if I understand you correctly, the building plans that you had did not show this at all.

MR. SILER: Didn't show it at all.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's incredible.

MR. SILER: Only shows – I went back and found a plan from 1920 and one from 1924, and it showed only the aboveground –

MR. CAMPBELL: Aboveground, sure.

MR. SILER: – fuel oil pipeline system that fed anything in the building.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. SILER: Okay. So what we wanted to do was – first thing we wanted to do was determine what's the extent of the issue that we have here, because we have to figure out exactly where all of these pipelines went and then figure out what we're going to do from that point as we characterize them. What we did was, we excavated the termini that we knew of each of the pipelines, then we put an electronic tracer on them. We traced them as far as we could with the electronic tracer; and then when we found the end of the signal, we lost the signal, we went and did another excavation in that area and we took samples at both ends, both termini, of each pipeline unit. And as we went through it, we actually did some additional areas that we found that we wanted to investigate. And so we also did some other things. There were a few minor sections that we found. We found some oil in some of those sections. We actually flushed and cleaned those, those pipes. We video-logged as many pipes as we could, the pipelines we could that weren't corroded. Because we found a number of these pipelines were so terribly corroded that if you touched them, they just basically kind of fell apart, and that would make sense because this building was constructed in 1919. Those pipelines have probably been here for 94 years, so they are probably not in good shape. I know I wouldn't be in good shape in 94 years, so you can only imagine what these pipelines are like.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Says who?

MR. SILER: So, one of the things we also found, if you remember correctly, we didn't know of any underground storage tanks in this building, but, of course, I stick a shovel in the ground, I found something strange, I found an underground storage tank. It's one of the strangest underground storage tanks I have ever found on the island. So, what this slide shows you is just some pictures of some of the things we did. You can see there is a – this one up in the upper right-hand corner, you can see where we had the video camera inside the pipe and you can see the oil in the pipe. We actually drained that oil out and then flushed it with a screen to get it out of there. There's an area where we actually did a vacuum test on some of these pipes that seemed to be in pretty good condition, but in the two places where we did the vacuum test, they both failed the vacuum test. And then this is the underground storage tank that we saw right here, and it – you can see where it was located right here. It had this valve on it. It goes up towards the

north here. This is about a 4-foot-thick concrete piece. It looks like they didn't pour it on top of it, that they put the tank underneath the concrete. And then when you go on the north side of this, this reduces down to 12 inches, and it seems to go a little bit to the north here, so what this exactly was, we're not sure. We didn't see any indication of petroleum hydrocarbons in the tank. We didn't see any indications of hydrocarbons in the 12-inch pipe on the north side of it. So this may have been something to do with the – some water that they used in the building, but we didn't see anything at all that led us to believe that there was any petroleum hydrocarbons in this tank.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: An old cemetery?

MR. SILER: Could be, but I doubt it. So the next slide, this is again this – this Removal Area 2 or the northern dirt-floor area, and you can see there's pipes that we found in very, very poor condition in here. We did take some samples in here, as well as a number of areas along these pipelines. This sample location G right here, it had the highest concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons that we found, about 9200 petroleum hydrocarbons of diesel and about 6100 of motor oil. In the southern dirt-floor area, the highest concentration we found was about 1100 diesel and about 2600 motor oil. And then moving along to the north, again this shows you two other areas.

If you could really see this, discern this, this pipe just almost falls apart if you take it out. It at least has enough structure to go across there, but its entire bottom has been corroded out. Same as this pipe right here. At this location, the highest concentration we found was about 990 milligrams per kilogram diesel. But you can see here we were able to electronically trace this pipe as it goes up here. It's real confusing, too, because inside here, one of the things we're picking up, there's a roof drain system inside the building for those roof drains that come down, and then there's a sloping water pipeline that comes down this area, too, and feeds out into the storm sewer, also. So we think we found everything in the building, the extent of it in the building, so hopefully we'll be able to go ahead and do some additional work inside the building to characterize some additional materials and also perform the remediation plan.

So now, Myrna, back to your question on the path forward.

So in Building 116, we still have some additional investigative tasks to do. We've got – there's a couple areas where we still had asbestos-containing tiles. We're gonna move those out, go ahead and collect wood, concrete, and soil samples underneath those areas. We're also going to try to evaluate the lateral and vertical extent, in addition that one area where we found TPH in the soil, there was a couple areas in concrete we need to look at. But after that, we're gonna prepare a cleanup plan to deal with the PCBs and petroleum hydrocarbons. We're going to implement that plan, probably remediate, remove the wood-block floor, pressure wash or scabble, remove the concrete where we found PCBs and petroleum hydrocarbons and then go down and take a look at the area and the extent of hydrocarbons and either remove the soil with TPH over the cleanup goals. And for diesel, it's 500 milligrams per kilogram. For motor oil, it's 2500 milligrams per kilogram.

MR. PASTERCHIK: Sir, what's the anticipated time from today?

MR. SILER: Well, this will probably take – getting this through the system, this will take six months to a year to get it through the entire system. Then we'll backfill, restore the floor, document the cleanup plan, and request no further action for this site.

MR. CAMPBELL: Neal, I have a question for you.

MR. SILER: Sure, Maurice.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did you have an estimated budget before on what this cleanup was gonna be and to what it is now?

MR. SILER: No, we didn't have any budget for this, because the problem was, since we didn't have a lot of data we could trust –

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. SILER: – I couldn't tell you what it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. SILER: I did – years ago, I tried to look at this and I came up with a whole range of potential costs of what it could be, and it's something like anywhere, considering everything that had to be done from the characterization to the finding out what we have and if we didn't have to do anything, just put in, like, say, you know, it would have cost probably a couple hundred thousand dollars, if we just had to characterize it as everything was unclean. If we had to put a land-use covenant on it, we were able to close it off like that, it jumped up to about \$600,000; and then if we had to remove everything out of it, the entire floor, everything like that, I think the highest cost was about two and a half million dollars.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. And also the time frame.

MR. SILER: Time frame. Again, it's gonna take about six months to a year to do all that.

MR. CAMPBELL: And –

MR. SILER: One – one –

MR. CAMPBELL: – your estimation before.

MR. SILER: That – that's about what I would estimate it would take before, too.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. SILER: So moving along to Building 386, again, we still have some additional investigative tasks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So –

MR. SILER: Sorry, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – to interrupt, Neal, for the folks who are here, just a reminder, that that cost is borne by the Navy, because the contaminants got there on their watch. So people might be wondering, who pays the bill? So just a reminder, that the people – the citizens of Vallejo, for example, do not – are not going to be paying for this cleanup.

MR. SILER: Okay. So in Building 386, we still have some additional investigative tasks. We need to look along the pipeline trace, make sure that we're characterizing those properly, evaluate the lateral – the extent of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil, prepare a work plan, clean up

the petroleum hydrocarbons above the cleanup goal, again backfill the excavations, document the work that we did, and work concluded. So that's the end of my presentation. If anybody has any questions, additional questions, I would be glad to answer them right now.

Okay. Well, thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Neal. This brings us to our first public comment period. Do we have any public comments? All right. We have a ten-minute break.

(Recess taken.)

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Looks like it's about time to get started again. So we are at administrative business and announcements. First thing, I wanted to remind the community members that the Navy sent out an interview question list, as well as a list of potential interviewees for the community involvement plan, sent it out by e-mail on the 21st of June. If you have any comments or further input on that, we would like to get your input in the next week or so, because we will be starting to schedule interviews.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you resend it, please?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Certainly, I can resend that. And then meeting minutes, as always get any comments that you have on the meeting minutes to Myrna or myself. Did you have any? Okay.

#### **V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So we are at focus group reports. We don't have a community or natural resources technical group.

##### **a) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Paula, do you have anything to report?

MR. COFFEY: How was your mobile home trip?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, technically how did the RVs do?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay. The road trip did not happen. The 1972 motor home, there is a problem with the Edelbrock fuel pump, so it didn't make it out of town.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Did you actually get on the road and start heading?

MS. TYGIELSKI: We got on the freeway, and then the fuel pump just sputtered, and we – no, the fuel injection sputtered and we slowed down to nothing and crept off the next exit.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Shortest vacation ever.

MS. TYGIELSKI: No, no. We did manage to get – we did manage to get to Gatlinburg, Tennessee, but it was on – we took an airplane to Atlanta; and the only road trip was on the freeway between Atlanta, Georgia, and Tennessee, in a rental car.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: As long as you got to go, right?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Mm-hmm. We did get to go.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Wonderful.

MS. TYGIELSKI: So that's what I have to say.

**b) City Report**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Our next report is the City report, and Dan was very kind to come and speak to us a little bit and answer some questions from the RAB. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Janet. Is this thing on? I guess it is. It's just very quiet. First of all, just let me introduce myself. For those of you who don't know me, I am Dan Marks. I am the interim, I want to emphasize that, interim Economic Development Director for the City of Vallejo. What that means is that I was brought on board while they went forward with a recruitment to replace Ursula Luna-Reynosa, who was the previous economic development director and left relatively quickly to another job April 15th. So I have been with the City since April 15th and will probably be with the City until the fall sometime when the recruitment is completed and they have found my replacement. I will not be that replacement. They will be finding someone else besides me. So my background –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know that.

MR. MARKS: I know that because I'm not going to be staying.

MS. TYGIELSKI: You are not applying for that position yourself?

MR. MARKS: I am not applying for that position, that is correct. I am a – I came from – I worked for an organization called Management Partners that does this, but in my previous life, I'm with the – community development director for the City of Berkeley for eight years and then a lot of other jobs, so that's my background. And so I'm here tonight.

I am happy to be here, but I am not as knowledgeable in my few months as a lot of people around this table are, Myrna in particular, about the history of the City's engagement, but I have learned a lot in my brief time with the City about Mare Island. So let me answer – I did get some questions that Janet forwarded to me that were asked, so let me see if I can respond to them as best I can. The first question is, what's the City's budget as it relates to environmental cleanup?

Now, when you talk about environmental cleanup for the City, we're talking primarily north Mare Island, which is the area that we are trying to deal with, and I am sure all of you are familiar with that. The City has given – the City Council has authorized a half-million dollars in the previous year's budget, in the '12/13 budget, and just recently upon the adoption of this last budget for '13/14, another half-million dollars towards demolition of the north Mare Island buildings. So we have got a million dollars into it, and we had a meeting on Tuesday night, last Tuesday night, a week ago Tuesday night, where the council's indicated to the City Manager that they were interested in finding more money for Measure B and committing more money for Measure B for demolition of buildings in north Mare Island. So the City is doing what it can and with a very limited budget. I don't think I need to tell anybody around here how limited our budget resources are, but they are devoting what they can towards demolition of buildings to take them down as quickly as we possibly can. And the Council is very anxious, both as an economic development manner – man – issue for the City and for the Mare Island – and for Lennar, to get those buildings down so that this is a more marketable site, not just for us but for Lennar, and so that the site starts to reach some of its potential. So we're working on it as best we can and devoting some resources to it.

The next question is about the ERS consultant. That is Mark O'Brien, and he was here until a few minutes ago, and Mark will be representing the City at these meetings most of the time, um, it is my expectation. So he will be the City's representative at these meetings. He is with a firm

that does essentially – they do a lot of environmental remediation issues. He’s quite an expert on, um, on BRAC closure sites all over the state and country, and so he brings a lot of background information about remediation. That’s their expertise and we’re really glad to have him aboard. And that’s what the budget is.

How does the City view the current state of the environmental cleanup on Mare Island? Well, that’s a pretty broad question. As far as we’re concerned, for our site, for north Mare Island, we wish it would go faster. We wish we didn’t have a fairly significant liability that we didn’t expect to have. We wish we didn’t have problems marketing the site because of soils issues that we didn’t expect to find. So we’re, you know, unhappy from our own point of view that we just didn’t understand the limitations and constraints on Mare Island as we do now and are facing now what we look at – and see – in many ways, a liability for the City rather than –

MR. COFFEY: Should have asked us. We’d’ve told you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, might have had your representatives or your staff fill you in. Can you elaborate on what you mean by that? You know, we could guess or we could say we told you – could have told you so, but are you talking about area – non-CERCLA, the property was transferred to you. I don’t know how it could have been through Department of Toxic Substances Control, who isn’t present tonight. But, of course, you know everything, Elizabeth. What issues are you talking about, lead in soil, lead in the buildings –

MR. MARKS: Well –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – asbestos –

MR. MARKS: – in theory –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – in the buildings, what?

MR. MARKS: It’s in the buildings. This is – in the buildings, there is lead paint.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mm-hmm.

MR. MARKS: This is virtually normal stuff.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. MARKS: That you find toxic materials in almost all buildings that are built of that period, especially –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

MR. MARKS: – by the Navy. Lead paint, asbestos, and probably mercury, and maybe some PCBs.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: PCBs.

MR. COFFEY: Not PCBs, no.

MR. MARKS: Supposedly we may have found some PCBs on one of the sites. That’s what I heard through the grapevine –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then you –

MR. MARKS: – though it’s not been confirmed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – would go back on CERCLA items –

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Possibly some light ballasts.

MR. MARKS: Yeah.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: You know, some of those light ballasts would have a little bit of PCBs, but it wouldn't necessarily be a TSCA item, like you would find in a transformer. PCB is –

MR. MARKS: That's why – [Simultaneous discussion; Reporter interruption.]

MS. D'ALMEIDA: PCBs were even used in paint, you know.

MR. MARKS: So I – you know, I – I don't have details, and we've not done enough assessment to tell you exactly what it is, but that's what I have been hearing through my sources –

and whether they – it's mostly – it's related to building materials, not necessarily other kinds of things, at least that's my understanding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. MARKS: But what – you said you wanted me to characterize what we found is... We have buildings that are more difficult and costly to take down than we expected. That's one issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. MARKS: And then we thought – and I think it was the assumption when we took over the site, and it was given to us by the Navy, that the value of the land – would pay for this work to demolish it. It turns out that the value of the land is not what we thought it was, and so it's – we do not get enough value from the sale of the land to pay for the demolition. That's what we found, especially in the market that has existed for the last ten years, to say the least, and we'll see what happens going forward. But it's – but, meanwhile, we have these eyesores that we need to get out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Dan, a couple of quick questions. From what I am hearing, the million dollars was expended totally.

MR. MARKS: No, it hasn't been expended yet.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, okay.

MR. MARKS: It's been allocated. We are evaluating – right now, the first building that we're looking at is the burn building – and that we're talking about taking it down to the concrete.

And that's as far as we'll take it. We'll – go to the second building, of course, is 7 – whatever the building is.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 755.

MR. MARKS: 755 is the second building we're – looking at. We'll see how far our money goes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, the next question is a lot of this is around tax increment funding for the City, and Lennar was expecting a return, I presume.

MR. MARKS: There's no tax increment at Mare Island, that I know of.

MR. CAMPBELL: None.

MR. MARKS: That's redevelopment. That's the redevelopment method, and there's no redevelop – Mare Island was never a redevelopment, so there's no tax –

MR. CAMPBELL: So there was no target zone on it, you are telling me.

MR. MARKS: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And it also, just to clarify, is not a Lennar property, that is a City of Vallejo retained or acquired property directly there, without transferring it – of course, maybe they want to give it to Lennar for a dollar. Lennar didn't mind all that other property for a dollar. Lennar – Neal, do you think that would be a good idea?

MR. SILER: No.

(Laughter.)

MR. MARKS: And nor can I blame him for that statement because, as I said, it's more of a liability than a benefit for probably some – for us, much less some future property owner.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you certainly gave it your all. I mean, I think you have had something like fourteen developers who you prayed to God would take this property and turn it into something special for you, so it's not like you haven't tried.

MR. MARKS: That is true –that's true, and the “you” here is not me, but certainly the City of Vallejo has been working at it –

for a while –

MR. MARKS: – with five exclusive rights to negotiate where we –where we actually negotiated a deal, thinking we have a deal, and then it falls through. And a lot of that was the economy, some of it just the problems that I have identified in terms of development constraints on the site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

MR. MARKS: It's a very constrained site in a lot of ways. I am here to answer questions. I don't really have much more to report, but I am happy to answer questions if anybody has any.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I do have a question regarding ERS as a consultant. No doubt, Mark O'Brien and his company have, you know, tremendous credentials. Is it – I mean, I don't know how much you are paying them, that's probably confidential, but I am just curious about – you say he has all of this experience with BRAC and all of that, but that doesn't really all that much matter, it seems like at this point, because I would assume that what you are using his services for, his company services, is – and correct me if I am wrong, as your consultant reviewing the invoices as they come in on the continued cleanup work on the eastern early transfer parcel or what – what's the job description?

MR. MARKS: The job description is to help us assess the state – the status of cleanup efforts throughout the island and then tell us when – whether they are being effective and how – what the issues and what the City needs to be concerned about going forward in terms of those cleanups. So that he is advising us on our liabilities and on how things are going with regards to cleanup in general.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So –

MR. MARKS: And, by the way, it's not – I don't remember what the contract is for, but it's not confidential 'cause all City contracts are public documents.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So is it sort of a short-term snapshot, or is this a long-term consulting?

MR. MARKS: Long-term consulting. We are – this is his – I think we're going into the second year with them working with us.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So who do you have doing a review of your invoices on the environmental cleanup, because you are partners, players in the eastern early transfer.

MR. MARKS: To the degree that they are being reviewed, it is by Mark, and he doesn't evaluate whether the invoices are adequate or not. That's being done by – I mean, there's four other parties that look at each of those invoices before we get them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. I guess the reason I'm kind of going on and on about that is because the City does have relatively limited resources, I would think, and I know that he was very involved in the two early transfer agreements and the insurance related to that. And I personally, in my observation, questioned whether the insurance – the way the insurance policies were constructed, and this is just my, what do you call it, lay observation, it is nothing professional about it, but that is what we're gathered together here for. I am not – I'm not so sure, and maybe others can tell us whether it was a good deal for the City, but I am just questioning – yeah, I guess I don't see those insurance policies as having panned out to be very advantageous to the City and to its cleanup partners. So I guess I still have a little burr in my saddle, I am concerned about that, and I wonder, not now, because maybe you don't know, but I guess that's just a topic that I am concerned about.

MR. MARKS: You are talking about – you're talking about the insurance policy. The insurance policy that I am aware of is not between the City and insurer but between the Navy and Lennar, is what I'm trying to say.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Were crafted with the assistance of your consultant, so ...

MR. MARKS: That's not – I don't think it was Mark, but –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes, it was.

MR. MARKS: He – what insurance are you referring to, then?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On the eastern and western early transfer parcels.

MR. MARKS: I will have to look into that, because I was not aware that Mr. O'Brien was involved in that. He is involved in observing issues related to current – the current insurance. There's some dispute between the insurer and the Navy and Lennar, and we are certainly keeping an eye on that issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then the other item regarding who represents the City, just want to go back to our charter and just – I have a concern, I guess, about pretty soon we could all have contractors representing various players at the table and very often contractors tend to not have the direct pipeline. They can't directly offer information or participate in a process like this, and we were pretty committed in our charter and in the RAB law to having actual decision-makers at the table. So just – and, actually, you know, my biggest concern as a community member, maybe even as the co-chair, is that, you know, we would just one day just meet up with a bunch of

consultants from all of the agencies and that it wouldn't be quite as effective as I think it could be.

MR. MARKS: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Dan, one – one more thing.

MR. MARKS: Mm-hmm.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of the million dollars you said it hadn't been expended, is there any problem in getting a breakdown of what the budget looks like and what the planned budget looks like for Mare Island?

MR. MARKS: All of it is going toward demolition in Mare Island. In terms of the budget we're getting, it's kind of hard to say "budget," because what we're doing is one building at a time, going out with requests for proposals from –

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, you must have some sort of plan that you can –

MR. MARKS: The plan is one building at a time right now –

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, so –

MR. MARKS: – as far as I understand it.

MR. CAMPBELL: – you guys have –

MR. MARKS: We have four buildings that we're starting with that we know of that are the highest priorities that have been established by – pretty much by staff at this point, and they have been described here. And we go out one building to clean – and – and get bids to do the work and – until the money runs out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. MARKS: 'Cause we really don't have any idea how much it's gonna cost to do these demolitions. We have estimates. We – we have received estimates from various parties but those were estimates, they were done several years ago, and they really don't tell us what it costs to do this until we actually go out and get bids. So our problem is, is that it's hard to establish a budget when we don't have a cost, say, per square foot, an average cost per square foot to take down a building of this type. And right now, the City, at least, doesn't know what that is and so we can't –

MR. CAMPBELL: So it's by the seat of the pants, you're saying.

MR. MARKS: A little bit.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: I mean, I don't mean to – I wouldn't say it's quite that loose, because we do take bids and, I mean, but it's like any project that you do when you are doing construction.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mm-hmm.

MR. MARKS: You estimate what it's gonna cost, and we've got some estimates, but the reality of that is – and ask the Navy about reality, they already went through this problem a few times. The reality when you actually get down and get bids is quite different than what you may have

estimated, and so we don't know how far this money is gonna go, and so we're kind of waiting to see how this first bid comes out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I also want to know that, um, that because that area, primarily the area that the City is working on exclusively, I guess, is area that is already transferred, we really don't have any influence over that property, and we probably don't need to have too much more of a conversation about that specific issue, though. It – we were requested by one of our RAB members, who is a resident of Mare Island, to have you talk about that –

MR. MARKS: I am happy to do it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – talk about that budget.

MR. MARKS: I'm happy to do it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But, also, that's actually not our purview.

MR. COFFEY: Not part of our scope.

MR. MARKS: If there's any questions about your scope, I would be happy to take that, too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you very much.

**c) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So we are at Lennar update.

MR. SILER: Okay. So everybody wants to go along, you should have this 11-by-17 figure that we have, and there's a number of documents that are in the queue. We have been lucky enough to have the regulatory agencies review some of the comments – or some of the documents that we have submitted recently, and they've given us comments on the implementation report and request for closure for former Building 811 area. In fact, we've gotten to the point where we're gonna respond to that, and that actually has been submitted since I put this together, so that's back in their hands.

We received comments on the groundwater monitoring plan for the Building 637 area. We have also received comments for the investigation of sanitary sewers in IA C2 and C1, and then there's a number of things that we have also gotten – received comments on, one of them being the revised operation and maintenance plan for the clean test area, revised sampling and analysis plan for sediments east of the key wall and IA K. Response to comments for the investigation of sanitary sewers, again, we have some additional comments there we're dealing with, by sampling and analysis plan for the storm sewers at IR 21, Buildings 386, 388, 390, and the revised sampling analysis plan for the underground storage tank 84 lower site. There is a number of documents that we have high on our priority list coming up for next month, and one of those is the revisions to the site characterization report for underground storage tanks 231 and 243 and investigation area H2. The approach to respond to discoveries of black granular material in the eastern early transfer parcel.

We're waiting, also, on comments for the implementation – not that, but the release of the pre-decision covenants for IA D1.3 north is where the success center lies, so we're looking forward to getting comments or either closing those areas out next month. There was one building that we

were able to close out this month, and that was Building 461. We did some additional sampling in there. We actually reported on that sampling, and we received closure for that building in June of this year. So we've got that one behind us right now.

You can see there's a number of upcoming documents, there's a number of fieldwork that we've got going on. You take a look up in the upper left-hand corner, the photograph up there is the demolition and remediation, which was a PCB site, it was an old electrical substation that had a land-use covenant on it. We are remediating the remaining residual PCBs at that site and demolishing the building, so that work has been going on. There's some – little bit of additional work we have to do here in the next few weeks to be able to close that out. In the upper right-hand corner, this is another PCB site. There were four pits in Building 742 that are known as UL O3 through UL O6. We have actually cleaned out those pits, done the sampling, and will be actually requesting no further action on those four sites in the upcoming months here. So, anybody have any questions on any of the work that we've been doing?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I remember a long time ago, Gil Hollingsworth, City of Vallejo, asking about the status of Building 742, perceiving it or representing the City as perceiving that building as a high – a highly desirable marketable building. Do you have any sense that you can share with us about progress on getting to closure on that building?

MR. SILER: We're getting closer to closure on that. We recently submitted the revised implementation report for the PCB site that went over the entire floor. It was another one of these wood-block-floor buildings. We actually removed the wood-block floor in that building, re-scabbled certain areas of the concrete, did indoor air PCB sampling. And then what I am doing here is some of the unknown sites that weren't part of the known scope of work, so we're trying get those done. Hopefully, these four should be done. We have one more to do, which is the elevator shafts in the building, and once we get – we would go along on those, we should be very close to getting that building done, building done. So hopefully within the next year or so, that building should be – possibly can be closed out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Paula has a question.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have a question, and that's about Building 781, which, judging from your picture, is smack in the middle of a blue-colored area called D1.2.

MR. SILER: That's correct.

MS. TYGIELSKI: And according to the key, D, it says, pending closure/closed, but remedial action cleanup should be green. It looks like you are doing remedial action.

MR. SILER: And the reason for that was, if you remember correctly, there were three PCB sites that we closed out within that portion of investigation area D1.2, because at the time we needed them to continue to provide power.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MR. SILER: So we were able to have them continue to provide power and be able to actually take the building down entirely without building new electrical substations 'cause Island Energy was still using them. There's two others, there's Building 671, which is located on Oak Street behind one of the mansions, and there's also another small site back there, too, called Q17A, but as we move forward, we will be actually closing those three areas out, also.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then will you have no land-use covenants on that section?

MR. SILER: It's – it's only on the footprint of those buildings.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. SILER: Okay. So once we get that done, there would be no other footprints where we would have a land-use covenant in that portion of investigation area IA D1.2. But we would still – in the commercial industrial portion of IA D1.2, we still have that commercial industrial LUC, which is different from that area we're talking about.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That was quite an enthusiastic, to use the word of the night, conversation amongst the various residents of the island recently that I got in on, weighed in on, I guess, regarding what trees you could eat fruit from, like the Garden of Eden kind of a deal. Does this D1.2 include those houses, they do not have a deed restriction for eating of the forbidden fruit?

MR. SILER: There is no home site on Mare Island that we have developed that has an environmental restriction on it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not that you have developed, but those two PCB sites you mentioned, those are within the historic house footprint, so will this D1.2 have any restriction from that?

MR. SILER: No, no.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

**d) Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Great. You are up. Mr. Gemar.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You are sitting down, but you are up.

MR. GEMAR: Hello. Weston's update is getting skinnier and skinnier, but it's gonna wind down on the west –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Bigger print.

MR. GEMAR: Western early transfer parcel. There is one document that is due to go to the agencies for reviews pretty soon, and that's the draft Feasibility Study for the Final Remedy for Investigation Site 5, and Dredge Pond 7 South and the Western Magazine Area, which is basically that portion of the background photo in the lower left showing the magazines there and then IR-5 south of that. In addition to that document that's due to go to agency soon, the agencies have a couple of other documents, the Post-Closure Care Plan for Investigation Area H1, which is the old landfill area, that – that's awaiting any final remaining comments and we should get those soon; and then the Annual Remedy Status Report for H1, basically documenting the previous year's results for the ongoing operation and maintenance that's also been under review, and I think we're going to, you know, get an approval letter soon on that.

And then, basically, the only other documents that are coming down the pipeline to close out those sites, that IR-5 and western mag are the Proposed Plan and the Remedial Action Plan and then the Record of Decision, and those, you know, will be hopefully coming up in 2014 as we get closer and closer to closing out the sites remaining under the western early transfer parcel. And then just a brief update on the H1 areas, the containment area. We, of course, continue to extract groundwater and/or leachate from the footprint of the landfill. Again, the flow rates are very, very low now because the landfill has a geosynthetic cap, which eliminates any

groundwater infiltration and has a slurry wall around the perimeter so our, you know, extraction rates are down to one or two gallons per minute, and that's over a 7,300-linear-foot trench, so a very, very small amount of water being – still remaining under that landfill. And then we are doing our second semiannual groundwater sampling event coming up in August, which will be 29 once. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Here. You might want to answer them. Here.

(Discussion held off the record.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This whole bunch of documents regarding the installation restoration site, five dredged ponds, 7S, western magazine, so my question is this: Because – I am not sure what all these things mean even after almost 20 years. After all these record of decisions and proposed plan, remedial action plan, those are approved; draft Feasibility Study, those documents come one after the other, or are they all a part of a package that goes before the regulators and the Record of Decision is the final document, right?

MR. GEMAR: Right; yeah, they are – they are sequential –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. GEMAR: – so the Feasibility Study comes first, and actually the Remedial Investigation was previously completed and that –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. GEMAR: – serves as a baseline for the environmental conditions and risk assessment for the site; and then the feasibility study just evaluates what, if any, remaining, you know, remedy options are appropriate; and then after that, we issue a proposed plan, which goes out for public review, indicating the final remedy that we think is appropriate, and then the remedial action plan is part of that and then the record of decision is the final action document or decision document.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Decision document.

MR. GEMAR: Right. So that's the end of the road, and there is no further remedial design in this case. We think that –

CO-CHAIR LEAR: There would be a land-use control remedial design document.

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: In this case, we're expecting it just to be institutional controls as the final remedy, so there would be a design document for that final remedy that followed the doc.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I am interested in the time line that you think that these – I mean, Navy's reviewing these documents now. What kind of time line are you looking at for, you know, going on to public review of the proposed plan, remedial action plan?

MR. GEMAR: I think the proposed plan slash remedial action plan and the record of decision are scheduled for 2014, and I think – I think we are scheduled to complete those in 2014, and then the land-use control document would come in... in 2015.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The proposed plan comes in 2014 and the ROD comes in 2014?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I think the ROD is scheduled to get done before the end of 2014, I think. And, of course, it's dependent on, you know, the priorities and the regulators. Unfortunately, our friends over at Lennar have been getting higher priority, I think, but –

MR. SILER: As we should.

(Laughter.)

MR. GEMAR: So it's all kind of dependent on that, as well.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For the record, not as you should. Equal, equal representation. Okay. The reason I'm asking these questions is because, Dan, you will not be here in 2014/2015. You have decreed and declared that here on the record. However, I would like to go on the record speaking to this issue as a representative of the City of Vallejo, and that is, if we were to step inside the Vallejo conference room, as it's labeled over there, and look at the reuse plan for Mare Island Naval Shipyard, the former, you will find that the City's reuse plan and I believe the specific plan, I might be wrong on that, remains silent on the reuse of these areas.

MR. MARKS: Correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That needs to be taken up at the planning level at some point, and the one document that does – well, all documents that to date have been prepared with the input of the community, including the most recent report written for the City Council under contract with contractors and the regional park task force, and our report to Council in 2007, which was accepted by Council and does say that that area should become part of the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve because it will tie nicely – it was historically part of the ammunition depot and it will also tie nicely with – to the trails that already exists on the western trail system, the San Pablo Bay trail, and that it connects up with the planned rest of the preserve, which is on the shoreline and on the hill above. So I would like to go on record as recommending that the City take steps, of course it has no money and no time and it's not a priority and all of those excuses, but I will still go on record as saying, once again, that – to go back to the documents that have already come forward and already are out there, that the recommendation is that this property be made part of that preserve. And the timing should – you know, it should start being worked on so that when these final documents are completed, the public and the City knows what the expected use is.

The other reason I think it would be important to this issue is because, unless I'm mistaken, I believe I heard Janet say there will be a land-use covenant or control on the property, and that is for munitions, and that makes sense to lock that property in with the adjacent San Pablo Bay trail and the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve because they are all munition-impacted and it would be important to have – and the public is already using that property. I happen to know, I have seen them out on it, not just copper thieves, but people walking their dogs and bicycling out there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And it would make sense to have the education program, that's going to need to be a part, I expect, of the land-use control, be a cohesive one for that property, as well. So, again, going on record as saying this is the issue that we need to address. I know that the majority of that property will come in to the City's holdings through a grant from the State Lands Commission, but it will nonetheless be a property that has not currently had any reuse study applied to it. Paula, speak.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I just want – it's not on. I just want to say to Dwight that I have been for the last many years watching Weston do a very good job and, you know, what needs to be done. The end is in sight, and it's been done well, and you guys deserve our thanks and congratulations.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

(Applause.)

MR. GEMAR: Thank you.

MR. COFFEY: So there, Lennar.

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

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Regulatory update.

MS. WELLS: Janet, DTSC, is in Japan and didn't send an e-mail or anything, so I think she must not really care about us.

(Laughter.)

MR. COFFEY: That's probably true.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. So –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For now. For now.

MS. WELLS: So, maybe she'll have a slide show for the next meeting. I don't know. So... But at the Water Board, we have been trudging along, trying to make it through documents. One of the things I don't know if you all know is as the Water Board's role is really – on the CERCLA side is really a support role to DTSC, so a lot of times what we try to do is provide our comments to DTSC and then she, Janet, incorporates them in her letter so that everybody's not getting two letters and trying not to expend more money in responding to comments. But one of the things that I have done over the last couple of months, actually started working with Lennar, sorry, Weston is now moving over to the Navy, is doing kind of an inventory of all the underground storage tanks out – primarily at the EETP, I think there's a few in other places, but one of the goals was to look through our data, our Geotracker database, and look through the lists that we have so that we are up to date on what the status of all of tanks are so that 2 or 3 or 8 or 17 years down the line, when Mare Island is finally done, we don't get sort of bitten on the rear end by, oh, my gosh, there's this tank out here that we didn't take care of. So that's something that we put together, and Neal's responded with some information, and now we're gonna be going to just gather up some information on that. So that's kind of what we've been doing.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I was out last week with Mel, and we went and looked at four PCB sites. Closure letters for three are going in the mail, one of them needs more samples. Then I was out with, um, with Neal this week, too, to look at another site on the Lennar parcel, and closure letter for that will be going in the mail.

**VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS**

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. For the Navy update, I have my normal monthly progress report, but I also have a couple of other issues that I was asked to talk a little bit about, so if you don't mind, I'm going to just let you read the information on the page so that we have some time to talk about these other things, 'cause I know it's getting late.

One of the activities that the Navy is doing right now is, we're painting some of the houses above the ammunition depot that were part of that property, just because over the years the condition of the exterior has degraded and they needed some upkeep. So, the question that I was asked was, How are we making sure that there's no lead-based paint going into the ground during that work because, of course, the old paint has to be scraped off. So, I did look into that, the contractor has a lead-based paint stabilization plan that they presented as part of the contract. Some of the things that they are doing is putting plastic ground cover on the ground, taped up to the edges of the house extending 10 feet beyond the working surface. They are wetting the surface before they scrape the paint to minimize dust. They are storing the debris in a secured area. They stop work if the wind kicks up above 20 miles per hour, and they are watching precipitation events so they stop work and clean up prior to rain. Obviously it's like a four-page document, some of it has to do with employee safety, of course, but those are some of the things that they are doing to make sure that there's no further distribution of that paint as part of the work.

One of the other topics that I was asked to address was the potential – or the future transfer of H1. This property is reversionary and has always been planned to go to State Lands Commission. There was a bill, Bill 1481, Senate bill, that was established in 2004 that allowed the City to receive that property, and it retains its character as a public trust but it goes from State Lands to the City as public trust property. So that is the plan and it has been the plan for quite some time. There was some discussion a year or so ago about whether State Lands wanted to skip their step in the process and have it go directly to the City, but that is still under review by State Lands' executive officers and their legal counsel and Navy legal counsel, so at this current time there is no change in the way the property is planned for transfer and to whom it is going to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I had a conversation with State Lands staff last week, and they claim, at least, you know, to me, and that doesn't mean anything, that they are taking me on the advice of the State – of DTSC, they are not intending to accept the property. However, that does not mean, and let's use North Island as a good example, Mr. Marks, however you won't be here, but please put in the record that does not mean that the City of Vallejo must accept that property, and that's a conversation we have had more than once here. While the City – while the Navy is keen on dumping all of its property so that its records look good, its BRAC process looks good, except for property that some of us would like to have as part of our park to hang on for dear life to, there is no requirement that I know of in the BRAC law that requires the City of Vallejo to accept property. You could just go on holding on to that property, and I don't see – we have gone on record, I know I have because I have been here for a heck of a long time, so has Paula, we started on the same day, and we – I believe share the same belief, that we don't need to accept that property, and it's not in our interest to accept it.

So whatever your lawyers are thinking, at least at the Restoration Advisory Board level, and be happy to have this agendized, I think we need to have a conversation about it again as it comes up close to – and it's not that Weston did inadequate work, it's not that the Navy, you know, shortchanged this, you know, community out of all kinds of awards, thanks to this Restoration Advisory Board, partly, for – that the – that the way to cleanup turned out, but it's still a landfill, and it's still considered a RCRA landfill, and I personally don't see why we should have it. I don't see why we should have to maintain the chain-link fences that we didn't want, and I don't see why we should be stuck with it. So, yeah, sure, you could come and fix it if anything happens to it, but it just doesn't seem like it makes good business sense, and it's conversation that I think

we need to have more in-depth, so I appreciate you at least bringing, you know, the topic up in your report, as I requested.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: As a follow-up to that, there have been several legal agreements that were signed between State Lands and the City about who was getting what property and an exchange for public trust uses on the property, so there is that legal document, there's the Senate bill, there's a lot of things that are involved in this whole process. State Lands has made some statements about how they don't want to take it, and we have requested to them, okay, so then you would need to have some kind of documentation saying that you are giving up your agreement, your right to that property per this agreement. So there's a lot of legal things that are going on, and when the lawyers actually make a decision about what's going to be required and who is going to do what, or when they get into a room – because this has kind of been lingering, the State Lands has gotten a new executive officer so there had to be a whole new brief on that. So, when we get more information, I would be happy to come and talk to you some more about it. But right now, it's – it's very much in the hands of the attorneys and what they decide needs to be done in terms of dealing with all these other legal agreements that have nothing to do with the requirements of BRAC, but they have to do with requirements of an agreement between State Lands and the City of Vallejo.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, they also have to do with reversionary issues. That property is not just City of Vallejo. It is first and foremost reversionary land. I think all of it is, and I think it's a perfect time, it's a perfect topic, for the Restoration Advisory Board to take on its environmental cleanup, its early and often communication about environmental cleanup, and it's at a point where at some point soon, decisions will be made and this is a very good time for us to be involved. So I will request that the topic be agendaized, and if the lawyers want to come here and visit with us, that would be perfect. They have done it lots of times before.

MR. COFFEY: That would be expensive.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, it won't. They are public servants.

MR. COFFEY: Lawyers?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: Like hell.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Excuse me. We have a City of Vallejo attorney who is public servant. We have State Lands Commission, the counsel who are public servants, and they have an obligation, whoever it is, maybe it's the executive officer herself who was the senior counsel for State Lands. It doesn't matter. To say, "Oh, well, they are expensive and they can't come talk to us," that's ridiculous. We have lots of high-powered people here in the room paid a lot of money who are staying late to visit with us, so I –

MR. MARKS: Just for the record –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: – respectfully disagree.

MR. MARKS: Just for the record, the City's attorney on this issue is a private attorney.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, the City has got money to hire that private attorney, don't they? There's always the money for what they need to hire people for.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I had two other quick things. Sorry this is taking so long tonight. One is just for your information, the Navy did institute furloughs beginning of July, so – 'cause Navy employees are working 32 hours a week, we're doing the best we can with the hours that we have, but we're really enjoying our long weekends.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Your free long weekends.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah, and with furloughs, there may be some slowdown in getting things done. Hopefully not. Biggest issue, of course, is budget, which is always uncertain, and I am not sure how things are gonna play with that, but as it moves further along, I'll let you know if we do end up getting our budget that was put in for several years ago, as you all remember from Mr. Perry's talk. The other thing is, dredge pond 3-E was scheduled to go to the field; however, that contract has been pulled, we aren't going to be able to do that work this year. We have a work plan, a final work plan, so we'll use that to submit for bid and hopefully get out there next year.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you will probably all be relieved that I have a very short report. And that is to thank everyone who participated in the first ever San Francisco Bay Osprey Day, which was a tremendous success. Not only did we have biologists from Golden Gate Raptor Observatory refer to them, the Mother Lode of Osprey nesting on San Francisco Bay takes place on Mare Island, and at the mouth of the river. We had a – we just, as a gauge of the public interest, we just had a tremendous turnout, and I want to thank everybody who had any part to play in ensuring the success of the nesting, which I want to credit again Weston and other contractors and the Navy's BRAC team who were respectful of not only the osprey nests but the great blue heron nests and were able to work with the contractors to keep – to not disturb those nestings. We really truly appreciate that. Coming up on a sort of hastily put-together Mare Fair this year because, as many of you know, my beloved dog who has come to visit here passed away this Sunday of leukemia, so I have just not been myself, not planning that event very effectively. So people who want a guide to hike or – or in some way give a presentation on the second weekend in August, the Saturday and the Sunday, do let me know. And so thank you very much. And if any of you do want to come to Ammo's kind of memorial celebration, that is Saturday at 3 p.m. at the Visitors Center at the Preserve.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Thank you everyone. Drive safe. We'll see you next time.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:34 p.m.)

#### **LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Presentation Handout – Production Manufacturing Area/South Shore Area Munitions Non-Time-Critical Removal Action Fieldwork Summary
- Presentation Handout – Recent Site Investigation Activities and Results Summary, Buildings 116 and 386, Investigation Area C2, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel
- Mare Island Draft Navy Field Schedule
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, July 25, 2013

RAB Meeting Minutes Comment/Correction Form

Meeting Minutes: July 25, 2013

RAB Member: \_\_\_\_\_

- I would like a copy of the final minutes of the above noted meeting.
- No comments or corrections to these minutes.
- See comments or corrections listed below.

Page No.	Line No.	Comment/Correction	Reviewed by	
			BEC	Hayes

**Each RAB Member, please submit this form to:**  
**Ms. Janet Lear or**  
**Ms. Myrna Hayes**

## RAB Meeting Agenda Request/Comment Form

Meeting Date: December 5, 2013

RAB Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Agenda Item No.	Request/Comment	Reviewed By	
		BEC	Hayes
1			
2			
3			

**Submit form to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes**