

**Mare Island Naval Shipyard
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Mare Island Conference Center,
375 G Street, Vallejo, California
September 25, 2014**

This packet contains the following list of items:

- September 25, 2014 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Notice.
- Agenda for September 25, 2014 RAB Meeting.
- Draft Minutes from the July 31, 2014 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 4, 2014
January 29, 2015
March 26, 2015



PUBLIC MEETING
MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
September 2014 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 2014 Featured Topics

**Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)
Corrective Action Requirements**

**Path to Site Closure:
Completion of the Site Characterization and
Soil Excavation in the Building 637 Area**



Date: Thursday, September 25, 2014

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. 207

September 25, 2014 – Mare Island Conference Center
375 G Street, Vallejo, CA

7:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions (Janet Lear, Myrna Hayes)	5 mins.
7:05	Public Meeting Opening Remarks	10 mins.
7:15	Public Meeting Presentation: <i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Requirements</i> Ms. Janet Naito, Department of Toxic Substances Control	25 mins.
7:40	Public Comment Period	10 mins.
7:50	Presentation: <i>Path to Site Closure: Completion of the Site Characterization and Soil Excavation in the Building 637 Area</i> Ms. Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island	25 mins.
	<i>Discussion</i>	5 mins.
8:15	Public Comment Period	5 mins.
8:20	10-minute break	10 mins.
8:30	Administrative Business and Announcements (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear) a) July 31, 2014 Meeting Minutes	5 mins.
8:40	Focus Group Reports/Discussion a) Community (to be determined) b) Natural Resources (to be determined) c) Technical (Paula Tygielski) d) City Report (Kathleen Diohep/Mark O'Brien) e) Lennar Update (Neal Siler) f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar) g) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito/Carolyn d'Almeida/ Elizabeth Wells)	15 mins.
8:55	Co-chairs' Report (Myrna Hayes, Janet Lear)	10 mins.
9:05	Public Comment Period	5 mins.
9:10	Adjourn	

THE NEXT RAB MEETING WILL BE HELD December 4, 2014

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 31, 2014

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 31th, 2014, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:08 p.m. and adjourned at 9:09 p.m. These minutes contain a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting.

RAB Community Members in Attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey (Community Member)
- Chris Rasmussen (Community Member)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Chris d'Almeida (Environmental Protection Agency)
- Kathleen Diohep (City of Vallejo)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Richard Perry (DTSC)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (Regional Water Quality Control Board)
- Heather Wocknik (Navy)

Community Guests in Attendance:

- Mike Chamberlain (Tihydro)
- Tim Hiemstra (Community Member)
- Gina Marr-Heimstra (Community Member)
- Susan Nichols (Community Member)
- Fred Ousey (Community Member)
- Jim Porterfield (Community Member)

RAB Support from Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC, in Attendance:

- Jessica W. Cooper (Assistant Project Manager)
- Wally Neville (Audio/Visual Support)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO -CHAIR LEAR: Welcome, everyone, to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board meeting and Public Meeting for the DRMO Proposed Plan.

We'll start off the meeting with introductions. My name is Janet Lear. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator for the Navy.

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

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

MS. TYGIELSKI: My name is Paula Tygielski. I'm a community member of the Restoration Advisory Board. My residence is in Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: And I'm Mike Coffey, and I live in American Canyon.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

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

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Carolyn D'Almeida, EPA.

MS. WOCHNIK: I'm Heather Wochnik with the Navy.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston Solutions.

MR. PERRY: Richard Perry with DTSC.

MS. NICHOLS: Susan Nichols. Susan Nichols, Resident on Mare Island.

MS. MARR-HIEMSTRA: Gina Marr-Hiemstra, resident of Vallejo.

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey, Envirotech Services.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain, Tihydro.

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

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. COOPER: Jessica Cooper, Navy contractor with Sullivan International Group.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. We will begin the public meeting portion of the RAB meeting. Usually these meetings are just the Restoration Advisory Board meeting, although public is always welcome to attend. But tonight we will be doing our public meeting for the Proposed Plan at the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office which announces our planned cleanup action, proposed cleanup action for that site.

Richard, did you have some opening remarks for the meeting?

MR. PERRY: I don't.

II. PRESENTATION (Dwight Gemar [Weston]): *Proposed Plan / Draft Remedial Action Plan, Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office*

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Dwight Gemar is with Weston Solutions. He's done a lot of the work on this particular site, so he's going to be giving the presentation tonight. But I did want to point out that this is your Proposed Plan. Did we bring copies of the Proposed Plan?

MR. GEMAR: Actually I did not, I have handouts but --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You all should have gotten a copy of the Proposed Plan in the mail. If you did not, let me know and I'll get you one.

I wanted to point out that the second to the last page of the Proposed Plan has a comment form. We will be taking comments verbally tonight, and we'll answer them if we are able, but we'll probably supplement those answers via writing at a later time.

Or you can submit your comments, questions, either on this form or any -- you can turn them into me tonight on this form or you can send them e-mail or fax. The information is on here on where to send them.

And what happens is we will consider all your comments, respond to those comments, and the responsiveness summary will be included in the next document which is called a Record of Decision.

Let's see. The public comment period ends August 20th, so we need to have any comments or questions by that time.

And at this point I'll turn it over to Dwight. At the end of his presentation we'll have a public comment period. If you would like to make your comments verbally, you can do so at that time; otherwise we will take them in writing tonight or e-mail, anytime until August 20th.

Any questions about the comment process?

(No Response.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GEMAR: Thanks, Janet.

So the agenda for tonight consists of the following topics:

This is the public meeting for the Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office site on Mare Island. This is part of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, CERCLA, process overview which allows for public participation in the selection of the final cleanup remedy.

After a brief introduction of those topics, I'll get into more of the detail on the site location.

Conceptual site model describing the types of contaminants on the site and sources.

Also go through a brief history of previous investigations and removal actions on the site.

And the remaining nature and extent of contamination.

Which will then lead to a summary of site risks.

And then presentation of the Remedial Action Objectives based on those risks.

A summary of the Remedial Alternatives that were evaluated in the focused feasibility study that was done as part of the CERCLA review process.

And then follow-up with next steps and schedule.

So, once again, the purpose of the public meeting tonight is to review the Proposed Plan for the preferred remedy at the DRMO site here on Mare Island. And this is part of the CERCLA process. And, again, it will allow the public an opportunity to comment on the preferred remedy that's presented by the Navy tonight; and then allow for the Navy then to respond to public comments in a responsiveness summary that is presented as part of the next document, which is the Record of Decision, in the Federal CERCLA process.

The Proposed Plan also acts as a Draft Remedial Action Plan which, under the State of California requirements for public participation, falls within their purview for sites that are not on the EPA's national priority list, which includes Mare Island.

So the Proposed Plan is a Federal document under the CERCLA process. The Draft Remedial Action Plan is basically the California state equivalent for that, that's why it's called a Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan -- serves two masters.

On the next slide is a graphic of the CERCLA process and where we are tonight. On the left-hand side is -- which is a little fuzzy. I don't know if there's a better way to focus that? I'm technologically challenged so I'm not sure if I'm worthy. Or maybe it's just me. That's better then.

MS. COOPER: Better?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah. Yeah. All right.

So the CERCLA process starts with basically investigations of the site or suspected releases on a site. It may involve interim removal actions as part of that investigation process which then feeds into the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.

And then that, in turn, leads to the -- a Proposed Remedial Alternative which is the Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan. And that's what we're here to discuss tonight.

And then after that -- which I'll get into in the next slide here -- that will feed into the Record of Decision/Remedial Action Plan based on feedback from the public that we get at this Proposed Plan stage. And that will be the documentation of the actual selected remedy.

And then, depending on the remedy, there's a series of other documents that may be generated such as a Remedial Design Plan or a long-term monitoring plans, and then ultimately will lead to a "response complete" or a "site closure".

So the DRMO site on Mare Island is located at the intersection of Dump Road, which is here, and Azuar Drive. So it's just a few blocks that way. And as you can see from the aerial, it's a relatively flat site. And at this point just a couple Quonset huts are still present on the site, otherwise it's basically a bare piece of property.

It covers eight and a half acres of which 4.6 acres is referred to as the fenced scrapyards area. That's where the majority of the material handling activities were -- took place; and where, of course, the majority of the contamination once resided.

The area where the DRMO is currently located is actually a fill area. It's right along the edge of the historic shoreline on Mare Island, so there was a lot of fill activity to develop that property back in the early 1900's.

As I mentioned, there were some structures on the site but only two Quonset huts remain.

And the initial use of the scrapyard began in the early forties with some buildings, primarily warehouses, some railroad spurs and scrap bins and such for handling, you know, the scrap materials.

And again, this is the -- this hatched line, outlined area is the fenced scrapyard area. That's where the majority of the handling took place. And the blue line is the actual boundary of the DRMO site.

The site is currently owned by the Navy but it is planned to be transferred to the city of Vallejo for commercial/industrial use.

The shallow groundwater under the site, which is typical of Mare Island, has a high level of dissolved solids or salinity and, therefore, it makes it inappropriate for potable water use. And, therefore, the Water Board has issued an exception for that use on this site due to the high salinity.

The past uses of the site include handling items such as listed on the first bullet, transformers, batteries, metal scrap, of course, paper products, and also petroleum oils. And unfortunately, over the decades of use that resulted in releases to the environment of metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and also petroleum contamination which would be expected for that kind of an operation in a scrapyard.

However, over the years of operation there were some unusual events, items recovered. Some munitions items were encountered in -- during handling of some of the scrap material, which certainly was not anticipated. And also some radiological materials were also encountered. And that was also not anticipated for this kind of a site.

Due to the past uses and the potential for releases to the environment, of course there was a number of investigations conducted on this property dating all the way back to the initial assessment back in the early 1980s.

And you can see that through the, you know, eighties and nineties there were a series of other investigations as listed here.

And those investigations continued into the, you know, late 1990's, 2000 time frame, culminating in some additional groundwater sampling analysis in 2012. So obviously the site has been extensively characterized during that time period.

And as I mentioned, there were a few surprises that were encountered along the way of operations. One being some emergency response actions which were handled by the Navy explosives ordnance disposal units when some of these munitions items were encountered during the handling of the scrap materials that were sent to the scrapyard.

And also the RAB folks that have been here a long time know that also there was a radiological removal action that was done at the DRMO based on radiological surveys of the surface.

And also -- and that generated almost 500 tons of soil that were removed from the site that were above the background level for, primarily, radium at the time; and also some discrete items were recovered as well, and those were disposed of.

In addition to those removal actions, there was also a Non-Time Critical Removal Action that was done in the 2010 time frame. This was -- the purpose of this removal action was to remove any potential munitions items that could remain in the subsurface as well as chemical contamination. So the entire surface area of the fenced scrapyard area was excavated to a minimum depth of 18 inches. And all that soil was mechanically sifted in order to remove any potential munitions items.

And as indicated, there were 11 remaining munitions items that were encountered and removed, as well as almost 40,000 cubic yards of soil that exceeded the cleanup criteria for the site, you know, due to the past releases.

And then most recently, there was a Petroleum Corrective Action that was performed at the site which was a very large soil removal project, given the extensive contamination of Bunker C fuel oil in the subsurface at the site. And as you can see, nearly 150,000 cubic yards of Bunker C contaminated soil was removed.

Some of the folks that might have been on the RAB tours in the past might have remembered this as the "Big Dig" because we took out all of Azuar Drive for about a thousand feet down to a depth of about 20 feet below that road surface. And then, of course, it all had to go get replaced.

Hopefully, if you didn't catch it, there's a pile of handouts over here that contain 11 by 17's. If it's hard to read the slide, there's some 11 by 17's.

This figure here is -- shows the relative depths below ground surface of the soil removal during the munitions removal in -- of the near surface, and then also the chemical contamination removal that was done at the time.

And then, as I mentioned, that was followed by the Petroleum Corrective Action and -- which is also provided as an 11 by 17.

And if you take a look at the legend on the right-hand side you can see that, you know, again, the depths basically went all the way to 20, 21 feet in certain areas. So there was pretty extensive petroleum contamination under portions of this site, which was all removed.

So based on the past investigations and removal actions, again the surface soil was complete[ly] removed down to a minimum depth of one and a half feet and, of course, in many cases much deeper than that, up to 20 feet.

Over 200 confirmation samples have been collected as part of the Non-TCRA and the PCA, the Petroleum Corrective Action removals.

And again, those confirmation samples were analyzed for a number of compounds such as metals, semi-volatile organic compounds, polychlorinated biphenyls, and pesticides, which were the anticipated contaminants or the known contaminants. And then, of course, Bunker C fuel for the petroleum.

And in the lower right is a photograph of the Petroleum Corrective Action that took place, you can see a large excavator on the right-hand side digging a deep hole, and some very large off-

road haul trucks ready to receive that material. A water truck for dust suppression. So that was typical of the site activities during the excavation work.

Based on the post excavation sampling, there was only a couple of exceedances that remained of benzo(a)pyrene in two locations, and lead slightly above the screening criteria in one location. Otherwise they were all, you know, clean bottom.

So that's kind of a summary of the removal actions for soil. And as I'll mention later, there is no residual risk for soil on this site based on those removal actions.

Groundwater sampling has been also extensively -- groundwater has been extensively sampled on this site as well. This figure shows a location of groundwater wells and also elevations for groundwater. Groundwater flow in this site is generally to the west, and it is -- it has a good spatial distribution of the well locations.

So in addition to some groundwater sampling done in the 1990's and a slightly later time frame, in 2012 there was more extensive groundwater sampling and more recent sampling done, again for the constituents of concern that are listed on the slide.

And based on that result, those sample results, again there were some exceedances of screening criteria for things like manganese, cobalt, vinyl chloride, methylnaphthalene and naphthalene, motor oil, and total petroleum hydrocarbon in the groundwater at locations slightly above the criteria.

And based on the results of the soil removals, from a human health standpoint based on the residual concentrations in the soil that were remaining, there are no cancer and non-cancer risks above the thresholds for an industrial/commercial user.

And although residential use is not certainly anticipated at this site, the non-cancer and cancer risks from soil are also below even the residential criteria at the site. So soil is a non-issue currently at the DRMO.

Shallow groundwater is a little bit of a different story. For a commercial/industrial user, recreational user or construction worker, there is no issue with non-cancer, or cancer risk.

However, for the hypothetical residential user, which is evaluated as a comparison in the remedial investigation, there are, you know, some non-cancer and cancer risks above the thresholds for ingestion which, again, is not a credible scenario in this case because the groundwater is too saline for consumption.

But nevertheless, you know, just from a comparison standpoint, manganese is above the screening criteria on a non-cancer basis, and vinyl chloride, benzene, and 1-methylnaphthalene is [are] above the screening criteria on a cancer risk standpoint.

There is no remaining ecological risk at the site due to the extensive soil removal that's been done. And there is no munitions or radiological risk at the site as well based on the prior removal actions.

The site was released for unrestricted use for radiological contamination after the removal action was performed in the 1990's.

And then MEC hazards were removed, residual MEC hazards were removed during the Non-Time Critical Removal Action work

And this is a bit of a eye chart, but this summarizes those kind of risk factors that I referenced just a minute or two ago. And again, it's -- for commercial users, workers, or construction workers there are -- the risk levels are calculated to be well below the applicable thresholds.

Ingestion is obviously a different story, you know, the risks for that are -- would be unacceptable. But again, that is not a credible use for this site.

And somewhat lower risks and more acceptable for DRMO contact or inhalation of vapors at this site.

So based on the risk assessment, human health and ecological risk assessments in the Remedial Investigation report, the remedial action objective for this site is clearly to prevent unacceptable risk resulting from domestic use of groundwater.

And again, as a footnote, it doesn't meet the salinity requirements for use as potable water supply, but nevertheless that is the one remedial action objective for this site based on the groundwater sampling.

So based on the -- based on the remedial investigation during the Focus Feasibility Study, two alternatives were evaluated. And these both -- well, alternative number two is strictly dealing with groundwater because, again, the remedial investigation analysis indicated that soil was not - was no longer a risk.

So Alternative 1 is always required, and it's a no further action, it's a baseline option. Basically the do nothing option.

And then Alternative 1 in this case is to implement institutional controls which would involve the restriction of groundwater, installation of groundwater wells or, of course, domestic use of groundwater would be restricted. And those restrictions would run with the land and would be enforced accordingly.

So in a Feasibility Study, the presented alternatives are evaluated based on nine criteria which, again, are a little busy on this slide. But there's a threshold criteria which is basically the minimum bar you must meet. And those two criteria are protection of human health and the environment, and compliance with applicable, relevant, and appropriate requirements, basically the regulations that would apply. And those are required to pass onto the next set of criteria which are considered balancing criteria.

And these have to do with the items listed here which is [are]: long-term effectiveness; reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness is evaluated; implementability is evaluated; as well as cost.

And then, finally, after these alternatives are evaluated and presented to the public, then there's also two modifying criteria which are considered; which one is state acceptance from the oversight regulatory authorities, and then also community acceptance based on feedback from the public.

So again, Alternative 1 is -- excuse me, Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative because, again, Alternative 1 does not pass muster on the minimum threshold requirements.

And again, the preferred alternative for Alternative 2 is restriction of -- restricts installation of groundwater wells and domestic use of groundwater without prior approval. And also -- and this obviously achieves a higher overall level of protectiveness compared to, you know, Alternative

1. So, therefore, that is the preferred alternative which is being presented tonight for public input as part of the Proposed Plan Draft Remedial Action Plan.

And as Janet mentioned, there are different ways to provide feedback. One is tonight verbally; or alternatively you can provide, either by letter or e-mail, comments to the folks that are listed on this slide. Janet Lear is with the Navy. Richard Perry is the Public Participation Specialist with DTSC. And Janet Naito is our project manager from DTSC. And so all those folks would be happy to get your feedback on their preferred -- or this remedy.

And then the next steps, again, are the public involvement piece, which is what we're doing tonight with the public meeting. And then also the public comment period runs through August 20th.

And based on those comments from the public, the Navy will prepare a responsiveness summary which would then be presented in the Record of Decision and the Remedial Action Plan which is the next document that would follow the Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan that we're discussing tonight.

And then beyond that, assuming that the preferred remedy is the final remedy, then a Land Use Control/Remedial Design Plan would be prepared to document how the institutional controls for the groundwater would be implemented.

And then, of course, there'd be annual compliance monitoring, as well as a five-year CERCLA required review to make sure that the remedy is being protective of human health and the environment.

And so this is an overview of timing. The -- again, the public meeting.

After the public meeting tonight, then the Draft Record of Decision and Remedial Action Plan with the final remedy would occur this fall.

And then after agency review and any further comment, a final ROD/RAP would be completed this winter.

And on the very end, in case I confused anybody with acronyms, there is a whole laundry list of acronyms for this particular presentation.

And at this point I'll turn it back to Richard for a wrap-up or public comment or the Navy.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So at this time if any of the public has questions or comments, or the RAB members have questions or comments, I'll open the floor for that.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I have a question, Dwight. Chris Rasmussen. Excuse me, frog in the throat.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Frog or fog?

MR. COFFEY: Chlorinated biphenyls.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it on the acronym list up there?

MR. RASMUSSEN: F-R-O-G. On one of the earlier, sort of the map of the site, there was a clear indication of a pretty significant area surrounded by a chain link fence.

Regardless of the chosen action, is the intent to have that chain link fence remain or can it -- would it be removed? Or could it be removed at some future time?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The fence has nothing to do with our final action, so the city could remove that if that's their plan for the site.

MR. GEMAR: Currently I believe it's our four-wheeler exclusion fence.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Not big enough.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah really. If there was a third alternative plan, a removal plan, is there a possibility of removal of said toxicity that would be sufficient to allow groundwater, or is that a - never going to be a possibility?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The Navy -- the Navy cleans up to land use, and in this case it's commercial/ industrial, one, so the residential risk wouldn't have been a driver for the cleanup regardless. But the fact in this case is that the groundwater is too saline for domestic use.

MR. COFFEY: Not the question. That wasn't the question. Is there -- would there ever be a way to clean it up, even if the salinity, to get the manganese out and all that type of stuff, if the groundwater was usable, was potable, is it cleanable, even if it can't be used because of salinity?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I suppose. That wasn't an alternative that was evaluated so I'm not sure if I can answer that question. But let me take that question back and we'll respond to it in the responsiveness summary. Thank you.

Any other comments?

MS. ROEBUCK: The Land Use Covenant that you described is for -- oh, this is Sheila Roebuck with Lennar Mare Island. The Land Use Covenant that's described is focused on groundwater use.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Correct.

MS. ROEBUCK: There is an assumption throughout that this would be a commercial/industrial reuse area, which is what is in the plan. But your description of the Land Use Covenant doesn't include any restriction on sensitive uses. Is that -- is that because you think that's not a problem, it's just the groundwater that you're trying to deal with? So if, for example, I don't expect the reuse plan would change, but if it did, that would mean that it could be used for anything, even, you know, a school or a daycare center or other things that, you know, otherwise wouldn't be allowed if there were sensitive use restrictions in the Land Use Covenant itself.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's correct. As long as the groundwater is not used.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The city of Vallejo is the recipient of the property in the transfer, but am I correct that this property would go in the master developer agreement to Lennar? Don't you have housing kind of planned like right across the street? And I thought you tore down Building 866 because it was an industrial anomaly within a housing area.

So I'm just curious. I know it says commercial/industrial use, just curious what kind of scenarios you're envisioning at this point, leaning more towards commercial? Or what types of industrial could you imagine at that site that would be compatible with -- would seem compatible with planned housing right across the street?

I know that's maybe not relevant to the Restoration Advisory Board, but this is a public meeting for this planned action, and I would imagine that you could ask most anything in this. And I

don't know whether you're allowed as Lennar to comment in a public -- respond in a public meeting? I'm not sure about that.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, the reuse plan shows for that area a commercial building. So it could be an office or storage or, you know, something similar. It's not defined. But the initial look assumed that it would be a commercial building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So not having it cleaned up to residential level does not impact your planned reuse in any way?

MS. ROEBUCK: No, it doesn't. It could open up, you know, other possibilities, but right now the plan is commercial/industrial use.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a question. Because these evaluations of the property and cleanups, corrective actions and all those great terms you use, have taken place so extensively and for so long; for instance, where you had these dug to 20 feet and you have just those handful of, above the threshold I think you call it, or something like that on two or three contaminants, I'm just curious why the Navy didn't just go back with that data and clean that area up? And why that's allowed to -- whether that's the only reason why there would be a prohibition in residential for the land? Not for the water table, but for the land.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I think we'll definitely want to respond to that. But, you know, I think that the -- it's important to point out that for the soil, both the non-cancer and cancer risks are below the theoretical residential user. So there really wouldn't be any restriction technically for residential use other than groundwater consumption.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, here it is on your nature and extent of soil contamination, yeah.

MR. GEMAR: But we will respond back to you on the question that you asked about the remaining, I think there were two locations or one location?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, Benzo(a)pyrene, lead.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah. Yeah. Right. I remember.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And my only other question is, given the length of time that you've been studying this property, have you seen any apparent natural attenuation where at some point you might -- these products might break down, disappear, vanish from the groundwater? Do you have any plans to come back and monitor that? And would there be any benefit to learning whether some of those things have broken down or disappeared by natural causes?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The prohibition on installation of wells and domestic use of groundwater is that you can't do that without consent or approval from the Navy and DTSC. That leaves the door open if, in the future, a landowner wanted to resample the water to see if there was natural attenuation there. If they wanted to do that, they would submit that request to DTSC, and that idea would be evaluated at that time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I think my final question regards your comment, Dwight, that the groundwater flows to the west. And there -- you've indicated in your presentation that there are these contaminants that would make the property's reuse not suitable for residential and, therefore, implementing or recommending implementation of a Land Use Control.

What impact, since that's flowing to the west and there are wetlands adjacent to the property to the west, what impacts are those properties expected to have? I mean, you say this groundwater

is only, what did you say -- a foot and a half below the soil surface, or was I -- did I not learn -- did we not learn how deep it is, or does it vary dramatically throughout the season?

MR. GEMAR: Right. The foot and a half was the excavation depth.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, I see.

MR. GEMAR: Groundwater, I suspect, is probably about eight feet, you know, give or take at that location.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So could it flow into and become part of those adjacent seasonal wetlands and impact those in any way?

MR. GEMAR: Well, we'll definitely take that question into consideration. My guess is that based on a similar analysis for the investigation area H-1 area, that the answer would be no, that the groundwater would likely not daylight into the wetlands which, therefore, would not be -- there would be no pathway for the receptors to be exposed to groundwater even if it were a problem from an eco-standpoint. But we'll definitely look into that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I guess similarly, I don't know whether you have any land use restrictions for groundwater-well placement or use of the groundwater adjacent to the property, like west of the property, so that -- not that somebody's going to have a well to go draw at, for bathing or drinking, but there might be some other reason why somebody wants to pump salt water, apply it on, I don't know, on the -- on a wetland. And whether the property adjacent has land use restrictions.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, and there are. The property to the west is the investigation area H-1 property, and we do have groundwater restrictions on that property including, you know, pumping the groundwater.

So there would be no opportunity for someone to, without DTSC and/or Navy knowledge and approval, to insert a groundwater well downgradient of the DRMO.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Are there any other questions? Public comments? Thoughts?

MR. OUSEY: Yeah. Fred Ousey, Envirotech.

I just wanted to say that Myrna's comments have some merit because there's a little pond there, a duck pond that's directly west of the property line and I think downgradient --

MR. GEMAR: Yep, wetland B, yup. I know it well.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That pond I believe you're referring to is part of H-1.

MR. GEMAR: It is, that's wetland B, yes.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's part of the actual remedy for H-1.

MR. GEMAR: But certainly that response or that question will be responded to for sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And just to follow up on Fred, Mr. Ousey's, statement and my questioning, I would agree with you, Dwight, that it's -- that wetland B is primarily a, may be totally a freshwater or seasonal wetland. It's certainly designated as that by the Army Corps.

And I can't imagine that there would be any reason to mitigate, create some kind of a mitigation bank there creating -- trying to convert it to a salt marsh because that's -- that's not a part of your H-1 package, sort of remedy.

But I would think that it's, maybe it's just my imagination, but sometimes in -- way back when we used to have rain in the winter, it seems to me like the groundwater table --

MR. COFFEY: Rose.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- rose quite significantly, and possibly even above the ground.

MR. COFFEY: Flooded.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that's really the reason for my questioning on that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So if there are no more public comments or questions, I just wanted to say thank you all for your time and your comments.

And, please, if you think of anything else you'd like to ask, send any questions, comments by e-mail or mail or fax, and you can send them also to Janet Naito with DTSC or Richard Perry. We'd love to hear from you. And then we can respond to all those comments and consider them for the remedy. Thank you very much.

(Thereupon the Public Hearing portion of the meeting ended at 7:54 p.m.)

III. PRESENTATION (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island]: *Results for Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 4 and T-2 Oil Water Separator*)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And we will move onto the next part of the agenda which is another presentation. This one is by Mr. Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island. He's going to talk about the results for Industrial Wastewater Pump Station Number 4 and T-2 Oil Water Separator.

MR. SILER: I tried to get a few more sites in there for you, Janet, but I could only find two this time.

But when we last talked about this site and the pilot test that was being conducted at the site was back during the March 2014 RAB meeting. And at that time, we were in the process of finishing the first phase of the injections at Industrial Pump Station Number 4, and we were in the midst of doing both the first and second stages -- I'm sorry -- the first stage of the enhanced, in situ bioremediation injections down by the T-2 Oil Water Separator, and we had not performed the second injection event at Industrial Pump Station Number 4.

So what I'm going to do is I've gone over a lot of this information before. The first three topics there we've talked about before, I'm going to go through it pretty fast. And I'm going to try to spend a little more time on the last two topics, the questions there, the pilot testing and the next steps, just to give you an idea of where we are and the results as we're moving forward.

And at any time during the presentation -- I want to make this statement because I know everyone here is real shy -- please feel free to break in and ask questions at any time.

So moving along to the site description. These two sites are located in the northeastern portion of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel in a subarea called Investigation Area C-1.

And see this area right back here is Industrial Pump Station Number 4.

The T-2 Oil Water Separator is right down here.

And they actually lie within another subarea called Installation Restoration Program Site 03.

And we did a major excavation in that source area, and that's what you're seeing right here. But these sites all fit within Installation Restoration Program Site 03.

Now, the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you -- not to be shy -- but could you tell us where those cross streets, something? Remember, there's no picture here.

MR. SILER: Well, this is Weisman Avenue right here.

Nimitz is right out here.

If you come right up here, G Street is going to be right up here.

Where we're at right now is about right up in here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right then.

MR. SILER: So Industrial Pump Station Number 4 and the Oil Water Separator T-2 were part of another Installation Restoration Program site. See, you can't tell any of your sites without a program, so you have to make sure you have a program to follow along.

Part of another Installation Restoration Program site called IR-14, which was the industrial wastewater system on the island. It was operated between 1972 and 1996.

In 1996 the Navy decommissioned the industrial wastewater pump system. They removed sludge. Flushed and plugged the pipelines that went into the two sites we're talking about here, but they left the pump station and separator in place.

Now, there have been a lot of investigations that have gone on here from 1983 to 2003. You can see there were a number of investigations. But in that time period there was no remedial action until a FOPL line that went into the T-2 Oil Water Separator was removed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We have some guests. You have to say what a FOPL is.

MR. SILER: A FOPL is a fuel oil pipeline. And it was part of a distribution system of fuel oil that went around the Mare Island at the time that the Navy was here.

Now, the first significant remedial action took place in 2005 when about 1,300 tons of soil that was contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated volatile organic compounds was removed from Industrial Pump Station Number 4.

In addition, to evaluate any residual contamination, there were a number of investigations that took place between the 2009 and 2010 time frame.

And then in the midst of that -- and you saw this on a previous slide, but I'll put it back up so you can take a look at it here -- is that in 2009 this removal action of the IR-03 source area was removed and it extended to cut right between Industrial Pump Station Number 4 and the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

So in addition to these investigation and remedial actions that took place, there were some other things that went on at the site.

This slide right here shows you what the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 removal action looked like.

That is the pump station itself right there.

This excavation was about 55 feet wide by 60 feet long. And it went down to a depth of 20 feet. In addition, this entire structure was removed. The one thing that was left in place, they couldn't get to, was this concrete stand that it stood on right in here.

Now, when they did this removal action they took confirmation samples all around. Those confirmation samples met the commercial/industrial cleanup goal at the site, but they weren't able to get any confirmation samples below this concrete pad here.

And then as they went forward and they did monitoring activities at the site -- and this really started taking off after the 2005 removal action in both areas of Industrial Pump Station Number 4 and the T-2 Oil Water Separator -- is that they saw that the volatile organic compounds and the petroleum hydrocarbons, and they were seen mainly as diesel at both Industrial Pump Station Number 4 and the T-2 Oil Water Separator were not decreasing in concentration. They had stabilized, and in some cases they were increasing. So based on that, it was evident that something else had to be done at this site to bring it down to the cleanup goals that were in the cleanup plans.

So this shows you -- and you can't see it really well here -- just the distribution of volatile organic compounds. And I'm using vinyl chloride.

You can see in these two wells right here, they're in the source area of Industrial Pump Station Number 4.

The green means that the concentration is above the cleanup goal that we're trying to attain.

You can see there are a couple of sites down here that are downgradient. Groundwater flows from west to east, and west is toward Mare Island Strait which is right here.

There are some volatile organic compounds, vinyl chloride in this case, that are still elevated, but we don't see any vinyl chloride that gets near the strait in the wells that we have between the source area sites and the strait itself.

Now, as far as diesel is concerned, diesel is much more widely distributed. You can see we're seeing petroleum hydrocarbons in the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 source area.

And also we're seeing it downgradient of the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 area in the vicinity of the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

You're also seeing it in here downgradient of this large excavation that we did in the IR-03 source area.

So we knew something else had to be done here.

MR. SILER: So in 2014, earlier this year, we actually had a work plan. We had that work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. And we started actually injecting reagents that we felt would break down the constituents that we were concerned about, the volatile organic compounds and the petroleum hydrocarbons.

And I guess if you want the Aesop fable rendition of this thing here, is that this PersulfOx here, okay, this is sodium persulfate, this is the hare. And by hare I mean H-A-R-E portion of it. And the ORC, or its oxygen release compound, that's kind of the tortoise here.

This is a real reactive reagent, and it tends to go pretty fast, tends to get used up pretty fast.

The ORC is meant to actually be a slow controlled release of molecular oxygen that helps break down some of the constituents that we were seeing at the site.

Because of the case that this is so reactive, we wanted to keep this away from the strait, because we didn't want to see anything getting reactive at the strait.

So this is pretty much concentrated in the Industrial Pump Station 4 area. And this is downgradient of the industrial pump station 4 area in the vicinity of the T-2 Oil Water Separator and down in the IR-03 site.

In addition to actually doing the injection events -- and there were two injection events--we have the first one that took place in February, and the second one took place in April -- we also did performance monitoring testing of the wells in the area. And there was a baseline monitoring event that we conducted prior to doing any injection.

And then after we actually completed the two injection events, we had three performance monitoring tests, and we're still conducting quarterly monitoring at this site. But those performance monitoring tests were conducted one, two, and four weeks after the second injection event. And you can see that they took place in April, two in April and then one in May.

Now, what we're going to do here in the near future, we're actually going to prepare a report that presents the results. We've actually submitted a report. It just is a data dump. It says here's all the data, here's what's going on at the site.

But there's going to be a report that's coming up here in the near future that talks about the results that we're seeing from the performance tests, and an evaluation of those results. And we hope to submit that in the near future and propose any next steps that we have.

So moving along to the results or actually what we did here. This slide shows you where the injections took place. The red dots are for the PersulfOx injections. And the blue dots are the oxygen release compound injection areas. So that was over a much wider area.

So these next three slides just give you some photographs of where we did the work. You can see this is the spacing of the borings that we did.

The photograph on the left is Industrial Pump Station Number 4. This is down by the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

Here they're injecting the PersulfOx in the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 area.

And the next slide shows them injecting the ORC or oxygen release compound down by the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

MR. COFFEY: I don't know, Neal, it looks like fracking to me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I wish it was, get something out of it.

MR. SILER: So the slide you're seeing right here shows you the concentrations of vinyl chloride that we're seeing, particularly in the area of the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 which is right here. And if you look at this, and also you can see it down here by the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

And the next slide is a trend chart of what we saw before we actually did any of the injection events. And this is the first injection event right here. Took about two weeks.

The second injection event took about two days. That's this blue line you're seeing right here.

But you see we had fluctuations here. It started to go down actually right around before that. You can see it's really dropped off really quickly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Neal, you don't have any concern -- I'm not a chemist here, so bear with me. But sometimes when you were injecting at sites, depending on what you had present, what contaminant, you were concerned about it morphing into something else that you didn't like on the site.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What other products?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did this just turn into nothing?

MR. SILER: It eventually will. I mean, when these break down, they break down into innocuous compounds eventually. But again, the reason, as I mentioned earlier, that we wanted to do this right here away from the strait around the industrial pump station 4 site is that, as you can see, once this goes, it's really reactive. And you'll see as we start talking about petroleum hydrocarbons how it differs.

Now, if you take a look down at the, near the T-2 Oil Water Separator site, this is really interesting because it started to go up, okay. And remember now, what you're seeing down here is a different reagent that's being injected. You're seeing the oxygen release compound being injected down here. But it went up and then it really came down also.

Now, this is downgradient of the Industrial Pump Station 4, but you can see even here it started to really go down quite a bit.

Now, there are a couple of other wells that are closer to the strait that are right by the old wharf at the edge, and they've kind of stabilized. They haven't gone down, so we have to take a look at that and continue monitoring.

Because again, remember, this reagent that we're using here, you know, although we're really down below concentrations, I think this well -- one of these wells right here went down to something like 550 parts per billion down to non-detect that we're seeing here. It went real fast.

There's a couple of other wells that we have to take a look at and continue to monitor because, again, this is that slow controlled release. This is the tortoise that says slow and steady wins the race. So we have to continue monitoring. And we expected that as we did this injection because we knew we were going to see some fluctuations as we went forward because of the type of the reagent that we were using.

MR. COFFEY: How long do you monitor afterwards to see if there's any more fluctuations or it bounces back?

MR. SILER: Well, we're going to continue to monitor -- and you'll see that later on in a slide -- at least through the end of this year. We're going to continue to monitor beyond that. It really depends on what the results look like, and we'll decide exactly what interval we're going to monitor, whether we'll continue the quarterly monitoring or come to some other type of interval for monitoring. But once we get those results, we'll go ahead and evaluate that and decide on the best steps forward.

Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How do you know that these are -- that you don't have a source any longer?

MR. SILER: Well, the only source that we ever saw in this area was the pump station. We have a number of those investigations that we did between '83 and 2003. All the borings that they put in, all the trenches that they dug, all of the wells that they installed only pointed to the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 as the source in the area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So while it was supposed to be pumping industrial waste out to the waste treatment plant, it was actually distributing it?

MR. SILER: Well --

MR. COFFEY: It leaked.

MR. SILER: Yeah, it probably leaked, yeah, exactly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. That's great.

MR. SILER: Okay. Now, what this slide shows you right here is the pilot test results for petroleum hydrocarbons.

And again the green, if you look at the green, this shows you the constituents, in this case this is diesel, that are still above our cleanup goal. And the cleanup goal for diesel is 640 micrograms per liter.

I should mention that the cleanup goals for the volatile organic compounds differ. For trichloroethylene, that we're not seeing much of that, it's 360 micrograms per liter or part per billion.

For cis-1,2-dichloroethylene, it's 590 micrograms per liter.

And the vinyl chloride is 13 micrograms per liter.

MS. TYGIELSKI: So those oxidizers that you injected before are not going to work on these?

MR. SILER: Well, I'll show you --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you repeat her question? Because nobody here could hear it.

MR. SILER: Repeat your question.

MS. TYGIELSKI: The oxidizing substances didn't break down diesel, it broke down other stuff?

MR. SILER: I think it did. I think that the reason that it looked at re -- or at least it reacted with the volatile organic compounds faster than it looked at the diesel is from a chemical, from a dynamic aspect. It took less energy to break that down than it does the diesel.

I think it did have some positive effects, and I'll talk about those a little bit later when we get back to that, but it's going to take a little bit longer time to see how that works out, okay.

So as you're seeing here, we still have some petroleum hydrocarbons in the Industrial Pump Station Number 4 area. Although they've kind of decreased, there's a couple places where they've increased.

And then down here by the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

And then this one down here that's kind of isolated that we're seeing down by the southern end of the IR-03 source area, this is well 3W018.

MR. COFFEY: Neal, why is it injections rather than just further excavation? Simply because of that concrete pad?

MR. SILER: There's just nothing to get at. There's nothing to get at. And so --

MR. COFFEY: Well, this has got to be coming from somewhere.

MR. SILER: The reason is, it's more environmentally sound to do something like this. Because if you excavate it, you just pick it up and take it --

MR. COFFEY: Somewhere else.

MR. SILER: -- and put it somewhere else.

MS. TYGIELSKI: This get moved.

MR. SILER: Okay. So what you like to do is you like to do things where you can actually get a reduction in mass and toxicity. That just kind of moves the mass from one place to another. This reduces it, gets it, you know, reduces the mass, reduces the toxicity, so you kind of want to do something like this after you've done that.

So this again is the well that's in the center of the Industrial Pump Station Number 4. And you can see it started to go up, and then after we did the first and second injection -- it was actually starting to go down before that, but it's still -- for diesel it's still above the 640 microgram per liter cleanup goal, which is represented by this line right here that you're seeing.

Now, for motor oil it's gone down below that line. So motor oil doesn't seem to be the issue, it's the diesel fraction that's the issue.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is it less reactive because diesel is a bigger molecule?

MR. SILER: I couldn't tell you off the top of my head. I'd have to see. It's probably some different lighter fraction compounds. Usually they tend to break down a little bit better than the heavier fractions do in something like this.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Heavier fractions tend to be bigger molecules.

MR. SILER: Could well be.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're talking to a chemistry teacher.

MR. SILER: Well, you'd definitely have more carbon actually, a higher amount of carbon in those.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Thank you.

MR. SILER: This is a well in the T-2 Oil Water Separator area, it's T2-M0100. And you can see here it's kind of fluctuating. We did the injection event, and again this is the oxygen release compound. And this went down. And then the motor oil here kind of went up, and it's kind of fluctuating right now. But both are a little bit above this cleanup goal that we're seeing.

MR. COFFEY: Is the increase simply because of the fact that they've used up the material?

MR. SILER: I don't think it's used up, the ORC. I think one of the reasons that you're seeing the increase is that when you inject the slurry that goes in there, I think that you're actually releasing

or getting the petroleum hydrocarbon to desorb off the solid molecules, so you're seeing a spike in the concentration.

But then again, as you go forward with this oxygen release compound, remember it's the slow and steady, you know, it keeps going, and it's going to take time for this to break down.

So this here is well 03W19 which is a well that's further downgradient of the T-2 Oil Water Separator, Industrial Pump Station Number 4. The motor oil you can see it's below the cleanup goal, and the diesel is getting down there, it's kind of fluctuating right now. But it's right around the cleanup goal.

MS. TYGIELSKI: And why is a stretch of data missing?

MR. SILER: They just didn't collect any samples during that time period.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MR. SILER: Yeah. Okay. So now this is well 03W18 which was the one that was on the southernmost portion of IR-03. And this one is kind of funny. Again, this one was kind of going slow and steady. We did the injection event. It elevated, you know. And now it's come down, but then it's kind of come up again. We need to continue monitoring here to see exactly what's going on.

The motor oil hovers around the cleanup goal line, but this we really have to keep an eye on to see what's going on in the future.

MR. COFFEY: It's pretty wild.

MR. SILER: So what did we learn? At Industrial Pump Station Number 4, the injection method and the reagent was effective on volatile organic compounds. Those compounds have decreased below even the laboratory detection limits, so it looks like in that area it's cleaned up pretty well.

The petroleum hydrocarbons have decreased. We have seen some decreases, but we've seen some increases also. I think there may be a flushing effect, when they did the injections they actually got some of the hydrocarbon to desorb. We're going to have to see as we continue to monitor in the future whether we have to do something else or whether this is going to be all we have to do. So we'll continue to monitor there.

And again, in some ways that's a good thing when you get the petroleum hydrocarbon molecules to desorb because it gives you a much larger area for the reagent to react on, and it gives a more contact area than they get with a reagent.

MR. COFFEY: Doesn't that force it to move?

MR. SILER: Not necessarily. It's really slow here. It takes like -- from this point here where we're seeing that, it takes something like 79 days or something to even get to the strait. It's really slow.

MR. COFFEY: Okay. Will that increase as the wet weather comes?

MR. SILER: It might. We haven't seen that when the wet weather comes, to tell you the truth. We just kind of --

MS. TYGIELSKI: Well, we haven't seen that.

MR. SILER: We haven't seen wet weather, that's for sure, exactly.

MR. COFFEY: Be positive, we will have wet weather.

MR. SILER: Exactly. You probably jinxed it now, Paula, we were going to have El Niño's.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Hey, I've got some drums at home, I can pound the drums and get some rain going.

MR. COFFEY: Will you provide video of that, please?

MR. SILER: Now, down at the Oil Water Separator T-2, the injection method, the reagent, it's slower reacting. You know, the reason we did that is because it's not as reactive so it isn't as much of a threat to Mare Island Strait.

We've seen some VOC decreases and increases. We need to see how that reacts as we continue to monitor. In both petroleum hydrocarbons we've seen some increases and some decreases. The decreases have not been significant, but we need to keep an eye on that as the ORC keeps releasing.

So the next steps, you know, we're going to be submitting a formal report here in the next few months that describes what we did and evaluates the results.

We're going to continue the quarterly monitoring program. Continue to monitor these wells through the end of the year. And we'll probably be monitoring beyond -- for sure we'll be monitoring beyond that, we just have to go ahead and see how we're going to be doing that as we evaluate the progress going forward.

So with that, that's the end of my presentation. If anybody has any questions, I'll be glad to provide a response.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula does.

MR. SILER: Paula?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Have you considered another injection of the oxidizing reagents?

MR. SILER: We haven't done that yet because we really want to wait and see how it reacts over a little bit of time to give it a chance for the oxygen release compound to work. But it's something we would consider moving forward with depending on what the results show us.

MR. COFFEY: What do you consider the timeline?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just was going to ask that question. Finally you beat me to it.

MR. COFFEY: Somebody has got to step on your toes.

MR. SILER: We're at least looking at the next six months to probably a year to take a look at that.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a question. What happened to your fancy logo you used to always have on your presentations?

MR. SILER: I don't know, it's just not there anymore.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow. This is boring as the Navy's -- actually, theirs is better now. See there. Something happened. Corporate, huh? Corporate killed your logo, I'll bet.

MR. COFFEY: Part of the cost cutting.

MR. SILER: Mike had the right answer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was a Navy oversight of your last cleanup efforts. Nix that logo.

MR. SILER: Any other questions that anybody has? Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: This brings us to our second public comment period. Do you have any public comments?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Ten minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.):

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. We are at administrative business and announcements.

If you have any comments on the May 29th meeting minutes, please get those to either Myrna or myself.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So focus groups. Do we have any community reports? Chris, did you have anything you wanted to say?

a) Community Update (Chris Rasmussen [RAB Member])

MR. RASMUSSEN: There was one thing I might bring up. For those who may not be aware of this, recently the Vallejo Architectural Heritage and Landmarks Commission approved an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for what has come to be known as the SOS Project or the 658 Submarine Sale Project that was proposed some four years ago, originally by the Mare Island Historic Park Foundation. Since the approval, which was only a week or two ago, maybe a couple of weeks ago, by AHLC, we've also become aware -- actually we were aware of it somewhat before that AHLC meeting -- there is also another sort of obstacle, not so much an obstacle, but probably a built-in potential delay in the form of an upcoming soil analysis on the planned installation site for the submarine sale, which is in the parking lot on Railroad Avenue right in front of building 46, the Mare Island museum currently.

I think Neal Siler is well aware of this. He's one of those who brought this to our attention and brought some detail to the SOS group and MIHPF about it. And I assume that this is eventually going to become an item that may appear before the RAB, I don't know. There's some planning that needs to be done evidently.

The time frames at this point, as far as I understand it, are kind of unknown. I just wanted to bring this up and bring it to your attention, to the public.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Thanks.

b) Technical Update (Paula Tygielski [RAB Member])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Technical?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How's your RV?

MS. TYGIELSKI: One of my son's friends is currently renting it, living in our backyard.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Don't tell the city.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah, don't tell the city.

MS. NAITO: She just did.

MR. COFFEY: Wrong city.

c) City Update (Kathleen Diohep [City of Vallejo])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. City report. Kathleen is here with us again, did you have anything you wanted to say?

MS. DIOHEP: Does this work?

MR. COFFEY: Yup.

MS. DIOHEP: A couple quick things, actually chronological. In May with the city budget two things got approved; I'm new as in April, I'm the manager, and two came in the budget, we're getting two new professional staff. One I see as being the Mare Island project manager, so I think that's a good thing for the greater good in the long term order. Not that I'm not really enjoying digging through boxes and learning all about Mare Island, but so --

And then we also got approval and contracts have been awarded to demolish building 755 and the two barracks up at the north island. And we've roughly a million dollars in funds, and that work should be happening in August.

MR. COFFEY: Geez, a million dollars to do that.

MS. DIOHEP: And then we just recently got approval to prepare an application for a federal loan for \$4.7 million to deal with more North Island demolition and/or things that would make it more ready for development.

And then we issued a Request for Qualifications for development. And I meant to bring some of the announcements and I forgot them. But what we did was a Request for Qualifications for a developer for north Mare Island, looking for a developer and/or income producers. So several different entities said I want a chunk to do my blank, we could put them together. So responses are due September 17th. So those are, it's moving along.

MR. COFFEY: Cool. That's the most we've heard from the city in a year.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Usually the city's report is nothing to report. So thank you, Kathleen, that was wonderful.

Yeah, I always hate to say this, but I just feel like I have had enough questions about -- people have walked up to the barracks and come back and told me, hey, there's a mistake on there, it says that it's being demolished because of fire, and it's not fire, it's homeless people taking apart

something. Two people have said that to me. So clearly people are interested in your project, just regular citizens.

But I always clarify that actually the Vallejo Fire Department burned those buildings down. I watched them do that. I was very tired of burning in my eyes, and went out looking around to see what was going on.

And so I think that the public almost deserves knowing that we really set this whole thing in motion. And I hope -- and I appreciate that the city is finally taking responsibility for the derelict status, you know, appearance of the north island, but I just hope that in the future there's a little bit different decisions made around -- I mean, if you look at other parts of the island, you don't see that kind of derelict state. And people say, well, the city's bankrupt and, you know, we've been able to get off on being good landlords, being good, responsible property owners by playing that card. And I'm happy just to see the city taking responsibility, sucking it up, and putting our tax dollars to work up there, because the city let it go in the condition it was in. The Navy never gave us the properties like they are.

And I just wanted to just really make that point that there was just a time when it just seemed like it didn't matter to the city. And I'm happy to see it turning around.

I am also proud that this Restoration Advisory Board and the state and federal regulators, the Navy, the players did work hard to make sure that that property, the majority of it is available and has been transferred, because reminding people that environmental cleanup makes reuse possible. And so I'm proud of that.

However, one of the things that I think the public deserves to understand more clearly is the types of costs, of infrastructure costs and hard costs that are required for the types of development that people are excited about on the property.

And I recall at least one number that sticks in my mind, and it might not be a current number, but because of the cost of infrastructure, Touro University and Seaman's Project was looking at something like, the city staff project manager told me -- or the public that it was around 37 million. I think I've seen 62 million in terms of the costs of the infrastructure before a design would be sketched, before dirt would be dug.

So I'm wondering if the city is going to be -- I mean, how -- of course we'd love to see the Request for Qualifications, I know that it's a new team. But there's been like maybe fourteen -- maybe I'm exaggerating by four or five -- development agreements, and I think those have been entered into sincerely by all parties. But they continue to make this sort of disgruntled feeling about Mare Island for the community, because I think the community misunderstands how complex that issue is. And maybe counsel does too, you know, throw a bunch of Measure B money at it, throw millions of dollars of HUD money and all kinds of money at the property, and at the end of the day you have a clear-cut piece of property that still has tremendous up-front costs if you're thinking the way that we've been thinking.

And what I'm saying is there -- are you presenting it as a property that might have a phased or an interim or a less heavy on the development side kind of property?

I mean, I know a woman worked really, really hard -- I don't remember her name, maybe some of you who lived on Mare Island -- proposing a nursery type, a commercial nursery type facility. I might even go so far, and I have publicly here at the RAB, as to say could, you might be considering this property after a while as a mitigation bank for sea level rising. I mean it might

be that because it was the most recently filled it might be the easiest to return to wetlands to protect some of the city's other resources or somebody else's resources.

So I'm just hoping that somehow the communication can get out there that it isn't -- it isn't dumping that's killing the deal in the north end, it isn't vagrants who are killing the deal, the fire department kind of helped, and it isn't just cleaning it up. I mean, sometimes the burden gets -- ends up being, oh, it's environmental cleanup, it's because we don't have that seven acres or that seventeen acres or whatever that's killing the deal.

And so I hope that there's a way -- and I know it's kind of messy -- but if there's a way to present the project site in a reality way as well as a, you know, I mean, a plausible way as well as an inviting way. I know it seems like an impossible job, but it's kind of neat property in its current state for the -- probably the most people that come to visit the island go there to look at those buildings, that's what the security guards tell me. There aren't bad people.

MS. DIOHEP: They've been chasing away prospective real estate developers to look at the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Exactly. Everybody is intrigued with this sort of no man's land. But I hope there's a way to present it in a way that makes it seem doable, but also not a pie in the sky or a deal killer, you know. That seems like the real challenge for the property.

MS. DIOHEP: Well, the actual Request for Qualifications is on the city's website. So if you go to the city website.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that's what I was going to ask you.

MS. DIOHEP: So forward slash north Mare Island -- www.ci.vallejo.ca.us/city_hall/.

And it was a real challenge because how much do you -- detail do you put into it? So we are asking somebody to tell us in concept what they want to do and why they are capable of doing it.

We're not asking for design. We're not asking for a proposal. We're not asking for a promise that probably wouldn't come through, you know, really, because it's all on spec at this point. Then we'll see.

And we're laying it out saying -- so San Francisco, San Francisco Bay area's economy is very hot right now. There are not large sites for industrial or business development. That's the -- that's -- the moment in time is a little bit different. But we're explaining that if you want to do what it's approved for, you could get into contract very quickly.

If you want to change the plan, we are doing a General Plan update. You might be able to have the change happen with an EIR already funded. So that's one less.

And if you want to do something that's just comes up with all sorts of new ideas, you probably have to pay for a very extensive and a long entitlement process.

And we've stated, you know, the city's goals are a jobs-generating use, and something that can pay the way. So that's the evaluation and the metric.

So we'll see what comes in in September. About a hundred people have said they downloaded the RFQ, and are interested --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And are they also interested in addressing the traffic issues?

MS. DIOHEP: They have to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean it's supposed to be this prime property on Highway 37 which is a deal killer. It's not a good place to have it be adjacent to anymore, I don't think.

MS. DIOHEP: I can't make a deal killer, I have to be in marketing mode right now. How's that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We're just experiencing it as residents or businesses on the island.

MS. DIOHEP: Right. I had a draft that explained all the different earlier generations of efforts, and people told me you should just take that paragraph out. But I am digging out and making available all the infrastructure studies, all the cost estimates, the work that Touro's done, so people can like come into it with --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As much information.

MS. DIOHEP: Yeah. Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good. Good. Good. Thank you.

b) Lennar Update (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. SILER: Okay. If you'd like to follow along, you should have a copy of the 11 by 17 handouts that we usually have.

Now, we didn't do a lot of fieldwork in July, but the two photographs that are on here will give you an idea of what we performed.

In the upper right-hand corner of the sheet we performed a well installation at Building 144 Oil Water Separator, and we also sampled that well. And hopefully, if the results come out well, that that's the last physical work that we have to do in Investigation Area C3. So that will be nice.

MR. COFFEY: Wow.

MR. SILER: In the upper left-hand corner, that's actually them working today. They're conducting the third quarter 2014 groundwater monitoring event at Installation Restoration Program Site 03, Industrial Pump Station Number 4, and the T-2 Oil Water Separator.

Now, although we didn't get a lot of fieldwork done last month or this month, we actually set the stage for getting a number of things done next month. And one of the things we're excited about is completing the excavation work at the Building 637 area. And that will be starting next week. So hopefully we can get that moving along and get that done here in August.

Another thing that we're working on right now and we'll be starting next week is the Remedial Action Work Plan at the IR-21 Buildings 386/388/390 storm sewers. That will be starting next week also. Hopefully that will be done in August.

One of the exciting documents that we were able to complete --

MR. COFFEY: Wait, that just doesn't go together.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It does in Neal's world.

MR. SILER: That's right. Exactly. That we were able to get done this month was the Land Use Covenant for Investigation Area B.1, the Crane Test Area. That was executed and recorded. So that's in place.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That makes it even better, it's a land use covenant you're excited about.

MS. WOCHNIK: That's the one I was excited to read, huh?

MR. SILER: Exactly. Exactly. That's why it was exciting.

And then today we actually submitted a print ready copy of the investigation area B.1 O&M plan for Janet, that Janet will be signing any minute now so --

MS. NAITO: I look forward to that.

MR. GEMAR: But are you excited?

MR. SILER: Exactly.

MS. NAITO: Wow.

MR. SILER: And then other things that we're trying to get done this year. We have submitted the Draft RAP for Investigation Area C-1. RAP stands for Remedial Action Plan. We're hoping to get comments back on that soon.

But today we actually submitted the RAP for Investigation Area C-2. So with that, all the Remedial Action Plans -- you can see how much Janet is excited by that news.

MS. NAITO: You didn't hear Liz going, "Yay!"

MR. SILER: And we also have a number of different documents in the pipelines. We've got a number of approvals for moving forward at different sites or for closures of different sites.

If anybody has any questions on the work that we have completed or are working on, I'd be glad to answer any questions they have.

Thank you.

c) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar [Weston Solutions, Inc.]

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update.

MR. GEMAR: Well, I have, once again, a shorter and shorter handout. Under document status I'm extremely excited to report that four documents went final that are listed on the upper left corner on the shoreline of San Pablo Bay. And one of those is the Final Feasibility Study for Installation Restoration Site 05 Dredge Pond 7 south in the Western Magazine Area, which will now feed into one of the remaining documents that are listed below which is the Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan for that site.

So I'm not sure about the next RAB meeting, but the one after that we might have another Proposed Plan Draft RAP presentation, I hope. But we'll see how that one goes. But it's going to be a snoozer.

And another day we're watching the grass not grow, pumping groundwater and chasing drones out of the landfill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Drones?

MS. DIOHEP: No, you toured city staff, you can't explain that as drones.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ooh.

MR. COFFEY: They just drone on.

MR. GEMAR: No, we actually had one of our volunteer policemen from the city of Vallejo was flying his drone, and it went missing, and he thought it went missing inside the landfill, so he contacted us to see if he could go look for his drone. But said drone is still missing. So I suggested that he get the NSA involved and try to locate the drone. So never a dull day on Mare Island.

So that's all.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: At least you're not droning on anyway.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Probably an expensive loss for him.

MR. COFFEY: Nah, he bought it at the mall.

MR. GEMAR: Maybe Radio Shack, I don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There was one time when the Navy had an active -- I've seen this in the National Archive photos that when the Navy was active somebody landed an ultralight out there somewhere like near the marine barracks, and they got busted for that. Droning on, huh?

MR. GEMAR: Yep.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, I have a question actually. What's -- so the Record of Decision for IR-05 Dredge Pond, okay, and WMA. What -- how is that different from or how are those unrelated projects to the Feasibility Study and the Proposed Plan/Remedial Action Plan for some of those properties? Oh, it's all the same?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, they're all IR-05 WMA. So the Feasibility Study was the one that just went final. And so then that has, you know, a remedies that were evaluated. And so the preferred remedy will then be presented in the Proposed Plan for that site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So then you'll be giving a public meeting about those leading to the Record of Decision --

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- at some point soon?

MR. GEMAR: Correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MR. GEMAR: They all flow together.

d) Regulatory Agency Update (Carolyn d'Almeida [Environmental Protection Agency], Janet Naito [Department of Toxic Substances Control], and Elizabeth Wells [Regional Water Quality Control Board])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Regulatory update.

MS. NAITO: You're very excited to give your report.

MS. WELLS: It is with great excitement that I would like to report that I continue to review Mare Island documents. I continue to be showered with Mare Island documents by Lennar and the Navy. Thank you very much.

MS. NAITO: Hi. I wanted to let everybody know that within the next month or so we -- Richard and I will hopefully be releasing a fact sheet that talks about the -- how we would like to

proceed with the RCRA corrective action determinations, and the facility -- and modifying the permit facility boundaries for a number of Navy sites. It's going to be a document which is part of the process. Rather than doing it at the -- or together at the Finding of Suitability to Transfer stage, we would like to make it more concurrent with the remedy decision phase. And did that make sense to nobody?

MS. NAITO: Okay. Good. If anybody has questions, you all have my number.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is this -- is this fact sheet going to be a work in progress so that we can help you make it a more user friendly document? Because clearly your presentation wasn't.

MS. NAITO: I know, oh.

MR. COFFEY: Smack.

MS. NAITO: That's why I have Richard to take my tech speak and turn it into English.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, that was really mean of me.

MS. NAITO: That's okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But I think I kind of followed what you were saying, but could you give us just one example? Or maybe you're just getting the word out. But if you want some advance help on the fact sheet, you might tell us what you're thinking about.

MS. NAITO: An easy way to think about it is like for the DRMO Proposed Plan that we've just discussed tonight, we are proposing that -- we are proposing to issue a RCRA Corrective Action Complete Determination once the Land Use Covenant is complete, or once we've finished the Land Use Covenant's remedial design. So in conjunction with getting to the end of the cleanup process.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Would you like to give a presentation on this topic at the next RAB?

MS. NAITO: I would be happy to.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I think that would be an excellent plan.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I agree.

MS. NAITO: And by then I will have it put in English.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's complicated, and we had a long discussion about this at our BCT today, so I think we can devote some time to it at the next RAB.

MS. NAITO: Sorry. Carolyn?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I don't have anything to report. I am all caught up on my PCB reports so far. And so I don't have anything pending.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good for Carolyn.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Co-chair's report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You can go.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I'll go ahead and go first. You have the Navy monthly progress report. We have been doing fieldwork at the Paint Waste Area vicinity, IR Site 04, as well as Building 742, the former degreasing plant.

At the Paint Waste Area vicinity, we completed the trenching activities and the surveys, and we still need to do groundwater sampling, soil sampling, and some backfill.

Happy to report that we did not find any MEC items or radiological items like the deck markers and things that we found when we were doing the excavation a few years ago.

We did find some paint waste. So although we were going to change the name of the site, we can't now cause we found some more paint waste. We expect to complete that work at the end of this month.

Sampling was also conducted out at IR site 04 which is down in the southern part of the island just north of the Production Manufacturing Area. We are doing data gap sampling on that site in follow-up to the fieldwork that was performed last summer. And that data will be used to complete the RI/FS for site 04.

A couple of photos are here showing some of the work being done at site 04, including some geophysical clearance for subsurface obstruction at the site before drilling, and then a photo of the drill rig also.

At Building 742, which is a Navy-retained condition within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, we collected some additional groundwater samples, and we're evaluating those sampling results to assist with plans for future activities at the site.

We submitted six documents this month, and received comments on two documents from DTSC, and comments on two documents from the Water Board.

And our next BCT and RAB meeting day is September 25th. And we will be excited to see all of you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We'll make this presentation short. I wanted to note that there has been apparently some rumor trying to get traction that the causeway will be closed August 9 through 11. And for those of you who live on the island, that mystery I hope has been solved. The bridge is closed to marine traffic for August 9 through 11, so they will not be lifting the bridge. But it is not closed, according to the Public Works Department, for pedestrian and vehicle use. So that took me two or three days to learn.

But I hope that I got to the root of that because the seventh annual Mare Faire is taking place on August -- Friday, August 8, Saturday, August 9, and Sunday, August 11. And given the traffic nightmares, not just on race days but permanently on Highway 37, I think it would be a big disappointment to people coming from outside the area to have such a complicated way to get onto Mare Island.

So I want to tell you that on Saturday is the 70th anniversary of the Port Chicago mutiny, so-called mutiny that the Navy called it, and that they charged fifty individuals with following the Port Chicago explosion three weeks before that. That event took place, the mutiny took place on Mare Island at the Naval Ammunition Depot, and also included the housing area for the sailors, 258 sailors who were buried at Rider Street where our sanitation district is now.

So we will be showing a movie on Saturday evening. And the orientation for at least Saturday, but even my talk on Friday evening will be a conversation about that action by those gentlemen and the impact it had on desegregation.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah, we got it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- desegregation of the military as well as its lasting impact on the modern civil rights movement.

I think it's a story that has not gotten traction as it should in Vallejo. Touting itself as sort of the multi-cultural capital of the world, and pretty much being that, I'd like to see more attention paid to this very special moment in time that men gave a tremendous amount of their lives, really, for; not that they were killed like their colleagues three weeks before, but that they had the courage in those times and under those conditions to step forward is a really tremendous story that this town just hasn't really embraced, probably because it doesn't know about it.

Other than that, for instance, the chapel will be open for tour like it is at the Flyway Festival. There are only two times that I'm aware of that the chapel is open without reservation. So Sunday, eleven to four.

The museum will open on that weekend even though they don't normally open on the second weekend.

And so we have a tremendous level of participation by various Mare Island organizations in that event. And I promise you in another hour or two the schedule will be up on Facebook and on our website.

So thank you very much to the Navy as well for allowing, providing for a permit to allow us to go onto the historic south shore again this month on Saturday, ten to twelve.

If you haven't been there, osprey are still hanging out at their nests, and at least one great blue heron, a late start, still has young at its nest on the housing area.

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

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:09 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Proposed Plan / Draft Remedial Action Plan, Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
- Presentation Handout – Results for Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 4 and T-2 Oil Water Separator
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, July 31, 2014

RAB Meeting Minutes Comment/Correction Form

Meeting Minutes: July 31, 2014

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 4, 2014

RAB Member: _____

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

Submit form to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes