

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 2009**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, January 29, 2009 at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 8:50 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)
- Michael R. Coffey
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Janet Lear (Navy RPM)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Shirley Fu (Tetra Tech)
- Craig Hunter (Tetra Tech)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston Solutions)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Carolyn D' Almeida (EPA)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Misty Kaltreider (Solano County)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Dijl Christian
- David Godsey
- Stan Golovich
- Wendy Plank
- Jim Porterfield
- Annabelle Rhodes
- Bill Stephens
- James Pollock

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, everyone, we'll go ahead and get started. Happy New Year everybody. Welcome to the January, 2009 RAB meeting. I'm Michael Bloom, the Navy Co-Chair and BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the Community Co-Chair of Vallejo.

MR. GOLOVICH: Stan Golovich, Benicia.

MS. KALTREIDER: Misty Kaltreider from Solano County.

MR. GODSEY: David Godsey, Vallejo resident.

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

MR. POLLOCK: James Pollock, I'm with the USS Iowa group.

MR. HUNTER: Craig Hunter with Tetra Tech.

MS. FU: Shirley Fu, also with Tetra Tech.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble with California EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

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

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island.

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

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth with the City of Vallejo.

MS. MOORE: Carolyn Moore with CDM.

MS. LEAR: Janet Lear with the Navy.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Our first presentation will be given by Janet Lear with the Navy and Shirley Fu with Tetra Tech. And it's a Site 17 Update.

**II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Site 17 Update*
Presentation by Ms. Janet Lear, Navy and
Ms. Shirley Fu, Tetra Tech**

MS. LEAR: Good evening, everyone. As Michael mentioned, I'm Janet Lear, I'm the Navy project manager for the Site 17 Building 503 Area. I'd like to introduce you to Shirley Fu; she's the risk assessor for this project. And together we will be presenting an update of the ongoing activities at the site. Just as a refresher -- this map doesn't show very well -- but here's the Site 17 Building 503 Area.

Azuar Drive comes right through it here, and we are in the building right about here. So I think there's a better representation of this on the -- oh, yeah, I'm sorry. It's this bridge, right. Okay, got it. The other bridge. Sorry. Okay.

So this evening I'll be presenting a brief history of the site and a short discussion of the additional soil groundwater and soil gas sampling that was recently completed at the site. At that point I'll turn over the presentation to Shirley to give us an update on the vapor intrusion risk evaluation that was recently completed. And then I'll finish up with a few slides on the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis as well as the schedule. Okay.

Site 17 is known as the Paint Manufacturing Facility. Paints and varnishes were manufactured on the site from the 1940's to the mid 50's. Materials used in the paint manufacturing process were stored at two tank farms. And over here I have a figure showing the various site features. This is the former northern tank farm here, and there were approximately 21 above ground storage tanks there. Here is the southern tank farm where there were six above ground storage tanks. The paint manufacturing actually occurred in this building here, 503, as well as this building -- well, it's no longer there, but it's Building 519 here. Drums that were used to store the product were also manufactured on site in this former Building 567. These two Buildings, 601 and 499 were warehouses that were used to store the finished product.

There have been fourteen previous investigations conducted at the site associated with the Site 17 and Building 503 Area. These were conducted from 1985 to 2006. Including in those investigations was a removal action that was done in 1998 and 1999. During that removal the soil under building -- under the footprint of 519 was removed, as well as the product pipeline, which you can see here in these dashed lines. All that area, all the pipeline was removed and the soil associated with that, as well as an oil water separator that was located just north of 519. In 2006 a Remedial Investigation Report was issued which summarized all of the information that had been collected over the fourteen investigations. The RI recommended that removal of free product be conducted at the site.

Later in the investigation, in 2002, there were two wells -- they don't show here -- but they were in this area right here, and there was a small amount of product that was noted in the groundwater wells in that particular area, and that's why there was a recommendation for removal of that free product in the RI. After the RI was issued, the Navy and the regulators agreed to conduct a Non-Time Critical Removal Action. And to implement that, it was agreed that additional data collection was required to refine the areas for the removal action and to complete an evaluation of vapor intrusion risk. This additional sampling was conducted in two phases, in summer and fall of 2008.

Phase one of the sampling consisted of a qualitative passive soil gas survey and soil gas samples were collected at 248 locations across the site. The sample results were used to focus the second phase of investigation.

Phase two included soil and groundwater sampling and active soil gas sampling to refine the area for cleanup evaluation. The active soil gas samples, as I mentioned a moment ago, were also collected to be used in a vapor intrusion risk evaluation. The phase two field activities included 32 soil borings with a soil sample collected from each. We sampled fourteen existing monitoring wells, as well as installation and sampling of four new monitoring wells at the site. Active soil gas samples were collected at 40 locations.

Now, although free product was not measured in any of the groundwater wells during the 2008 investigation, the concentrations that were detected in the soil and groundwater of the volatile organic compounds indicated that there was free product in a residual phase in the area that was previously identified in the RI. VOCs and TPH in the soil and groundwater, the maximum concentrations were in the same general area of the site as was identified during the RI. The maximum concentrations in the active soil gas were also in that same area.

Now we always have to have our photographs of our field crew. Here's one of the crew drilling a soil boring near Building 503. And here we're showing the field crew installing the soil gas well and the tubing that will be used to collect the active soil gas sampling. And the actual collection of the soil gas sample.

This is a photo of the temporary well locations being installed in the parking lot of Building 759 which is this building here. They're installing the wells here, and the photograph is looking towards Building 503 which is the tall, white building there which was one of the locations of the paint manufacturing. Okay. So that wraps up a real brief discussion of our activities in the last year. And now I'm going to turn it over to Shirley to present the vapor intrusion risk evaluation.

MS. FU: Thanks, Janet. Hi, my name is Shirley Fu. I'm the human health risk assessor, and my job is to estimate health risk to people from chemicals that are released. Tonight I'm here to tell you about the vapor intrusion risk evaluation that was done for the IR-17 and Building 503 Area.

And before I get into that, I first want to explain what vapor intrusion is and why the Navy evaluated it. Vapor intrusion is when volatile chemicals that are in soil or groundwater travel up through soil and into indoor air inside a building. And so if you take a look at this picture here, this picture illustrates how vapor intrusion happens. So if you take a look at the bottom layer here, this represents volatile contamination in soil and groundwater. And because the chemicals there are volatile, they produce vapors. The vapors travel upwards, that's what vapors do. And if there is a building on top of where the vapors are, the vapors can then travel into or intrude into the building.

And the reason that happens is because building foundations, whether it's a basement type building or a slab on grade type building, all building foundations have a small percentage of cracks, so they're not entirely steel, and when vapors contact those cracks, they can migrate through the cracks into indoor air. And people who either work inside the building or live inside a building can then be exposed to those vapors that were in soil and groundwater from breathing the air. And so essentially it's what I call sandwiching between the ground surface and the overlying building foundation is what allows vapor intrusion to occur. Again, the vapors come up, there's no place for them to go when they hit the foundation, and because of cracks in the foundation they can then go inside into indoor air.

What I'd like to do next is talk about what an exposure pathway is. And the reason I want to do this is because you need to have an exposure pathway in order for there to be health risk. And so there are five things that comprise an exposure pathway. First is you have to have a chemical source. You have to have chemicals. And an example of this is having chemicals in an underground storage tank, for example, in gasoline. The second thing that has to happen is that those chemicals do need to be released from where they are into the environment. So, for example, if there is a leak in the storage tank, then the chemicals in that storage tank can be released to soil or groundwater. They can volatilize upward into indoor air. You need to have a location or a place for exposure. You need to have what we call in risk assessment a route for exposure. This is a way that people can contact chemicals. And those routes are either through inhalation, breathing; dermal contact, which is touching the chemical; or ingestion, which is eating the chemical. And then, lastly, you do have to have people there, people who could be exposed to the chemical. In risk assessment we refer to those people as receptors. And in risk assessments we evaluate both current receptors, people who are currently at a site where there is a chemical release; we also evaluate what we call future receptors, these are people who could be at the site in the future. And then, the most important thing out of these five elements is that you have to have all five in order for there to be exposure and health risk. If any one of these five things is missing, then there is no complete exposure pathway and there cannot be health risk.

So, moving onto the risk evaluation for IR-17 and building 503. As I mentioned, we do take a look at current receptors and if there is any current health risk. Within the site we did not identify that there is a current health risk. The reason for this is because the site is not currently in use and so there aren't any current receptors. And as I just mentioned, you do need a receptor population -- that was item five on that list -- in order for there to be complete pathways. So we don't have a complete vapor intrusion pathway under current site use conditions. Now, for future site use it's very unlikely that there will be a future health risk associated with vapor intrusion. The reason for this is that plans for the site consist of developing the site into open parking lots, open parking structures. The plans don't include development of enclosed building for occupancy like homes or office spaces. And so based on that -- we don't actually have a location for indoor air exposure, and without that location for exposure, which was number three on that list of five elements that I mentioned, without a location for exposure, again, we don't have a complete exposure pathway, and then there can't be health risk from vapor intrusion.

So now, what we did do is we did look at risk for what we are calling a hypothetical future exposure scenario. And the reason we did this is in case the plans for the site change and the site is developed into something other than parking lots, we took a look at what the health risk might be if the site were used for residential purposes or commercial industrial purposes. And as part of that evaluation we made a few assumptions. One of the assumptions is that we assumed that there would be enclosed buildings and those buildings would be constructed directly on the ground surface. And then we also assumed -- oh, I should mention that the buildings that are currently at the site are actually not constructed directly on the ground surface. They're elevated about five feet above the ground. They're built on pilings. And the reason for that is because the underlying soil is a loose fill material, and the construction of buildings on top of the pilings adds a lot of stability for those buildings. And so it's likely that if there were future construction of buildings, that that same type of construction practice would be used to add stability to the buildings. As Janet mentioned earlier --

MR. GRIBBLE: I really think that we shouldn't be talking about it's the likelihood of what will be there in the future. I think that's putting the cart before the horse. You know, right now we know what Touro's development plans are, but I don't think that's relevant for this part of the discussion. They could change that and we have no control over that currently. So regardless of what their plans are, we have to -- we can't count on that at this point.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, I mean you're right, Chip, and that's why we looked at, I mean, the residential use also. So, I think she was just pointing out that, you know, at least right now that's what's planned, but as she goes through you're going to see that they're all looked at.

MR. GRIBBLE: I know that because we've gone through that ourselves, but for the benefit of everybody else in the room. And as another example, the building construction being on pilings, we're not engineers here, you know, and this is not the forum for engineering conversation, but it's really not for us to say that engineers won't do that or that the builder won't do that. They could do that. And, again, we shouldn't be basing our evaluation on what we think is likely to happen in the future. That comes later in the process when we consider how are we going to address the residual contamination such as institutional controls or deed restrictions based on the, you know, the site conditions. And then at that point we have the ability to dictate prohibitions against certain future uses. But currently we don't have that ability according to the deed title for the property.

MS. FU: Thanks for your comments, Chip. I do want to make it clear that despite the current way the site is used, we did include an evaluation -- this is our hypothetical future evaluation which does assume buildings not on pilings, buildings in direct contact with the ground, and commercial industrial uses and residential uses. And so that is what the risk evaluation is based on.

As Janet mentioned, sampling was conducted, active soil gas samples were collected. These are samples that measure concentrations in the vapor phase, in the subsurface. There were 40 locations that were sampled across the site. Each of those 40 locations in the risk assessment was evaluated as a separate exposure point, as a separate location. That's kind of unrealistic, I think it might be on the overly conservative side because it assumes, for purposes of risk assessment that people, the receptors, are solely in that one location and they don't go anywhere else for the exposure -- the duration of exposure for which we evaluated risk. But it is conservative, and what it allows us to do is not average in high concentrations with low concentrations. All of the chemicals that were detected in the soil gas samples were included in the risk evaluation. There wasn't any sort of screening to remove chemicals. And based on those two scenarios that I mentioned before that we considered in the risk assessment, the two receptors are future commercial industrial worker and also a future resident. Using the active soil gas results, we estimated what indoor building air concentrations would be using modeling. We used the model called the Johnson- Ettinger Vapor Intrusion Model. It's a very widely used and well accepted model for doing this type of evaluation. And it's used by both DTSC and EPA.

As part of the modeling there are also assumptions that need to be made. One of the assumptions is, of course, that the buildings are directly in contact with the ground surface so that vapor intrusion can occur. A couple of the other assumptions are that the chemical concentrations in the subsurface remain constant, that they don't biodegrade or decrease over time. Another assumption is that vapors in the subsurface will only actually travel upwards. But in actuality vapors do travel laterally as well as upward, but for purposes of this assumption it's assumed they only go upward. And another key assumption is that there's very minimal indoor air exchange, so that inside a building the assumption is that basically the windows are shut virtually all of the time.

Assumptions also need to be made for exposure for both the commercial industrial worker and the resident. For the commercial industrial worker we assumed that a worker would be inside a building eight hours per day, 250 days a year for 25 years. And for residential exposure, all day twenty four hours a day, 350 days a year for thirty years. And these are long periods of exposure, these are conservative assumptions, and they're based on recommendations by both the California EPA and the EPA for evaluating risk. We want to be conservative to ensure that we don't underestimate health risk.

So what happens when we put all this information together in the risk assessment is that we end up with numerical estimates of health risk. And there are two types of resulting numerical estimates. One of them is the cancer risk which is the risk from exposure to chemicals that can cause cancer. The other one is a non-cancer risk, it's also known as a non-cancer hazard. And this is the hazard or the risk from exposure to chemicals that cause effects other than cancer. And there are some chemicals that cause both cancer effects and non-cancer effects; we evaluate both for those chemicals.

Cancer risk estimates are compared with EPA guidelines for Superfund sites and other sites, not Superfund sites. Cancer risks that are less than one in a million are considered negligible. And for risks that fall at that level no further action is needed. Risks that fall between one and a million,

one and 10,000, this is called a risk management range, and the decision for whether further action is needed depends on site specific factors. And then risks that are greater than one in 10,000, action is recommended. For non-cancer hazards there's another benchmark; less than one, considered negligible, no further action. Greater than one, action is recommended.

So the results of the risk evaluation. I mentioned that there were 40 locations that were evaluated for risk. For the commercial industrial scenario, one out of the 40 locations had a cancer risk that exceeds one in 10,000. So that falls into the actions recommended category. Two of the 40 locations did have a non-cancer hazard that was greater than one. Again, that falls under the action is recommended category. And then the remaining 37 locations the cancer risk was either below or within the EPA Risk management range, and the non-cancer hazard was less than one.

And for the residential scenario, the results didn't differ too much. That scenario, as you saw, has a longer duration of time for exposure. The risk results show there would be one additional exposure with the cancer risk that fell into the action as needed category with a risk greater than one in 1,000. And that there were two additional locations at which the non-cancer hazard exceeded one.

So if you go to the next page, what we've done is we've summarized the risk in this figure, and each of the squares represents a separate active soil gas sample location. Each of the squares was individually evaluated for health risk, and it's color coded here to show what the risk results are. The squares that are green are the squares for which the risk was less than one in a million which is no further action is needed. The squares for which the risks -- the squares that are sort of this yellowish orange color -- fall into the between one in 10,000, one in a million risk management range. And then the red square here is where the risk exceeded one in 10,000. That's also co-located with the free product area. And then the two squares that have the stars are the locations where the non-cancer hazard exceeded one. That's it for my summary. Janet.

MS. LEAR: All right. So at this point we've got the results of our vapor intrusion risk evaluation and we have the results of our additional sampling conducted last year to give us a better idea of the areas that need to be addressed in the removal action. And with this information we're preparing an Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis to evaluate our alternatives for a removal action. The free product area will be addressed in the removal action, and we'll also address -- or the two areas that were identified during the vapor intrusion risk evaluation as providing risk will also be evaluated in the -- for removal action.

So we have this area in yellow which is our estimated extent of the free product area, so that will be part of the removal action. And then this area here, as well as this area here, were identified in the vapor intrusion risk evaluation as areas that should also be evaluated. The removal action objectives for the site are to reduce the apparent occurrence of free product and to reduce the occurrence of subsurface contamination that contributes to vapor intrusion risk. The recommended removal action alternative would be to excavate and backfill in the area of the free product. And then also conduct selective excavation in areas identified with potential vapor intrusion risk, those two areas I just pointed out that are outside the area of free product. As far as schedule goes, we plan to issue the Revised Draft Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis report in February, with a thirty day public comment period on that document to follow in the February, March time frame. And then a draft action memo will also be issued in that same time period. The Final Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis is planned to be issued in March and April of '09.

So before I open this up for questions, as you may recall, in October Liz closed her presentation with a picture of her baby dressed up as a witch for Halloween. And in December Marie closed her

presentation with her dog dressed up in a Santa suit. So to continue in the Mare Island tradition, I am going to close with a photo of my boys dressed up for Valentine's Day and my dogs. Okay. So we're open for questions now if anyone has any questions on the Site 17 update.

MR. GRIBBLE: Just to finish up with what I was saying earlier, so the Navy's removal action that you're planning on doing -- I know this because we've been working on it -- so the other part of the story would be that the Navy is going to propose this removal action that will eventually support a limited cleanup for the site that will result in a deed restriction for the site. What we know about that, the site, is that it's zoned by the City's reuse plan for industrial reuse.

Number two, the developer at Touro, specific development plans are consistent with that. Therefore, if the Navy were to propose and the Navy were to issue a final remedy for this site that would require a deed restriction limiting, you know, sensitive uses, no residential uses and so forth, that that would be consistent with, you know, the City's reuse plan, the developer's plans. It's my understanding that all of the regulators are in agreement with that. So this removal action is pointing us toward a limited cleanup that assumes a deed restriction at the end of the day.

MS. LEAR: Yes.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I can just give you my update. I submitted my comments on the risk assessment to you today, and I don't think they're too extensive. There were just three pages of technical comments that I think can be addressed without affecting the removal action schedule. They are things that can be addressed concurrent with everything else. It's really a matter of coming to agreement on what this means in terms of the cleanup standards that are going to be required for this site. A couple of things that EPA has expressed concern about with this action has to do with the City's utility corridor is going to go right through this site, and one of the concerns with vapor intrusion that you can have -- that we've seen at some other sites -- is that vapors can actually migrate along utility corridors because they provide a preferential flow pathway, and it can actually reach buildings that are away from the site. So that needs to be taken into consideration when we're coming up with the cleanup standards for this site. It may mean that there may need to be additional institutional controls for building construction standards for new building construction standards. So there are those kinds of implications.

And also, EPA is asking the Navy to continue to investigate vapor intrusion in Building 759 which is also adjacent to this area and looks like it could be impacted by vapor intrusion. So I just wanted to add that. That's the other thing. But we recognize that that can be a separate action, it doesn't have to be -- it doesn't have to hold up this particular action, but a follow-on action. So I just wanted to let you know, that's basically the summary of our comments that we submitted today.

MS. LEAR: Okay, Carolyn, as you know we were traveling today, so we haven't seen them yet.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: But thank you.

MS. LEAR: Thank you for your comments and we will be responding to those appropriately.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you.

MR. PORTERFIELD: I was just wondering is there a specific or average depth that you drilled the wells and took samples at?

MS. LEAR: For the soil gas samples?

MR. PORTERFIELD: Yes. You mentioned wells and sample sites on here. I'm just wondering how deep you went into this fill soil that's out there?

MS. LEAR: The soil gas samples were collected about three and a half feet below ground surface, because we wanted to stay above the groundwater. The soil samples that were collected in 2008 were also taken just above the water table. So that varied across the site. And then the groundwater wells were drilled to a total depth of approximately fifteen feet, the ones that were installed in this particular investigation. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, first of all, I wouldn't assume there aren't any current receptors. There are copper miners. And they are very busy. I happen to know that just across the way there, been very busy. Free product -- you know, this whole removal action which sounds like where you're headed, seems to me like it was recommended by Tetra Tech and the Navy or was planned, there were alternatives that they were considering like about eight years ago, wasn't it? A long time ago. So why wasn't this done then? I guess when you had money. I mean, do you have money to go do this removal action? Why has this place just sort of sat there waiting when you knew what there already was there a long time ago?

MS. LEAR: The free product wasn't found at the site until 2002, so I'm not sure what timeframe you're referring to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that was a long time ago by now.

MS. LEAR: Yeah. And so the remedial investigation that recommended the removal was issued in 2006. Now, as I mentioned in the presentation, at that time it was determined by the Navy and the regulators that additional sample collection was required to conduct the vapor intrusion risk evaluation and also to get some more information about the extent of the free product. Now obviously I wasn't on the team at that time so I'm not sure, you know, all the details of what transpired, but that's --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, the presentation that was given by Tetra Tech, I remember that guy clearly, and I remember these trenches and the pictures of the free product. And it was like that was going to happen that summer, it was just going to go and get taken care of. So now it's sat there for forever, and it could have been affecting the groundwater or whatever. And maybe if you'd removed it, then you'd be coming back and doing some much smaller kind of analysis now to do the checkmark on this vapor intrusion. So I guess I just wonder what happened between 2002 and 2006, you say? And now we're three years later. So whatever that is, it could be somewhere around eight years, I don't know.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I can't answer that, but I can tell you that we are moving forward. We have been moving forward since we've been on the project. And I think we're getting a lot closer to where we need to be.

To answer the question about the funding, we do have the funding to do it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that going to be in one of those infrastructure bailout things or what? Got a lot of conditions on that. I'll be on your board.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And then the only other comment that I have is, Carolyn, this isn't a trick question, but it did come up in a public forum in American Canyon, so I'd like to know, when you mentioned 759, will you also be requiring soil vapor analysis for Building 505?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: 505 is -- that's the Fish and Wildlife building or where the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it's the Navy's building.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: What was or is going to be the Fish and Wildlife building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I don't know of any issues associated with that and there's nobody in that building. The reason why we're interested in Building 759 is because the data that we received back from this -- they didn't give you the full data package -- but it indicates that there might be some vapors actually going underneath this building. And it is an occupied building. It's owned and occupied by someone, and state law requires actually, there's a new state law AB 422 requires that vapor intrusion risk assessments be done anywhere you've got a building that could be affected or a new structure in an area that could be affected by this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you don't envision Building 505 at some point being caught up --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I'm not sure --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- In the risk analysis?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I'm not sure what the issue is with Building 505.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well it's nearby, and one of your colleagues made a public statement in an American Canyon commission meeting that, where I was giving --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Is that Matthew Plate?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- a presentation, and he indicated that you and he -- I mean he was very confrontational with me and said that EPA, and you as his colleague, had a concern about --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I haven't talked to Matt about that one. Maybe --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He shut down my presentation and the request that was --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Maybe he was thinking of a different building, but I haven't really talked too much to Matt about this recently, so I don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but what I'm trying to divine is just how expensive or extensive -- I'm not arguing about whether vapor intrusion analysis should be done, but I'm rather, you know, we're still looking to that building as a permanent environmental education center for the region, and a science center and whatever. So to the extent that this property and the removal action that's taking place would be linked to 759 then to 505, or do you have some way of looking at the data that we haven't been presented with, you would say, yeah, that doesn't really sound like a place we would go.

But when a colleague of yours makes a public statement about a specific property, I don't mean that you have to answer, but I've been sitting on that for a year waiting for this moment, and I have to say something.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay. Well, it's hard to say what the issue is with that particular building because for one thing you have to have a source and you have to have a way for it to get there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, this would be the source.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: This would be the source. Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because it might not be --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay. Well, I don't think Matt has that much knowledge about Mare Island, so he may not realize how far away this building is from that or whether or not there are utility corridors. There are a lot of issues that would need to be looked at. But we need to look at Building 759 first because that's the closest.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And it's right there. If it's not an issue there, then you've got an argument for saying, you know, you don't need to look further.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I haven't seen, and it sounds like you have, the data for the rest of the soil to the south -- or I mean to the west of Azuar. You're talking about 759, 505 is a long ways further out, but I assume that you and Matt must have had a conversation and that he must have known geographically where this 505 was for him to kind of jump on me about it --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: No

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- so I just thought maybe you have some insider trading information that some of us could have access to.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I haven't talked to Matt in years. I mean I might have asked him a question about it a long time ago when I had questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But looking in the analysis, he referred to his own site at Moffett Field as, you know, being one of the reasons why vapor intrusion was of interest. But all I'm saying is Navy, what kind of data did you come up with? It looks like your free product is on the south -- or west side of Azuar, and once you remove that, will you come back and do some soil gas sampling or did you do it on the west side of Azuar too, you know, it doesn't look like you did, so when will you do that and kind of why didn't you?

MS. LEAR: These squares are the result -- these are our active soil gas locations. Now, when we did the passive soil gas, there were many, many more samples. And then we focused our active soil gas on the areas where the passive soil gas said there would be most likely a concern. So that's why they're not totally blanketing the site. So the reason that you don't see active soil gas here is because the passive soil gas didn't indicate that that was the most likely place for an issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. LEAR: And, you know, I'm sorry, we had to cover a lot of territory tonight and we weren't able to spend a lot of time on the individual data points. As you know, we've been on an accelerated schedule for this site, so we've covered a lot of ground in the last few months.

MR. GRIBBLE: So it's possible that since this active soil gas survey really didn't extend as far to the west as, you know, to encompass everything that's possible out there, it is possible theoretically that there is more contamination west of there. But if I may speak for Paisha, the Water Board representative and the geologist from DTSC that's working on this site, that we don't see a high likelihood that that's the case. But if -- at some point we'll be getting -- we expect the Navy's going to follow up on that and, you know, finish an investigation on that side as a separate action. However, even if there were contamination further west of the yellow plume that you show on your figure there, for it to get to Building 505, that contamination would have to migrate through bay mud or dredge material, which is very fine material, very low permeability, and that's just not how

this contamination moves. It really moves through permeable backfill, through utility corridors, and there really aren't any of those types of connections between this vicinity and Building 505. So even though we don't have this site fully defined, and I'm talking about west of the yellow plume there, the likelihood of Building 505 somehow being impacted is not realistic in our view given what we know now.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thank you, Janet and Shirley. Neal, you're up. Next will be a presentation given by Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island. It will be an Eastern Early Transfer Parcel update.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) Update*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island (LMI)**

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you, Michael. My name is Neal Siler and I do environmental work for Lennar Mare Island on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. And what I'm going to talk about tonight, I'm just going to give you an update like I did in January of last year and just talk about some of the documents that we've submitted this year, the major documents and some of the activities that we have initiated or completed. Then I'm going to run you through some of the documents that we have already submitted or are planning to submit in 2009, and some of the activities that we hope to initiate and complete during 2009. And the reason that I want to talk about this tonight is that this is probably a good night to give you kind of an overview of what we're planning on doing in 2009 because this entire program is going to be accelerated quite a bit. And there are a number of major documents that we have already submitted or are going to submit in 2009. One is the Draft Final Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Plan for the Crane Test Area. That's scheduled to be submitted in March.

In Investigation Area C-1 we have two feasibility study and remedial action work plans, one for IR-03 and one for IR-15. In Investigation Area C-2 -- oh, we have one more in C-1 also, and that's the Building 461 Removal Action Workplan. In C-2 we're going to be submitting the IR-21 Remedial Action Workplan, and the Building 680 work plans and notifications for the PCB sites.

And what that's going to culminate in is, finally, in about the third or fourth quarter of this year, we're going to be submitting the Remedial Action Plans for Investigation Areas C-1 and C-2 to get everything completed at that point. At that point most of the remedial action plans will be submitted to the agencies.

So for those of you who aren't familiar with the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, this is it right here. I kind of like to think of it as the continuous parcel, and then up here, A-3, that's kind of like Alaska, it's off by itself. But this is the parcel right here. It actually covers an area of about 670 acres. Originally it was broken into eight investigation areas, and since that time, with differing environmental conditions and trying to develop as much of the property as we can, it's been broken up into twelve investigation areas.

So the first area I'm going to talk about is Investigation Area B. B covers this entire area right here, including the Crane Test Area. And the things that we were able to submit in 2008 was the Draft FS/ RAP, and that says removal action plan up there, it should say Remedial Action Plan for the Crane Test Area. And then the last area that we have to close out in Investigation Area B.2 is UST 839. We removed about 1,500 tons of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted or abrasive blast material,

and we're going back to complete that. So what we've got planned for 2009 is to finalize and implement the Crane Test Area, FS/ RAP.

We're going to remove the remaining ABM at Building 839. And the reason I had to stop is because it actually went underneath Building 839, so I had to stop and demolish Building 839 before I could get to it. That building is down now so we should be starting back on that shortly.

And then we're going to complete the remedial actions in Investigation Area B.2.1, in fact, that should do that. And then we're also going to get a leg up on getting removal actions in Investigation Area B.2.2. And the reason this is broken out is because it has petroleum hydrocarbon issues with the Navy that we've been cooperatively trying to decide how we're going to address those problems. And like I said, it crosses the boundary here in certain areas, so we're going to be addressing those in the future.

The next area is Investigation Area C-1, and that's in the northeast portion of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel which is this area right here. It was one of the industrial areas. Things that we completed were we completed the implementation of the fuel oil pipeline work plan. We started working on that with the investigative and remedial activities. We completed investigations and a pilot scale study for the remedy selection and IR-15 Area. We submitted the draft FS/ RAP for the Building 461 Area. And we developed a strategy for addressing issues in IR-03 which is a petroleum hydrocarbon site.

So this is what we have planned for next year, and we've already submitted some of these things. We submitted the source area work plan for IR-03. We're going to be submitting in March the FS/ RAP for IR-15, and started working on that. Again we're going to be submitting the FS/ RAP for Building 461. And we've actually just submitted a Removal Action Workplan for UST 693, and that's quite a large excavation. It's right in here along with what's going to be proposed for IR-03. It's probably going to be about 11,000 cubic yards of material out of here, and likewise about the same amount of material in IR-03.

Moving along to Investigation Area C-2. Again we started working on the fuel oil pipeline work plan. We got that submitted. We've started implementing some of those programs. We initiated the remedial actions at Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6, and also at UST 1310. In fact, this right here is the beginning, or at least at some point during the removal action at Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6, and there will be another photograph that's further along that Steve will show you when he does his portion of the presentation later this evening. And then we implemented the removal action at IR-19, and we're working with that.

So, a major activity that we're planning for 2009 is submission of a draft FS/ RAP for IR-21. We're going to submit notification and work plan for Building 680, the PCB sites. And that's the interior of Building 680 right there. And then we're also going to submit the final IA-C2 Remedial Action Workplan. Moving along to IA-C3, again we've submitted and implemented removal action at UST, Underground Storage Tank, Site 102. We investigated Black Granular Material in what we call the IA-C3 triangle, which is this area right here. And we actually have submitted already in 2009 a Draft Feasibility Study and Removal Action Workplan for the BGM in that area. It's being reviewed by the agencies right now. We developed a strategy for the remedial actions in the BGM and the triangle, and we're moving along with those right now.

Now, there's one area that we found out that was an unknown that we didn't know about and we're just starting to work on this area right here. It was associated with UST 142, but this is the

Independence Wharf Area, and we've got petroleum hydrocarbon, free product that we found underneath a wharf that was left in place as they built up this area here. So we'll be addressing that in 2009 also. Now this --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The Independence?

MR. SILER: Independence Wharf Area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mean the Independence?

MR. SILER: Yeah, that's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The receiving ship?

MR. SILER: Yeah, that's correct. This is Investigation Area H2 which is in the eastern central portion of the property. And really the main thing we have here is we're trying to deal with Underground Storage Tanks at UST Buildings 231 and 243. We've actually implemented a program. We removed about 10,000 cubic yards. We had again to knock down buildings. This is Building 1331 right here. This is Building 231 right here. If you look in this photograph you can see that the top of Building 231 is gone, and this pile of rubble right here, that's what's left of Building 1331. So those buildings are down now, and they're actually re-implementing the removal action at UST 231. They've removed about another 2,500-3,000 tons of material out of there right now. So what we have left to do is complete that removal action, because this is going to be a residential area, and as you saw in the previous presentation there was this concern for indoor air pathway, we're doing a number of rounds of soil gas sampling in this area because we got high concentrations of gasoline in the soil gas. So we're looking through a number of rounds of sampling as we move along at this site. And also we're going to do some additional work at UST 243 which is right to the northeast of UST 231.

In addition to that there are some environmental programs that are separate from the investigation areas. One of those is the UST program, or Underground Storage Tank program. We closed ten sites in 2008, bringing the total to 89 out of 112 sites. And we're addressing those final 23 sites right now -- starting to address them at this time. In fact, I'm looking at about six sites right now, and I know that CH2M Hill is probably looking at the remainder as we move along. In the FOPL program we've closed 61 of 111 segments. We've got fifty more segments to work through. They're actively working in both Investigation Area C-1 and C-2 on all these segments. Actually there are five documents right now in the regulators' hands that we're requesting closure of these sites. I reviewed another four last night, so Paisha will be busy over the next weeks looking at these. And then the PCB program we closed 19 sites in 2008 bringing the total of 445 out of the 570 sites. Currently -- I counted 'em today -- there are twenty sites that we have closure documents into the regulatory agencies, and we're looking at right now in addressing the rest of those sites. And on top of that there's also a long-term groundwater monitoring program that goes on quarterly, it's been going on for a long time, we keep doing quarterly programs all the time. So that's the summary of what we're looking at for next year. It's going to tax a lot of resources of both CH2M Hill, Lennar, and the regulatory agencies. And you'll be seeing a lot of, you know, public participation in this. We'll be looking at a number of presentations, both here at the RAB meetings and also separate presentations. So if anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to field them at this time. Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: I'll be a little direct here, and I'm not being critical of you or anybody in particular, but there was a failing with the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel project the way it was

conceived. The failing is sort of like this. The Navy -- three parties to that, three parties involved basically, the Navy, the DTSC, and Lennar. And all three entities had different goals and different motives to go through that to enter into that Eastern Early Transfer Agreement. But there were three independent -- three differing goals. Everybody had a different idea as to what they were going to get out of the deal. And it was never really clarified in the planning documents.

And the Navy's goal was -- this is my interpretation obviously -- the Navy's goal was to transfer property, get some property off the books. And they were successful with that, they certainly achieved that. DTSC's goal, from my view, was we were going to get things done easier, better, because there wouldn't be as much arguing or disagreement or policy issues that were road blocks that were insurmountable. And Lennar's view was that they would get title to the property. They would be able to -- through having title they would be able to make their development plans better, and they would accelerate insofar as there wouldn't be this interminable disagreement, you know. Lennar would do what the regulators told them to do. But Lennar's expectation of how fast that they could go exceeded just that simple trade-off and it assumed that there were unlimited resources or something approaching that within the regulatory agencies. So that was the failing. It didn't address where those resources were going to come from.

And so now we're talking about accelerating this significantly. I don't know, maybe you've got that worked out, but I'm wondering the same thing, where are these resources going to come from? The agencies don't have unlimited resources. I would speak for, you know, the three of us here, and you're talking about accelerating it to the point where everybody is shaking their head. And we've been through that exercise before, you know, there's an unrealistic expectation. Is there some agreement here or are we all looking at another unrealistic expectation that will come back to bite us at some point?

MR. KAISER: Not to mention our furlough. I have to compliment Paisha, he's not here tonight and I'm sitting -- oh, I have to press it. Yeah, Paisha's not here tonight but I have to compliment him for dealing with the high output that we've been receiving. But now with the news today that the Governor's position on furloughs has been sustained, that adds an additional piece of pressure here of essentially a ten percent reduction of our ability to respond more promptly. Regardless of that, we'll attempt to accommodate you. I may double up some of my staff with Paisha to make things happen, but we have our limitations.

MR. SILER: And that's true for everything. And actually the one person that was there, Chip, at the signing of all this, was you. And there was a consent agreement that had a schedule in it, and it was believed at that time that everybody could meet that schedule. Now, there's a number of reasons why people could not meet that schedule but -- and, you know, there's a lot of reasons why those things couldn't happen. But, you know, we are where we are, and we're trying to get this done as fast as we possibly can. And I totally understand that the agencies are going to be taxed by this, and how we're going to get through it. And that's probably the critical, you know, issue is basically how we get these reviews back and forth. I mean we're going to go pedal to the metal as fast as we possibly can and try to get this done, and we do understand it's a limitation.

MR. GRIBBLE: All I'm saying is that if that's not part of the plan explicitly, then you're setting somebody up for failure because it sounds like it's unrealistic again. So if have you discussed this with the agencies, with DTSC, and --

MR. SILER: Yes, we sure have. We've discussed this to Barbara and Dan, and they're aware of it. And Henry's aware of it also. And, again, we've discussed this with John and Paisha also, to some degree. But we've let everybody know that this is part of the program.

MR. GRIBBLE: So I think that as far as that goes, I think it would be constructive to make that clear at this forum so that the public isn't left wondering are these things going to be rubber stamped out of the, you know, just out of the basis of expediency, and they're not going to get the proper review and analysis by the agencies.

MR. SILER: And certainly we do not expect that. We expect you to give us critical feedback on any plans or implementations that we do. And we know that there are differences of opinion on how to get things done, but we're definitely trying to work through all those differences of opinion.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a quick question for you. You list several of your programs in your summary here. What is the status of your covenant deed restriction ongoing monitoring? And I'd like to request for you to consider scheduling a review of that program and bringing to us some sample reports that have been submitted so we can get a sense of how that process, that program is going along.

MR. SILER: We'd be glad to do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Great.

MR. SILER: And as far as the programs going along, the only site that has land use covenants that have been signed and recorded and agreed to is the commercial area of Investigation Area D1.2, And there are eleven LUC's or Land Use Covenants in that property. There are ten site-specific, and there's one that covers that entire commercial area of the property. And that's the one that has been undergoing the O and M over the last three years, and we signed those in 2006.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be then very timely, I think, for you to bring that to us, that program. Thanks.

MR. SILER: Sure.

MR. GRIBBLE: Neal, I had another question.

MR. SILER: Sure.

MR. GRIBBLE: Last week we were meeting and talking about the Marine Corps firing range with the Navy and laying out a path forward to get that resolved and then transferred. And I recall there was some something about tying -- getting that done which will allow Lennar to then tie the storm drain discharges to the back of the Mare Island, there's a channel that goes out, that exits out to the south. And I was just thinking about that the other day. Has that been approved? Did that require a city permit or what's happened with that?

MR. SILER: You mean the drainage itself?

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah.

MR. SILER: What they're doing is that's all in the planning stage right now, but that is the plan to have it drain from the former Coral Sea Village from the Kirkland area and then move it up toward -- I'm sorry -- the Farragut Village up to the Coral Sea village to the south. Now, that's in the planning stage, there have been no approved plans that are on the books right now, but that is the plan as to how that is supposed to drain.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Will that go through a CEQA process? Will that be a CEQA project put forth by the City that will go out for public comment?

MR. SILER: I would imagine that that will be put forth by the City exactly with their permitting and their planning process.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Because what occurred to me was that's going to run through, I think, probably Navy property, at least some of it, and some of that property, if I know the line or the path correctly, it would go through some areas that if it doesn't already have a deed restriction for explosives of concern, it will when we get to that point. Which is to say if you were to go through there and do some excavation or some kind of construction, we would need to see, just like being treated like a MEC site with a deed restriction, which is to say we need a work plan as to how you're going to do it and those types of things

MR. SILER: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: I just wondered if you had plans for that.

MR. SILER: That has actually been planned for as part of that process.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you would also, on that same property, be planning for review of that proposal's impact on endangered species habitat which is there now and is a salt water marsh, and I would assume you'd be dumping a lot of fresh water into that site.

MR. SILER: My understanding -- yeah, I mean I think that's all being reviewed. I know there's being a wetland delineation that's being done right now. There have been a number of plans that are in place, and I'm sure that's all been accounted for.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that might be something to bring back at some point too for a topic.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Neal. Okay. We're going to juggle the agenda just a little bit. Let's see. We'll go into our first public comment period.

Any public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. If not, we're going to take our short break. And when we get back we'll get into Myrna's presentation.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I don't quite have a presentation because I was working on the Flyway Festival.

MR. FARLEY: My fault.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, it's a joint fault. It will be even better in February when I give it.

MR. FARLEY: I have to do it even better now, right?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't know how it looked in the first place. So you want to take over from here?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No, go ahead, you're doing great.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah, I'm standing up. You'll see there are very little refreshments. Somehow or another, maybe one of my volunteers for the Flyway festival, cleaned out all of our

sodas and things like that. However, I do feel like I probably should pass along the opportunity for some one of you maybe to sign up to bring refreshments from time to time rather than kind of just me and the kitty because, I don't know, the kitty is kind of starving. You know those feral cats. So if you're interested in having refreshments at the break, maybe we can pass around a sign-up sheet.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So the first item would be administrative business and announcements and that says Michael and Myrna. So you have any?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I have no administrative business other than if anybody has any comments on the minutes, please get them to myself or Myrna. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: December 2.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And they would be the December 2nd minutes by the way.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. So, focus group reports, Mr. Wendell Quigley, the Community Outreach.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: We have nothing to bring forward.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Natural Resources.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jerry Karr has been leading that effort. Jerry gave me -- or sent an e-mail today, just so you as his friends and colleagues know, he started on the 20th another eighteen rounds of chemotherapy with three new drugs to see if we can't chase that little evil spirit away. But he said he just feels too -- he's feeling stronger every day since that 20th, but then his next infusion would be on the 9th of February. But he felt pretty tired tonight, so he decided not to come. So send a note and keep him in your thoughts. Paula, Technical Focus Group.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: (Shook head.)

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Mr. Hollingsworth, the City report?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That sounds like the city manager's report every Tuesday night -- no, it's the city attorney, the city manager usually has something to report. Okay. The Lennar update, Mr. Farley.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Myrna. Okay. So we have a handout at the front table that's eleven by seventeen, a couple photographs, etcetera. I'm going to make this rather brief because Neal stole all my thunder tonight. He gave an update on all of the things that are currently going on.

Let me highlight a few things for everybody. Let's start in the lower left corner. A number of major documents that are in review and some upcoming documents that are relatively significant. The IR-21 FS/ RAP and the IR-15 FS/ RAP, both of those are coming out in February of this year. Neal mentioned a number of USTs and PCB sites, FOPL segments, etcetera, that are closed. Those numbers are listed down here down below. The public comment period for the IA-B1 Crane Test Area RAP is coming out in April, May. That's the public comment period. So mark that on your calendars for April/ May, '09, for that public comment period. In the body of the map there are a number of UST sites that are highlighted there; those are some of the ones that have closed in the last month or two. And if you're -- the legend for what is an underground storage tank versus a pump station is down in the lower right corner.

Let me jump real quickly to the figures or the photographs. The one in the lower left corner is another view of the pump station six, the Industrial Wastewater Pump Station 6 excavation as of just a few days ago, January of this year. This is the same area that Neal showed some photographs of earlier, just a different view. I think you can get a sense of the size of the investigation and the efforts that we're going through to remove the contamination there. Above that is -- it's mainly a photo to show something kind of, I think, a little different maybe, a little interesting, installing sheet piles. Sheet piles are some engineering controls to keep the side walls of excavations in place. Particularly when you're up against a building like you are here, you can't slope the side walls of the excavations back to allow you to get to the depths needed sometimes, so we install sheet piles. So here's a nice photo showing how the sheet piles go in, and that is at UST 1310.

And then in the upper right corner anybody know -- well, it says what building it is so I was going to see if anybody -- it's Building 386, and inside that building there are a number of pits that held very, very large pieces of equipment. And the equipment is largely gone, and what's left behind are concrete lined pits with various sort of cubbyholes and cradles. You can see a couple of cradles there for some big monster shaft that sat in there at one time. And we're going in and removing water and sediment, and in some cases some small accumulations of petroleum that may have leaked out of a crank case of something. So that work is going on at a number of those pits. I think there's about a half dozen inside that building that we're cleaning out. So I think that covers it. Along with what Neal talked about, that covers most of the major activities for now. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did this guy drop his vest and pick up some chemicals?

MR. FARLEY: You know, I just had to -- the short answer is no, Wendell. But I found out something interesting today. You have to, in my business, I have to go through an annual health and safety refresher every year, it's an eight hour refresher. And what I found out today is there's actually a requirement or a standard for how much of a vest has to be of reflective material. And apparently he's got a current vest on because it looks like there's a lot of reflective material on that vest. I don't know if it comes with batteries or if that's a reflection, I suspect that's a reflection. Thanks, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But no reflection on you. Okay. Cris Jespersen, Weston update. Oh, microphone.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thank you, Myrna. We also have a handout here which everybody has. First off, this is just an update on our document status. And you can see a number of documents that we

either submitted last month or have into the agencies for review, so I won't go through and belabor those. Next up is an update on the soil excavation work, it's IR-05. And the backfill of the excavated upland areas was completed. Once we receive agency concurrence the cleanup goals have been achieved, and right now the Navy and Weston are waiting on the biological opinion that is being developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow for excavation of remaining soil hot spots within some wetland portions of IR-05. And. You can see in the upper right-hand corner there a picture of the backfilled area by IR-05, very exciting stuff.

And then finally, coming up next month, we're anticipating submittal of the munitions response action completion report in the early part of February for the IR-05 and Western Magazine Area. And you can see an example of one of the survey maps for IR-05 there in the bottom portion of the handout. That shows the subsurface metal targets, and the location in the little red dots there are some of the MEC items that we removed during our investigation removal action. That's all I have. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. So we're off and running. The regulator agency reports updates. Carolyn?

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble, Paisha Jorgensen, Carolyn D'Almeida)

MS. D'ALMEIDA: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Chip, you have something more to say tonight?

MR. KAISER: I do too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And John does too. Okay.

MR. KAISER: Hey, you're supposed to go first. I keep knocking this thing over. Anyway on Paisha's behalf I just wanted to give you a sense of what's going on with him. He mentioned that there's a Board order currently in place on Lennar Mare Island, and it's a little bit out of date, and one of the tasks that Paisha is going to be working on in addition to these other items we've mentioned earlier will be revising that order to make sure that the schedules reflect reality, and also reflect the accomplishments that have been set forth already. Navy documents that he's currently reviewing regard the Draft Investigation Summary Report and Vapor Intrusion Risk Evaluation which actually, following my review, should be out tomorrow.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Great.

MR. KAISER: At the latest you'll get it Monday, but I'll try and get it out tomorrow. It says 'Lennar Mare Island, I'm reviewing numerous', and he underlines that, reports for closures of USTs and FOPLs, fuel oil pipelines. And remedial action work plans for UST 693, and the source area in IR-03. He mentions in part the IR-17 schedule. I think I'm going to defer any comments on that to Chip if you want to add anything to that at all? And that's about it.

MR. SILER: Actually, John, I have a question for you. On that Board order, that actually names both Lennar Mare Island and the Navy. Are you going to try to bifurcate the order now and just have one for the Navy and one for Lennar?

MR. KAISER: Actually under our system, under the Water Code, we would name the original discharger as well. I don't have any more to report, I think I've said enough.

MR. GRIBBLE: We've been working on the offshore sampling plan, IR-17, developing the documents for that. We think IR-17 is going in the right direction and it's looking like the Navy's

shaping up to put out a good removal action proposal for that. And we also had a meeting on the PCB sites with the EPA. We had a meeting with the Navy and Lennar on the Marine Corps Firing Range, as I said earlier, path forward on how to get that finished. We think the cleanup part of that is done, actual remediation part, it's administrative tasks that remain to get that property transferred. And then also the paint waste addendum. Last year the Navy did a removal action for a number of sites, a consolidated Time Critical Removal Action. And all the work pursuant to that has not been completed, yet specifically with regard to the paint waste site, more contamination was found there than they anticipated, and also at IR-05 where it gets into wetlands. And so the Navy's had to stop and go back to Fish and Wildlife Service and negotiate with them or talk to them about the adequacy of the mouse avoidance measures at the paint waste site. The Navy unexpectedly found waste ordinance and some more RAD buttons, so they put out, an addendum to that, and we've been working on that. We had a meeting to resolve issues or comments, and I think we're there. So the Navy is going to put out revised responses to the comments and a revised addendum, and I think that that's going to work. That might be a topic for another presentation at some point. It's up to you guys.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It will be a topic of discussion for the RAB.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well, Michael, do you have anything for the co-chair's report?

VII. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I do. Exactly, although Chip talked a lot about stuff we've been doing -- but anyways. As far as field work goes, field work began -- so I can read I'll take my glasses off. Field work began this week, actually beginning of last week to implement the petroleum corrective action plan in the Former North Building Ways A-2 Area. We gave a RAB presentation on that I think four months ago or so. For the seventeen small areas, approximately 3,000 cubic yards, will be removed. So far what's been ongoing is utility clearance, things of that nature. But they expect to have that completed, all the soil excavated by mid-May.

In addition, Chip mentioned we've been coordinating with the BCT for a bunch of different reports and some field work. On the offshore we've put out our sampling and analysis plan and our response to comments, and we expect to be in the field -- in the offshore doing that phase two sediment sampling the second and third week of February. As Chip mentioned, we also met and you heard a presentation tonight about Site 17. We are in the process of receiving comments on the vapor intrusion evaluation. And then we're also then going to incorporate everything into the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis. And at that point in time we will come back to the RAB and present it and also have a public meeting on that topic. We received a bunch of comments and/or letters from all the regulatory agencies since December 2nd when we met last, most of them pertaining to Site 17 and the offshore. We were planning to have our next BCT meeting next Friday, but with the --

MR. GRIBBLE: Furloughs.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, with what just happened we're going to have to reschedule. I talked to Chip at the break, so when I get back Monday we'll come up with some dates and propose that to all parties.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Think how fast that would go.

MR. GRIBBLE: We're not allowed to work state furlough.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Right. Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's what Gil's point is.

MR. GRIBBLE: He needs a microphone, I didn't hear him.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: That's my report. Myrna, I'll turn it over to you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just wanted to say since you had the day off, that's the Friday before the festival, guys, so you're welcome to volunteer.

MR. KAISER: My wife just volunteered me for something too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sorry your wife beat me to it.

MR. KAISER: I was trying to keep it a secret.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it was all over the news tonight. Here I'd like to pass out copies along of the Flyway Festival schedule that is just off the press, a little bit late. But it is going to be a great line-up of a lot of outings on Mare Island, and the south end park open. The Navy with the City arranged for us to gain access to the South Shore Areas, the Western Magazine for bird watching outings and history walks all over the island including the Mighty Midget, the last LCS, Landing Craft Support, gun boat will be open all three days. So probably just the most outings that we've ever offered on Mare Island, the most self-guided ones and guided.

So thank you for everyone who's put their shoulder to the wheel on that project, and including Weston Solutions as our host sponsor, and CH2M Hill sponsoring at the major sponsor level, as well as a lot of support graphics and photos and things that you're doing for us.

The Flyway Festival still does need volunteers, and it will be easy assignments, and it might be only an hour or two of your time. We need a projector, at least one of those PowerPoint projector things, and maybe even two. And we could use a laptop -- a loan of a laptop or two that connects with that projector. And --

MS. MOORE: We have two.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Carolyn's saying you can use the one she has.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, that would be so excellent, yeah, excellent. And then, let's see. The Coast Guard. The Coast Guard -- I wanted to let you know that the federal government is incredibly responsive, as of January 20th we have a new world order. The Coast Guard was planning machine gun maneuvering in San Pablo Bay, shooting at a fake, I guess, pirate ship or something all day -- all next week all day long, and they are going to take the weekend off and then go at it again Monday. But we've prevailed upon them, George Miller's office is working with us to get them to cease and desist on Friday afternoon, so that we can go bird watching -- if there are any birds left in San Pablo Bay after they've pretended to blow them all out of the water. It's amazing. But they are a military agency I was told today, I was reminded by their lieutenant somebody. So I appreciate George Miller's office and the team of folks that are working there at the Coast Guard too. And the last thing I wanted to mention to the Navy is that I think it would be great to have some conversation and possibly a focus group meeting regarding your community relations plan update that you have in mind or that you have underway through a contract. So that's all I have.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Can I talk?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, no, you can't talk.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah. I mentioned to Myrna and Chip obviously, and maybe some other folks already, but we are in the process of -- the Navy awarded a contract to update the community, and now we're calling it Community Involvement Plan, the CIP. The last update was in 2001, I believe, or 2002. So that is in the works. And one of the things obviously, as Myrna mentioned, we've talked about maybe doing a focus group with RAB members and community members and anybody else to get ideas. One of the things we're going to do is possibly putting, right now starting to put together a questionnaire, maybe we'll do interviews. We don't know yet, but more to follow on that. And we'll probably even have a presentation at the RAB on that. But thank you for mentioning that. With that, we'll go to our last public comment period.

Is there any public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. If not, thank you, everybody, we'll adjourn, and see you -- not until the last Thursday in February, or at the Flyway Festival beforehand.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:50 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Site 17 Update – Navy
- Presentation Handout – Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) Update – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update January 2009 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard January 2009