

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, February 28, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, January 28th, at the JFK Library, City of Vallejo Blue Room 505 Santa Clara St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:04 p.m. and adjourned at 8:56 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)
- Jerry Karr
- Wendell Quigley

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

- Liz Barr (Navy)
- Patricia McFadden (Navy)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Brian Thompson (Water Board)
- Cris Jespersion (Water Board)
- Tom Wallis (CH2M)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)

Community Guests in attendance:

- David Godsey
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from CDM:

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: My name is Myrna Hayes, as most of you know, and I'm the community co-chair of the Restoration Advisory Board. Michael Bloom, my co-chair from the Navy, is on a holiday -- no, he's not really, he's actually working. He's at an installation restoration site program that the Navy has put together for –

MS. MCFADDEN: At a conference.

MS. Barr: At a conference.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: At a conference, yeah, all right. So Liz Barr is going to fill in for him, but I thought I could kick off the meeting. When I was coming up that derelict elevator that had its note that said it really will work, be patient, I was reminded of the city manager -- did you work under this manager, Gil?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Which one?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ed Wallinburg.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No, I came shortly -- well, the first one I had was --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Penny Barclay.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No, the one that died.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, Walt Graham.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Walt Graham.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We have a long history, as you might have noticed, with politics amongst the fire department and police and other organizations at city Hall. And Ed Wallinburg got stuck in that elevator, and there was nothing that would get him out except for the fire department. And the story goes that -- I shouldn't be saying this on the record -- that the firemen who came to rescue him called down, "Well, if you'll have a meeting with us over our contract, we'll get you out. So whenever I ride that elevator I think of that story."

Okay. Anyway, could we just go around --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: What happened to Ed Wallinburg?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I haven't any idea, do you know?

MR. KARR: He's still in the elevator.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Turn off her machine I'll tell you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, at the break. At the break, we'll learn. All right. So if you'd not mind introducing yourselves. I'm not sure that you need a microphone, only I do tonight. If you think you do, I'll pass it around.

MR. FARLEY: You need a microphone?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm just teasing. Did I say quick introductions?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Want to start with me? Gil Hollingsworth, city of Vallejo.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble, DTSC.

MR. THOMPSON: Brian Thompson with the Water Board of the San Francisco Bay region.

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley, CH2M Hill.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, community member.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, community member, Napa Solano Audubon.

MS. MCFADDEN: Patricia McFadden with the Navy.

MR. GODSEY: David Godsey, resident of Vallejo.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Jim Porterfield ex-Mare Islander.

MR. WALLIS: Tom Wallis with CH2M Hill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Tom Wallis with CH2M Hill and Jim Porterfield, resident of American Canyon. All right. Thank you all. Our very first presentation this evening is Patricia McFadden, and she's going to give us a presentation on the Draft Supplemental Site Inspection Report conceptual site model for the Fleet Reserve Piers and Berths 1 and 2 update. I know that I might have been the one who prompted you to do the Fleet Reserve and do the Berths 1 and 2, this all goes together, this is all one --

MS. MCFADDEN: It's all one report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So great, I'm glad to have you here.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Draft Supplemental Site Inspection Report and Conceptual Site Model for the Fleet Reserve Piers and Berths 1 and 2- Update*
Presentation by Ms. Patricia McFadden, Navy

MS. MCFADDEN: Thank you, Myrna. I think I need to figure out to switch the slides too, hold on.

Hi, my name is Patricia McFadden. I work with the Navy's office. I actually work at the caretaker's site office, but I also assist with the munitions project. And I'm here to present just a brief overview of the Supplemental Site Inspection Report that we did for two of our offshore sites in the northern part of Mare Island, the Fleet Reserve Piers and Berths 1 and 2. This is where they are at. This is the causeway, fleet Reserve Piers here, Berths 1 and 2 there, with a pier that's no longer there. In our supplemental site inspection, we conducted this over these two sites, and it was the original site inspection was completed in 1997. Because of all the time that passed and because we wanted to do a little bit more robust research on some of the histories there, we started the Supplemental SI. And in order to further document and investigate site history we did some additional interviews. And then we also wanted to kind of present a more risk-based approach in evaluating how we should move forward for this site. Here's a picture of the Fleet Reserve Pier back in 1945. These piers were actually constructed then. And these are some of the mothball fleets that were there. Not a great picture from the causeway, but you can see that just the piers are there and no ships. When we were looking at lines of evidence in order to see what munitions may have been placed there or trying to investigate what kind of operations went there, we looked at several lines of evidence. Site history is the broad topic, but that included historical records. We looked at maps. We looked at aerial photos. We looked at archival records of operations and communications. We also looked at the dredging history because, as we all know, at Mare Island dredging was a large part of the operation, and also a large part of the cleanup. We did some personal interviews with people that worked at the base and had something to do with either the Fleet Reserve Piers or munitions handling. We looked at analytical data in the sediment. And we also looked at all the different potential sources of MEC. So speaking of the dredge ponds because they play a strong part here, you can see again the Fleet Reserve Piers and the Berths. In relation to the several lines that went across Mare Island and were part of the dredging, the routine dredging that occurred in the Mare Island Strait. While there were predominant lines across different areas, we know that there were some cross connections as well that happened in the dredge ponds. We

don't have great records as to what went to which ponds where but we do have a lot of information about what is in the dredge ponds.

So for the Fleet Reserve Piers, prior to World War II they were used for occasional ship mooring up in that area. The northern part of the island was not used as much as the central and southern parts in -- prior to World War II. But with the buildup of World War II, they constructed the piers there in 1945, and they were used to store reserve naval ships after those ships were mothballed. Essentially a lot of the equipment was stored the supplies were taken off, and they were made for -- a ready reserve so if they were needed they could be brought back into service. The suspected source of MEC -- MEC is munitions and explosives of concern -- is from the ships. Basically the fact that the ships were there, the fact that maybe miscellaneous items that weren't off-loaded could have been dumped in the water is what was envisioned as a source for the munitions. We also didn't know if there was off-loading of munitions there -- and that was part of our research. One of the main lines of evidence that MEC may be present was that we did find it in pond 3W which is just west of the Fleet Reserve Piers. And this area was routinely dredged from 1945 until the -- '76, the mid seventies. We do know there's metal anomalies present in the pier area. This isn't surprising because it was a place where a lot of tools were handled. The pier had a lot of metal on it as well. So we know there's metal debris, which is expected in waterways, but we don't have any confirmation that those anomalies are MEC.

So in our report we make the following conclusions. The Navy recommended no further action for this area because we did not find any evidence of ordnance handling in this area. We did find evidence that showed that this pier was solely used for the inactivation and storage of vessels. We did not find any documented evidence that ordnance disposal occurred. We had a couple of unnamed sources that we couldn't validate, but didn't have any of our current sources indicate that. We did see in the records that there was never an explosive safety arc over that area. An explosive safety arc would indicate that that was an area where routine handling of munitions occurred. So that just helps-assists the case. We did interview several people. One key interview was a former naval captain who actually operated with the EOD team out here. They did a couple of training dives. He also then did some dives with one of our contractors. And he never saw any evidence of munitions in his training dives. The one invalidated source we had from the 1997 SI had said they did a dive and they found munitions, but we couldn't find any records of it. We couldn't find a name; we couldn't find an interview document, so we sought out additional sources for that information.

The dredging that occurred throughout the use history, often the theory is that the dredging that occurred is also what brought the -- any materials that were there to the dredge pond. So we feel that any dredging that occurred would have eliminated any MEC that may have been present. And also we looked at the sediment and we didn't find any detectible levels of munitions or any other constituents that would be of a concern. So the other site we looked at is the Berths 1 and 2. It's just south of the causeway here. This is a former freight pier that was there that's no longer there, and this is what it looks like in the present.

And a little bit of history on the Berths 1 and 2. It's located just south of the causeway. It was used for general berthing, including a lot of tugs and barges in its later use. The former freight pier was used from the forties until about '54, and it was used for supply off-loading from what we were able to discern from the records. This site was included in the 1997 SI based on a record that the Special Boat Unit, which was a river patrol boat unit, had used the Berths for their boats, and that they had disposed of munitions over the sides of the boats. Well, that main piece of evidence that brought it

into the SI was actually found to be false. The boat unit was actually located at the south end of Mare Island, and then it also turned out from talking to some boat unit representatives that they didn't actually use live munitions, that they actually used blanks when they did their river patrols.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They were sure loud. They'd wake you up in the middle of the night.

MS. MCFADDEN: Yeah. So again, similar to the Fleet Reserve Piers, the main point of evidence for munitions that may be present is that there are munitions found in the dredge ponds just west of it, and in this case both 1 and 3W are a little closer to Berths 1 and 2. And again, we did do a survey long ago with the technology that has developed since, and we know that there's metal anomalies in the water, which is not unexpected in a waterway, especially next to an industrial area, but we don't have any confirmation of munitions. So for Berths 1 and 2 we also recommended no further action, primarily based on the fact that the reason we included it in the SI was based on inaccurate information. We also felt that no evidence exists to support those previous reports that we had; it may just have been that those representatives were mistaken about the location or -- it's hard to tell because, again, we didn't have names to those interviews. Certainly the strongest thing was that the Special Boat Unit that was reported to have operated there and brought that area into suspicion for munitions was actually located -- the boats were located at the finger piers at the south end of Mare Island, and that they didn't actually use live ammo for their training. Now, we also found that Building 509, which is adjacent to Berth 2, was used by the Special Boat Unit, but it was for classroom training, and some of their administration. So we did find that that was partly why it was connected there. And again, we concluded that MEC is unlikely to be present there because we did not find any sources for munitions.

So that's what we presented. And we just had a long conversation with DTSC just a couple days ago, and while we presented our case and we thought we made a good case, DTSC believes that there still is sufficient reason to believe that munitions are present, and they believe it's enough to warrant further investigation. And this is primarily based on the fact that the munitions found in the dredge ponds, in the proximity of it, and also that we know there's metal anomalies in the sediment. And this just happened when -- Tuesday. So the Navy and the regulators were going to be discussing this further to discuss a path forward about just how to present our disagreement in documents and how to move forward. So -- and with that I'll take any questions that you have. I'm sure Myrna has questions, but does anybody else have questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jim?

MR. PORTERFIELD: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you go back to the dredge pond image? I know that I always say use the microphone, but Molly and I were thinking we might not need to use the microphone tonight, but maybe I could at least stand up.

You said that MEC was found in 3W?

MS. MCFADDEN: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what about that paint waste site that you're just cleaning up that kind of looks like it might also have an outfall because it's got all those RAD cat eyes in it. Where is that?

MS. MCFADDEN: Is that over here, Dwight, about?

MR. GEMAR: No, that's over there on the right-hand side, second from the right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 3W.

MS. MCFADDEN: Over here.

MR. GEMAR: Just to the left of that pipe.

MS. MCFADDEN: Right in here.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, right around there.

MR. GODSEY: Yeah, that's it.

MR. GEMAR: It basically comes right along D Street, and then goes out to 3W and the pond.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So where's the paint waste?

MR. GEMAR: It's right along that line from Berths 1 and 2.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay. What did you mean in your second slide when you said -- I guess it's two slides past that one when you said that you didn't have any current sources that confirmed --

MS. MCFADDEN: For which Fleet, or Berths?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- that there was no evidence to support ordnance disposal at the pier? What did you mean by no current sources?

MS. MCFADDEN: What -- we looked at the SI, the 1997 SI, and there are statements in there about somebody said they disposed of something -- for the Fleet Reserve it was somebody said they dove and they found munitions. So we went and we talked with Larry and all the folks who are still around, and we -- he searched his files and we said - Do you have a name? Do you have an interview thing? We didn't have any hard information on it. And so we sought it out. So we sought out some of the contacts that they had in the past. We sought out new contacts. And we just we didn't -- we didn't have a lot of information to work from. It was just a one sentence in the report and no backup information. So we didn't have any evidence to point to, say, John, who was a former ensign at the shipyard said this happened around this time period at this site, which is what we'd ideally have when we do historical research for a site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So when you say that on the Fleet Reserve that there's no ordnance handling and no documented MEC findings, it's my understanding that most of the munitions that got into the dredge ponds, I mean like we don't exactly know how they got there, but that they weren't necessarily from ordnance handling sources either.

MS. MCFADDEN: Correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So what would lead you to believe that -- why would the Fleet Reserve for Berths 1 and 2 be different than the way MEC got into the ponds from other parts of the river?

MS. MCFADDEN: Well ships -- the ships that came and went were more, they tended to be for maintenance and such, the larger ships were down here. These were actually the mothballed ships so they shouldn't have had any ordnance. Of course we know they may have had the one locker that didn't get emptied. You know, maybe there were occasions where they found it.

For the Fleet Reserve Pier we actually found a letter from somebody requesting to off-load there, and we couldn't find the response. But the fact that they requested it meant that it was not normally done. If it was a normal operation they wouldn't have had to send a letter to request it. But then the Berths were a freight pier so -- but it was -- it wasn't in a munitions area. Any munitions would

have been off-loaded down here, which was the norm and did have established safety arcs since the twenties.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, right. However, you have a dredge material disposal site at River Park, so why wouldn't those dredge materials from River Park possibly have come from dredging here? What leads you to believe that you -- do you know where the material came from that was in River Park? Because our photos that I've seen show that River Park was being dredged or being --

MS. MCFADDEN: Filled.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- filled with dredge material in the early fifties and up to -- through the late fifties. So why couldn't that have possibly been material here? And we know there are munitions in River Park.

MS. MCFADDEN: Well, that is -- there's the one finding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because there's a big outfall.

MS. MCFADDEN: Yeah, there was the one finding on Wilson Avenue that was on the other side of the outfall.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. But we could gather that the outfall that's about right there -- this has nothing to do with that one way down there -- would, why wouldn't it have had no munitions in it? So I guess I don't buy that just because you didn't -- that everybody like promised and crossed their heart that they didn't put something over there that there wasn't something over there. It doesn't sound very strong.

MS. MCFADDEN: For River Park we didn't find any information about dredge -- we believe River Park was probably dredged from this side of the strait because we didn't see any dredge pipes across the water from what we were able to find.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But why would the Navy have dredged material and -- on this side of the river?

MS. MCFADDEN: That I don't know. Like I said, this wasn't the focus of this.

MR. GODSEY: There were berthing areas on the Vallejo side of the Mare Island Strait during the war and after the war.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And so why would that material not have MEC in it when this did? I guess I'm not -- I'm obviously not DTSC, so I'm not going to waste your whole night trying to -- but I just -- that doesn't make sense that this somehow is some special site, even though munitions came up to those dredge ponds and you found it there and we can't prove that it didn't also come from river -- go to River Park, that this site doesn't have any munitions concerns.

MS. MCFADDEN: I think it's no different from the rest of the waterfront which was always believed that essentially the dredging moved the problem from the waterfront to the dredge ponds.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, at least Lou Burglin and Stan Gullavich think so, but did you have other interviews besides that? Or any other site models?

MS. MCFADDEN: We had a lot of interviews. We tried to just look at everyone we could that we had information on.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So on these training dives -- to move onto other questions. How would they discover evidence of munitions? You said they did training dives and they didn't see any evidence of munitions, how the hell would you know?

MS. MCFADDEN: It's just a case of we have people who went down and they didn't find anything, whereas the report was --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But did they go around in the dark like that one proposal to have divers go down and feel around --

MS. MCFADDEN: That's what their training was, that's what the EOD divers do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. MCFADDEN: I mean that's what they're trained to do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did you put down that they were EOD divers?

MS. MCFADDEN: I did, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where is that?

MS. MCFADDEN: It's on slide --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Officer, it doesn't say diver.

MS. MCFADDEN: Well, he was an officer and a diver.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MR. KARR: And a gentleman.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What does -- on the next one on Berths 1 and 2, what does no confirmation of MEC mean?

MS. MCFADDEN: I say it that way because we don't have any records that any munitions were found there. We don't have any records that munitions were dumped there. But we know there's metal debris in the water, but we haven't gone to see what it is so we haven't confirmed -- we don't have any data. It's difficult in these areas, we're talking about ten to fifteen feet of water and probably two to five feet of sediment on top of what would have been there back in the last dredge period. And so this effort was to go through the records search to say is there any reason to believe these sites are any different than the rest of the waterfront? And we believe there's not based on the information we could find.

Now, DTSC is disagreeing, and we have to kind of figure out what that means in terms of how we move forward. Essentially DTSC feels like, well, there is enough info, and we've already gone so far down the path with these areas that it's worth going and looking is essentially what -- they'd like to see some data to show that it's not there. So, to prove the negative. It's hard to prove the negative with records.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MS. MCFADDEN: We could bring a hundred divers who didn't find anything, but that's -- it's all a matter of perspective in terms of how confident that makes you feel.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess in your future SI's you'll get the names of people you took interviews with.

MS. MCFADDEN: Oh, well, they're all in the Supplemental SI, I just didn't the name them in this. The one I mentioned is Mike Murray.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You said you didn't get names of people who were interviewed.

MS. MCFADDEN: Yeah, that was the SSPTS folks who did it in '97.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MS. MCFADDEN: I'm sure they -- somebody had the names somewhere, but they didn't put it in the documents, and we're left with no record of being able to follow up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. And how could you -- how could something like where was the Special Boat Unit located not be known? Isn't there --

MR. GODSEY: In the shipyard, things moved around a lot on a shipyard. If you needed a building and you needed space, you might have it one year, and the next year you decide you need more space so they move you to a different building. In fact, SB 11 had two locations, one they had the training building up near Berths 1 and 2, which superficially would allow somebody to make a statement that they were located at Berths 1 and 2. Well, all they had was classrooms there. We found pictures that showed the actual boats down in Berth 34 or the finger piers, and when we talked with people who were actually in the unit and they confirmed the fact that the boats were down there and not up at Berths 1 and 2 as SSPTS claimed. So there was a large amount of data that SSPTS presented in their original SI that was just wrong, it was erroneous, and it was leading us to conclusions that couldn't possibly be real. So we went back and we looked at it with the SSI.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jim does have --

MR. GRIBBLE: To the extent there was a lot of information that was incorrect, there's no doubt there was a lot of information that wasn't in there correct or incorrect. It just doesn't have the full history of all of these areas. And if operations moved around as freely as Dave is indicating that's even suggesting even a greater possibility that there are gaps in the history that could be significant here.

MR. GODSEY: Well, we know the history of the Special Boat Unit pretty good.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well I'm not talking about -- I'm just talking about the history of that part of the waterfront or that stretch of the water, not the Boat Unit 11.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And my final question, I guess, is what -- you say that you made a case to DTSC and they felt that it was insufficient reason to go forward with the no further action. Did you make a similar case you've made tonight to them or a more sophisticated case or a more documented case?

MS. MCFADDEN: It's all documented in the Supplemental SSI. There are photographs; there are copies of administrative records and historical maps. I'm just presenting a very brief summary of that. I actually added more detail to this than from the last time we presented this because it didn't have a lot of the history so I tried to tell the story. I didn't obviously do a hundred percent job of that, I'm just trying to give enough detail. If you want more, the Supplemental SSI is there with a lot of nice photos, etcetera, to try and piece together the history that we didn't have -- Chip is right -- and there are certainly holes still. It's hard to look at all the documents available for the shipyard. You always start looking for what are you trying to answer. So we looked at all the maps that

covered this northern area. We looked at historical drawing maps, meaning the drawn maps as well as the aerial photos. We looked through records. We went to the archives down in San Bruno. So we looked and did all the searching that we could that's readily available.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well I guess I am -- just in the end you say that, in your final statement the kind of conclusion is that MEC is unlikely to be present because there was no source. And I guess I don't understand how MEC could show up magically in the other pond and not have a source, so it's confusing to me.

MS. MCFADDEN: We just don't know where it is.

MR. GODSEY: One thing that's not showing on management, these things will -- the dredge unit would have maybe a quarter mile of dredge pipe behind it. And then the individual ponds, they would manage those so that not everything went from corresponding berth area to the pond that was closest, because often that pond may be taken out of service.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Full already.

MR. GODSEY: Yes, it's full. So if they're finding stuff at 3W in an outfall, all that means is material ran through that pipe and ended up there, it does not mean that it came from the Fleet Reserve Pier or it could have even come from Berth 1 and 2, it depends on how far they connected up that piping and the dredge went and operated. So it's just simply not valid to say they found stuff in 3W so it had to come from the Fleet Reserve Pier.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I just want to make one other thing very clear, that the way I saw the photos for River Park, it did -- you didn't have to have a dredge line go underneath the causeway, your dredger could --

MS. MCFADDEN: It could have been from the dredger.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Your dredger could have done just like every dredger does today, hooked up a pipe, set it up, and shot it out there. So don't tell me, oh, well, we haven't found a pipe underneath the bridge, I'm not going to buy that. That's a very, very clear image of a lot of material coming into that site.

MS. MCFADDEN: I'm not denying that it was used for dredge and that it was dredged, probably most likely based on the Navy uses, on this western side of the strait. Did they also maybe use it for some of the middle of the strait or the other side? We don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was right after the war, they might have had a huge amount of capacity -- need for extended capacity. For some reason they appropriated that property, moved the badge and pass office, it looks like --

MR. GODSEY: The pictures show that there was an outfall along the causeway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The causeway.

MR. GODSEY: The causeway. Now they probably created it by putting up the berms and created this dredge pond area. And as, you know, it was easier or it was more possible to dredge into that rather than have dredge piping blocking the strait and going to the Mare Island dredge pond. So what came from that though was probably very localized to the Vallejo side of the strait. The question is was there any sources of MEC? Obviously they found an ordnance item. What isn't answered is was that placed there by human activity, meaning did somebody find it and later throw it out, or were they actually --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well I'm not even talking about that piece of ordnance. I looked at these photos of River Park long before that ordnance was found. And when you have an outfall the size of what it appears where there was a pipe back here and then a few months later another photo is taken and the pipe's been extended way out here, you were pumping a lot of material in there, and it was filling fast to have that pipe extended. So maybe it's under fifteen feet of continuous other dredges by the city of Vallejo after that, but I'm just simply not going to buy that that one little piece of ordnance way down the street says, oh, well, that was all the munitions, etcetera, that are in River Park, and that it's not relevant to the Navy. Because the Navy owned and managed that property, it wasn't a city of Vallejo dredge.

MS. MCFADDEN: I don't think anyone here is saying that, it's just that that property is, because of when it was transferred, the Navy BRAC program can't put funds for that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I didn't ask you to address that tonight, I said to say -- to simply say there's no source of munitions anywhere up there because it all came from down there, and it doesn't necessarily hold water in my opinion.

MS. MCFADDEN: All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So if you made a different presentation to DTSC, well, I'm just curious to know what else you told them.

MS. MCFADDEN: Well, DTSC agreed with you, so -- I don't know if you caught that on the last slide.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, don't say that to me, I did catch that. I'm going through your statements saying there's no source and it's unlikely to exist. But anyway, that's all.

MS. MCFADDEN: Any other questions?

MR. PORTERFIELD: Not a question but I can make a statement on the thing. I hope I don't shoot too big a hole in what you're looking at. But the ships that into went to service, the pier for the reserve fleet, the subtenders and destroyers, tenders that were up there didn't come directly from a combat area the way the ships that tied up at the south end did. Those ships may have had their ammo lockers emptied somewhere before they got to Mare Island, but every little cubbyhole in a combat area held ammunition, and they missed that stuff. There was agreement with the city of Vallejo, like he was talking about the arc, the ships that went through the bridge, that was a very difficult operation because the submarine tenders had huge cranes on the back, like 150-tonners or something like that, and they stuck out, and the ship had to be tilted and turned and jiggled to go through the old draw bridge. Those ships were clean when they went through there to go over there and service the reserve fleet. Any of the submarines that went out there had been cleaned. We usually didn't do that here, they brought them from somewhere else, but we did do some of the ones that were up there for storage. Not likely to find any live ammunition on those.

And I remember only one time the river patrol boat was tied to the pier in that Berths 1 and 2 area, that's when we did the experimental hull and tried to sink it. Twice as many guys as was designed to be on board, and probably ten two and a half inch fire hoses going into it. That was the only time I remember a small boat tied to that particular part of the sea wall.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. MCFADDEN: Thank you. All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Next we have our second presentation by Tom Wallace and Neal Siler on UST remedial action.

III. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Underground Storage Tank (UST) 231 Remedial Action Workplan - Update*
Presentation by Tom Wallis, CH2M

MR. WALLIS: Everybody have this handout? Can you guys hear me okay? I'll just speak without the microphone if that's okay with everybody. I'm happy to talk about USTs 231 1 and 2. They are some of the more interesting USTs on Mare Island, and we're going to do a Remedial Action there, and I wanted to talk to you guys about that before we actually implement the plan. So the agenda tonight is we're going to go over some background information, the location of the site, the history of the UST's, removal actions completed to date, and go over the -- not all of the sampling that was done, but highlight the important parts. Neal actually -- Neal Siler of Lennar Mare Island came to you guys on November 30th, 2006, and made a presentation on UST 231. I want to give an update of what we've done since then. And then go over the scope of the Remedial Action Workplan, the proposed excavation area, the -- what monitoring we're going to do after the remedy is finished, and then go to the implementation tasks and schedules.

So this is where the UST site is. It's within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. It's within Investigation Area H2. It's in the area that will be residential and that's a very important part. That's one of the reasons why these USTs are more interesting than some of the other USTs on the island. These are some of the former facilities around the former UST 231. The UST is down here. And it was part of a fairly complex fueling system that was connected to two other USTs, 243 1 and 2. This whole system was put in in the 1930s and 1940's, and it could be fed by railroad which could come along here and feed the tanks, or trucks could come in and feed the tanks. And then vehicles would come up to this pump island and get dispensed fuel that way. Other things in the area are diesel AST, above ground storage tanks, some underground storage oil water separators. There's a lot going on in this area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you tell us what this road, where we are?

MR. WALLIS: Oh, sorry. This is Azuar, I believe.

MR. SILER: That's right.

MR. WALLIS: This is --

MR. SILER: And in between Buildings 811 and 837, this is Connelly.

MR. WALLIS: This is Connelly. So the new residential area is over here.

MR. SILER: Does that get you there, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh.

MR. WALLIS: Okay. So the history of the UST's: So the whole area, the infrastructure for the fueling system was installed in the 1930s, 1940's. These USTs, at the time that they were removed, held gasoline. They have held leaded and unleaded gasoline, but there are records that they held diesel at some point in their history. They were 7,500 gallons total combined capacity, and they were steel construction. UST 231 2 was removed out of service in March, 1993. And both USTs

and all the piping were removed by the Navy in 1994. So it's been thirteen years since the -- any possible source has continued to drip, where there's no additional source added.

When they removed the tanks, the Navy did not report any holes in the tanks or the piping, and the steel was in good condition.

MR. GRIBBLE: They reported the steel was in good condition?

MR. WALLIS: Yeah. Yeah. So, to date, the removal actions are as follows: The Navy did the 1999 removal action here. And the piping and the tanks in 1995. And CH2M Hill came in in 2004 and did another removal action in this area, and along the piping and up here, and also went over to 243. These are some pictures of the excavations. Neal went into more detail on these excavations back in November, so I'll just leave it at that. The point here is that we do have some of the contamination already removed before we do our removal action. So when Neal came to talk to you on November 30th he reported that we were implementing this Sampling Analysis Plan in April, 2006, we were in the middle of implementing that and we were waiting on data. Since then we got the soil-gas data from the October November sampling ground. We looked at that data and determined that actually there were still some data gaps remaining. There were still some unanswered questions.

MR. KARR: Excuse me. We need to have one conversation or you need to use a microphone.

MR. WALLIS: Okay. Sorry. So after we did the October and November, 2006 sampling round, we determined that there were still some data gaps remaining, so we did some additional soil-gas, soil, and groundwater sampling, and laboratory analysis of those samples. And we also did some exploratory trenching, three exploratory trenches in the hottest area -- the area of most contamination. And we did that in the summer of 2007. Once we got that data back we came to the conclusion that we had sufficient data to support remedy selection and also to write this plan here. This is the document I'm talking about today, here it is. So that's the copy. So we were able to write the plan.

We've been having several meetings with the Water Board and DTSC to agree upon Site Specific Cleanup Criteria for this future residential land use. It's very important to remember this is going to be used as a residential area. And the result of all this work is this Remedial Action Workplan, and it will be submitted to the Board and DTSC shortly, meaning they should get it by 11:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. It went out by Fed Ex tonight, and e-mail.

So that's an important point. DTSC and the Water Board have not actually reviewed it, they have not had a chance to review this document that I have here.

MR. THOMPSON: Tom, I brought my truck in case it doesn't fit, I'll take it back with me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I thought maybe you could start now.

MR. WALLIS: So the way we figured out where we should dig is we looked at all the data. Each one of these dots represents a location where we collected either soil-gas, soil, or groundwater, and you can see a lot of data.

And then we have the trenches. This is the exploratory trenches I was talking about we collected in the summer 2007. So we put on-- we looked at that data and inside this green shape here is soil that either exceeds TPH gasoline or TPH diesel or hundred milligrams per kilogram. That's our cleanup criteria for this Remedial Action Workplan. There are some little dots here, isolated locations where the soil is above gasoline and diesel of a hundred milligrams per kilogram. Now, we laid on

top of that the soil-gas. So this orange area is the -- is where the soil-gas TPH gasoline result is about 335,000 micrograms per cubic meter. So that is the area that exceeds the cleanup criteria. And the soil -- the soil does exceed for benzene and -- but that's all within the green area. So everything that is exceeded is within that area. So that's why the red box incorporates all that area. And that is our excavation area.

Our proposed excavation plan is broken down to these three steps. For the area inside the red line, all these areas, we're going to excavate to approximately 9.5 feet below ground surface. And we're going to properly profile the excavated material. And then we're going to properly dispose of it. And then we're going to, inside the excavation we're going to collect side wall samples and bottom samples of the soil and the groundwater, and compare those results to the cleanup criteria. And if the side walls are still contaminated, we keep digging. So this is our start. It might be that we end up bigger than that. And what I have put on here also is the former removal areas. And you can see by the time we're done all this is going to get replaced. It either has been replaced already, or it's going to get replaced. And the third step is to backfill with imported clean fill.

MR. FARLEY: Tom, if I could make one point here just for everybody's clarification. The building on the far lower left side, that's Building 531, that building is actually gone, so this work isn't going to be affected by working underneath a building.

MR. WALLIS: Right. Did everybody hear that? Okay.

So after we finish we want to make sure that we did a good job and got it all. We want to demonstrate that the Remedial Action Objectives are achieved for soil, groundwater, and soil-gas. Well, the side wall samples and the bottom samples, the soil we'll deal with the soil. Okay. We will also be collecting groundwater samples in the pit, and we will also be -- for groundwater we will also be putting three new wells in across the site. And Brian and I will meet and talk about where we need to position those new wells. Okay. Then we're going to conduct one year of quarterly monitoring in those three wells and compare the results to the Cleanup Criteria. For soil-gas what we're proposing is a round of sampling six months after backfilling. So we clean up, we put the backfill in, we wait six months, and then we go in and we put soil-gas samples on a twenty foot grid at the locations where we have done historical sampling. Now, we may need to go back within twelve months and do a second round, depending upon the results, depending upon the water levels. Depending upon how the whole excavation goes, we might need to do a second round. Okay. Now, implementation tasks, the first step is to submit this draft RAW to all the agencies for review. Come tomorrow I'll put a little checkmark by that. Then we need to present the RAW to the RAB -- that's what I'm doing tonight -- to get your questions. And then, optimistically, we hope to work with the DTSC and the Board through March to get their comments and incorporate their comments into a final, so that we can be in the field in the late March, early April timeframe. We really need to get out there soon because we want to get it backfilled and have as long as we can before the rains hit next winter, because you can't be sampling for soil-gas if the water levels are too high. So we want to get the site backfilled, a long time, and then sample the soil-gas, perform soil-gas monitoring in October. And then, like I said, depending on the results, we might need to go back in April, 2009 and do another round perhaps. The other thing we'll be doing is performing groundwater monitoring in June, September, December, April. And then in the June timeframe I look to be doing the Implementation Report, depending on how well the groundwater results come back. Okay. And that's my presentation. What questions do you have?

MR. KARR: What's the source of your backfill, clean backfill?

MR. WALLIS: The actual location?

MR. KARR: I mean is it currently on the yard or are you going out for purchase?

MR. WALLIS: We'll go out for purchase.

MR. FARLEY: Jerry, one of the common sources is a quarry up in American Canyon. And in order to import soil onto the island we have to comply with analytical requirements that are in the soil and groundwater management plan that set certain criteria. For example, it can't have any detected organics in it. So most of the stuff that -- I shouldn't say most -- much of the stuff that we've brought in for backfill has come from a quarry up there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can I just ask you again on your presentations to do a -- whatever you would call it, an upright photo of the site with the buildings looking at them from street level so that we know where this is? Because I don't have aerial eyes, and it's hard to figure out where we are in space and time by looking at something from an aerial shot. So just add another photo onto this one that would just show the buildings, because some of us anyway are kind of familiar with some of those intersections.

Then I just have a couple of other questions. I can see this is a huge project, but why wouldn't you use in situ treatment?

MR. WALLIS: Good question. Let me go back here. Okay. So right here, I missed a step here. After we did this additional soil, groundwater, soil-gas sampling, we determined that there was sufficient data to come up with a remedy. So we sat down, we had a day long meeting internally, CH2M Hill did, and we flew in experts from around the country, and we went over all the potential remedies; in situ bio, soil vapor extraction, all these different remedies were considered. But the drivers of this site, the most important factors of this site are it will be residential, okay. There can't be any doubt that it's going to work. Secondly, it's -- the geology is such that we have relatively tight material, so a clay silty layer above. And then we have the contaminated zone, which is about seven feet to nine feet, that's where the contamination is. So we talked about putting bubblers in and bubble air into that zone. And then you have to have a way to collect the off gas and soil-gas, but then you got this seven feet of clay on top that it's got to make its way through. So all the remedies we looked at had problems with them. Excavation is fairly foolproof. It's much more -- you know you get a bulldozer, you know you're removing it. So we felt that excavation was the preferred alternative for this site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. It is except for I guess all that stuff goes to somebody else's backyard so -- but that sounds like a good enough argument, the clay soils and the groundwater issue. Are there wells there now, and have they -- and has this -- this affected the groundwater, this contamination? So it's two separate questions.

MR. WALLIS: There are wells there. There's a well here. There's a well over here. There's two wells down here in a downgradient area. The hottest area in the soil-gas is right here. That's the bull's-eye. So what's interesting is we have 73 groundwater samples. The ones which are contaminated, in other words, above Tier 2 values, all have groundwater samples. We go down and do a direct push and quickly take a sample. Those come back hot, okay. The wells right next door are clean. So the wells which were properly built with a sand-pack, etcetera, those the groundwater is actually below Tier One values. So it looks like the groundwater is unfiltered and it might be getting soil entrained with it, but it's there and we can't ignore it. But the groundwater wells their samples are clean.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And my last question -- I'm not sure if you'll answer this or if Neal will or you'll come back to us -- but on a site like this that is slated for residential, it's a different kind of residential scenario than much of the rest of the current new houses where there was contamination but it was green sand or it was lead in soil. What -- and I guess I'm going to go back to presentations that have been done at the Navy and Marine Corps RAB Co-Chairs conferences where there are companies out there who are -- as part of the long-term information that's available to the homeowner, the potential purchaser or the -- or series of purchasers of property, there is information on-line readily available to anybody who wants to look at it regarding what the history was of this particular site, even if it's transferred for unrestricted or hospital daycare or residential use now, a way that they can go back and research what the cleanup was. What are your plans for being -- for people being able to access the information about the cleanup of this site in the future?

MR. SILER: As far as Lennar putting together a database and relational database with photographs and putting that together so people can access it on-line?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't care who it is, if it's Lennar or Gil, he has --

MR. SILER: There are no plans we have to do that. Everything has to be uploaded on Geotracker, you know, and on the DTSC's website, so they can access all that information from the DTSC's website, and all the documents will be available for them to review. But there are no plans to put together any kind of a website where someone can go in and just take a look at that information, a third party website to do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So --

MR. WALLIS: So are you familiar with --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we've heard about it, but we've heard that nobody knows how to use it because we were -- it was suggested to us that maybe one day we could have a presentation about it, but there's something that like, I don't know, you guys can't figure out how to use it or Mare Island doesn't -- isn't in it or some goofy thing like that.

MR. WALLIS: Really?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So are you telling us that in about thirty or forty years it will be in there, Mare Island will be in there?

MR. WALLIS: No, that's a little unfair. In the last month Brian and I have made great strides in getting the information on Mare Island into Geotracker.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well I'm not being unfair. I just, as far as we heard the last time you guys talked to us, you said you -- it wasn't in there yet. I don't know if it's you or Brian or who does it, I'm not making -- I'm not picking on anybody, I'm just saying --

MR. WALLIS: Right. Well, so let me give you an update. So Brian and I are working together, and he provides me with Geotracker numbers, I.D. numbers. And I have been going in over the last month and uploading documents like this into Geotracker. And come Tuesday, I will have finished all of the sites that are closed. This document and the implementation report will one day be in Geotracker.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But will it be by parcel number? Will I be able to go to a county parcel map and then look at something simple -- not that -- about my property.

MR. GRIBBLE: You're looking at -- you're talking about two different things. The Geotracker and the Envirostor are --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't know what those are.

MR. GRIBBLE: The Water Board has Geotracker, and DTSC has Envirostor. And all they are electronic databases where you can take all these files and throw them into this electronic database, and there's your project file. There's nothing that says, here, you click on this button for this parcel and you got everything related to that parcel that comes up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. You've answered my question and I've made my case. I think this is really dirty kind of cleanup. It is really sloppy. I don't care how good you do under the ground, if you can't have someplace that I or Wendell or Jerry or anybody else in this room for the next thirty, forty, fifty years can go and say, oh, no problem, we know what happened on your property, or we know who knows; that's not fair because then you get all this stuff that goes on now. Oh, the Navy buried some really big hot pieces of equipment and they're out buried under -- over here and over there. You get this hearsay. Oh, that's the island that glows in the dark. What are you going to do to make sure that in the end the environmental cleanup passes the straight face test? That being the person who comes to use the property understands what took place and what remedies were used. I don't get why we're here if the end product isn't a level of assurance that can be tracked.

MR. FARLEY: I want to address a comment that you just made about it being dirty, sloppy cleanup. I resent that. And I wasn't --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I didn't say that.

MR. FARLEY: You did.

MR. SILER: Yes, you did, Myrna.

MR. FARLEY: Yes, you did. And I resent it --

MR. GEMAR: Yes, you did.

MR. FARLEY: Myrna, don't shake your head at me. This is extremely --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I didn't say -- I said what's dirty and sloppy is the end product.

MR. FARLEY: Myrna, you said this is dirty and sloppy cleanup, you said it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I said the end product. I don't want to debate it. What I want to make sure of-

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we'll look at her --

MR. FARLEY: -- that it's clear that we are complying with all of the state regulations. We are working very closely with both the Regional Board and the DTSC and the EPA in certain projects - - Myrna, please don't interrupt me, I'm trying to make a point here that's extremely important. I understand -- I think I understand your frustration about the other aspect of sharing information, but that does not reflect on the adequacy of the cleanup. And I'd like to have you make sure that you separate those two issues in the future.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I am sorry if you all misunderstood that, but I will say it again. It is a dirty cleanup if the community, the public does not have a way to go back and learn what was accomplished. I have never accused any of you in this room, anybody you represent, of doing a dirty and sloppy cleanup. I have been very impressed with the thoroughness of your cleanup. But

I'm going to say it again. If you cannot give me a mechanism to go back and show the public or the public -- the new homeowner, the new purchaser of the property cannot track, in layman's terms, in a simple, easy to use mechanism what was done, it opens the door for the perception or the stories that come back to say that a dirty, inadequate cleanup was done.

MR. FARLEY: I suggest you look at Geotracker.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Fine. Give me a parcel number.

MR. FARLEY: All you have to do is go to the map. It's extremely --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We were asked to be trained on it, we were told it's hard to use.

MR. FARLEY: It's not hard to use.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd just like to make a couple comments here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I'm not trying to get you defensive, Steve Farley.

MR. THOMPSON: So I do appreciate your concern, and we are making efforts to get Geotracker in a position where I can come to present it to you to facilitate being able to use it. One of the things you can't do on Geotracker that, the intent of it was, it was designed for, based on, after MTBE came out, to make it available to the public --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I remember you saying that.

MR. THOMPSON: -- so that they can go on a website and actually do what you're asking which is look over an area, get a map, look in the area, and it will highlight, okay, there's UST here. You click on it and it will give you information. So I haven't given a presentation yet. I've been starting, last year I was looking at getting my arms around all the USTs at Mare Island, not just the ones on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel and that the Navy still owns, but get them all together. And I did that and got that kind of update on the status. And the next step, which I've been working with Tom on, is making sure that these documents are being uploaded, and I will be working with the Navy starting at the next RPM meeting to make sure that they're -- I think they have an agreement with their consultant to get those out. And once I think we have a suitable database so we can go through some examples, then I'll plan to come present it at the RAB meeting. So I'm hoping that will be soon.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. All right.

MR. THOMPSON: That will be a tool. I don't think it's at the level that you're requesting which is -- it will have documents in there and Envirostor has a similar process, but it may not be -- you may not be able to track them in all the ways that you may want to, for example, by a parcel number.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm not even planning to buy property there, so I'm only speculating for people who do call. I mean they used to call because they used to buy property on Mare Island, they aren't right now, but they did call. I don't want people to just take my word for it or Wendell's word for it or anybody else in this room. It's nice to be able to go back to the documents or to go back to -- by parcel and have a little narrative that this is the kinds of issues, these are how they were addressed, and here's where we are today, even if there are permanent groundwater wells that are necessary. I just think that you haven't done the complete job unless you can demonstrate over time to new audiences other than a small group of people here and the folks who read these nice big documents. And I'm not pointing fingers at anybody or saying what the timeline is, I'm just saying, what's your strategy? What's your game plan?

MR. THOMPSON: And I think one of the things what I would hope is maybe you and some of the other people from the RAB would go on and use Geotracker. There is a limit to how much we can, information we can put in there to make it easy to track, but we do have a little bit of wiggle room there. It's a huge database all through the state, so it's not going to be specific to Mare Island. And that may make it a little more difficult to track, you know, the chronology at Mare Island, for example. But it will have information in there for Mare Island. And if it's difficult to track, then maybe we can have a back and forth conversation, and maybe there's different ways we can input data into the database that make it easier to extract it out. So that will come after maybe some people have used it and see if they can find documents in there. Okay?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. WALLIS: What else? Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. BARR: Next we have the first public comment period. So if anyone has any comments? (No response.)

MS. BARR: Then we can go into our break, a ten minute break. (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Liz Barr)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Welcome back to our RAB meeting. It's kind of hard to be here when our city is possibly doing something, but I guess they're not, huh, Gil?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: What's that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Over at city hall.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's all over with, the mayor --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can't make a decision, huh?

(Thereupon there was a discussion off the record.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Administrative business, that would be the minutes. If anybody has any issues with last month's minutes, please give me the corrections by e-mail or give them to me tonight, or preferably send them to Michael because he's closer to the staff that fixes them. And Liz, do you have any comments here?

MS. BARR: No.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mr. Quigley, you are the community outreach focus group chair. Do you have anything you'd like to share with us

a) Community

MR. QUIGLEY: I only want to reiterate what you brought up about -- I do get phone calls about parcels where people live, exactly what's under us? And if there's any area that they can go to to find out if there's anything in writing about just how clean this land is. And there's just -- I mean there's not. And so that is something that people are concerned in. Those around the school are extremely concerned, especially the playgrounds and stuff. I mean, we know it's been said that it's clean, and it's supposed to be safe, but they told that to the same people in Benicia so, you know.

To be able to have something to fall back on would be nice. For a site to be able to say, well, if you go here, this should help you out. And if in the future if you could do that, and break it down to layman terms. Because I use my computer after somebody sets it up, I'm very illiterate on it, it's my own fault I'm trying to correct. But if the people who are creating the site can't really understand it, I would assume that the basic person on the street would have problems with it too. So that's my point.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah, thank you. Yeah. I just think that if we're going to spend as much money as we are, and we're going to do as good a work as we're doing, then there ought to be a way that that can be -- that people can know that.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Mr. Karr, we're really happy to have you here tonight.

MR. KARR: I'm happy to be here. I apologize for being out of the loop, on medical for a while and I haven't done much of anything. But I am coming back to life and happy to be here.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And Paula's not here this evening.

Anybody else that had any report regarding technical issues that you've reviewed, commented on? Gil, city report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I have nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Lennar, Steve Farley.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Okay. Got a couple of handouts here. A document schedule, an eight and a half by eleven, and then our normal eleven by seventeen. Let me start in the lower left corner, documents that were in review, significant upcoming documents, etcetera. None of that has changed since last month, so those were all the same pieces of information there.

Let me draw your attention to the photographs. The photographs on the left and the upper two in the upper right were all related to fuel oil pipelines or FOPLs. You can see some of the fuel oil pipelines being removed around the Building 743 area. And just for your reference, these photographs are keyed back to the location on the map so you can see, for example, that Building 473 is up in the upper right corner of IA-C1 near the causeway. Anyway, you got some pipelines that are coming out of the ground. The photograph below, the reason I included that one down below is just so you can see some of the tools that we use to try and locate these metallic fuel oil pipelines as they go underground. This is sort of a little beeper that they tag the pipelines with, grab the metal pipe, and then they use sort of a magic wand to find where that pipeline is going. It's a very useful tool to find where these pipelines go, particularly considering that there's been lots of different generations of pipelines and sometimes the maps aren't right. So we use this to trace the pipelines out. The lower right corner is just a photograph showing some of the various tools and pieces and parts that we use to do groundwater monitoring. The two little white water bottles between that is a piece of pipe, that's a piezometer. It's a temporary well that we installed, and we're collecting water samples from that location, which happens to be over on the south side of

Building 686. And Building 686 is shown in gray in the middle of IA-C2. The other photograph with the backhoe in it and a worker, this just shows you some of the sort of logistical hassles with doing work. We're right up against the building. This is on the south side of Building 89. And we have a utilidor that runs through the excavation. We didn't know it was there, it's got various pipes and electrical conduits and such in it. Probably the most interesting thing that's happened is in the upper right corner, the photograph that is, shows what looks like to be the outside of an old brick oven or something. It's actually a manway, historic manway or tunnel that we encountered when we were doing some trenching for -- looking for -- yeah, it's pretty interesting huh, Wendell?

MR. QUIGLEY: Interesting.

MR. FARLEY: -- looking for these fuel oil pipelines. And we encountered this structure totally as a surprise. We called out Parr Environmental. They're the folks that come out and take a look at any historic findings that we might have. They're not entirely certain what it is, but they believe that it may be a tunnel. We were able to pop a small hole in the top to see what's inside. It's about half full with sediment and various bottles. And, of course, the guy from Parr is sort of frothing at the bit to grab some of those bottles and date what the age of the bottles are and such. So just a few examples of some of the logistics and the work that's going on.

The other thing that I'll point out is on the figure you'll see where USTs 231 1 and 2 are in H2 -- that's the site that Tom talked about tonight.

And then the other thing is there are a number of blue labels and open light blue circles, those are a number of PCB sites that were the subject of a site walk with DTSC folks last week. We walked through those. We wanted to make sure that we had all the work either planned or done that DTSC felt was important. And we walked through there, identified some additional work that DTSC thought we needed to do, so we're going to go ahead and proceed with that. It's mostly some limited sampling in some areas of the sites. And so that was a big help to us to pin down exactly what needs to be done to wrap up those sites. So we appreciate that effort and the time from DTSC for that. And with that, I think that covers what's going on right now. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Does the tunnel run towards the water or away, or north south or what?

MR. FARLEY: It runs parallel to the water, generally north south.

MR. KARR: What's the diameter, Steve, do you know?

MR. FARLEY: What's that?

MR. KARR: What's the diameter, roughly?

MR. FARLEY: It's about ten feet across.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Really?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, about eight to ten feet.

MR. QUIGLEY: You don't know how long?

MR. FARLEY: We don't know how long it is, we just know how wide it is, eight to ten feet.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wow.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, it's pretty interesting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe it's this, I got a phone call this last week asking me in all seriousness to confirm the tunnel that this guy was told goes from Mare Island to Skaggs Island.

MR. FARLEY: Quite a tunnel.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Quite a tunnel, yeah. Probably more than half full of sediment, but maybe this is the tunnel.

MR. FARLEY: Well, I think the most interesting thing really was the fact that the guy from Parr Environmental was so excited at finding this structure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

MR. FARLEY: So a little piece of Mare Island uncovered. A little piece of history uncovered.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's as exciting, I think, as when they were doing at the south end -- remediation at the mobile unit nine was working, trying to determine where munitions were, and they found the granite sea wall that's down there. And now the wall -- the dock is much further outboard of that. But maybe about thirty feet outboard of it, but it's lying in there in-state.

MR. GRIBBLE: The tunnel goes under Building 89?

MR. FARLEY: It appears that's the case, yeah, or at least up to it.

MR. KARR: Any tentative idea on what to do about it? I mean it's just a very curious -- and the history involved and so forth, but I guess, number one, you have to see if there's any contamination inside, to determine that piece. If not, you're done with it. But how does that historic feature get protected and/or at least investigated?

MR. FARLEY: Well, Parr Environmental will provide some guidance to Lennar and CH2M, but primarily to Lennar on what the age and what the historic significance of that structure is consistent with their guidelines -- I guess the state's guidelines and the federal government guidelines on identifying historic structures. So that's really the first step. Our goal so far has been to not disturb it unless it's necessary to remove the contamination.

MR. KARR: Thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Beginning of the underground tours of Mare Island.

The next update we'd like to hear is the Weston update. And welcome back, Cris.

e) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thank you, Myrna. You should all have a copy of the handout here. Starting off with the status of some documents that are either out for review or we plan to get comments back from the agencies here in the next couple of months, so I won't belabor reading through the list. We did conduct a radiological survey of two former dredge ponds or dredge outfall locations, rather, in the Western Magazine area. The survey was a radiation sensor mounted on a wheeled cart which you can see in the little photograph there, and this was used to cover the survey area. We have coupled location information along with sensor data in real time. We collected over 54,000 RAD readings, and that was also coupled with an ultrasonic positioning system so we knew spatially where those points were, where the data was collected from. Based on a preliminary review of the data, it looks like there are only a few points exceeding the statistical background levels which require us to go back and follow up and take a look at those areas. Again, if we find something that's worth further investigation, we will excavate those areas and determine what

radiological item may be present there. Typically in the past these have been the small radioluminescent buttons. And in some cases those have been broken down and you get dust, a low level contamination in the soil. For IA-H1 we received concurrence from all the agencies on all the hot spot data packages we've conducted.

MR. GEMAR: Yay.

MR. JESPERSEN: Yay is right.

All the hot spot confirmation data samples were compliant with the cleanup criteria, so the work is complete on that. We have backfilled some of those areas, and the backfill work will be completed when the weather conditions allow us to wrap that up. And you can also see there the map that shows the current status of the landfill cap installation, and how we plan on finish phasing it out here in 2008.

Finally, in the Western Magazine area and IR05 we've been doing some data gap sample collection to further compile and investigate, to finish a Remedial Investigation Report for those two areas. Collected a significant number of additional samples, I believe, in January and February. Once we analyze the data and validate the data, a Draft Final Remedial Investigation document will be compiled and submitted to the agencies for review.

And I guess one final thing. In January, late January we did participate as a sponsor of the Flyway Festival for Myrna. It was nine straight years that we've participated. So did a lot of you folks out there. And hopefully we'll have a space in the future years. That's all I had. Any questions?

MR. QUIGLEY: I have one. On the removal of this area, is any of this going to be going on H1, or is this all going off island?

MR. SILER: No, that all goes off island.

MR. QUIGLEY: So it's all going off island?

MR. SILER: All going off island.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do we have any idea how many truckloads? We're talking about a lot of dirt, right?

MR. SILER: Yep.

MR. QUIGLEY: I was just asking him because I'm worried about the road. Are they going to take it through 37 or are they --

MR. SILER: They will not take it across the causeway. Everything will either go out the island on Railroad Avenue up to 37, when it comes on the island it comes on Railroad Avenue.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. All right. Thank you. All right.

f) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble, Brian Thompson)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I gotta use that microphone. Last, but not least, regulatory agency updates, Chip or Brian, which of you prefers to go first? Speak.

MR. THOMPSON: I think Chip thinks he should go first.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you concur.

MR. THOMPSON: Do you want me to go first? I'll go first.

MR. GRIBBLE: You go.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. All right. So in the last month -- we'll go together, how's that? In the last month we've been -- DTSC and MS have been working with the Navy on the Draft Remedial Final Investigation for Investigation Area C-2, also called the North Building Way Site, and on a Draft Analysis Sampling Plan for Investigation Area F1. Also we've been looking at an underground storage tank site on Eastern Early Transfer Site 498. And I've also worked with Lennar looking at their land use covenant, some information on the land use covenants for Installation Restoration Site 10 and Installation Restoration Site 13. That's it for the last month.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. We've been working on a lot of offshore stuff. There's the offshore -- the Navy had an offshore work plan to go do additional investigation for a Remedial Investigation context for the offshore Mare Island Strait. We've reviewed an offshore Navy document to do additional sampling for the offshore Mare Island Strait area for chemical contamination as part of a remedial investigation effort. We also -- as you -- obviously from the first presentation, we spent a fair amount of time going back on -- to review past documents on the offshore MEC issues. And then, as Dwight already said, we spent a lot of time finishing up on hot spot excavation confirmation data for H1 which is, as Dwight said again, is done.

MR. GEMAR: Yay again.

MR. GRIBBLE: So we got a month off.

MR. GEMAR: You got another list of documents in here.

MR. GRIBBLE: We're also working on the SSTP outfall area which is a carve-out in San Pablo Bay for residual contamination issues in that area. That's it.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Liz, you want to go with your report?

MS. BARR: Okay. Everyone probably got the Navy monthly progress report. I'll just walk you through it. Because of the rains there haven't been a whole lot of field activities on the TCRA or the DRMO, although we are going to be doing some geophysical work at DRMO in the middle of March.

The Flyway Festival was a big success. We had three tours that went and went by five sites. And everyone that went had a great time. We got a lot of positive feedback. And that was really successful. On the back there are a number of documents that are out for review. We submitted two recently and got a couple of comments on other documents. And also included in here is the Early Transfer update. It's the same as what we had put in here last month. But for those of you that weren't here, it's written in here again. And that's essentially it. Michael will be at the next RAB meeting in March.

MR. GRIBBLE: Liz, at the Flyway Festival did you get any RAB applications?

MS. BARR: We passed out a number of RAB applications, but no one filled it out and gave it to us right then. We might get some in the mail. But a lot of people seemed interested and were asking a lot of questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And we actually got a specific newspaper article regarding that tour, and I thought that they did a really good job on it too. So I want to thank the Navy for making that extra effort to run those tours. And some of them were quite full, weren't they?

MS. BARR: They were very well attended.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. People really appreciated that opportunity. And, yeah, I think it was a successful festival. It's always successful in retrospect. When it's done it's really wonderful to be done. But, again, thank you to Weston as our host sponsor, not only underwriting the festival in a significant way, but also just all the things that you did and your staff do, Cris, to just make it happen. And also representing Lennar tonight, Neal, I want to thank you for the tremendous support, again, that Lennar was as well and, again, to their construction manager providing restroom facilities, North Bay Construction, he arranged with them to provide some fuel and barricades. And also, of course, for underwriting it in a substantial way, the festival, with cash. And then a number of other organizations represented in the room this evening as well Napa Solano Audubon Society and others who stepped up to the plate in a big way. And we actually did it even without you, Jerry, which means that it could also be without me, so that was the good news.

MR. KARR: Who'd you have to yell at this year if I wasn't there?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There were plenty of people. Maybe there wasn't enough because obviously I got some more action tonight. Jim, you had your hand up?

MR. PORTERFIELD: I was just saying I might have been the subject of some yelling at some time or another.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't think -- I can't remember. Okay. So there are two announcements that I for sure have. One of them is that the next meeting is going to be up a week, it's not going to be the last Thursday of the month, so kind of make a note of that. I don't know what that next meeting date is.

MS. BARR: March 20th.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's because Michael is really truly going to be on vacation then, so that will work all right. And the second announcement is very important. Must have jinxed that elevator because it really doesn't work, that's what the library assistant came in to tell us that if you'll go out this door there is another elevator, he says, that away.

(Thereupon there was a discussion off the record.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Let's adjourn this meeting so that we can go on. But is there anybody who has a public comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Didn't you have an announcement about Marie?

MS. BARR: Oh, I think most people already know. Tomorrow is leap year and Marie is getting married tomorrow, Marie Dreyer, the Navy remedial project manager. Is that what you wanted me to say? I think most people already knew.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's news. All right. So this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you, everyone.

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Draft Supplemental Site Inspection Report and Site Conceptual Model for Fleet Reserve Piers and Berths 1 and 2 - – Navy
- Presentation Handout – Underground Storage Tank (UST) 231 Workplan Update – CH2M
- Presentation Handout – Eastern Early Transfer Update – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Document Submittal Update – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update February 2008 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard February 2008

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:56 p.m.)