

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, March 20, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, March 20th, at the JFK Library, Joseph Room 505 Santa Clara St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:03 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)
- Paula Tygielski
- Wendell Quigley
- Michael Coffey

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy)
- Liz Barr (Navy)
- Marc Smits (Navy)
- Deb Theroux (Navy)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Brian Thompson (Water Board)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Carolyn D'Almeida (EPA)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Jessica Beck (Tetra Tech)
- John Romie (CH2MHill)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Bruce Christensen (Weston)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Mike Reddeg
- Katrina Kaiser
- Jim Mitchell (Touro University)

RAB Support from CDM:

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: We'll go ahead and get started everybody. Welcome, everyone, to the March, 2008, Mare Island RAB meeting. We'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the BRAC Environmental Coordinator for the Navy and the Navy Co-Chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hello, everybody. I'm Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair from Vallejo, California.

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

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

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island community.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble, California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth, city of Vallejo.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley, CH2M Hill.

MR. THOMPSON: Brian Thompson, the Water Board with the San Francisco Bay Region.

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

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Bruce Christensen, Weston Solutions.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MR. ROMIE: John Romie, CH2M Hill.

MR. SILVER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. MITCHELL: Jim Mitchell, Touro University.

MS. BECK: Jessica Beck, Tetra Tech.

MS. THEROUX: Deb Theroux with the Navy.

MS. BARR: Liz Barr with the Navy.

MR. SMITS: Mark Smits with the Navy.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, everybody. We'll go ahead and get started with our first presentation. It will be given by Bruce Christensen from Weston. He will be talking about the Western Magazine Area outfall radiological survey.

**II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Western Magazine Area Outfall Radiological Survey*
Presentation by Mr. Bruce Christensen, Weston Solutions**

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Michael. As Mike said and I introduced myself before, my name is Bruce Christensen, I'm with Weston Solutions, the radiological division. And tonight we're going to have a presentation about the recently completed radiological high density survey that was performed at the WMA dredge outfalls.

As some of you may wonder where those dredge outfalls are, the little map on the lower left-hand side shows in yellow the approximate locations. And those of you that are golfers, it's just west of the second fairway of the golf course. If you then look at the larger picture, the upper outfall is west, the lower one is the east, and in each outfall we did a high density survey out from the outfall approximately 300 feet up to the wetlands boundary.

Now, what were we looking for? Well, there have been radioluminescent RAD deck markers, that are commonly referred to as buttons, that were used during World War II to illuminate passageways aboard Navy ships. Now, these deck markers were removed from the Navy vessels in

the 1950's and 60's, and then they were discarded overboard from these ships that were berthed in the Mare Island Strait. In the picture there are two typical radium deck markers. So how did the deck markers get into the outfalls? Well, the sediments from the Mare Island Straits routinely were dredged and pumped through -- from the dredge -- to the dredge ponds located on the west side of the island. The discharge from those dredged pipes are the outfalls. In the late 1990s, some discrete RAD items were found, along with munitions of explosive concern at these dredge outfalls. And between 1999 and 2006, high density RAD surveys and/or some RAD screening was performed at the 18 known dredge outfalls. Now, several hundred RAD items have been removed from the outfalls, and 29 of these were removed from the Western Magazine area during the MEC work that was performed there. Based on those being found, once the MEC work was complete, a high density RAD survey was performed in January of this year at each of the outfalls to determine if any detectable RAD items remained.

Now, the RAD survey approach for this area was as was performed in the other outfalls, and that's namely a high density survey that would cover virtually a hundred percent of the survey area. We used an ultrasonic ranging and data system, referred to as USRADS, to track the survey measurement positions. And the vendor calls the accuracy of this equipment plus or minus one foot. We were actually able to get closer to six inch accuracy as far as our location was concerned. The radiation detector is positioned within two inches of the ground, and then the scan survey is performed over the ground surface. The picture on the left shows a detector in the tray sitting just two inches above the ground surface. The picture on the right shows two surveyors. One of them is actually moving the cart at a rate between twelve and eighteen inches per second. The other one is marking the path so that we can be sure and not -- and we can be sure and get the proper overlap.

Now, the RAD survey results. In the west outfall we were able to survey 1.9 acres and collect more than 50,000 measurements. In the east outfall, we were able, because of the wetlands boundary, to only survey 1.2 acres, and obtain more than 30,000 measurements. These measurements -- any measurement that was less than the investigation level set by DTSC were considered to be at background level, indicating no residual radiation contamination. Now, eight survey points, and they're all in the west outfall, exceeded the investigation level, and were confirmation checked using a one minute static count. And only one point was above the investigation level based on that static measurement.

Now, if you'll bear with me for a minute, I'd like to show you, using that instrument that is used for this survey, why we do a static count. While I'm removing the instrument I'd like to -- this is a little audience participation. What am I holding up?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Smoke detector.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Smoke detector. Guess what it has inside of it?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Radium.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, it doesn't have radium, but it has radioactivity. It actually has an isotope called americium. And that smoke detector, we use these sometimes as a source. I'd like to show you, by way of demonstration.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you have Brazil nuts or bananas?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I might eat those before I finish my presentation.

So what I'll do is I'll just turn this on and we'll get a background reading. You hear it? This might surprise some of you, but it probably shouldn't because there's radioactivity all around. See there's radioactivity over here. And the background in this particular area is right around 10,000 counts. Watch as I approach the smoke detector, and listen.

You may have noticed it picked up as I passed over the smoke detector. And again. And that's about the speed that the scan goes. So you can hear it increase. But that only increases to about half again between half and twice background. If I want to then find out what it really is, I leave it on. And the detector then reaches saturation, and this is increased by a factor of three over background.

So you can see why we do a static check. Sometimes we get a false positive, and that's what we found on seven of those eight elevated readings, seven of them were false positives. But you can tell for sure once you stop and do a stationary reading if you really have something there. So with that, I'll get rid of that radioactivity.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Put it back in your house.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yeah, right. Now that's a very low level of radioactivity, and it's not dangerous, so if you have a smoke detector, please keep it. Okay, then.

The follow-up investigation resulted in the excavation at the confirmed elevated survey point, and we were able to retrieve the one and a half inch diameter rating 226 deck marker located six -- eight inches below the ground. There's a picture, though you can't see it too well, but it's encrusted in dirt, so that's part of the reason. If we had cleaned it up, it would look just like those that were shown on page three -- maybe it was page two. At any rate, we packaged this and we identified it, first took a photograph of it, and it's currently stored in a secure area awaiting disposal by the Navy.

Now, in summary, what did we accomplish by the survey of these two outfalls? Well, the high density radiological survey has been completed over virtually a hundred percent of the accessible ground on the outfalls, and the only radiation readings were found in the eastern WMA outfall. We did have eight elevated readings. In the western WMA outfall, and subsequent static readings indicated only one location above the investigation level. We've removed one radiological item, the deck marker, from that elevated area. And then as a result of this survey, we have determined that no residual detectable radiological contamination remains. So that then gives these two outfalls a clean bill of health. Now, are there any questions or comments?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: What is the date -- what's the danger if somebody walked out there in the dredge ponds and picked up one of those and put it in their pocket?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Technically there's probably very little danger, and that's probably the reason that they got tossed overboard in the first place. However, in the wrong hands and/or if it was handled incorrectly, it possibly could be dangerous. And it's like so many other things that we live and learn. And, of course, back in the forties during the war they were used, and when they were removed many of them got tossed over board. They're virtually was no over radium. And people that have seen radium clocks and watches and dials understand that. Now when we find them we're obliged to remove them and dispose of them as radioactive material. And you can still in some antique shops find radioactive radium clocks and watches and so forth.

Anything else? Any other thoughts or comments or concerns?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Just as a matter of curiosity, how much did it cost to find one radium button?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I would have to yield to my supervisor for that because he knows a little more of the detail of all the ins and outs and whys and wherefores. So, Dwight, can you answer that question?

MR. GEMAR: You're looking at about a \$75,000 radium button.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Cheap at half the price. Okay. Anything else? Again, any concerns or -- If not, I will return it to Mr. Bloom and pick up my goodies and go.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Bruce. I liked the demonstration, that was pretty cool. All right, next we're going to turn it over to Liz Barr with the Navy and Steve Farley from CH2M Hill. And they worked with the Navy on this project. So we're going to do a J-Lines update.

III. NAVY PRESENTATION: *J-Lines Update*
Presentation by Ms. Liz Barr, Navy and
Mr. Steve Farley, CH2MHill/Navy

MS. BARR: So I'm just going to go through a brief presentation overview of the J-Lines, and then I'm going to hand it over to Steve so you can ask him all the hard questions. Give a background on the J-Lines. That is the part that is the Navy retained condition on the eastern early transfer parcel. We'll briefly discuss the industrial wastewater pipeline system. Then we're going to go through a summary of the cleaning and flushing activities that were conducted on the interior portion of the pipe. This was presented in the February, 2008, closure certification report. The next steps for closing out the interior. Then we'll talk about the sampling, the soil samples, and the results for closing out the exterior portion of the pipe. And the next steps to close the exterior portion of the pipe. And lastly, we'll open it up for questions and answers. With that, I'll hand it over to Steve because he knows a lot more about this site than I do. Thanks.

MR. FARLEY: Thank you, Liz.

J-Line. For those who are not quite as familiar with the island, the industrial wastewater pipeline system out at Mare Island consists of a number of segments, A through K. This is the J-Line. It is part of the IR-14 Installation Restoration site. It was constructed in 1972. There are tens of thousands of feet of this piping system out at the island. It was used to convey industrial waste from different areas on the island, different activities in various buildings, and either flowed by gravity drainage or flowed via a force main from a pump station. And ultimately it all went out to the treatment plant out on the west side of the island. The use of the system ended in 1996 at base closure. At that time the Navy -- or shortly after, the Navy shut down the system and removed the sludge and liquids that were remaining in the pipe at that time.

The specific area that we're going to talk about tonight is that portion of the J-Line that is within Navy property. This sort of orange colored line right here is the boundary of the eastern early transfer parcel, essentially Lennar's property. And you can see where we are. We're way down on the south end of the island, and the J-Line continues on up here, I believe it goes to Pump Station 7, I think that's the next pump station in line. The area that we're going to be talking about or that segment that we're going to be talking about is this portion that goes from the edge or the boundary of the EETP or Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, and goes down here to Pump Station Number 8. And then there's two smaller segments, that J1-Line and the J2-Line. So those three segments, for tonight's purposes, we're calling the J-Line and -- even though technically it's the J1 and J2 and a

portion of the J-Line. These two buildings down here were used for various painting related activities. The J-Line is an eight inch diameter force main which conveyed water from this pump station that way to Pump Station 7 and then off the island. These two smaller segments, the J1 and J2-Lines, were both four inch diameter gravity lines, which means that liquids flowed by gravity from the origin inside these two buildings, by gravity down to Pump Station 8, where it went into a wet well, which is a below ground structure, and then the pump station would kick on periodically and pump that liquid out to, essentially, ultimately out to the treatment plant. The treatment plant was located out here.

Pump Station 8, which is located right here, was removed by the Navy in 1989. And so this system hasn't been used in a very long time. And as I mentioned, painting operations were the main contributor to the liquids in the piping system. Back in February, or about February of 2005, we wrote a final IR-14 Piping Closure Plan. This closure plan focused on the interior of the pipeline. The purpose was to identify the activities to close out the interior of the pipeline. And what was done was video logging. We actually passed a camera down through the inside of the pipeline. We also used high pressure water jetting nozzles and a mechanical cleaning device to remove the encrusted paint inside the pipeline. There was a fair amount of paint that just was encrusted, basically they painted the inside of the pipeline is what they did, just through years and years of using it. In some cases we actually removed the pipeline, small segments of the pipeline, when we couldn't get the mechanical cleaning tool through the pipeline. We just went in, cut the pipe, removed the pipe, and backfilled around it. And that occurred in one small area of the J1-Line, and it was plugged with hardened paint. So the whole interior of the pipeline, the four inch line, was completely loaded with dry paint. Then after all the cleaning and flushing was done, we would pass rinse water through that, and then collect a sample and analyze that sample or those samples for metals and various organics. In some places we had to excavate through the dirt to get down to the pipeline to access the pipeline. In other words, we would dig down, cut into the pipeline so we could pass the cleaning tools in there, and that soil and the abrasive blast material, or ABM, that was encountered when we removed that segment of the pipeline down the J1-Line, all that stuff was hauled off-site at the conclusion of the cleaning and flushing activities.

Here are some representative photographs of a couple of things that I mentioned. Here it just shows how we capture the rinse water. We would line the small excavation with this heavy gauge plastic, tape off the lines, and then we would pass either cleaning tool or the flushing tool up the pipeline this way, and the same thing here, and then we would capture the rinse water as it came back out. The nozzle was one of those nozzles that blew all the rinse water backwards. So we'd pass the nozzle all the way to the end, and then we'd pull it back slowly, and the nozzle would push everything back towards, ultimately, this opening. We would capture it here, remove it, stick it in a tank, characterize it, and then dispose of it properly.

This is the chain flail tool. This is a medieval tool that -- at least it feels like it -- air operated tool. There's a big old hose that comes off here. These arms here in the center of the tool in the middle of the pipeline. And this part out here is actually the spinning head that has links of chain on it. And it beats the daylight out of whatever is inside the pipeline. And even with all that mechanical effort and force, there still were a couple of segments that we couldn't get through, that was a small segment of the J1-Line, because the paint was so encrusted that we couldn't get the tool down to break up the material. I didn't get a chance to see this tool working, but I would have loved to have heard what it was like when it was operating. Okay.

We issued a Draft Report some while ago, and we got comments back from the agencies. We issued the Draft Final Closure Report that address the inside of the pipeline in February of this year, just a few weeks ago, about a month ago, and incorporated the comments that we got. It was only a few comments. And they dealt primarily with sort of administrative kinds of things, making sure that we made certain kinds of statements and included certain kind of information, which we did. And so, based on that, we believe that all the regulatory closure requirements for closure and certification of closure of that pipeline interior have been met. So as soon as we do get the final comments or approval of that document from the agencies, we'll issue a final closure certification report for these J-Lines .

The other part of the project that we're working on is the pipeline exterior. This is fundamentally the soils that surround the pipeline.

I might mention -- backing up one step -- that the video logging basically showed the pipeline was in good condition. There weren't any major holes or breaks or fractures or joints that were loose. I think one of the reasons for that was the fact that a good segment of that line was a force main. And a force main, if there is a problem you know it right away because the pressure drops and you have to manage it much more quickly. So the point is that the video logging gave us some insights into the condition that we might expect on the outside of the pipeline.

There was field work and sampling done in various phases. Some was done way back by the Navy during the latter parts of the active base operations. The Navy went through and collected a number of soil samples. They did a, I mean a huge, sampling program for all of IR-14 at the island, and collected soil samples at about one hundred foot intervals, I believe it was, in general, for all of these various pipeline segments. Then in 2005 when we did the cleaning and flushing, CH2M Hill collected some additional soil samples as part of the removal of that segment of the J-Line, and the removal of the soil to gain access to the pipelines. The sum total is that there are about 23 samples. The list of an analytes includes metals, VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, a whole range of things. And there are about twenty locations for which there are samples.

In summary, the metals were the most commonly detected constituent by far. And most of those occurrences of metals were below the ambient levels. There were some that were above, and we're looking at various regulatory criteria now for how those other levels compare. But most of the metals were all below ambient levels. There were very few organics. In fact, there were a couple that are related to the source water, things that you would see in the chlorinated water that was used as a source water for the cleaning and flushing. All of the organics that were detected are below the Tier 1 Environmental Screen Levels for Commercial/Industrial future uses. And this is based on the November, 2007, Tier 1 spreadsheet that the regional board issued back in November.

So our conclusions right now. We don't think there's any additional work that's needed for the pipeline exterior. And there will be a draft closure certification report for the pipeline exterior that we're preparing for the Navy, and we expect that draft document to be to the agencies sometime in the spring of this year. So, two parts of the program, the pipeline interior, the pipeline exterior. Pipeline interior, we've got a Draft Final Report out. We're expecting to get comments, you know, any day now approving that. Pipeline exterior, we're going to write a report, actually we're preparing it now, for the -- to address the soils on the outside of the pipeline. So with that, thanks for your time, and I'd be happy to entertain any questions.

MR. GRIBBLE: Steve, I have a few questions. Since I haven't read the report, I'll just ask. What were the organic constituents that were detected?

MR. FARLEY: You're talking about the pipeline exterior or the pipeline interior?

MR. GRIBBLE: Interior or exterior actually.

MR. FARLEY: Well, I don't remember off the top of my head what the constituents detected in the flushing water was, but they were all very low levels. The bottom line is they met all regulatory criteria, and indicated that the interior of the pipeline was adequately cleaned and flushed. The comments that we got back from the state indicated that they concurred with the accuracy of the cleaning and flushing and that it was done.

MR. GRIBBLE: You're referring to the other sections of the J-Line, I'm talking -- of the IR-14. I'm talking about just this segment.

MR. FARLEY: I am talking about this segment.

MR. GRIBBLE: You're talking about the first --

MR. FARLEY: I'm talking about the pipeline interior. If we're talking about the pipeline exterior, samples that we collected of the soil, and submitted for analysis, those came back with, I think, two hits of diesel. One hit of chloromethane, which is actually in -- I think that was in the rinse water, and we believe that probably came from the source water. One hit of motor oil. One hit of bis-2 methyl-hexyl-phthalate. And one other constituent I can't remember off the top of my head.

And all of those levels were below Tier 1 Screening Levels for Commercial/Industrial. And all of that -- all this data will be included in the Closure Certification Report for the pipeline exterior.

MR. GRIBBLE: And how much sediment did you -- were you able to get out of that segment of flushing?

MR. FARLEY: From the inside of the pipeline?

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: It wasn't very much sediment. What was inside that pipeline was mainly encrusted paint. So inside this segment, for whatever reasons, inside this, the J- and the J1- and J2-Lines, the primary solids that came out were paints. And most of that mass of material that came out was from the flail tool that we used to try to clean out the inside of the pipeline so we could get the video camera and the flushing tool through it. But, like I said, there was some places we couldn't, so we just cut the pipe and removed it. And then of course we cut and capped the segments that we removed -- well, the remaining ends.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a couple of questions. The areas that were plugged with hardened paint, what would that line -- what would the product flowing through that line, where would it have gone?

MR. FARLEY: I suspect what happened is when the Navy stopped using the system, whatever paint was remaining just jelled up and hardened.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just hardened up.

MR. FARLEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that was on the --

MR. FARLEY: That was the J1-Line.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But what was the diameter of that line?

MR. FARLEY: That was –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That was the small pipe?

MR. FARLEY: That was the four inch line. So you can imagine the paint has probably got enough viscosity to it, that it sits in that line for a while --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

MR. FARLEY: And the other thing -- and everybody probably knows this -- but in gravity drainage lines there's a concern about the overall slope, that sometimes you can get little bobbles in the bottom of the pipeline which might allow the paint to accumulate, and some areas can even completely close the pipe if it sits there for a while.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the other question would be a comment. You say that your concentrations were below the Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels for Commercial/Industrial land use. I guess this would be a comment to Lennar. If you're going to be discontinuing the use of the rail lines and other, it looks like disincentives to using the properties at Mare Island for industrial use, when do you begin to reconsider your cleanup levels that you're cleaning up to?

MR. SILER: Okay. I'm not sure what you're asking us, Myrna, but this is not our property, this is the Navy's property.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it's a generalized statement. I mean, I'm sure you've got property that has similar types of issues. It's just something that's come up this last few weeks here in the news where we've heard that you're trying to close down the rail line. It's been on the front page of the paper, so that's an indication that your company is not considering -- that you've done, I guess, your market due diligence and there's not an industrial market. And so then at what point do you start to apply different cleanup levels to your properties just because you'd be looking at a different land use?

MR. SILER: Okay. I'm not sure that there's a non-sequiter here. But the commercial land use and the areas that we're cleaning up for Commercial/Industrial standards that's a Commercial/Industrial land use. We're not changing the land use, it's the same in the land use reuse plan that was published in 2000, it's the same today.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But it appears, you know, and again this is a forum for the public, you know, so we can be not quite up to speed on everything. But it appears in the news, in the media coverage -- maybe that's not accurate -- that you don't want to take responsibility for or there's no way to fix the rail line to make it work in this Commercial/Industrial mixed use. So even though you are cleaning up to Commercial/Industrial use, if one of the main tools to use the property for industrial will be gone or won't be being able to be utilized, then when do you reconsider your cleanup levels?

MR. SILER: We wouldn't reconsider the cleanup goals because the land use is still the same.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But it can't be used that way it's sounding like.

MR. SILER: Sure, it can. Sure, it can. We're going to use it the same way whether the rail is there or whether the rail is not there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's not what the press lead us to believe, and so sometime maybe -- and I'm not trying to get into a dog fight here, I'm just kind of making an observation that at what point do you, does -- do you move to another land use that then needs a better, a higher cleanup?

MR. SILER: We wouldn't. We wouldn't because, again, the use that we're cleaning up to is the same use whether there's a rail in place or a rail is not in place. They still have the trucking option. They still have surface roadway options. It's just that there will not be a rail line there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, some of the media has implied, the interviews have implied that that is a critical element of industrial –

MR. SILER: I don't know anything about that, Mona -- excuse me -- Myrna, as far as the -- what the press has said. I'm just telling you about what the land use is and what we're cleaning it up –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, sure, I understand you're cleaning it up to a particular land use, and obviously –

MR. SILER: And that won't change if a rail is there or a rail is not there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah, it sounds like it's a planning question. But it's an interesting question to me because at some point, do you actually have industrial capability?

MR. SILER: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

MR. FARLEY: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Steve. We'll go ahead and get to our third presentation. It's going to be given by John Romie with CH2M Hill representing Lennar. And it's on the update on the Fuel Oil Pipeline Investigation in Investigation Area C-1.

IV. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Update on the Fuel Oil Pipeline (FOPL) Investigations in Investigation Area (IA) C1*
Presentation by Mr. John Romie, CH2MHill/Lennar and Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island

MR. ROMIE: Let me get set up here real quick. While Steve's getting me set up, I'll let everybody know that it was Steve's talk that reminded me that I don't see red very well, so it's going to be interesting if I start pointing up to the ceiling like that you'll understand. But I'm going to try and make the best use of this that I can. Okay. Thanks, Steve.

My name is John Romie, I'm the construction site manager at Mare Island for CH2M Hill. And I'm also the manager of the Fuel Oil Pipeline, or the FOPL program. And that's going to be the subject of the presentation tonight. There we go. Okay. Anyway, what I want to do tonight is give you an overview on the Investigation Area C-1 FOPL field work that's in progress right now. And just kind of give you a photographic tour of some of the observations that we've been making in the field as we've been conducting this work. And just as a real brief summary, the FOPL segments remain to be closed in both Investigation Areas C-1 and C-2. We're in the process right now of evaluating the available information for Investigation Area C-2, and we'll be preparing a work plan for remedial action that's going to be conducted, probably starting in the summer of this year, and we'll be submitting that work plan, actually we'll be submitting that work plan in the summer, the field work will probably start sometime in the fall. And at present right now we are in the midst of doing both remedial action and investigation field work in Investigation Area C-1. And that's what I'm going to be talking about. And in IA-C1 there's 35 Fuel Oil Pipeline segments. And these are basically pipelines that were used for conveying fuel oil throughout the site, primarily down towards the

wharf area. Eleven of the segments in IA-C1 have already been closed. They've received regulatory approval. Five of the segments are ready for closure, and we're in the process right now of preparing Implementation Reports for the work that's been conducted so far, and Requests for Closure of those segments. Four of those segments are going to be addressed under other programs. And fifteen of the segments are the subject of our existing current field investigation cleanup activity. And that's where I'm going to be concentrating in the meeting here.

What I'll try and do is -- I'm going to show you on the map area. Hopefully I can get you located at least approximately on the site. And I also have photos showing about where we're doing the work. And the first one here is right near IR-03. It's in -- the Fuel Oil Pipeline is I1/6/B473. Just so you know, I1 is basically the map grid. That's the designation of the map grid on site. Six is the diameter of the Fuel Oil Pipeline. And in this case B473 means it's in close proximity to Building 473. And that's basically the way these things are named. And the pipeline I'm talking about is this yellow pipeline here, and a piece of it goes up to the northwest. The yellow basically indicates that it was previously an unlocated pipeline. And, in fact, we located it during some trenching that we did, and did not do this in this area here. And just for reference sake, this building here is that building right there. The photograph was taken in about this direction. The fuel oil pipeline is located over in the trees there.

MR. FARLEY: Can you show again where that building is?

MR. ROMIE: This is, I believe it's Building 289. This building here is that building. I took the photograph from probably right about here in this direction, so this face of the building is that face there, okay. Now, the subject of the field work for this pipeline segment was to uncover it, to do a vacuum test of it to see if it could hold a vacuum, which meant it was tight. And if it passed the vacuum test, then we go ahead and flush it and abandon it in place. If it didn't pass, then the idea was we would remove the pipeline.

In this case it failed the vacuum test. You see up here they're preparing the vacuum test equipment to conduct the vacuum test. As I say, it failed, so they ended up pulling that fuel oil pipeline out. And if you look at this photo here you can see why it failed the vacuum test, there's a number of pinhole leaks in that pipeline. So after we pulled it out we backfilled the excavation. And in this case we'll be conducting additional work at this location under the IR-03 program as part of that overall program.

Next we have, in the Building 89 area, this is actually located between Building 271 and Building 89. It's an excavation in the little corridor or little alleyway there. This photograph here was taken from about this location, looking in towards the excavation, which is right here. And the driver for that excavation was total petroleum hydrocarbons diesel in soil, about 9,400 milligrams per kilogram.

And we began that excavation and found kind of an interesting structure. It was a brick -- a real nice brick structure in that excavation that initially was thought to be perhaps a cistern. Then it was thought perhaps it was a manway or a tunnel. And when we actually went in and broke it up and took it out, we thought it was probably a steam tunnel from a boiler that used to sit between Building 89 and Building 271. So where we stand right now with this particular excavation is we pulled that structure out, we backfilled the excavation with a weak grout. And then we're going to go back in there again and excavate that area, most likely in strips, in such a way that we protect the integrity of the Building, because the building is somewhere on the order of 150 years old or

something like that. And we have to take great pains to keep from damaging the building while we're doing the excavation right adjacent to it. So that's where that one stands.

The next one is in the Building 85 area. This here is Building 85. Behind it is Building 271 which I was just talking about a little bit. This picture here was taken -- well, this excavation here is right in front of that doorway. This is one of the FOPL segments here that parallels the building, and another one here that parallels the building in this direction. And the scope of work that's planned here was excavation to address TPH concentrations in soil. That's this excavation here. Again, you see the driving concentrations there. And then we were performing vacuum tests on this line in here to see if it would hold vacuum and if we could abandon it in place. And, in fact, the excavation itself outside of the building -- as you see, we often run into things when we do excavation work out here. In this case there was -- there's an active electrical duct bank here, a fiber-optic cable, there's a water line below the duct bank, lots of things that we have to excavate around. So we ended up excavating this one in pieces.

And just to show some of the things that we observed, this is the duct bank. Basically I'm looking at this excavation here. This is the duct bank here. Below the duct bank -- and I don't know that you can even really see it -- but there's an active water pipeline here, I believe it's about a ten inch diameter line. This is the water pipeline taken from a camera that we dropped down to about five feet below -- about five or six feet below surface. And the interesting thing is that you can see that the pipeline appears to be acting as a conduit, potentially for movement of oil, of hydrocarbons. But we've completed this excavation here to present satisfaction, and we've also done the vacuum test on the pipeline going into the building. That pipeline has -- did not pass the vacuum test, but we're still conducting additional work inside the building locating, finding out where that line goes so that we can continue investigating that one.

Down towards the wharf area at Berth 10 you can see the yard ship here. There's quite a bit of work we've done down here. There were two excavations that were identified with the bases being elevated, again elevated concentrations of TPH in soil. These were sample locations. We centered the excavations around the sample locations. And then in this area here there had been a past failure at a valve box right here that had been cleaned up in the past, but there was concern about contamination in this area. So we did some trenching down here as well.

You can see in the photo this excavation here is actually this one. And then if you look way off in the distance there you can see some little black marks that are these trenches, just to get you an idea where you are. The excavations were completed. We've cleaned them up. We believe we've cleaned them up to acceptable goals. We'll be submitting reports requesting closure on those sites. And just an example of one of the trenches that we've dug here, I guess you could say not very interesting from a technical standpoint, there's nothing in the way of free product in those trenches. There wasn't a whole lot of odor. There was a small zone of contamination down near the bottom, but there was nothing that seemed to be very significant or widespread. And that, combined with very minimal contamination groundwater, which was not present in any of the trenches, leads us to believe that we might be ready for closure in this area as well.

But this fuel oil pipeline is at one end of a very long line that goes up to Building 121, so we need to work on that area before we close the whole line. Building 493 and 971 area, this you see here we're actually excavating, this is ongoing right now. The 493 fuel oil pipeline that leads up in the direction towards Building 121, which is the power plant up here. I've taken this photo from about this point here, and I'm looking up towards Building 121. Building 121 would be right here on the

map. That pipeline had been previously unlocated. We found it during trenching and it's located in a concrete duct bank. You can see the pipelines in a utilidoor in the trench that we excavated. Here they're beginning to pull the pipeline out, and we're going to end up taking out the utilidoor as well.

And just so you can get an idea of what some of these pipelines look like. It's hard to see in the photo, but at this location here there's actually more air than there is metal. In some cases it's pretty well destroyed. And then once we get that utilidoor out, we'll look into what the condition of the soil is that's beneath it.

Building 207 area. This actually isn't too far from Building 85 that I spoke about a few moments ago. I'm standing right outside of Building 85 here looking basically south on Nimitz. And this little green area in here is behind the fence right here. And as you look down the street along this FOPL line that follows along the building here on the side of the street. And we're doing trenching there to evaluate the significance and the characteristics of the TPH in the area of Building 207. And then there was one excavation that we dug as a removal for one significant hit of TPH oil, 18,000 milligrams per kilogram. And at that location, again, the trenches, a little different character. It appears as though the petroleum in the trenches at the Building 207 area mostly has an appearance of being a lighter end hydrocarbon, like a diesel or something like that. You can see the walls of the trench are a little bit on the greasy side, it appears greasy, kind of slick. But all in all there's no groundwater. There's a little bit of water in this trench, which I think is probably purged because in the other trenches we did not see groundwater. Nor is there free product to speak of. And the next action at this location is we're going to be collecting some groundwater samples that are going to be downgradient in this area here. This is towards Mare Island Strait in this direction. And so we'll be collecting some groundwater samples here which basically involves drilling a boring and collecting the samples, and then we'll see where we go from there.

Finally, Building 121 area. Again, Building 121 is the power plant. This is the south end of the power plant. And what I'm looking at here, I took this photograph from about here, looking at 121. This wall of Building 121 is this wall that you see here. A lot of our work has been concentrated right behind the building in the corner, and as you go outside the building on the concrete, and that would be this area here. And then these pipelines here basically turn off in this direction towards the Mare Island Strait. And we've been digging trenches there to evaluate elevated TPH concentrations around Building 121. This is the same pipeline as one of the ones I showed you earlier down near the shipyard. And again, these are two different trenches. This trench here was actually outside a little ways away. But, again, there is, in this case, a water pipeline. I believe it's about a fourteen inch water pipeline. And, once again, that pipeline is not carrying oil, but it appears as though it may be providing conduit for oil moving along in the pipeline, because that's where we tend to see the material coming into the trench. And this is one of the FOPL lines behind Building 121 that we found, and we ended up removing that pipeline. And just to give you an idea in some of the areas, this is kind of the character of the product that we do see. And it's usually, you find it in the partings of the clay stone. In this case it's really in a not very mobile state. But if you part them sometimes you'll see just these little glubs of oil -- I'll call them glubs anyway -- in the clay partings.

So that's -- that's about it for now. You know, I just wanted to kind of give you an idea on the kinds of things we're doing and what we're seeing. And I'd be happy to answer any questions if you have any.

MS. TYGIELSKI: A simple question. You have TPH-D and TPH-M. What are the D and the M?

MR. ROMIE: Okay. I could have explained that. TPH-D, diesel, so that's primarily diesel. And TPH-M is TPH motor oil. And that's basically the way, that's the kind of -- that's the information you get back from the laboratory, it's typically TPH diesel, TPH gasoline, which we see very little of out here, and TPH oil. Other questions? Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. All right. We're on our first public comment period. Is there any public comment? No? (No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll go ahead and take our break. (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. We'll go ahead and get started with the second half.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The better half.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: The first thing on the agenda is administrative business and announcements. I would say if anybody has any comments or changes to the minutes, please get them to Myrna or myself. Any other? Nope. Okay. We'll move right ahead into the focus group reports. First is Wendell with the community.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: Oh. Sorry. Yeah. Here we go. I'm just interested, maybe Lennar or the city could put a little knowledge on me here about -- being that the railroad is going to be going out because it's not feasible for anyone because no one's using it, and Lennar really doesn't want to pay to bring it up to standards, is this going to change what we're looking for in the industrial area as far as heavy industry or for reuse?

MR. SILER: Okay. I'm going to answer that question. And the way that I'm going to answer it is my understanding of what this forum is for environmental cleanup, not for planning issues on Mare Island. If you need to talk about those types of things, I would bring them up to the planning commission or somebody else. But this is to talk about environmental cleanup on Mare Island, and I don't think anything else comes into that at this time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I would like to comment on that. The Restoration Advisory Board actually, you're right, doesn't deal directly with planning issues, it doesn't set planning issues; however, any environmental cleanup issue that is related to or there is a nexus to planning, we can talk about here. And, in fact, as community members, we can actually bring up any topic we want. And we can be told, well, you should go to this resource or that resource or that resource. So I don't think it's inappropriate for either me or for Wendell to have brought up the comments we did --

MR. SILER: You have to explain to me how the railroad has anything to do with the environmental cleanup.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we already talked about that earlier. But I'm just making a comment as a co-chair that you actually can bring up any topic you want, no one should feel like they can't, but then you're right to say the, you know, you can go to planning or whatever. But when you are talking about changing and our perception must be, as it is mine, that you take out a major source of your industrial, you know, carrot to industrial businesses, that you may then impact your ability

to be able to, in fact, continue to have zoned industrial. So, because it won't have a viable use to the market –

MR. SILER: Again, isn't that a planning issue?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It affects -- it's our right to ask at what point -- as I asked earlier, at what point do you begin to consider, rethink your zoning, and how does that impact the level of environmental cleanup? And it's not to be discussed here, as far as I'm concerned, but I think these topics can be brought up.

MR. SILER: That's fine. But that is a planning issue and a zoning issue. And our intent right now is not to change any of the use on the island as the way it was exhibited in the reuse plan, and there is no intent or any plans to change it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wendell, does that answer your question?

MR. QUIGLEY: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks. Next, Jerry, is natural resources. Any report?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just want to comment that Jerry did e-mail that he's not able to be here because of other obligations that he has, but he's continuing to be on the mend with his illness. So that's good news.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Technical, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Last summer I went on an extensive camping trip, and maybe I missed something, but I had asked questions earlier about deed restrictions, and I have not heard any answers yet. So I'm interested in feedback about that.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, you did ask about it, and I know we had a RAB presentation, I believe, correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm pretty sure we did. I don't know if you were –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We were going to hold a focus group meeting.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Myrna says we were going to hold a focus group. So let me talk to Myrna and see if we can get something set up.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: But in the meantime, let me just fill you in on what's going on. The city, DTSC, and Lennar, of course -- we have a section coming up that we are looking to finish and get a No Further Action on it, and we call it, for identification, town center. And it's the part from G Street over along Azuar going south between, I think it's around Railroad, but don't hold me to that, Railroad to Azuar, G Street south. And we're close. We're close to getting No Further Action on that. And we're working with DTSC and Lennar -- the guys are running back and forth trying to come up with a, I'm going to call it a plan for what you're referring to, it's called Land Use Covenants, which are deed restrictions. Same thing, just another name for it. So we don't have that agreement yet, so we can't sit down and tell you that, you know, on that piece of property the following deed restrictions or Land Use Covenants are imposed. That doesn't mean that your subcommittee couldn't meet and discuss the actual deed restrictions, but we do not have the process for administering deed restrictions. And that's what we're working on now. And it's very technical and very expensive to administer this program.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could I ask a question on a followup on that then? There are in place already, I think in D, area D1, D something, D-2, some covenants that are already recorded.

MR. SILER: Area D1.2 there are eleven LUC recorded in the Commercial/Industrial reuse area of Investigation Area D1.2.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And could we see the -- don't you submit quarterly or yearly reports?

MR. SILER: We submit annual reports.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could we see a copy of the annual reports --

MR. SILER: Certainly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- at another meeting?

MR. SILER: Certainly. In fact, there should be one in the public repository. There should also be one in the DTSC's website.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, if we could be given some information on that as RAB members, that would be good because I don't think -- I'd like to have us be able to be, have better, more ready access to that than having to go to the library, so --

MR. SILER: I want to clear up one thing that is being implied here is that Lennar is the only person on this island that has Land Use Covenants. Michael, how much of your acreage has Land Use Covenants or are going to have Land Use Covenants on it?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: They will. They will be restricted.

MR. SILER: How much?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: A lot.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know, I --

MR. GEMAR: The western early transfer parcel, 800 acres.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know, I want to -- I might have said some things last meeting that you might have not had let me complete the sentence on, so it was a complete sentence. But at this time I do want to set the record straight right here and now. Never have I singled out Lennar, and never will I single out Lennar regarding Land Use Covenants and the responsibility to make easily accessible -- which was the theme of my last meeting's comments -- easily, readily accessible, super simple for the community, those who go after us, after we're all retired, dead, gone, disposed of, there ought to be a way that the people that come after us have a way of learning what the work was that we all did here together. And I --

MR. SILER: And they have that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I am not singling out Lennar, I'm not singling out the Navy. It is a collective responsibility that we have, and the reason why we hold these meetings together is not to single Lennar out or the Navy or Weston or any player, or to pit the community against the environmental cleanup contractors, but to me we have an obligation, and we have -- what I found, and what I've heard from regulators, for example, often, is that actually a better product comes out of the ability for us to communicate formally and informally together on these issues. If you hear this topic continuing to come up, then that's when you say, hmmm, how are we going to address this issue in a way that makes not only those pesky Restoration Advisory Board members happy,

but how is it going to pass the straight face test with a broader community over a longer period of time? And it's not -- it really isn't picking on Lennar. I just wanted to make that clear.

MR. SILER: I didn't hear you say that anybody else's cleanup was sloppy and dirty last time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know, I know you guys like that quote, and I would run with it if I were you, I would run right to the PR firms, get me on national news. But what I did, when I reread the minutes, there were periods put in there that I did not put in there. I said it is a sloppy and dirty cleanup as long as you do not communicate the work that you did in a way that can stand the test of time over time for people who will come ten, twenty, thirty, fifty years from now and look at that property. And I was asking about a specific property that was going from a fairly significant environmental problem to residential. Unlike your residential property that is in place right now which was -- is -- was relatively clean when it was freed of environmental contamination. This one was dicier from the beginning. It is going to end up at the same place, I have no doubt about that myself. But why should the community take my word for it or -- and why shouldn't you present the very best tools to convince the people who go after you?

MR. SILER: And we will continue to do that. We will work with the community, like we've always done, we will work with the regulatory agencies, and we will make sure that the cleanup is to the best use of the land as it's supposed to be.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, there again --

MR. SILER: And we will put all the money we can into the cleanup which is where it is important to put it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, there is a disagreement, and that's a good topic to bring up. I mean if we're just going to sit down and talk over this, I think -- I disagree with you that all the money should go into the cleanup, and none of the money should go into providing a tool for people to rest assured. I disagree with that. I think that's what the Restoration Advisory Board was created for by the Navy and the -- later the Department of Defense, and now codified in a rule is because -- it's specifically because the better you can tell the story, the more convincingly you can tell the story over time, the more comfortable the community is going to be and the people who come after us. And that's our job. As much as your job is to clean up, and we can trust you to do that, we can see it on the ground; our job, as -- all of us, because we all do live in these communities together, is to champion that good work.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I -- just on a side note to that, the conversation about the reuse plan and the level of cleanup that's being done and what I'm hearing, I know that there had been some talk about possibly putting in some little work loft type situations in some of the areas that are actually zoned industrial and we've been cleaning up to industrial standards, and I wanted to ask Lennar if there were still plans to go forward with any of this kind of development, live/work lofts in the industrial areas?

MR. SILER: There is no plan to put in live/work lofts in that industrial area. We're evaluating, there's no plan to do so.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There was actually permission given to do so in the 2005 specific plan, I think it's 29 units.

MR. SILER: Not without the cleanup being appropriate for that type of reuse.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. But in the industrial area.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Let's move on. Gil, city report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We have nothing.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Lennar update. Steve.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Can I just borrow that? Thanks, Michael.

Two handouts as usual. One showing the status of the various documents that are in review, and the other our normal eleven by seventeen handout. Let me jump to it quickly. The last meeting was only a few weeks ago, so there's not a lot of changes in terms of the number of sites closed or documents that are coming up or significant documents in review, etcetera.

There have been a few changes to the number of PCB sites that were actively working on. And as you can see in this sort of the magenta colored -- is that right, magenta? Would you call it magenta? -- magenta colored lines in IA-C1, those are the FOPL lines, many of which are those that John Romie talked about a few minutes ago.

A couple of photographs that I included in the upper right is a small drill rig, hollow stem auger rig that we're using to install some monitoring wells at installation restoration site fifteen. This is a location where we have some solvents, PCE, TCE, in the groundwater, and we're doing some additional monitoring in advance of doing a pilot study for bioremediation of that material -- excuse me, it's bioremediation.

The other photographs on the left-hand side, this is one of the segments -- in the bottom, one of the segments that John touched on, G1XB-493, you can actually see one of the tools that we use to remove the pipeline, put a chain on it and drag it out of the ground. This is actually not underground, it's actually in the utilidoor. It's actually in a concrete, a very long concrete rectangular box. And they're called utilidoors, they're called various things, but commonly utilidoors. And the pipes were actually not buried in the ground but were actually in the bottom of this long rectangular concrete box. In fact, on the right-hand side there you can actually see one of the pieces of concrete that was used as a lid to put on top of this utilidoor. But grabbing that chain and yanking it out is a pretty effective way to get it out of the utilidoor.

Up in the upper left corner -- I don't know how many folks have had a chance to go into these buildings, they probably haven't because of the environmental issues. But one of the things I always have found fascinating is the number of wooden blocks that form the floors in these buildings. And I assume -- I don't know, but I assume it was to protect equipment in case you dropped it or something. I don't know that for sure, but that's always been my assumption. And you can see in the lower left-hand corner of the photograph in the upper left a big pile of wooden blocks there. Imagine having literally thousands and thousands of six inch long or three inch long two by fours that are standing on end all squished together and forming the floor of the building. Those form the floor. And as you might guess, if there were releases of PCB oils to those blocks, that's where they would end up. And so in some cases, like here in Building 271, we removed all those wooden blocks, haul them off, get rid of them, dispose of them properly, and then we'll come back and collect samples of the concrete. This is a concrete floor. It looks reddish, it looks like dirt, but it's actually concrete, and the color is actually coming from the residue from the wooden blocks.

So anyway, just a couple of interesting photographs to reflect some of the work that we're currently doing. So if anybody has any questions, I'd be happy to entertain them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Steve, I just wanted to comment on a couple of things there. I would imagine that that wooden blocking would have been used for two other reasons. One, if you were going to be having machining or where you were using cutting oils and that sort of thing, it seems like it would be safer –

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- for the workers if it's saturated. Because those all end up –

MR. FARLEY: Yup.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- cuts on the wood –

MR. FARLEY: Rather than having it go on on the concrete floor and be slippery.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: That's a good point.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the second thing is, if you're going to standing at a tool like that all day, it's a little easier to stand on wood than it is to stand on concrete. But I would imagine it would have been that saturation thing because it's all end up.

MR. FARLEY: It's really fascinating. There must be a million wooden blocks in these buildings out there. Thanks very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, I actually remember seeing that at Alameda, actually, also in some of the buildings that had blocks out there. Thanks. Next is the Weston update, Cris.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: I've got a bit of a contact lens problem, so I'm going to see if I can actually do it with some borrowed glasses, so bear with me here.

First off, the document status. You can see the two documents that we received comments on during the month of March, and the three documents that were submitted for agency review actions for the next two months listed there. Next would be the status of the Western Magazine area dredge pond outfall radiological survey which Bruce presented earlier tonight, so I won't repeat that.

Moving on, there's an update on the status of Investigation Area H1. Last month we received agency concurrence on all the hot spot excavation data packages for area H1. And all the hot spot soil was excavated, has been placed in the containment area, and site work on the remaining portion of the engineered landfill cap is on hold pending the end of the rainy season. And we'll let the site dry out a little bit to allow the work to be completed.

And then, finally, an update on the Mare Island San Pablo Bay Trail. As part of the Remedial Action Plan that pertained to the earlier transfer of the western portion of Mare Island from the Navy to the State Lands Commission to the city, which required public access on the western levees. The trail will have access to the western portion of the island by the public. And you'll be able to view San Pablo Bay, Mare Island Straits, and Marin, Napa, Solano, and Contra Costa counties. Weston will be constructing and maintaining the trail. The trail will eventually end at a future park that's going to be located at a site near the Marine Corps rifle range. Until that's built, we're going to put in temporary trailheads north and south of the residential areas at Mare Island.

And we actually plan to start construction this summer. And you can see in the right hand corner of our handout there the proposed route of the trailheads that overlooks the trail. And that's all we have unless there's any questions?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Cris, on the trail -- and I'm trying to -- it's been so long since we visited this -- but it seemed like to me that the length of the trail is significantly more than you promised to DTSC and State Lands. Am I correct in that? I mean, you know, it looks to me like it's twice as much.

MR. JESPERSEN: I'll defer to Dwight on that since he's been in charge of it.

MR. GEMAR: Well, it's not twice as much, but it's probably a good 25 percent more. And kind of what we're thinking is that part of the trail will coincide with the perimeter access road for the containment area, so I'm not double counting it basically, I'm excluding that from the perimeter trail or from the perimeter road. But even without that I think we're still comfortably over the -- I think it was 12,500 linear feet requirement.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah. Okay.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Cris. We'll go to the regulatory agency updates. Chip.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble, Brian Thompson, Carolyn D'Alameida)

MR. GRIBBLE: We'll be back into the SSTP outfall site and -- the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant outfall site which is an area in the near shore in the San Pablo Bay. Weston had presented us with some analysis of the limited data that exists for that area. The contaminants out there are mercury and PCBs. We didn't agree with that analysis, and we recommend that additional sampling per our letter be completed, and then we would deal with the site further based on the results of that additional sampling.

And then also on another subject, in 2003, as some of you probably remember, the department conducted a comprehensive monitoring evaluation for the, sort of the compliance for the RCRA facility landfill which is also often called Investigation Area H1. The Navy was found to be in numerous violations of RCRA, that's the Resource Conservation Recovery Act, environmental law. And so that the department has had an open -- an active compliance enforcement case ongoing since then. That case has now been concluded with the signing of an Enforceable Agreement, which basically notes that at this point the department finds that the Navy has returned into compliance at the landfill out there, and that significant progress has been made toward closure. And in short, the Enforceable Agreement, acknowledges that and concludes the enforcement case with the signing of the order. We are pleased with the progress that the Navy has made in coming to compliance and moving toward closure at the RCRA landfill which is in Investigation Area H1, a significant accomplishment.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. We'll move on to Brian, Water Board.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Last month our attention had been focused on two areas specifically, Investigation Area A2, which is kind of at the northern end of Mare Island next to Mare Island Strait. And there's a Remedial Investigation Report that's coming out for that. At the North building way site is another area. So we've been looking at that and providing comments. And the other area is Investigation Area H2. And we're reviewing a Remedial Action Workplan that was presented at

the last RAB meeting. We've also provided comments on the Land Use Covenant Operations Maintenance Plan for that area. Let's see.

We are also doing a review on Investigation Area, IA-F1, kind of in the southern area -- southern portion of Mare Island. And working on some responses and comments to Lennar. And the Navy provided responses to some of our comments and we're having discussions about them. I think that's pretty much it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Brian. Carolyn, EPA.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I am very, very pleased to report that today at our BCT meeting the Navy has finally agreed, we're finally getting around to discussing IR-17 Building 503 area. And the Navy has now finally agreed to respond to our comments from five years ago by collecting additional data to better characterize that site.

And today also we learned something very interesting. Gil came to our meeting and started to talk about some very big plans that Touro University has for that particular area, and the cancer treatment center that they're going to be constructing in that vicinity. And Gil might want to talk more about that, because I'm sure people would be really interested to hear about what they've got planned, a state-of-the-art cancer treatment center on the north end of the island. If you can?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Not without --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Permission?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No -- yeah, that's a good way to put it.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay. Maybe next time with permission.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks, Carolyn. Next is our report.

MR. THOMPSON: I did have one more comment, I'm sorry, I forgot. I just wanted to give kudos to the Lennar CH2M Hill team, they -- I've reported a couple of times in an effort to get my arms around all the underground storage tanks in Mare Island. And as a followup to that, to make sure that the electronic reporting for those sites is up to date. And that kind of goes with, Myrna, your desire to have something that's readily accessible and a future presentation on the Geotracker. Well, the Lennar CH2M Hill team has been making a lot of strides to make sure that the UST sites in there are up to date. So I'll be working with the Navy and Weston next.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Brian. The Navy update is, since the last three weeks, if you look at the handout, the field work that we've been doing is over at the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office or DRMO area. And we've been doing geophysical survey field work to determine the lateral extent of metallic debris, if any, on Azuar Drive and Dump Road. Based on the previous investigations, the petroleum contaminations has been typically found where the metallic debris is present. So that's the purpose of now doing this geophysical work. It's pretty much completed, should be pretty much done tomorrow on that. And we'll report the results of that along with some of the sampling that we've talked about before at -- probably the next RAB meeting.

If you turn it over you can see that we submitted one document since the last three weeks, that was the Draft Non-Time Critical Removal Action Completion Report on the DRMO area. That was for

the CERCLA Non-Time Critical Removal Action that we performed. We received some comments. One set on area F1, and another on the geophysical investigation at the PMA, production manufacturing area, the south shore area and -- from DTSC. And we received one set of comments from Brian, or actually from Linda, I believe, on Investigation Area K for the offshore. But we did have a BCT meeting today. And that's the Navy's report. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I just want to make one comment, one reminder, that environmental cleanup does make reuse possible. And coming up in our April meeting we will have an anniversary of our Restoration Advisory Board, April 14, 1994. Chip and Paula and I joined a team of eighteen members, I believe, of the community, selected out of a group of 65 who applied, and joined with the regulators and the Navy staff that night. And here we are. And many of our other members of the community have served along with us over the years. And I do believe that environmental cleanup is as good as our ability to talk about what's been accomplished. And I think a great deal has been accomplished at Mare Island. And I think that any communication we do amongst ourselves here, or any other way that we can communicate about this cleanup and about Mare Island in general is money well spent, just as much as digging in the ground. And that's why, I think, that Paula and I, as members of the community, have been here since 1994, and many others of you have faithfully participated as well. And democracy is messy. So we'll have celebration, I hope, this next -- in April of that milestone and that accomplishment.

And speaking of reuse, if any of you are interested in a chapel program of music and history associated with the Daffodil Tea, that's coming up Sunday, March 30 on Mare Island, two seatings and two programs. A program at the chapel at ten, and end up with the tea served at noon. And then one chapel program with the tea served at three. And we want to thank Lennar Mare Island for donating the facilities for that, to make it possible for us to hold the fundraiser that we hold, and the public awareness effort that we're making to protect St. Peters Chapel and to do the necessary restorations there. So see me if you want tickets.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Myrna. With that, this is our final public comment period of the evening. Any public comment? (No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. With that, we'll -- no public comment, we'll adjourn. We'll see you all April 24th. Thank you. (Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:50 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Radiological High-Density Survey of the Western Magazine Area (WMA) Dredge Outfalls – Weston Solutions
- Presentation Handout –J Lines Update – Navy/CH2MHill
- Presentation Handout – Status Update on the IA C1 Fuel Oil Pipeline (FOPL) Program – CH2MHill
- Presentation Handout – Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island Deliverable Schedule – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update March 2008 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard March 2008