

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, April 24, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, April 24th, at the JFK Library, Joseph Room 505 Santa Clara St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:12 p.m. and adjourned at 8:57 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
- Michael Coffey
- Kenn Browne

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy)
- Marie Dryer (Navy)
- Bernadette Herrera (Navy)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Brian Thompson (Water Board)
- Cris Jespersion (Water Board)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Ellen Hetfield (CH2M)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Diji Christian
- Howard Williams
- Bill Stevens
- Jim Porterfield
- Marilyn Wong

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Laura Axelsen (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, everybody, I think we're ready to go. Okay, everybody, we'll go ahead and get started. Welcome to the April, 2008, Mare Island RAB meeting, which is also the 14th anniversary of the Mare Island RAB. Some folks have been here since the get-go, and I was not one of them, but some introductions. My name is Michael Bloom. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator with the Navy and the Navy RAB Co-Chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm Myrna Hayes, and I was here, have been here since the beginning. That was April 14 and I live in Vallejo and I'm the Community Co-Chair.

MR. BROWN: Kenn Brown of Vallejo with the Solano Group Sierra Club.

MR. JESPERSON: Cris Jespersen, Weston Solutions.

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

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

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth, representing the City of Vallejo.

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

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley, CH2M Hill.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. WILLIAMS: Howard Williams, with Historical Ships Memorial at Pacific Square.

MS. WONG: Marilyn Wong, same organization, USS Iowa.

MR. STEVENS: Bill Stevens, operations manager, same project.

MS. DRYER: Marie Dryer with the Navy.

MS. HERRERA: Bernadette Herrera with the Navy.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Diji Christian of Shoreline Preserve, Shoreline Heritage Preserve, advisory board.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Jim Porterfield, ex-Mare Islander, Mare Island Historical Foundation.

MS. HETFIELD: Ellen Hetfield with CH2M Hill.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks everybody. We'll go ahead and get started on our first presentation. I apologize for the technical difficulties at the beginning, but we're ready to go. The first presentation is going to be given by Bernadette Herrera, who is an intern with us on the Mare Island team for the Navy, and Ellen Hetfield with CH2M Hill on behalf of the Navy, and it's Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, what we call the DRMO, and the geophysical total petroleum hydrocarbon update.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) Geophysical Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) Update Presentation by Ms. Marie Dreyer, Navy and Ms. Bernadette Herrera, Navy and Ms. Ellen Hetfield, CH2MHill/Navy*

MS. HERRERA: Thank you, Michael. My name is Bernadette Herrera, once again. I'm with the Navy. I'm an intern RPM. This is my first rotation at BRAC, and I will be at that rotation until June. I'm also shadowing Marie Dryer, who is in the back, also for the Navy. I'll go ahead and start with the first slide.

Some of the things we're going to cover for this presentation are the objectives of the current investigation. By the way, this is for the DRMO, I think Michael mentioned, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Geophysical Investigation. So it's kind of an update. Also, some of the things we're going to cover are the objectives of the current investigation, the status of the field work, the preliminary findings of the trenching activities, preliminary findings of the geophysical survey that we conducted this last March, and the upcoming field activities, and also our path forward. This is a follow-on to the investigation performed in 2005 and 2006, which are summarized in the Draft Technical Memorandum, April, 2007.

The first objective is to perform the trenching, soil boring, and the soil sampling in order to assess the distribution of the TPH. Also, we're going to assess the possible interrelationships between the TPH and find possible source areas and assess the migration pathways related to the metal.

This is the aerial view of the site. This is a photo that was taken in 2000, and you can see the Dump Road and Azuar Drive. This is where the trenching took place along Dump Road and Azuar Drive, and the triangular area is the DRMO. So there's DRMO in the triangular formation. Right above it is the crane test area, and what's not shown here to the left is the H1 Landfill would be located here, and the Lennar property is located here, just east of Azuar Drive.

Since the RAB presentation in November, 2007, we completed the trenching activities in December of 2006. We conducted these activities to find out the lateral extent of the petroleum and metal debris along Azuar and Dump Road, and samples were taken from these trenches. Also soil samples were collected when the trenches were open in 2007, December, 2007, and we conducted the geophysical, as I said, in March of this year, and that was also to determine the lateral extent of petroleum and metal debris along Dump -- see it here along Dump Road and Azuar Drive. And that portion, Ellen will cover in the geophysical portion of the presentation.

In this slide, you can see where the trenching activities took place. The top slide shows you Azuar Drive with the TPH investigation areas. It's kind of hard to see up here, but if you can look in your diagram -- the little segments, they're pink, those are the ones we did after the last RAB presentation in November, 2007, and the diagram on the bottom of Dump Road Investigation Areas, and same thing, the pink segments are the ones we did after the last RAB presentation.

In this first picture, we can see the oil seeping into Azuar Drive, Trench 2. In the second picture, you can see metallic debris in Dump Road, Trench 1. This third picture you can see the debris from sanitary sewer line Trench 4. So this gives us great visual correlation of what's going on. You can actually see the debris. You can see the oil seepage. In this picture, you can see the oil and debris in sanitary sewer line Trench 4, and to give you a summary, we found that TPH correlated strongly with the metal debris, and on Azuar Drive, one possible source could be the former oil sump box, and there was an abrupt end to the metal debris and the TPH on the east side of the road. Dump Road sanitary sewer line and the crane test area showed that there was TPH and metal present, but there's no clear source as of yet. DRMO fenced scrap yard has spotty presence of petroleum, and no metal debris was found. And I'll turn it over to Ellen for the geophysical portion.

MS. HETFIELD: Okay. Thank you. With the trenching that we did last fall, we saw great evidence that shows correlation between when there is metal debris, there's quite often this oil residue or free product TPH, and as Bernadette said, there are certain areas at the site where we've noted a fair amount of metal and free product, such as along Dump Road. Several of the trenches that cross cut Dump Road had both metal and TPH. Those are trenches that would correlate to this part of the site. Some more of the trenches that were on the kind of northwestern side of Dump Road, we saw

metal and free product there. And then as Bernadette said, several of the trenches along Azuar Drive had metal and free product in them, and there were some trenches on the east side of Azuar Drive that had neither metal nor TPH. And what we're seeing is this, like she said, strong correlation where we find buried metal, there's quite often free product, and one of our objectives is to understand that lateral distribution of where the free product is present at the site.

So a real great tool for doing that is using geophysical surveys to identify areas of buried metal. So we got a geophysical survey subcontractor, NorCal Geophysics, who is from the Petaluma area, to come out and run a couple different types of geophysical surveys for us. And our primary interest was the areas along Azuar Drive and along Dump Road in the areas we've already done some trenching and seen evidence of metal. Because we found such a strong correlation between the presence of metal and the presence of free product, we thought if we can get out the geophysical survey techniques and find through those non-intrusive methods where free product -- where buried metal is located, that might give us a good indication of other places we should look for free product.

As one of our earlier slides said, we are going to be going to the next phase of field investigation in the coming months. We're going to be doing a soil boring and soil sampling investigation, and so the geophysical survey results will also help us plan that next phase. So NorCal Geophysics came out and ran two types of Geophysical surveys for us, Electromagnetic Terrain Conductivity surveys, also just referred to as EM, and then Vertical Magnetic Gradient survey, VMG, also just referred to as a mag survey, basically a metal detector, a pretty high tech metal detector. The neat thing about using these techniques, like I said, it's a non-intrusive method for getting a lot of data relatively quickly without disturbing the site, not having to trench or anything like that.

The techniques that we used or that NorCal Geophysics used could detect metal on the order of 10 to 20 feet below ground surface, and in the time that they were on site, they surveyed approximately 10 acres, and you'll see that on the next couple of slides in a moment, but a long stretch here along Azuar Drive kind of in this intersection area and then along Dump Road. We didn't have them survey in the fenced scrap yard area. That area had undergone only geophysical surveying as part of the Non-Time Critical Removal Action, the excavation work that was done back in 2005, 2006.

This is a photograph of a NorCal geophysicist doing the EM survey, and as you can see, it's an instrument that you walk with. You carry this. This device is about 10 feet long, and what you're doing is you're inducing -- well, let me back up. Let me see. What you're doing with the EM survey is you're measuring the conductivity of the subsurface, which can be the earth materials, such as soil, but also it's great for metal detection. You're able to detect both ferrous and non-ferrous metals, so basically iron and other types of metals. It's considered an active type of geophysical survey because what this instrument is doing, one end is a transmitter. The other end is a receiver, and it's sending off a signal to the subsurface, and it's inducing a current in the ground, and if there's certain things in the ground, such as metal that can carry a current themselves, those items are going to respond and send a signal back to the receiver. And so essentially what you're doing is as you walk up and down this property is you're getting response to the presence of metals, both those that are buried below ground and some above ground metals too, as I'll show you in just a moment.

When the NorCal Geophysics folks walked the site, they, as I said, surveyed a 10-acre area, and what they did is they set up a grid with 10-foot spacing in between transects, and they walked these

transects, and every five feet along the transects, they would take a measurement, and then they come back later, and they can tie it in to a survey location. So we can map their results quite well.

The other type of survey they used this mag survey. It's considered a passive system. It's measuring variations in the earth's magnetic field. If you have some buried ferrous metals, any iron, any type of metal that contains iron that will affect the earth's magnetic field, this instrument will pick that up. And this is a figure that you also have in your handout package, the 11-by-17's. We just got these results the very beginning of the week. So we've just started working with this data. So you're seeing some pretty new information that we will attribute a lot more and work with our previous trenching results to start correlating some of this information, but in our initial review of some of this data -- This the EM survey. This is the method that picks up both iron and non-iron types of metals, and so what you're going to look for is areas where you have a high signal coming back from the ground, which is implying that there's buried metal, and I'm just going to point out some areas, and you're free to come up here during the break. We put larger versions of these figures up here, and I can talk to you more individually about them if you have questions. But I'll point out just few areas that kind of catch our interest. One is this blue zone that you'll see on your figure that's along Azuar Drive that's an area where we've already done quite a bit of trenching, and we have already observed there's a fair amount of buried metal in there. And so what this is just confirming is with geophysical techniques where the extension of what we're currently attributing to be buried metal is below ground surface.

We're seeing another large high response area over here along Dump Road. This is also an area where some of our trenches have already shown a fair amount of buried metal with free product. There's some other areas, and I can show you this more closely up here if you would like during the break, but there's some other areas where we're seeing some high responses, and the things with both of these methods is that they pick up not only buried metal, the type that we're looking for, but they'll also be influenced by things such as buried utility lines and surface features such as fences, manhole covers, things like that, anything that could affect the geophysical response. So there's an area up here where there's some yellow to red response, and in that area, we already know there's some buried water line, electric line, there's a steel man cover in this area, so those are the kind of things that this technique will pick up. But this is where our interpretation comes in, and we'll start looking next at some of the utility maps for the facility and start to understand more what this response represents. There's a feature right here, but there's a fence line there. So we're getting a strong response from the fence line.

So but the areas of particular interest to us as we go forward in the TPH investigation are certainly the area along Azuar Drive and Dump Road because we already know from trenching that those are areas where we have seen buried metal. So that's the EM response.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Could I ask you a question on that?

MS. HETFIELD: Yes.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The areas that have the negative, the pink color.

MS. HETFIELD: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Especially across the road in the Lennar property.

MS. HETFIELD: Yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: What does that mean?

MS. HETFIELD: Okay. I'm not a geophysicist, but I'll do my best. What you're looking for on this -- and on the next figure is a strong response, like the middle of the color bar is -- the white is an area that represents essentially no special response, no significant signal other than what the earth is putting up itself. But if you go either to the positive or to the negative side, it's representing a strong geophysical signal. You're looking for a strong signal either way could represent some sort of influence of metals. So that's a good point. The pink in this case is also indicating some sort of metallic influence, but talking to the geophysical surveyors, what's very interesting you'll see it, like there's a pink section here going to this building. We know there's buried utilities there. I talked to the guy who did this survey. I spoke with him this morning, and he said these areas are -- like I drove by it this afternoon -- they're pipe lay-down areas where there's a lot of construction material just laid out on concrete slabs. So those will provide some sort of signal.

Another interesting feature, you see this kind of blue area right here on your maps that I can show you up here later. They're Baker Tanks right outside the building there. So the metal from the above ground big metal Baker Tanks is influencing the signal. There's some response along the corner here that's due to the slab of the building. There's a blue response right here. If you go in the field, you see there's a remnant of a building slab with rebar in it. So did that answer your question?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes.

MS. HETFIELD: Okay. So our next step will be to take these maps and out in the field, basically field truth what we're seeing, what can be attributed to buried utilities or other surface features, like fences, former slabs.

Another interesting area is there's a blue response right down here in the southern end. There's a railroad -- a rail segment down there. So these are definitely subject to interpretation and understanding what else besides buried metal could be affecting these. But -- well, let me show you the results of the mag survey are quite similar, and, again, you're looking for the extremes, the highs or the lows. Magnetized materials can either have a positive or a negative end. So similarly with magnetic survey, both a positive or a negative response is possible, but what you're looking for are the extreme responses. So on this map -- and, again, magnetic surveys show you just iron bearing metals. So steels and alloys that have iron in them, we're looking for areas that are pink to red or green, and what you'll see is there are a lot of similarities. There are areas along Azuar Drive. Here's that area where we've seen remnants of a slab with rebar, the area along Dump Road definitely of interest. Sometimes you start looking for some linear features. We know there's buried electrical through here, but we'll verify that.

So, again, two different methods. They're slightly different in what they're looking for, but when you take the two of them together, at least our initial interpretation of this is that they're generally confirming each other, which is good. Where are we going to go with this next is, again, I've already mentioned a few areas where we were seeing particularly high responses to both surveys, and in the areas where we know we can rule out surface influence or surface features, fences, utilities, we have seen a couple of areas that suggest and we know there's a large amount of metallic debris. And what's kind of interesting with this, a lot of times when you use geophysical survey in an investigation, it's one of the first things you do to help you plan an investigation, but it's interesting to us in that we already have some trenching results and observations that we can use in tandem with some of these survey results to say the trenches that we put in here we know there's metal. So that's a pretty good indication that where we're seeing this area of blue, there's a good

chance there's more metal. Similarly over here, our trenches have shown up, so we know there's metal there.

So this is helping us to see what the extent of buried metal may be, so that moving forward we can use this information to help us plan our soil boring program. We're going to go out later this spring with a direct push drill rig. It's a relatively rapid way of collecting soil borings and soil samples, and we're going to use that equipment to go out and select places to collect soil borings, soil samples. We're looking for areas where there are petroleum hydrocarbons in soil, but conversely we're also interested in finding areas where there's not petroleum in the soil just to help us delineate the extent of the TPH. Another thing that's good with this direct push investigation is we're going to be able to go a bit deeper than we've already trenched. Most of the trenches have been in the eight to nine foot depth range. There are a few trenches that have gone as deep as maybe 13 or 14 feet, but with the direct push, we're expecting we can go 20, 25 plus feet rather quickly. What we're planning to do moving forward is use the geophysical survey results and plan boring locations and then hold a working group meeting to get input on our objectives for the sampling program, what we intend to do with the data we collect.

Once we have that data, we're going to go back and update a Conceptual Site Model that has already been initially prepared in the April, 2007, Technical Memorandum, and we're going to incorporate all the new information since that was issued. So that will include all the trenching material, all the trenching investigation, observations, soil sampling, and free product sampling associated with the trenches, geophysical survey results, and then the results of this boring program, sampling program. So that's just a quick update on what we have done since the November RAB meeting, some of what we're starting to find, and where we intend to go next. If you have any questions right now, I'd be happy to answer them, and, again, if you'd like to take a closer look at some of these big figures during the break, I'd be happy to look over them with you.

MR. GRIBBLE: Is this on? So when did -- we haven't met before. When did you start working on this project?

MS. HETFIELD: Last month I started working on the Mare Island project, yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. This whole subject is very controversial. You should know you that.

MS. HETFIELD: Uh-huh.

MR. GRIBBLE: If you don't, you should know.

MS. HETFIELD: I do. I do know.

MR. GRIBBLE: And I don't think that people really understand how controversial it is. Let me just go over a few things here. The Navy did a work plan for this a long time ago and did not want to submit that to us for review and comment, and then they've done addendums to that, to which we really didn't do any formal review and respond and comment review, which is hard to understand because this is a -- this site involves, you know, source areas and who is responsible for what, Navy versus Lennar, Lennar versus Navy. Is it coming from Lennar property, or is it coming from Navy property?

From our perspective at this point, the department has believed for some time that this rises to the level of a hazardous waste site, and that as such, needs to be either excavated in its entirety or contained like a landfill containment area that we already have on Mare Island, and that's a view that, as I understand correctly, I believe you know, but that Lennar doesn't agree with that view at

this point. Because of all that disagreement and controversy and potential for the significance of the field investigation, I thought it was very important that several of the regulatory agency people made firsthand observations of the trenching, trenches and excavations that were going to take place, and I don't know how many times you saw regulators out there, but I know that it was not anything close to what I had anticipated or hoped for, and it was not because that we didn't make an attempt, but it was for a lot of reasons, in part because we didn't have a lot of notification.

We made attempts to come out and were not able to see these things for whatever reasons, the holes were kept open. So because of all of this, going forward if you were going to be doing any more field work out there, I strongly advise or recommend that every attempt be made to have several regulatory agency people out there to observe these things first hand as much as possible.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I'd like to respond to that.

Thank you, Chip, for the comment. We will have regulatory agency people out there. If you see on the slide, we are going to involve regulatory agencies and where we want to do the soil borings and this direct push, et cetera. But I somewhat disagree with your statement in that, I mean, we did inform regulatory agencies when trenching was going on daily to come on out and look at the trenches and be there. We set up a website on the FTP site to look at information. There was constant communication. So I think I beg to differ with you on that.

MR. FARLEY: If I could just add one thing, just to be clear, that website or that FTP site is still operational, and we still are sending out weekly updates to the external password. So it's still available for folks to review if anyone wishes. Is that right, Ellen?

MS. HETFIELD: I'll have to check what materials are currently on there.

MR. THOMPSON: So there is I think on some level regulatory agencies are a little bit in the dark, at least I am in terms of the overall direction and goals of what this work is doing. I think there are multiple objectives in what's happening here. I do want to make one comment related to that, and that is that this is -- the title of this is for the DRMO, and there's excavation that was done in there in the past, but it was specifically not targeted to petroleum hydrocarbons. So if there was a geophysical survey that was previously done out there, maybe you haven't done it yet, but I'm assuming that those two data sets are going to be merged and that this is going to be looked at more comprehensively.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, it will. It will. It was just entitled the DRMO investigation because it's on the border of the DRMO, and that's where we're trenching and doing this particular geophysical.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a couple of questions. I know you haven't had a lot of time to work with this data yet and not merged it, but can you tell me based on your trenching that you did in -- was that November?

MS. HETFIELD: November-December.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do your trenches where you found metal debris and free product match up with these -- predominantly these two blue areas, or did you in your trenches have product that was outside of these?

MS. HETFIELD: That's a good question, and, you know, that is definitely one of the things we're going to be doing is we just had enough time to get these overlaid on a site map, but definitely one thing I think is going to be useful for us to overlay our trench locations on the geophysical survey results so that we can see that or better illustrate that there is a correlation. It's a little tough, but,

yeah, here we go. This is the figure that showed the trenching locations. Sorry. It's on a little bit of a different scale, but you can see along Dump Road the areas that we trenched are just looking at the shape of the -- well, this line, this edge of the CTA. So you can see our trenches generally are along Dump Road kind of midway from the intersection to the fence line here and past the CTA fence line. So we're looking at trenches that we've done -- that are kind of in this area, and trenches in the Dump Road area and in this sanitary sewer line area have definitely shown presence of metal. What I'd like to do, though, is definitely overlay the trench locations on this and looking for that more exact correlation. Similarly, the trenches along Azuar Drive, Building 661, which is here. So our trenches were generally from about here this stretch, from Building 661 towards the intersection.

MR. FARLEY: Ellen, could I add something?

MS. HETFIELD: Yes.

MR. FARLEY: The short answer is yes.

MS. HETFIELD: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're going to give me a short answer, Steve?

MR. FARLEY: Well, that was the short answer. Here's the long explanation.

MS. HETFIELD: I tend to be a long answer first person. Sorry.

MR. FARLEY: Most of the trenches -- and we did soil borings, too, a while back. Most of those soil borings and trenches were within the footprint of the geophysics. There were some trenches, like the ones out inside the fence scrap yard area, that were outside of the proposed or the executed geophysical area. What we were looking for was that sort of the 95 percent correlation between the trenching that we had done, the soil borings, the observations of metal debris and oil, and used the geophysics to fill in the gaps in between, and as Ellen has pointed out a couple of times, it looks like the areas where we had the trenches with oil, the geophysical response, at least at this level of analysis, looks like the gaps are filled in with more metal debris in between. So, again, the short answer is yes, the area where we did the geophysics largely corresponds to the footprint of the area where we did the trenching along the roads.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Thanks. Steve, I guess it's confusing because in looking at this big map, you've got it -- you don't actually show the intersection. So I can't tell for sure whether you did trenches in this area that in the geophysical just doesn't happen to show this concentration of metal. So because this --

MS. HETFIELD: Yeah, it's on two different scales.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Like the rest of Dump Road is right there.

MR. FARLEY: The geophysics is a larger area than that covered by the trenching. 90 percent of the trenches fall within the geophysical footprint, but there are areas within the geophysical footprint that don't have trenches in them, like the corner of Dump Road and Azuar Drive.

MS. HETFIELD: Yeah, but one of our first steps will be to get them on the same type of figure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then I see that you went on the geophysical analysis to survey out to just like a magic point, I guess to the west. Was that to the edge of H1, Investigation Area H1? Because that concentrated blue that you're --

MS. HETFIELD: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- thinking is metal debris stops right there.

MS. HETFIELD: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So what are you going to do about that?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, and forgive me for jumping in on that. It's just that I was involved in the early part of it, and, you know, Ellen's done a great job. The questions that she was asking me today were difficult, and so she's really come to up to speed very quickly, but in general --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't care if you answer.

MR. FARLEY: The short answer, again, Myrna is yes. The area we extended to trenching up to about the limit of H1 just outside the fence line of the parking area on the far west side of the current test area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So my second question was what do you plan to do beyond that now that you see that you have a really high concentration of what might likely be metal debris that might be some other mystery beyond that magic line you have there? Any speculation?

MS. HETFIELD: Well, if we can get clearance to sample there, then I would think that, like you said, the presence of a high response, magnetic response right at the edge of our geophysical survey, I would want to see what's going on up there.

MR. FARLEY: The other thing is that because this is very preliminary data that might disappear because there's a manhole there.

MS. HETFIELD: Right.

MR. FARLEY: So there are a number of utilities that are out there. In fact, there was a trench that was installed. I call it the D ditch, but there was a trench that was installed that ran parallel to that, sort of the color break there between the -- yeah, right in through there, and there were a couple of utilities that ran through that area as well. So some of these blue areas may just be a reflection of utilities and not actually metal debris that may or actually does contain oil.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Didn't that trench have staining in it?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. HETFIELD: All right. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Ellen and Bernadette, thank you. We'll go ahead and get set up and ready for our second presentation. It is Proposed Remedial Action at Underground Storage Tank 102 given by Steve Farley of CH2M Hill on behalf of Lennar, and then Neal Siler will put on --

III. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Proposed Remedial Action at Underground Storage Tank (UST) 102*

Presentation by Mr. Steve Farley, CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island and Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island

MR. FARLEY: It works. Thank you. Complicate this for just a couple seconds. Okay. We're going to talk about some work that we have planned for UST 102. It's a suspect UST. I'll explain what that means in just a second. We've had a couple of discussions with the agencies about this. There

are still things that are evolving, but we have come to an agreement with the agencies on a basic approach, which is what we're going to talk about tonight.

First thing I'm going to do is explain how UST 102 came to be defined as a suspect site. Fundamentally, what that means, we've never found a tank. There's no real clear records about this being a tank, but it appears to be a tank. We're going to talk about the investigations that have been completed to date, talk about the results that we've received so far, and go on and talk real briefly about the things that we have initiated and will continue to do.

So why is it a suspect tank? It's a suspect tank because that's about the limit of the information about the existence of this tank at the island. This is from a 1911 map, and I have to say the maps that exist for this site are absolutely fascinating. You could get lost in looking through the history of the island very quickly, but I never do. But this is from a 1911 map, and it's a little hard to see, but this right here has the number 102, and this is Building 102. And this big purple dot isn't from the original map. We put this on there for reference for tonight. But the bottom line is that that is the sum total, that and a map from 1916, that had that same tank notation but in slightly different area. This is Building 1326, which is a current building. Building 102 used to be across the street here. It's now up at the corner of A and Railroad, I think, yeah. It's been moved. If you come on the island and go down Railroad Avenue, it's a large open building. It's a lumber shed basically, but this circle is the same, essentially the same area as shown on the previous map. So that's for reference. If you do look at the previous figure, you'll see that none of the dry docks existed back in 1911. It was a very, very different place back then.

So suspect UST 102 is thought to be in this area. We're working on -- we refer to it now as the area around 1326, but it's still for UST 102. For reference, you can see where we are on the island. UST 102 is here. UST 142 is just slightly south. 142 sits right in here. Actually, it sits right down there. Forgive me. Okay. This is street view of the same area. You're now looking to the southeast, and the railroad tracks here. Dry Dock Three is just on the other side of these bollards. You can actually see the east side of the Dry Dock Three right here. This is Building 1326. The purple ellipse right here is what was shown on the previous figure as the circle. So the footprint of the area where UST 102 is thought to have been or to be is right in here. And, again, for reference, this is Building 840 right here. It's a Quonset hut. There's a transformer pad right here, and this is Building 1329.

So the brief history is, as I mentioned, that this suspect tank may have been associated with Building 102, which was an old 18,650 square foot lumber shed, unknown size, unknown use of the tank, not really sure. Exact location of the tank's not known, even though there have been multiple investigations at this location starting back actually in the late nineties. I'm not sure it's worth going through all of this, but in general, there was a geophysical survey done by the Navy over here. There was a geophysical survey done up here, all to locate this tank, and this tank has never been found. There was a removal action done here by CH2M Hill back in 2003. And then there was a series of soil borings that were installed around the area, and if you look here at the numbers, different soil borings were installed, nine soil borings, 18 UVOSTs. UVOST stands for ultraviolet optical screening tool. It's a way of indirectly evaluating what kind of materials you have, meaning TPH soil samples, ground water samples, all the way up through January of 2008.

So there have been various phases of investigation done at this site for over 10 years. Here is the map showing the distribution of TPH, or total petroleum hydrocarbons, D for diesel, M for motor oil, and the reason for limiting it to diesel and motor oil is there was only one or two gasoline hits. They were very low. It's really the diesel and the motor oil that are detected in this area.

Let me give you just a quick overview of what these different colored symbols mean. Red means that it exceeds Tier 1 Environment Screening Levels, and the green means it does not. Here are the criteria for the concentration values, against which those data were evaluated to determine if it should be a green or a red dot. If you look at this, what you'll see is most of the red areas, or the exceedances for soil, are in this area right in here, and that around the outside of that, you largely have data that show that you're below the Tier 1 number. Here are the same constituents, diesel and motor oil in ground water at the site, and, again, you see the same basic pattern. You see that in this central area, you have exceedances of the Tier 1 numbers for ground water, and they're given right down here, and on the outside, you generally have lower concentrations, meaning below the Tier 1 numbers. So kind of bringing the points home for the data, diesel in soil is bound for Tier 1 except to the east. So to the west and to the north, we believe that we have the concentrations exceeding Tier 1 bound. Diesel and motor oil exceed the Tier 1 numbers in the north and east of the building, and the Tier 1 for diesel is exceeded in the northeast corner of the building.

So let me just go back real quick here. What this is saying is that in the northern portion and in the north corner, the northeast corner of the building, we have these exceedances. We also have a few other constituents beyond diesel and motor oil that were detected in the samples. We have gasoline, arsenic, cadmium, chrome, and then a few of the PAH's here that were detected above Tier 1. In general, the most commonly detected constituents above Tier 1, non-diesel, non-motor oil were the PAH's. In a case of gasoline and arsenic, cad, these things were found in maybe one or two borings. I think in the case of gasoline, it was very near, maybe actually even below the Tier 1 number, but it's one hit or two hits, something of that sort. We didn't see any PCP's.

And the work that we did in January of 2008, the most recent sampling event was focused on this area of the building. We've done a bunch of work up here. We did this excavation, and this excavation, by the way, was largely determined by this boring. This is one of the very first borings that we put in. And there was a geophysical anomaly that was found by the Navy's work. We went back in put a boring in there. Actually, this was by CH2M Hill's work, excuse me. We put a boring in there. We got a TPH. We went back to that same location to do some excavation, expecting that we were going to find the tank. We didn't. So we've done this large excavation here, have all these borings. We then went in in January and put in more soil borings underneath the floor, expecting that we would either find very high levels of TPH, indicating where the tank was, or we'd bang into the tank, and we found neither.

You can see here that all of these levels, except for two, are below the Tier 1 numbers, and these two are just slightly above the Tier 1 levels. TPH gas and VOC's and this is -- I actually don't like this term. I don't know how they get to these presentations, but they're talking about BTEX here. When I think of VOC's, I'm always thinking of chlorinateds. I think it's just because that's where I was raised, Silicon Valley. But, no, actually no BTEX was found. Benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylenes, and like I said, just a little bit of gasoline. The TPH motor oil and diesel exceeded the Tier 1 numbers just north of the building and underneath the northeast corner. If you look at your figures and see where those red dots are, you'll see that's where the ground water concentrations exceed Tier 1.

PAH's are also found in the same general area, and it's not surprising, not uncommon to have PAH's associated with especially the heavy end diesel and motor oil. Vinyl chloride was detected in one sample. The Tier 1 ESL is 0.05 milligrams per kilogram, and we had a detection of 0.051. So it's virtually at the tier 1 ESL. None of these chlorinateds, PCE, TCE, DCE, were detected in any of the ground water samples that we collected.

Okay. So what does all this mean? What are we doing next? What we're going to do next is we're going to go into that area. If you want to turn to your last slide so you can follow along, we're going to go to that area to the north and to the east of the building that is highlighted in a red polygon on your last slide, and we're going to excavate that soil to remove the contamination, the diesel and motor oil above the Tier 1 numbers. So excavate to 10 feet, and if you look at the data, 10 feet is probably about where we need to be. We need to go a little deeper, but we'll go to 10 feet at least, and we're also going to install four ground water monitoring wells.

We had a meeting with the agencies a few weeks ago, and we came up with a basic plan for where to put these four wells. You can see them on your figure in I think green and –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Orange.

MR. FARLEY: -- orange and blue. The blue ones are already installed. We just got done installing them today. So when it says here install four wells, we've already finished three of them. We're going to prepare, although you can't read it here, we're going to prepare and submit a simple brief, basically a set of tables, work plan for agency review. Then we're going to conduct the excavation, and then we'll finish installing the last of the wells, and then we'll go back and do some ground water monitoring. So here's that basic plan in map view. Here's the area that we're going to excavate down to 10 feet. You can see that on the outside of this, we've got basically concentrations below Tier 1, except for these two, and as I said before, these are very, very near Tier 1 numbers, which are relatively conservative. These three wells are already in, and this well is going to be installed after this is removed and back filled. In general, ground water flow direction is in that direction to that direction. So these three plus another well that already exists up here should cover us on the downgradient side of the site. So that's the basic plan forward. Do an excavation for the areas that exceed the Tier 1 numbers in soil. Do some ground water monitoring to address the concentrations that we already have in the ground water that exceed Tier 1, from there, figure out what, if anything, needs to be done next for the site, and I don't think we're ever going to find the tank, but so be it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You may get lucky.

MR. FARLEY: Anyway, I would be happy to answer any questions anybody might have. Come on; ask me one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was actually going to be whether any of you are doing any murder mysteries or mysteries on these kinds of suspects.

MR. FARLEY: You know, it's what -- that's what keeps the heart pounding during the day. You never know. You never know. Should have sat down.

MR. COFFEY: You're going to get it now.

MR. GRIBBLE: Steve, you said that they saw this dot on the map and thought that might represent a UST. I wonder if you are any more familiar with thinking why a UST and not an above ground?

MR. FARLEY: Actually, I didn't make too much a deal out of it, but one of the other possibilities -- we wrote a report on this site that led to the borings that we installed back in I think '06 or '07 that basically acknowledged the fact that this thing could be an above ground storage tank. It could have been almost anything, but we're taking a relatively conservative approach by looking for the tank underground. If we don't find the tank, it still essentially doesn't change anything because if it was

an above ground storage tank, we still have contamination to deal with. But you're right, it could very well have been an above ground storage tank. Don't know.

MR. GRIBBLE: And then I wonder also, Brian, maybe you have some familiarity here. So this says the map was I believe 1911, and that's only a few years after the shipyard started using diesel fuel for ships, which is, you know, pretty near the very beginning of that period of use. And I'm thinking what's the likelihood that they were even doing underground tanks at that point in time versus something more immediate, more simple, which would be an above ground tank. Do you know what the state of practice for typical practice might have been at that time?

MR. THOMPSON: (Shakes head.)

MR. FARLEY: I think you raise a valid point. It may not have been an above ground or an underground storage tank. For us, the worst case scenario would be an underground storage tank and that we'd have to do something with that structure underground. So we've spent a lot of effort trying to find that structure. We're still addressing the contamination, you know, whether it was an above ground or underground storage tank. I mean, quite frankly, I don't even know if it was a tank.

MR. GRIBBLE: And then the other question was the UVOST. I know you went through it before, but I'm trying to recall. That's kind a CPT type of set-up.

MR. FARLEY: You use the CPT rig to push the probe down, and it basically sends out a signal that measures the reflectance off of the petroleum. It registers basically a certain kind of wave length of signal or optical signal. You really can't correlate it back to concentrations. All you can say is I got a whopping signal, or I've got nothing.

MR. GRIBBLE: So with that survey that you did with UVOST CPT, were you also getting density readings, and do you recall if there were -- did you get a lot of void cavities down there?

MR. FARLEY: I don't think we measured -- I don't know for sure if we measured any of the physical properties of the soils. I think we probably did not.

MR. GRIBBLE: Because, you know, because not to -- some areas nearby that particular location, I'm not sure you're familiar with that, particularly north of there, there's some huge void spaces in the subsurface. It's all in a non-engineered fill.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. And that --

MR. GRIBBLE: So if those are the subsurface conditions here, that would perhaps even dominate or dictate the subsurface flow.

MR. FARLEY: If you look at this figure and you look at this area right here, this is the boundary of geophysical survey that CH2M Hill did. We did this back in 2002. And this anomaly here, this geophysical anomaly, so talking about geophysics, the suggestion from the geophysical survey was that that was a void space. And so we actually went back, and so if it was a void space, it may have indicated that -- might suggest that there was a tank there, and it was a large void space on the inside of that empty tank. So we went back and actually put a boring. I won't go back to the other slide, but we actually put a boring right smack dab in the middle of this anomaly area, and as you can see here, we did this excavation in this area and didn't encounter any kind of void. No idea what the real meaning of this anomaly was, but it's interesting that you raise the question about voids because there was a suggestion, at least at the time the geophysics was done, that there was a void space there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you ever use historical photos to --

MR. FARLEY: All the time, and, in fact, Lennar and the Navy were both very kind and generous in providing access to the maps and air photos.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As close as that it is to the wharf, you would think that if there had been something above ground, there might have been a photo.

MR. FARLEY: We've looked at all the aerial photography that we can get our hands on, and there's either no indication of a tank or an above ground structure of any kind, or the photos are from such a large altitude that there just isn't enough resolution to be able to tell.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I wasn't actually thinking of aerials as much as I was thinking of some of the shots that I know I have of the waterfront.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. If we could only have the type of resolution that we have for some of the areas of the triangle where they look like they're taken from the top of a water tower or the roof of a building, and, you know, these old black and white images, the negatives were, you know, about that big.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. Right.

MR. FARLEY: And there's quite a lot of detail. Unfortunately, for this area, I'm not aware of any specific photographs that help answer the question. But we have looked, and it's a good question. Okay. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Steve. With that, we'll move to our first public comment period. Any public comment? If not, we'll go ahead into our break. We're celebrating the 14th anniversary of the RAB. There's cake and other goodies back there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I just want to note while Chip didn't acknowledge it, he also was here on that fateful night 14 years ago as was Paula Tygielski, who stepped away for a minute, and many of the rest of our RAB members have served for many, many years, just not quite that long. So thank you for the big show tonight, you guys.

(The proceedings were in recess from 8:17 to 8:33.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, everybody. Okay, everybody. First on the agenda is the administrative business and announcements. I would say if you have any comments on the minutes, the last minutes from March, please get them to Myrna or myself. Do you have any announcements? Nope. Okay. We'll move on to the focus group reports.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: First the community, Wendell's not here. No report.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Natural resources, Jerry? Nope.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay Paula I think stepped away. So we'll get back to her.

Gil, city report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Steve, Lennar.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: This is good because I have an hour's worth of discussion, make up for everybody else.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No, you don't.

MR. FARLEY: I got one handout. Grab one over at the desk if you didn't get one. Let's start with the photographs. Upper right corner, couple of examples of some of the Fuel Oil Pipe Lines for FOPL's that we're removing. I think one of the interesting things about the FOPL's is that a lot of them are in utilidor. And if you look here in the upper left photo, you can see what looks like a concrete tube there. That pipeline is actually not buried in dirt, and the dirt that you see adjacent to the pipe is actually dirt that fell into the utilidor is like a long, concrete tube, if you will, and if you look at the far upper top of the photograph, you see that there's concrete across the top. Those are actually removable lids. They're just big, huge chunks of concrete that sit on top. Makes it easy to get to it. Although, when they get buried below 12 or 18 inches of dirt and asphalt, makes it difficult to get to, but anyway, this couple of photos of some of the utilidor and FOPL's that we're working on.

In the upper left, there's a photograph of that brick tunnel that I mentioned a couple of months ago, I think fascinating structure between Buildings 89 and 271. Have no idea where it went. Didn't have any pipes in it. It was just pretty fascinating to bump into it.

In the main body of the map, there's a number of sites that are reflected here that we're working on. Starting at the bottom we've got PCB Site 672; UST 102, which we talked about tonight; then another PCB site, Building 50; and another Site 121. Those three PCB sites are actually sites where we're doing some indoor air monitoring. Sort of in the middle of the figure is an IR15 with a green rectangle, that's an area where we're doing a pilot study for Enhanced Reductive Dechlorination of the Chlorinated Solvents that are in ground water in that area. And, in fact, that Work Plan is one of the documents that agencies had been reviewing and commenting on. That's a pretty important pilot test, and we're spending a lot of time and effort trying to get that thing right.

So moving on, though, sort of the magenta lines or fuel oil pipe lines, doing a lot of work there. Building 461 towards the top, that's a little battery shop, and that battery shop has an air space between the bottom of the floor and the dirt, and underneath the floor, all of the old drain lines, and you can imagine those drain lines leaked over time. Well, what does the battery shop handle? Acids, metals, and we're actually inside underneath the building removing some of those metal salts. There's sort of big piles of these metal salts that formed from the evaporation of the water from the electrolytes, and we're removing that material now underneath the building, and the primary constituent there that we're addressing is lead in the soil.

In terms of documents and review, there's three or four important documents. Couple of O and M Plans, the EERD Pilot Test Work Plan, and then implementation for IAC3. No change to the number of sites closed, and then the next upcoming significant document is the B2-1 Implementation Report, and that's the area -- we're proposing that be the area that's sort of the

upside down L portion of IAB. See, it says B2-1. That's the area we're hoping to finish Implementation Report on a lot. So that site can be forward for closure development. So that's all I have for tonight. Be happy to answer any questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, since you have an hour, I have a lot of questions, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: I could talk some more. If that would keep you from asking questions, I can talk more.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What happened to the bottles?

MR. FARLEY: What happened to the bottles?

MR. SILER: In the manway, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: I don't know. We have a PAR Environmental --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MR. FARLEY: -- is the archeological services company that is basically on task to come out any time we encounter any archeological structure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. I remember that. That's how I know about the bottles. You told me.

MR. FARLEY: Anything that is found, they take.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but you didn't -- before you had just a little hole drilled, and they just looked down there. So now when you bash this tunnel up, what happened to the bottles?

MR. FARLEY: Anything of historical significance was taken by PAR.

MR. SILER: And my recollection when I talked to John Dougherty at PAR, is that although they thought they saw those bottles when they had the hole and put the camera down there, they weren't able to see any when they actually got any open or recover any bottles. That was my understanding from him. So I couldn't tell you exactly what happened to them.

MR. COFFEY: Mystery bottle disappearance.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Do they do documentation that would be available to the public? I mean, this is the sort of thing that kind of, as Steve said, makes your heart race, you know, that is some of the interesting part of the environmental clean-up that's a little bit jazzy that sometimes is actually of interest compared to this other torturous number games and letters and all that.

MR. SILER: Yeah, actually I get reports whenever they come out, and so I do have those reports. They're not something that regularly goes in as far as part of the environmental clean-up. It's kind of something that's ancillary, but I do have those reports, and if you would like to see them, I can bring those down for you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I think it would be interesting, and this is an example of the type of thing that I think would be -- I mean, it might be just my goofy idea, but that would be of interest to people on the Internet, if, you know, makes environmental clean-up come alive. So I'll keep on harping about that, and you can be assured of that.

MR. COFFEY: Steve, is there anything that dated that tunnel?

MR. FARLEY: No. No. You know, we call it a tunnel. We call a manway. It's really unclear exactly what it is. There were no pipes in it. It wasn't open on both ends. It had already been

plugged on either end. So you figure the buildings in that area are from the late 1800's, right, '89, '87, '85, that whole genre is from that time period. These are underneath that or in the same area. You can assume, I think, that it's probably from the same general time frame. I mean, I'm not an archeologist, but I would conclude that that's probably from the same time.

MR. COFFEY: There's no way to save it without smashing it into bits like this before?

MR. FARLEY: No. No.

MR. COFFEY: All right.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Steve. Next is Weston update. Cris?

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersion)

MR. JESPERSON: Thanks. First off, you can see the status of various documents we have in for agency review we're planning on submitting here in the next several months. I won't belabor that. Next up is an update of the work we did in the Western Magazine Area, looking at radiological survey of a former dredge outfall area. You can see the photograph there for the location of the historic outfalls, and right now preparing a summary report right of the radiological survey activities for these former outfall areas, and the outfall has now contained no detectable radioactive contamination rate in the background.

Next is the status of Investigation Area H1. And to date, we've backfilled pretty much all the hot spot excavation areas within the area H1 containment area. We will be doing some final grading and hydrosealing with native grasses later this year, and then finally we'll be completing site work on the remaining portion of the engineering cap on the containment area this summer and have that wrapped up by the end of the year. And then finally an update on the status of the creation area is. As you may recall, part of the remedial action plan for Investigation Area H1 required us to construct 8.25 acres to be wetlands. The majority of this area has been planted with pickleweed, alkali heath, fat hen, and saltgrass, so provide habitat for the salt marsh harvest mouse, and two photos there of some of the wildlife enjoying the wetland areas. A portion of the area is designed for waterable habitat there, and the early rains have helped with the development of this new habitat. Certainly more rain would be welcome, not just for the habitat area, but all of us here in northern California. So that's all I had unless there's any questions.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Cris. Next would be our regulatory update, so Chip.

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

MR. GRIBBLE: You were talking about the dredge survey and the dredge ponds, reminded me of something I heard in the office. There was another military base I think last week where they found some rad that had an activity 10 rad per hour. That represents more radioactivity in that one little item than all the radioactive waste that was taken out of Mare Island shipyard in that Radio Waste Survey 96, one item on this other base more than all of the radioactivity that was removed from Mare Island. There was -- which is comment about how little is -- what existed at Mare Island, how little radioactive waste there was at Mare Island versus this one.

Anyway, let's see. The last month we did the Weston Transfer Parcel Outfall and San Pablo Bay. We submitted comments to Weston on that, basically saying we believe that we need to do a lot more characterization out there before we move further towards additional excavation work, discussing some other alternative. We submitted comments to the Navy on Investigation Area A2. A couple of unresolved issues there, which is, you know, the treatment -- how PCB's will be

addressed in the documents. Right now standpoint from a regulatory standpoint, and I guess that's the main one. However, having said that, maybe the Navy apparently has the contract, so we're told, to abate the PCB sites in that area. So that's a way of getting past that if that ever gets done, which I believe is scheduled for this summer. Is that correct, Mike?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, I don't know which exact month, but, yeah, there is a contract awarded for the PCB work.

MR. GRIBBLE: And then we have the meeting on IR17. The City announced to the regulatory agencies and the Navy that they are interested in getting the IR17 site contamination addressed to the point where they can put in their utilities down -- it's not Cedar is it --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Azuar.

MR. GRIBBLE: Azuar by the school. So we were -- we got a meeting with the Navy and regulatory agencies to talk about how to get that done, and then we have another meeting that's actually about offshore use restrictions in light of a number of entities that are interested in accessing the dry docks or using the waterfront in some capacity, which in some cases also calls for some dredging. So in order for that to happen, there would need to be some -- well, we have no use restrictions in place for the offshore areas. That's part of the issue, and the other one is we're still trying to characterize the sediment in the offshore, which also is another complication for any interested entity that's interested in dredging. So we need to have that done to move forward the dredging.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Chip. Brian, Water Board?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, we're approaching summer, which means that people want to get work done. There's no surprise that I've been looking at work plans and doing site visits.

MR. FARLEY: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Some of the work plans that we're doing, there's two UST sites, UST 839 and UST 831 where they're planning to do some remedial action, which is good news. So we've been looking at those work plans, and as Steve mentioned, there's a pilot study in IR15, and we've been having meetings and reviewing work plans related to that. With the Navy, we've been working on having meetings the site visit for IR17, as Chip mentioned. There's also -- they're looking at moving forward some work in the Building 742 area. Let's see. Other site visits, there's work related to IAC1 FOPL's and visiting some of those excavations, and Linda Rao, she's been working on offshore areas sediment work. There are comments on one of the outfalls, the SSTP outfall, and she's also been involved with some other people at the Water Board, and with Chip on this proposal for doing some dredging, and I think that's it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Carolyn from EPA is not here. So we'll go to co-chair's update. Want to go first?

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure. I actually forgot to bring the current issue of the Navy mag -- environmental magazine Currents, which I just received a couple of days ago, but those of you who represent CH2M Hill and also the Navy will probably want to go take a look at that issue because it has an article of Vieques and clean-up there of the impact range in progress that CH2M has made on that site, and since I visited there a couple of years ago, that has been of interest. So, again, the

Navy Currents magazine, and you should be able to go on-line and find that magazine electronically as well.

Here I started to give the Navy progress report, and the only other thing I'll note is that with a little modification to some of the text, I've just published the May issue of the calendar for Mare Island for archeology outings and programs and events for the remainder of the year. And we've had -- just want to thank everybody who over the years has made it possible for us to have access to the area, that a portion of the area that is slated for the regional park, and I know that many regulators, environmental clean-up staff, and Navy personnel as well as city personnel have been responsible as well as the RAB been responsible for ensuring that that property is now available even on an interim basis. Kenn gave a hike, his first hike of the spring at the south shore this last Saturday, and previous Saturday I led outings to the top of the hill cemetery, and we made front page story for that Sunday that actually got also carried on the Sunday edition of Contra Costa times, the Mercury News because they're all related newspapers. So just want to really remind people that environmental clean-up does have a purpose and use and that is to make other public uses possible.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks Myrna. For the Navy update, I'll refer to this page -- when the Navy plugged the manholes outside Building 742. There were two manholes that we plugged with concrete just last week or actually this week. We're going to be doing further field activities once we have our EE/CA put together.

Brian talked about the Building 742, and both Brian and Chip talked about Site 17, which is the next item down below. There was a bunch of people out there on Monday, as Chip mentioned and Brian, doing a site walk there. Nice picture of a bunch of people there. We're going to be doing passive soil gas sampling there first, and then after we get the results of that, we'll then do full sampling of the soil, ground water, and active soil gas sampling out at that site.

If you turn the sheet over, you'll see the Navy submitted four documents since the last RAB meeting a lot of them were basically response to comments that were received from the regulatory agencies on the offshore area Investigation Area F1, and we submitted some closure site reports for a few PCB sites. And we also submitted response to comments on the Draft Final Geophysical Investigation down in the PMA and SSA. We also received a decent amount of comments and/or closure letters from the agencies. We received some comments on the Navy's Revisions to Response to Comments at A2. We requested ARAR's for EE/CA, for regulatory agencies at Building 742, which ARAR stands for Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. And we received them from both the DTSC and the EPA, and the Water Board, I believe. Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Not yet. Next week.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I'm sorry.

MR. THOMPSON: Next week.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next week. No, we got them from you all for Site 17 and for --

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry, for the J lines.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: Sorry.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And then we did receive a Closure Letter from DTSC on the inside segment of the J line, which we presented at the RAB actually last month. So that was good. Let's see. I guess that's about it for now. Any questions?

Although I do have a couple comments I'd like to make. One is at the conclusion, RAB members can actually stay because we would like to get a picture since we have a camera here. It would be good to have an updated picture of the RAB members. I appreciate it. And somebody please take the rest of the cake home. It would be greatly appreciated. I guess with that, we'll move into our final comment period. Okay. No public comment. All right. With that, we'll adjourn. We'll see you on May 29th. (The proceedings were concluded at 8:57 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Defense Reutilization Marketing Office (DRMO) Geophysical Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) Update – Navy/ CH2MHill
- Presentation Handout – Trenching Locations & Geophysical Test Areas – DRMO Site Fenced Scrapyard Area and Vicinity – Navy/CH2MHill
- Suspect UST 102 Update – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island

Mare Island Deliverable Schedule – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island

Mare Island RAB Update April 2008 – Weston Solutions

Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard April 2008

A News Note and Calendar for Mare Island – ARC Ecology May 2008