

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, June 26, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, June 26th, at the JFK Library, Joseph Room 505 Santa Clara St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:04 p.m. and adjourned at 9:24 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
- Chris Rasmussen
- Jerry Karr
- Wendell Quigley

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

- Marie Dreyer (Acting Navy Co-Chair)
- Stephen Peck (Navy)
- Jessica Beck (TetraTech EMI)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Brian Thompson (Water Board)
- Paisha Jorgenson (Water Board)
- Carolyn D'Almeida (USEPA)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Dave Hodson (CH2MHill)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Dijj Christian
- Ally Farley
- Bill Stevens
- Dan Koster
- Jim Porterfield
- Marilyn Wong
- Richard Burnett
- James Moore

RAB Support from CDM:

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: All right, folks, let's -- I guess we'll go ahead and get started. Wendell assures me I will not be hit over the head by Myrna for starting without her.

MR. QUIGLEY: She won't hurt you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: So here we go. Good evening and welcome to the June, 2008 Restoration Advisory Board meetings. I'm sure all of you realize I am not Michael Bloom --

(APPLAUSE.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thank you. He's actually in Iowa this week with his daughter and his wife. They are touring the state, both to look at the university and just to tour the state in general. She's actually going to be spending her next four years there attending the Iowa State University. So as a shout out to Ms. Emily Bloom, best wishes to you. And now you'll be immortalized forever in the June, 2008 RAB meeting minutes.

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Marie Dreyer, I'm the acting lead RPM for Mare Island. And tonight I'll also be acting as the RAB Co-Chair for tonight. And with that said, I will pass on the mike to continue on with the introductions.

MR. KARR: Thanks. Jerry Karr of Vallejo, Napa Solano Audubon Society.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Paisha Jorgensen, Water Board.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston on Mare Island.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Chris Rasmussen, citizen.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble with the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill.

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

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. FARLEY: Allison Farley, Steve Farley's daughter.

MR. HODSON: David Hodson, CH2M Hill.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Diji Christian, Shoreline Preserve Advisory Board.

MS. BECK: Jessica Beck, Tetra Tech EMI.

MR. WILLIAMS: Howard Williams, Historic Ships Memorial Pacific Square.

MR. SIEMENS: Bill Siemens, Historic Ships Memorial Pacific Square USSI.

MR. KOSTER: Dan Koster with the Vallejo Economic Development Commission.

MS. WONG: Marilyn Wong, USS Iowa Project.

MR. PECK: Stephen Peck, Navy.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski from Benicia.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thank you. And Carolyn D'Almeida from EPA just walked in as well. Let's get started with our first presentation. It is titled the, "Installation Restoration Site Update, Phase I Fieldwork." And it will be given by Mr. Steve Peck with the Navy.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Installation Restoration (IR) Site 17 Update: Phase I Fieldwork*
Presentation by Mr. Steve Peck, Navy

MR. PECK: If I can ask you all, we'll be using the green hymnals tonight. Okay.

Okay. Michael had asked that I give everyone an update on where we are with Site 17. We're going to be starting Phase 1 of our field investigation. And so I would like to -- I've been introduced, but I'd like to also introduce Jessica Beck, and she's with Chadux, and she's the project manager. And actually Jessica knows a lot more about the site than I do, so she's going to nudge me along here.

Okay. What I'd like to do is I'd like to bring everybody up to date on the site history for Site 17. And then after touching base on that, I will then continue onto the purpose of a two part sampling program that we've called Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 and Phase 2 sampling objectives will follow that. Phase 1 is the Passive Soil Gas survey technique, and so I'll be describing that as well tonight. And again, a short overview of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 followed by the schedule.

To familiarize everyone with Site 17, the history of Site 17 was this site was paints and varnish were manufactured here in the forties to mid-fifties. In the fifties it actually closed up, and they had produced or the products, materials used in the painting and manufacturing process were stored in two tank farms -- which I'll be showing you -- and these were namely oils, solvents, and resins typical to paint manufacturing.

There were buildings removed -- which I'll indicate here shortly. And then following that on our CERCLA process we conducted removal actions in '98 and '99, and I'll be indicating that as well shortly, followed later by Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study that was completed more recently in 2006.

And there are recommendations in there to remove observed free product. So part of what we're doing is conducting some additional investigations there. I apologize if this doesn't come into focus too well, hopefully you'll be able to see a little bit more on your maps.

To give perspective here. This is Azuar Drive, it's running east-west. And J Street -- it's hard to see in here -- but it cuts along right in through here. This building along here is currently owned by Earthquake Protection Systems, you'll be able to see that across the top of their building. I'm going to be discussing a bit about some of the facilities associated with this paint manufacturing plant. And so this is Building 567, Building 519, both of these were removed which I'll show you. 503 is still present there. This 519, that one was removed in the sixties, in fact, but they left the foundation till, I guess, thirty years later they finally decided to remove that as well. 567 was removed later in the eighties. And that was an area where they manufactured the drums. 519 and 503, this is where most of the manufacturing operations occurred for the paints. And the products were fed in through these tank farms. And this is known as the Northern Tank Farm and the Southern Tank Farm. And these two tank farms were removed also in the sixties about the same time as Building 519. 503 was later used as a naval reserve training center in the sixties. And these two buildings, which I believe are still standing here and here, were used for warehouses to store the RAW products as well as the finished products.

Okay. This slide kind of sits right on top of the other slide. So you'll see here this is, again, the North Tank Farm and the South Tank Farm. These are the buildings that were removed as I

indicated. This is Building 503 still in existence. And this is now where the Earthquake Protection Systems has their operation, not associated with the Navy. Some previous removal actions were conducted which reduced threats to human health via polychlorinated biphenyls, PCBs, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PAH's, and metals in surface soil. Approximately 4,000 tons of soil was excavated from the areas in 1988 -- I'm sorry, 1998 to 1999. And I'll show you here some photos in a sec here, but this comprised the area of the entire footprint of Building 519. The eastern and southern sides of the former electrical substation which was adjacent to Building 567. Some locations along the vicinity of Buildings 503 and 519. And the product distribution pipelines that ran between those two tank farms, as well as an oil water separator associated with 519.

So again here I just want to flip this slide just to show you -- I'm going to show you some pictures of this area. This was the former Building 519 prior to removal -- or I'm sorry, this was the foundation that was left from the sixties, and that was removed in 1998 as part of a removal action. That's what it currently looks like at this point. And this is looking sort of to the southeast with this building now is the -- again, the Earthquake Protection Systems building. This is kind of looking now at the opposite view to the other direction, standing on the other side of Azuar Road. This is where the Northern Tank Farm was located. So in '98 through '99 these removal actions were conducted, and they achieved the removal action goals set for those actions. We also had some site related contaminants that were detected above comparison criteria subsequent to these removal actions in other areas of the site. And namely these were Volatile Organic Compounds, VOC's, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons, TPHs, again Polyaromatic Hydrocarbons, PAH's, and arsenic in soil. The VOCs, TPH, phenolic compounds, formaldehyde, nickel, and zinc, were detected in groundwater. So there was recommended removal of free product in the vicinity of wells 17W12 and 17W15, which I'll indicate here shortly in the map.

MR. KARR: Test wise?

MR. PECK: Yes, sorry, right. Test wise, not production wise. And I'll show you the slide here shortly.

So now the purpose of going back out there is to gain a more current Conceptual Site Model of where Site 17 stands today. So the majority of groundwater soil and data was collected around '98 to '99 and may not represent current site conditions. So we know that additional data collection is necessary to understand current site conditions. And what we propose to do, or we will be doing, I should say, is we're going to accommodate this in two phases; with the first phase going out to do a Passive Soil Gas survey -- which I'll describe here in the next couple of slides. And this is a qualitative field screening tool to give us a better idea as to where to go back and collect further soil and groundwater samples to delineate areas that may be possible for further removal action if needed. And we'll also go out and collect some active soil gas samples in Summa canisters to complete the vapor intrusion risk evaluation for this site. So again, I won't reiterate too much, but the Passive Soil Gas survey is, again, a qualitative analysis, and that's to give us a better picture to go back, and sort of a screening tool, if you will, to go back and further determine where's the best areas to go ahead and collect soil and groundwater samples.

So I want to explain a little bit and have a little bit of show and tell as to what a Passive Soil Gas survey is. These are soil gas samplers that are placed below the sound surface at multiple determined locations. And Jessica has samples of the actual ones that we'll be using. These samplers that are being passed around, what they do is they absorb the volatile compounds and equilibrate with the surface conditions. So we keep them in the ground for a period of about two

weeks, and then pull them out and then send them to the lab for analysis. And, in essence, the data is then determined from these samples. It's a time weighted maximum value over the period of two weeks.

So this is obviously what you guys are seeing. In order to install these samplers, we'll have direct push rigs, such as the ones pictured here, which will drill a small hole that this can be pushed down in about three feet into the ground. And then -- Jessica's not pictured here, but -- Jessica and her team will then go ahead and put these samplers in. And these samplers are by Beacon, and I guess their kits are called B SURE kits apparently. These samples are pushed into the ground for about a foot or so, and again left there for a period of two weeks.

So the plan is -- and I'll show this diagram here -- the plan is to install approximately 250 Passive Soil Gas samplers on a grid across the entire site. And the spacing for this will be fifty feet apart on this grid in most of the locations, particularly where petroleum free product had previously been identified. And then there will be outer perimeter areas where we'll place at a hundred foot grid. And so on the back of your handouts you have a better presentation here. This is the grid that we're looking to achieve. Jessica and her team were out locating spots today, in fact. And the couple wells I had mentioned earlier one is here, and the other one is over here. So there had been some indication at one point of a free product sheen, a petroleum sheen, but I don't know if that's been -- that hasn't been consistent over time.

MS. BECK: It was like the last time that they sampled there, so it didn't show up for many years and then in 2002 it showed up.

MR. PECK: Okay. So again, the sampler there that's attached to the string will be pulled out of the ground in a couple of weeks, and then it will be sent off to the lab. And the constituents that we're looking at are namely constituents that we had identified in previous sampling out there which is the BTEX: Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylenes, Naphthalene, 2-Methylnaphthalene, and 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene, and 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene. As well as the TPH cluster.

And then at the lab, what they do is they provide these contaminant maps. Again, it's more of a qualitative analysis. And this is kind of just showing the typical scaling range and the coloring associated on the maps.

I'm going to show a couple -- these two examples are not Mare Island, but I just wanted to kind of show the audience here as to what the information is that we get back from the lab, and namely it's a qualitative expression of where the constituents might be, where the contaminants might be in terms of within the soil and the groundwater. Was that said right?

MS. BECK: Uh-huh.

MR. PECK: Okay. Great. And again, you can see is that the range of values here is, it's pretty wide, but this will give us an idea where to zero in on Phase 2 to collect this next round of sampling. So in Phase 2, just to kind of give you a preview at this point, is the results again from this PSG survey will focus the additional sampling in Phase 2.

Right now, this will be determined further in the work plan, but ballpark estimate would be about 30 soil samples would be collected in Phase 2, and collecting groundwater samples from about ten wells to verify the extent of free product in groundwater. And then we'll also go ahead and collect active soil gas samplers with the Summa canisters, and those are the round vacuum chambers that you open up and the air gets vacuumed in. And we'll do this at approximately 40 locations.

So wrapping up is the schedule that we have planned for Phase 1 is we're in the process now, we've sent to the agencies the work plan that basically discusses what I've shown tonight. We're actually looking to go into the field and do the direct push and placement of these samples July 16th. Again, that covers a couple week period. We'll then be able to take those out in two weeks and we'll get results back from the lab around August 15th. And from that point we'll be able to set up our sampling analysis plans for conducting Phase 2, determining where we want to collect the soil, where we want to collect the groundwater. That, of course, will go for review to the BCT. And we're looking then to be in the field with the Phase 2 quantitative sampling, if you will, October running through November, and getting those sampling results back in November.

So just in summary then is that we're doing this Phase 1 sampling to go back into the field to get more current recent results. And we're going to narrow it down to go into Phase 2 sampling which is more the quantitative, more exact in numbers to establish our Site Conceptual Model. We'll also be collecting, again, active soil gas samples with the Summa canisters to be able to complete vapor intrusion risk evaluation of the site. And I think that's about it. I'd entertain any comments or questions.

MR. KARR: The well sites, are these existing or -- from your -- it shows roughly ten on your map here, are those existing wells or to be drilled or what?

MR. PECK: The ones shown on the map would be existing wells.

MR. KARR: Do you have any plans to locate any additional wells downstream?

MR. PECK: Yes, as soon as -- when we get the results back from, again, the Phase 1 stuff, that will better help us appreciate whether these existing wells have that coverage that we need, or whether we need to broaden the network or use a hydro punch. A hydro punch we can direct push and collect the water to get a better idea of the areas that we've seen from this earlier Phase 1 activity.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I have a question. Is there something that's not shown on this as yet? Is there a Phase 3 which might be removal of these materials if the results determine that that may be necessary? Is that down the road next year or something?

MR. PECK: That is correct. The timing -- I don't have the schedule in front of me, but if after Phase 2 collection it's deemed that there is an area that exceeds the established or some established criteria that we've set, then yes, we'd go ahead and most likely conduct a removal action. That would be the Phase 3 that you've termed.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I just had a question about, you said that the results were qualitative, but you are actually having the data analyzed? You do get quantitative data back from this? And what are the detection limits for this particular method?

MR. PECK: Want to take a stab at the detection limits?

MS. BECK: I think it's down to 25 nanograms or --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Nanograms per grams?

MS. BECK: I don't know. I have something with me that --

MR. PECK: Carolyn, I used the word qualitative because it's not as exacting as obviously the samples that we collect and go through the whole CERCLA Q/A process. So there is a quantitative

number range like that scale indicates that would indicate, okay, this location would tend to show much more concentration than the outer areas or so, for example, as shown in the previous diagrams. But that's not the one that we would stick into any risk models or anything like that, if that's your question.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Right. Okay.

MR. PECK: It's just, again, to kind of narrow our focus, in consultation with yourselves, to find out where is the best place to go and collect those quantitative, more exacting samples.

MR. GRIBBLE: I just want to make sure that we're clear here. The city came to us in a meeting and said that they wanted to start digging along Azuar as of the Fall of 2008. So the timetable that you presented up there doesn't allow for the city to access that property by the Fall of 2008. So what is the plan? What is the Touro plan for the development of that north end land? Are they not going to build a cancer center or are they going to delay it some numbers of years, or what's going on there?

MR. PECK: Chip, I'm just going to be able to address our part of it. And namely, our schedule has been driven to the best of our ability to be able to get these results out of the field by November. And the discussions, you know -- and obviously Michael Bloom would be a better representative in that part -- but the discussions that have been held that I'm aware of was that there was a timeframe that they were looking to be able to make decisions about moving into the road. So Marie wants to add to that.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Yeah, please. The city is definitely aware of our schedule -- of this schedule. In fact, we are talking, we're making sure that our sampling doesn't impact what they're trying to do. So we're definitely making sure we don't step on each other's toes.

MR. GRIBBLE: But the sampling ends at the time that they want access to the property. There isn't any time available for a removal action to remove the contaminants in that strip or that corridor.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: They, like I said, they're aware of our schedule. They're aware that there may be potential removal action further down the line. And we are communicating so they are aware of it.

MR. GRIBBLE: And why is it the potential? The Risk Assessment, the Remedial Investigation and the Feasibility Study concluded that the Risk Assessment couldn't be completed because of the vapor gas component of the Risk Assessment and, in effect, the site had an excess of non-acceptable contamination as it stood, we just couldn't determine how unacceptable because of the vapor intrusion aspect. And that's why the Navy and we agreed for a removal action some time ago. So my understanding is that it's not a possible or a maybe, but it is a definite need to have remediation for this site, additional remediation. So as I understand it the timetable that you're proposing up there, you're working with presenting, doesn't allow for any remediation in a timeframe that we were, last I heard from the city in their timetable, that works with the Touro development schedule.

MR. PECK: Well, I think that's a two part question.

The first part, as I understand it, and you can correct me, has to do with, I think, the data. And the data from my understanding is the data from '98. I don't believe we have more recent data.

So we've had, obviously, Chip, as you're aware, we've had discussions with yourself and BCT as to the need to go back and conduct this two-part step to obtain the newer data, including our last BCT.

Also too we've also discussed the schedule during that BCT as well as Marie's alluding to phone calls that the Navy has had with the city. So I think the people that you mentioned are cognizant of where things stand.

MR. GRIBBLE: I just -- not that the newspaper always gets it right, but I keep reading in the newspaper, you know, these stories about everybody looking forward to the Touro cancer treatment center going in, and it doesn't seem like that's based in reality as far as I understand it.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: The Navy --

MR. GRIBBLE: And I'm surprised that Touro isn't here too. I've been trying to contact them to ask them these questions, and I can't seem to find anybody that's available.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thanks, Chip. And again, I assure everybody we are talking, they are aware of our schedule and, like I said, aware of the potential for removal actions.

MR. QUIGLEY: Tuesday night at the city council Touro said that they were going to go forth in September. This is what they presented to the city.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: I have to be honest, that's a date I hadn't heard. But perhaps Michael knows more, so --

MR. PECK: I think there are different portions too that they're involved with, so some portions may be other areas besides some of the ones we may be discussing.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: That is true.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Also from the meeting Tuesday night, the city council meeting Tuesday night, someone with Touro or one of the planning people or someone commented, and it wasn't pursued at all, and this may have to do with what this gentleman mentioned, but they indicated they wanted to have access to some grounds south of G Street over towards Azuar somewhere, so it wasn't named exactly where this was.

MR. PECK: Was it G or J?

MR. RASMUSSEN: South of G --

MR. PECK: Okay.

MR. RASMUSSEN: -- to install some infrastructure improvements associated with the Touro project.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, south of G would more than likely be Lennar property; right, Neal? Depending on where south of G on Azuar is. If it was on the west side that would be, you know, property that had some cleanup issues; correct, Neal, still?

MR. SILER: That's right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But if it was on the inboard side or this side it might be okay. But it sounds like it's probably just a utility corridor access or something like that.

MR. RASMUSSEN: That was the impression that came across just from the brief comment that was made in the council meeting on Tuesday which, as I said, was not pursued or expounded upon.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Would there be a way to expedite this project? Would this map in itself give us enough data to go out and start excavation? The Phase 1 map, once we have all the data plotted there, would that give us enough information qualitatively to plan a removal action?

MR. PECK: That's a good question, Carolyn. Let me go ahead and bring that back to the team and discuss that. Part of what may be -- I wouldn't say problematic, but -- is trying to establish, you know, the cleanup goals to go and do the removal action. So I mean likewise, too, we want concurrence with the BCT, because we would not want to go back and do another removal action if the BCT did not feel that that data represented what we were cleaning up. So --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Can we go with, say, Residential PRGs as our cleanup goal for this removal action?

MR. PECK: Typically those are screening levels, they're not the definite, you know, they're not --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: True, but they are risk based, and we've used that before for removal actions.

MR. PECK: Let me ask Michael to put that on the agenda for the BCT or an earlier meeting.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And this is just a question -- sorry I'm late. But does the Navy have the money to do a project, this project all the way through to removal action? Do you have that budgeted potentially for this year, or do you have money in your pocket you could do that?

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Yes, we do. Well, it's future budgeted, of course, depending upon approvals and such, but it is part of our plan. Any further questions?

MR. SILER: Actually, Stephen, I have a couple of questions for you. What's different about Navy paint that would necessitate having its own manufacturing plant on site? I mean it seems to me that the battleship gray is battleship gray, and why wouldn't they go and look for a commercial manufacturer?

MR. PECK: I don't know if I can -- that's from the 1940's and 1950's.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That might seem the case if you'd watched a few movies. But, in fact, I happened to be at the National Archive last month, and I was sitting in San Bruno, I was sitting at a table, and our team was in front of the team from Washington State in some other part of the world. And they were looking for paint -- paint examples on photos, and also paint formulas -- which we amazingly threw away by the truckloads here -- to try to replicate authentic, you know, paint schemes. And there was actually, because we were a submarine base as well as a battleship gray base, we had lots of paints and coatings and had a whole testing facility. I mean, that's my only response.

MR. SILER: Yeah, I guess I could understand that for the fast attack and slow approach boats for the submarines because they had acoustic properties that was associated with it. Back in the forties when you had, you know, the battleship, I think they were just going out and putting them together to try and sink something.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well the subs actually had like four paint colors on the World War II subs depending on whether it was the top, the top was black, the last third was black, the first two-thirds was a different color of a greenish gray. Yeah. So -- But they -- this was a place that was on the

cutting edge of technology of coatings in general, not just, you know, off Sherwin Williams. Well, maybe they were too.

MR. SILER: And then the other question I had for you, on your slide 24 you had mentioned that you have this qualitative soil gas survey, and it looked like that was Phase 1. And Phase 2 you were looking at that to try to go ahead and find the areas where you had free product as far as petroleum hydrocarbons were concerned. And I was wondering what the relationship between the qualitative soil gas results and finding the TPH free product was?

MR. PECK: Okay. Just to make sure, you had a two part question, and your last part, the first was - or I got the last part was you want to know the qualitative relationship between the collection of these Passive Soil Gas samplers and what would be in the soil? Is that --

MR. SILER: Yeah, if you look under slide 24, Stephen, it says, "Results from Phase 1 PSG survey will be used to focus the additional sampling in Phase 2." And then the second bullet: "Collect approximately 30 soil samples to verify presence and extent of free product in soil." And I was wondering how these Passive Soil Gas sampling results are going to lead you to getting those soil samples to be able to find the free product?

MR. PECK: Okay. I'm going to speak generally, and then I'll hand it over to Jessica to maybe add some detail to it. But the soil gas samplers themselves would absorb what's going to, you know, desorb off of the soil from the soil itself into the interstitial space and stuff in collecting in that conduit. Also, as she mentioned too, this will also be an aluminum cap on these holes with some soil put on top too to try to stanch that equilibration. Is your concern perhaps if it's a free product area the impact on the sampler itself, or just the skyrocket and the concentrations or --

MR. SILER: I think what you're doing --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think you need to use the microphone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm sorry, I stole your guys --

MR. SILER: I think what you're saying is you're making an inference based on the concentration that you're seeing in the soil gas qualitative soil gas results to whether there's free product there or not, it looks like to me.

MR. PECK: Correct, and which -- I mean that's a great segue, I think, to the previous question that I think Carolyn had too is that, again, this is a qualitative process, so we're not pegging criteria necessarily to this Passive Soil Gas sampling. Is there anything --

MS. BECK: (Shook head.)

MR. PECK: Did that hit the other part of your question?

MR. SILER: That's what I was asking.

MR. PECK: Brian, you had a question too?

MR. THOMPSON: I just wanted to provide an overall comment on the strategy. This type of a screening, screening methods are often used where there's a lot of unknowns, and it's a good way to kind of gauge what's going on to target collecting specific samples where you get a quantitative analysis.

And what we're doing here is kind of the reverse where there was a lot of sampling that was done, and there still are some unknowns, and we're going to do a screening method now to get a better constraint what the unknowns are. And the question that Carolyn brought up is can we use that information to target a removal action? And I would put a vote in that yes, we can, because we already have specific samples that were taken to get a quantitative analysis. So you can overprint the two. And there has been some time between when those samples were collected and now, but you can always use that as the maximum estimate for what you would be doing. And you should be able to plan a removal action from that. So there may be some level of sampling after that to confirm it, but in order -- if there's, I think there needs to be -- in support of what Chip was saying - - there needs to be communication with the city of Vallejo to figure out what the expectations are on the timing, and to consider a faster removal approach if those schedules conflict.

MR. KARR: That pretty much answered what I intended to say because based on Chip's comment, if there was remediation required from the existing data, that certainly would indicate that remediation is indicated, and is the testing going to determine has the earth healed itself or has the plume expanded in size? I don't understand the goal, really, of relooking at the data if existing data shows remediation is required.

MR. PECK: Well, I think two things are occurring here. And a couple of these are kind of before I stepped into the project. And I know the BCT had been involved in discussions with establishing where we were moving forward on this in a couple of meetings. With that said, is that that are data gaps, in fact, out there. And there were concerns presented to us by the BCT themselves, too, in terms of soil gas inhalation, etcetera. So we're trying to find an immediate effective way to be able to go and pinpoint exactly where we need to collect the samples. Also, too, the nature of compounds, which are volatile, means that the concentrations of these compounds do change over time. And so the results that had been collected in the past may not be representative of where things stand today. And also, too, we want to get a better understanding if indeed we've covered or we do cover the unknowns. And that grid that's being proposed is much more comprehensive than previous sampling that had been conducted at the site, much more comprehensive. And in fact, in the meetings with the BCT, the BCT asked us to include even more points. In fact, some of the fifty point grids we've -- or some of the hundred point grids we've reduced to fifty point grids because of the collective agreement amongst the BCT, the regulators, and the Navy. So that's what's being proposed is stuff that had been discussed previously. I think that's -- there was another thought but that's -- I'll stop there.

MR. THOMPSON: Just a couple more comments. One of them is that in terms of evaluating how much conditions may have changed is -- there are monitoring wells out there, and if there's product present that you're detecting, some sulphates and constituents, and the concentrations in those wells haven't changed that much. That gets you information on how much conditions may have changed. It gives you some information on how much conditions may have changed. So I think there are ways we can look at the data we have. Specifically, we have long term wells out there, we're getting reproducible results presumably, and we can look at those and say, is it reasonable to assume that conditions may have significantly changed? So that can kind of answer that question. If there's product present now, there's product present then. I think there's product observed in some of those wells. And if there's product present at the site, our mandate from the Water Board is that the product needs to be removed to the maximum extent practical. So that answers the question as to whether corrective action is needed or not at the site right there. And then looking at the concentrations in the wells, you can kind of determine, once again, the likelihood of there being

significant concentrations. So I think the important thing here is that the screening, the plan for the Phase 1 is important, it's going to get us to look at some of the unknowns.

And then the question I really have is the presumption that we're going to need to do a lot of sampling after that. We may not need to do that, we may be able to come up with a Corrective Action Plan as needed. If what we see in Phase 1 is different than what we're seeing, and we have well results that are significantly different, then there's an opportunity where we get together after Phase 1 is done and talk about if we need to regroup and to do some more sampling.

MR. PECK: I would agree with that, definitely. Now I ask, I guess, to return is you folks have the plan to do Phase 1, if we can get your guys comment about it, we're ready to go and collect the samples. And then we can reconvene to discuss what's the best approach for the next step. I think I may have taken my allotted time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe so. I have just a couple of questions. I assume there's an approach that you've been taking on this site for so many years that was based on a particular thinking of the BCT and the Navy and its contractors. Do you all believe that you would take a different tack knowing that one of the city's developers apparently needs that property for their development? Is there a faster way to get to the same end result?

And I don't know if this came up before I came in, I'm sorry I was late, but whether you even have the opportunity to screen this product to see if it would be -- preliminarily if it would be suitable to head for the landfill. I don't know if any of that's come up before it gets its cover on it or whether that timing would be possible to save on cost if removal was what was decided was the best approach.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, we've had some conversation about ways to expedite this or not. But I'm particularly concerned about what appears to be a disconnect in the scheduling, the timing of the Navy's work here versus what the city and Touro have in mind. And, unless I'm mistaken, that concerns me that somebody's expecting something that's not going to happen, or that's not currently being planned to happen.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And Myrna, I just wanted to state for the record that what the Navy is proposing to do now is what the EPA has been asking them to do for years at this site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That was my understanding, yeah.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yeah, so we're thrilled that they're finally doing it.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thanks, everyone.

And again, Chip, just to reiterate, I know the schedules look funny, but we are talking with the city, we understand where our program is, we understand what their needs are, we understand and we're looking at ways to, you know, work with each other, again, so that we don't step on each others toes and needs for this North Island Site.

Looks like we're done with questions, so let's continue on --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually he didn't answer my question.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Sorry, Myrna turned to me and said that I didn't answer her question about the landfill. That's a very big topic and issue with us right now, particularly our

upper management. We are definitely looking into possibilities or what we can do to see if we could utilize the landfill while it's still open.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That seems like you'd have to be on the fast track for that.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Right. That is one of the things we have to --

MR. GRIBBLE: Can you use the microphone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Would I use the microphone? That just seems like you'd have to be on a really fast track to do that, so I assume you're going to be trying to put that landfill to bed, put it under its covers before winter, eh?

MR. GEMAR: Tuck it in?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, something like that.

MR. GEMAR: That has been the current plan, unless it changes. So far we haven't been directed to change.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, this is once again a good example of why early and often communication -- which is what the purpose of the RAB and the RAB law is -- would be very beneficial in terms of the city's current developer and the city itself. It's sort of frustrating to sit here and have some speculative conversation with only one party in this particular project, which is, you know, the owner of record, the responsible party of record, but here, you know, we might not be even talking about half of this conversation if there wasn't some other driver that was now out there somewhere either. Frustrating. I tried to get them here.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: One last question?

MR. QUIGLEY: Yeah, please. Wendell Quigley. So can we get some clarification, can I get some clarification on this? We're going ahead or they're not going ahead? Are they going to do the -- put the cap, finish the cap on the H1 Area, or are they leaving it open for the north end of the island? We're kind of hanging out here now. I thought it was a done deal.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: No, I mean it's not a completely done deal, you know, the Navy hasn't yet decided what to do to best, you know, like Myrna said, save on costs or other things. Truth be told, Wendell, our upper management hasn't yet come to a conclusion as to what we will be doing with the landfill.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And as far as --

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: So as Dwight -- excuse me just a moment. So as Dwight had said, currently the plan is to go ahead and tuck it in by the end of the year.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And as far as this project is concerned, one of the things that's still up in the air that we need this data for is to figure out if the soils that we have here that need to be excavated even meet the acceptance criteria for the landfill. So we haven't even got that question answered yet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that is what I just said. I said if you find that the -- that it would meet the criteria, what mechanism would you use, and would you do that? So, yeah, I understand that. But here again, in April, we -- the RAB Co-Chairs were asked to have the current developer, wanted to have a presentation here by June, and I've offered many times for them to give a

presentation about their plans here at this meeting, and we didn't get a response. So for those of you who might be in contact with them, I think this is an important venue for that conversation to take place.

MR. QUIGLEY: You talking about Touro?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes. Yes.MR. GRIBBLE: That was my question. You've been talking to Touro to get them to come here and give a presentation?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, they requested in April to use the June time -- the RAB to give a more overarching conversation -- presentation specifically about their building. They want their building to be state-of-the-art, as we all might want that, and to be LEED certified. They're shooting for platinum which I guess is up there somewhere. And we suggested to them that this wasn't -- this wasn't the venue to -- you could say, talk about that in passing, but that this wasn't the venue to talk about just general building construction practices. We're really here to talk about environmental cleanup.

And with the comments I made and others have made, you've made on the initial study, it would have been a great opportunity for them to come back and say this is how we will proceed, and we're working in partnership with the Navy or we're in communication. But they declined then to come back and talk about their plan for addressing the environmental issues in their plan. So I'm eager to have them come as soon as possible to get the rest of the story.

MR. GRIBBLE: I've made several calls and left messages, and I haven't heard anything back from them. Touro.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Okay. Thanks, folks. And sorry, but in the interest of time and Dave's being so patient here, I think we should go onto the second presentation. It is titled the, "Underground Storage Tank 231 Remediation Update." And will be given by Mr. Dave Hodson with CH2M Hill.

III. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Underground Storage Tank (UST) 231 Remediation Update*
Presentation by Mr. Dave Hodson, CH2MHill and Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island

MR. HODSON: Thank you. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Hodson. I'm an engineer with CH2M Hill. I've been working on the Mare Island project for about seven years, and I'm going to be presenting an update on the remediation at UST Site 231.

I'm really excited to present this site to you. I think it's an interesting site. I think it does present some technical challenges, but I think it's a good site to present to you, in particular, for the RAB meeting. The agenda for the presentation, I'm going to quickly go over and provide an update on the background. This site was presented during a RAB presentation in February, 2008. At that point we were preparing the Remedial Action Workplan or RAW. I'm also then going to update you with the progress that's been made since that February meeting. It's been about four months, and there actually has been a lot of progress. I'm going to do a brief overview of the excavation plan, and then follow that up with the progress that's been made since excavation or since the removal action has began. And then just round it out with our plan for post remedy monitoring, and the next steps forward which will include the schedule.

UST Site 231 is located in Investigation Area H2 or IA H2. H2 is located in the central portion of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel or, generally speaking, in the center of Mare Island. It's a small IA. It's one that doesn't see a lot of activity right now. And the site in particular, 231, is located in an area where the proposed future land use is residential.

MR. FARLEY: This photo shows many features around the site. In particular, I'm going to first present the features that are associated with UST 231. We have the two former USTs, 231, one, and 231, both located in the southern portion of UST -- I'm sorry, Building 231. There's a car filling station located adjacent to the former USTs. It's actually a former car filling station and a former pump station as well. There also is associated piping that connected these features, and they also connected up to another UST Site, 243. Now, this Site 243 is being evaluated as a separate site and not as part of 231. You'll see there's a number of other features to the north, AST's, USTs, car fills, status. These are not known sources or not associated with the former USTs --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you not use acronyms?

MR. HODSON: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because a lot of the audience doesn't know what they mean.

MR. HODSON: So I said USTs, and UST's are Underground Storage Tanks, I'll keep referring to them. So these sites are being addressed as other sites of potential environmental concern. Okay. Since the last RAB meeting in February we've completed the Remedial Action Workplan that was submitted to the agencies on February 28th. Both DTSC and the Water Board reviewed this document and provided comments in March and April. The response or the comments specific -- well, generally were addressing the post remedy monitoring that's going to occur after the removal action. So it didn't necessarily impact the size of the remediation project or the removal area. We're at this point now where we're addressing those comments, and we suspect in the next week that we will pair and submit those responses to comments to them.

So that leads up to June 2nd. June 2nd we actually began the removal action. It first started with some pre-excavation activities which I'll go over in later slides. And also in the later slides I will provide an update as far as how the progress has been made.

On June 10th an agency meeting was held to discuss, as I said, the post remedy monitoring is for groundwater and for soil gas. There were some comments from the agencies on how we would evaluate the soil gas, post remedy monitoring.

So a meeting was held on June 10th to just come to some kind of mutual agreement on how it's going to be approached. We decided that we were going to prepare what's called a Forward Risk Assessment after the samples have been collected. And currently right now we're preparing a technical memorandum that is going to explain the methodology of how that risk assessment is going to be conducted. And then, of course, ongoing with the removal action is a confirmation sample, soil sample sampling. And that's ongoing and will continue throughout the removal action. Okay.

There's a lot on this feature. What this illustrates is an interpretation of the analytical data that's been collected. These pink locations, what these represent are samples that have been collected at the site during previous investigations. Now these include soil samples and include groundwater samples and they also include soil gas samples. Now, this green area here, what that is that's an interpretation of where soil -- where TPH gasoline or Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as gasoline --

I'll just continue to refer to that as gasoline. It's where gasoline or diesel was detected above a hundred milligrams per kilogram. This is the Water Board's Environmental Screening Level, and it's also our cleanup criteria for the site. And this is for shallow soil, and that's within the first ten feet.

This purple area represents the gasoline concentrations in soil gas that exceeded roughly 10,000 micrograms per meter cubed. And this is the Water Board Environmental Screening Level for residential areas. And then the red line outlines this whole area is our proposed removal action area. There's also a couple other small areas here to the south.

Those excavations are proposed because we just did get a couple of hot spots right there, so we'll remove the soil from there as well. Also in yellow we have areas that represent former Navy removal actions and former CH2M Hill removal actions. And if I haven't pointed it out already, this building that's east of the site, that's Building 231. You'll see we also have a building that's illustrated on this photo, that's Building 531, that's actually been demolished.

Actually, let me go back for one second. I also want to point out that in addition to gasoline and diesel that was detected at the site, in soil we also had benzene and naphthalene that were detected above screening levels. In soil gas there was benzene, naphthalene, and ethyl benzene that was detected above screening levels. And in groundwater, gasoline, diesel, and ethylbenzene were detected. These areas aren't highlighted on this slide, but the locations of these samples where these were detected are within the red areas and are being addressed as part of this removal action.

Okay. So again this slide illustrates the removal action again. It represents roughly a 25,500 square foot area. And based on the analytical data, we've determined that the gasoline impacted soil extends to depths of approximately -- it's actually approximately eight or nine feet. And we've selected a depth of 9.5 feet for the removal action.

The way this removal action is going to be phased -- and I'll continue to expand on this a little more -- is that the soil will be removed, it will be directly loaded with an excavator or a backhoe into trucks, and then will be hauled off-site for landfill disposal. During the removal action, both sidewall and floor soil samples will be collected to confirm that our cleanup criteria are met throughout the process. Now, if those confirmation samples come back to be in exceedance of the screening levels, excavation will continue where possible both laterally and vertically.

Okay. When we got started there were a couple of hoops we had to jump through. There were requirements for this type of work. One being we had to obtain a city of Vallejo grading permit. So there are some other construction related pre-excavation actions include putting up a security fence around the site, this both keeps the public out and it just enables the site workers to stay within a confined area. There's also some privacy fencing that was put up along Azuar Drive. Equipment was mobilized and mobilized to the site. The surface concrete was removed. And also inactive subsurface utilities were capped -- were removed and then capped. Now, earlier on I pointed out that there were a couple of other site features that weren't associated with UST 231, however, their locations are commingled with contamination that resulted from releases from 231. Now, within those areas there was a UST in a pit west of Building 811, and there was also an oil water interceptor south of Building 811. So what this photo shows is the removal of those features in advance of the soil removal action. This -- in the background here we have our excavator at work starting excavation. And right here that's Building 231. Okay.

The progress that's been made to date: We have excavated approximately 540 cubic yards so far. That was a few days ago. We started in the eastern portion of the site, and that's west of Building 231. So right here in green, that represents approximately what's been removed and -- as I said, as of June 23rd.

This means, based on the size of the area and the depth -- which I didn't point out -- that the removal action encompasses about 9,000 cubic yards. So you can see we still have a ways to go, about 8,500 more cubic yards. And as I said, that's ongoing each day.

Okay. Now I'm going to focus on what's been excavated so far. The reason I'm going to do that, it's -- we had to excavate that area west of Building 231 a little differently than we're going to excavate the remainder of the area. Because this excavation is directly adjacent to 231, there is a potential risk to cause damage to the building and the foundation beneath the building. So what was proposed are these slot excavations. And slot excavations vary. There were both two foot and four foot trenches that extended perpendicular out into the building. Now this trenching was sequenced such that they would excavate first. This is a plan view of Building 231, so these are columns. It was sequenced such that two foot trenches were excavated on one-half of the column, backfilled, and then that clean backfill was compacted before they would move on to the next column. And they would continue in this manner until all of the excavations -- all of the half trench excavations were complete, and then they would continue with the second half. And the reason this is done is because this doesn't impact the resisting forces of the soil on the foundation. Essentially it's kept the building up and just protected the foundation.

Now, I say there are also four foot slot excavations. These four foot slot excavations were, again, perpendicular trenches between the columns. They're a little bit wider. And I can safely say that that has all been completed. The building is still there. There appears to be no damage. So we're happy to get that done first, because it was a little bit of a slower process, and now we've moved onto the other areas and we're able to proceed a little bit quicker.

This photo here shows the slot excavation taking place. We had Building 231 here, and then the perpendicular trenches that extend out from the building. And they extended out approximately twelve feet. And as I said, it was to the proposed depth of approximately around nine and a half to ten feet depending on if we observed any TPH or any gasoline contamination. Again, these are photos of the slot excavations.

Building 231 has a really clean trench. We had really good soil conditions so there wasn't a lot of collapsing, as you can see. And this is a photo taken along the Building 231 after most of the excavation has been complete. You'll see in the background this piece of equipment has a vibrating instrument at the end that actually pounds the soil down and provides the compaction necessary. Okay. So once all the excavation is complete -- and that's going to be primarily based on the results of the confirmation sampling that's conducted -- we have to do some soil gas monitoring and some groundwater monitoring. Groundwater monitoring will be conducted from monitoring wells.

We're going to have to install, at this point we're estimating three new monitoring wells at the site. And then a minimum of one year of quarterly monitoring will occur after all site activities have been completed. And then we'll evaluate the results.

The same goes for soil gas. Soil gas monitoring is tentatively scheduled for the end of summer, after the excavation is complete. That should occur sometime in September, October. There may also be a need for additional soil gas sampling. Again, that's tentatively scheduled for April, 2009

and September and October, 2009. I say tentatively scheduled because we don't really know what the results are going to show on the first round, and there will be some time to evaluate the results. And, as I said, run the Forward Risk Assessment on that monitoring.

And the proposed locations for the soil gas sampling are going to be consistent with soil gas sampling that's already been conducted at the site. Approximately, I'd say, one hundred to 120 samples on a twenty foot grid across the site. And we'll probably propose to replicate that same sampling effort for the post remedy monitoring.

Okay. I went over a little bit the schedule for the post remedy monitoring, and basically today I'm presenting the remediation update to you. The comments are expected to the agencies on the RAW in late June, which is soon. Implementation of the removal action is taking place now and should continue into July. The first round of soil gas monitoring is tentatively scheduled for October, as I said, September, October timeframe. Again in April, 2009 and October, 2009, depending what the results yield. And again, groundwater monitoring is scheduled quarterly -- is tentatively scheduled quarterly to begin on August 8th. Then once all that's done, we've received all the results, hopefully shows it's a clean site and meets the residential cleanup scenario, we will prepare an implementation report for agency review -- tentatively scheduled for next year in August. Okay. So I appreciate your time to present this. This is my first time, as I said, at a RAB meeting. I'm open to any questions you may have.

MR. KARR: The source of your clean fill?

MR. HODSON: We have fill that's been used from clean areas on the site and also imported areas. If we exceed what's already on site then we'll import clean fill. And that site hasn't been determined yet. That's obviously after it's been characterized and sampled to see if it's clean.

MR. FARLEY: Just to add one thing to that, Jerry. All of the soil that we're using for backfill has DTSC approval for use in whatever excavation work. So we don't bring dirt onto the island without agency approval for the backfill.

MR. KARR: I understand that. I just wondered if the majority is preexisting stockpiles or, you know, that's a pretty good quantity of excavation and backfill, I'm just curious as to how much will have to be imported from elsewhere.

MR. GRIBBLE: Steve, can you, I'm assuming -- could you talk a little bit about the criteria, the acceptance criteria for imported fill? It might be a little more informative rather than just 'got DTSC approval'. He may not like DTSC approval. Don't say that, Jerry.

MR. KARR: It's what I use in my yard.

MR. FARLEY: There's a document that was prepared for the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel at the inception of the project called the, "Soil and Groundwater Management Plan." And that document has the criteria for import of backfill from, for example, quarries onto the EETP for use in backfilling.

There's also -- it's not a steadfast requirement, but it is, at a minimum, a starting point for discussions with the agencies on the import of material. So the soil and groundwater management plan specifies certain criteria that must be met to bring soil onto the site. And whenever we bring stuff on, for example, if we get soil for use as backfill, and we get it from one of the quarries up in American Canyon or something, we'll go out and collect soil samples from that quarry, have it

analyzed for a variety of organics and inorganics, get those data back, and then send the information off to DTSC for approval before the stuff comes on site.

MR. KARR: Well my question I guess was misunderstood. I'm not concerned about the quality of the soil, I know you're not going to excavate bad stuff and put bad stuff back in the hole, I mean that's why we have the control process. My question is, do you have any guesstimate on quantity? My concern is --

MR. FARLEY: 9,000 cubic yards.

MR. KARR: Well, total project?

MR. FARLEY: Right.

MR. KARR: How many truckloads from elsewhere, truck traffic noise, all the things that keep Wendell awake, that's what's bothering me.

MR. FARLEY: And you're actually hitting upon something, Jerry, that we're working very hard with the agencies and with Lennar on to try and minimize the -- I mean anytime you have that many truckloads coming in from off-site, 9,000 cubic yards, it's a lot of truckloads.

We've actually got some soils on site that we're characterizing or have characterized to try and both get rid of the dirt that has been stockpiled, clean dirt that's been stockpiled on the island that certain residents are concerned about it just sitting there and creating dust problems, and also trying to reduce the total number of miles that the trucks have to haul this stuff from off-site to on-site.

So all of those things are being evaluated. And we're hoping that we can get a lot or most of the backfill material from clean sources on-site, areas that have already been closed, like down in the D1 area down south of the Marine Corps barracks, for example, and use that soil for backfill.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I do have one question. The soil that's been excavated, that will be excavated as well, where is it being hauled to? Is it the Mare Island landfill or is it off island?

MR. HODSON: No, it's going off-site. And you know, I don't have the name of the landfill. I believe it is Kettleman, but I haven't checked to confirm that with the construction manager.

MR. FARLEY: The actual land -- there's a couple of landfills that we use depending on whatever the waste profile shows, and Altamont, Kettleman, those are all different landfills that we use depending on a whole bunch of stuff; one being the waste profiling, but also just where are -- where is the landfill in receiving X number of yards of soil on any one day. Sometimes they just can't take it. And so -- and sometimes they have to -- it even depends on the time of day that you take it there or want to take it there. Because if they get towards the end of the day they have different criteria for the cover material they place at the end of the day versus the stuff that they bring in earlier in the morning and cover with a different material.

So the short answer is we have several different landfills that we use, and it's largely based on the waste profile that we submit to the landfill. And they actually tell us whether they're willing to take it or not willing to take it.

MR. THOMPSON: One of your slides doesn't have a number but it's the Building 231 slide excavation. And a couple of questions in looking at this picture. Yeah, thank you.

So the picture on the left -- correct me if my memory doesn't serve me well here -- but I think the depth of nine and a half feet was largely based on the presumed groundwater depth, so that

excavation would contact or slightly go under groundwater. So I'm not seeing any groundwater here, and I'm not sure -- I would like a comment on that.

And then the other comment is if you could expand a little bit on what the criteria is for determining --

(Thereupon a phone began ringing).

Excuse me, sorry. If you could expand a little bit on how you're evaluating the base of the excavation? The reason being is that the color of the soil at the bottom, the grayish, greenish gray could either be native soil or could indicate that's also the color you would expect in petroleum infected soil. So if you could just expand on what the criteria is for evaluating if you need to dig further or not?

MR. HODSON: Sure, Brian. To answer your first question, the photograph on the left, that is actually not the final depth of that excavation. I believe that's -- I took that photo when it was maybe five or six feet. That trench was dug deeper.

The criteria used in the field generally -- and I'm out there full-time -- is once they reach approximately nine and a half, ten feet, I'm on-site, I evaluate the soil, generally just looking at the physical characteristics of it, smelling it. Then we have -- then I'll submit the sample to the lab, get analytical results back. If there's any question at all that I believe we're in jeopardy of exceeding the screening criteria just based on observations, I'll do field tests, PetroFlag analysis in the field to determine if additional excavation is required. So far we've been lucky. Visually the soil looks great at about ten feet. We've been hitting bedrock that doesn't seem to be impacted by the gasoline. And we've also received the analytical data back from the confirmation samples collected from the trench, the slot excavations, and they're all non-detect for gasoline, I believe. And there's one very, very low concentration of diesel. And all other constituents of concern in soil are below cleanup criteria.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just have a couple of questions possibly here. You say lots of truckloads or a lot of soil and, I was just going to ask, like how many truckloads? Because these are going on public roads, unlike the work that Weston was doing last year when they were going out around the back forty. So in the -- the outs and ins sound like they could be, and arounds and abouts and throughs could be a pretty high number.

And while you're doing that math, were these columns on this building, were there piers under them, or it was a grade B foundation and you were just -- the column was bearing more weight than the --

MR. HODSON: It was actually a slab, concrete slab.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Slab, okay. You got that calculation?

MR. FARLEY: What, twenty yards a truck, is that what it is?

MR. GEMAR: Twenty tons.

MR. FARLEY: Twenty tons, so that's what, thirty --

MR. GEMAR: Probably thirteen yards about.

MR. FARLEY: So you're talking hundreds of trucks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what route are they using?

MR. FARLEY: We have a traffic control plan; I don't know the exact route. I'm assuming it's up Azuar and out the north gate, but we have a traffic --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And this work is going to be complete, you're hoping by like the end of July?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Including refilling, backfilling?

MR. HODSON: Yes. They're probably continuing -- I think the current schedule is backfilling into the first week of August.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay. And when -- where will you add those additional ground wells on? Can you show us that or does that matter to us?

MR. HODSON: At this point we haven't determined the location. We'll meet with the regulatory agencies after the excavation is completed and determine the appropriate location with their approval.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then --

MR. FARLEY: Myrna, just if I could add one thing. Part of -- there are several things that go into that selection process. One is what were the concentrations across the site before we did the work? What are the concentrations in the confirmation samples after we finished the work? And considerations for understanding not only the concentrations in the groundwater after we finished, but also looking at information regarding the hydraulic gradient. So putting the wells in not only an absolute location, but relative locations to one another so that we can get the hydraulic gradient using a simple, you know, three point problem or something. So lots of factors.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you have this -- back to your last page here -- perform groundwater monitoring, you would do that, it looks like, four times beginning in August of this year. Then will you pull those wells out or will you -- what will you -- I mean I know what you use them for, but this is going to residential, so --

MR. FARLEY: Once we get site closure -- and this goes for all the sites on Mare Island. Once we have site closure, we will go back and abandon all the wells that were part of the program. Let's assume a simple case where we do this work, we get the soil gas and the groundwater monitoring complete. Once we have official formal closure, written closure on those sites, then we'll go back and abandon all the wells so that they're not in the way of any future development.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And where in this, in your last page here, your next steps in the schedule, where does the -- what you were talking about, your former Risk Assessment Tech Memo, where does that fit in this lineup? I don't see it actually described in your schedule.

MR. HODSON: Yeah, you're right, that doesn't show up on the schedule. I know they're working on it now, and they anticipate to prepare a technical memorandum that outlines the methodology for the Risk Assessment, but those evaluations won't actually take place until we've conducted first round soil gas monitoring, which is potentially scheduled for the September-October timeframe. So once we receive that data from the labs, then we will perform that evaluation.

MR. FARLEY: The short answer, Myrna, is the tech memo will probably be to the agencies sometime in the next 30 to 45 days.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that actually, its purpose is to explain to them how you're going to do the soil gas and groundwater monitoring?

MR. FARLEY: Not --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then the -- --

MR. FARLEY: Not the monitoring, but the evaluation of the data relative to human health and eco risk.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that's -- just comes somewhere --

MR. FARLEY: It's within the next 45 days.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Before -- okay.

MR. FARLEY: Before the soil gas monitoring is performed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Starts being performed, okay.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then the final question I have is this submitted draft implementation report. What is an implementation report after you've already done everything?

MR. FARLEY: We'd be done. It would report all of the findings, all of the background information, all of the post remedy data, site conditions, and then essentially report on what the final confirmation results showed, of not only the soil, but also the post remedy groundwater and soil gas monitoring. And the hope would be that all of those data and all of those evaluations and those risk assessments would show we met all of the cleanup criteria, and the site is suitable for closure as a future residential area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that brings up, of course, an item that I'm a little leery about saying anything about because I might be perceived to or have been recorded to say something that will get you fired up, Steve, and then Neal will get in there with me and we'll have a combat scene here. But I want to ask this question in the most gentle and loving and gracious way I can.

This area is slated for residential. And we were told in a February presentation that there is no requirement that you ever tell those folks who purchase or live in that residential property when it's built 150 years from now, after the great collapse of the housing industry, that you have to tell them about the old times on this property, that there's no requirement to do that because you will have cleaned up to clean, clean, clean. And, of course, I had that question that made it sound like I don't think you do good work, and that's not true. So you do great work. But how are we going to tell those new residents 150 years from now that you did good work? How are they going to easily, comfortably, even in a fun way, learn that they live on a place that used to be non-op, but is not now? Is that sweet enough to get the point across without getting anybody mad, but get my question answered maybe?

MR. SILER: No. And, you know, what's going to happen 150 years from now, Myrna, I can't say, and I don't think anybody here can predict that. But there are always disclosure statements that always go along with real estate transfers that tell people exactly what has gone on at those properties. There's all the documents are in place. Hopefully Chip will still be around in 150 years and he can answer the question. (LAUGHTER.)

MR. SILER: So that's what's going to end up happening.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, he doesn't regulate that property, unfortunately, unless he gets a promotion. And I probably -- well, I might be here still. That's if you believe that the earth will by then have been destroyed and then you come back for a thousand years, because you were bad, and walk around and look at it. Some Christians in the room. But really seriously I think that the important thing that we're doing here, and we sometimes forget about it, we're not really here to spar and to trick you into answering, you know, a trick question, you know, or not, or to make me mad or whatever; but we're really here to make sure that the community really understands and can gain access to the environmental cleanup so that it just feels like it passed the straight face test. And because we inherited an island that people whisper, "Glow in the dark," we have this kind of ongoing have to be extra reassuring to people that we did do our job well.

So all I'm saying is maybe you don't have an answer today, but maybe by your implementation plan you will have a way that you can just like, I don't know, do something that feels good, that says, hey, you know, I could go right to that website right there, Mareisland.org, and I could just learn what happened, the history of that property, would be interesting. That's all. That's all. Cost a few thousand million dollars, but that's all.

MR. QUIGLEY: Am I right on this Area 231, by that building wasn't there old concrete that was removed, contaminated concrete?

MR. HODSON: What area?

MR. QUIGLEY: Or just dirt?

MR. HODSON: Excuse me, in what area?

MR. QUIGLEY: In this area that we're talking about right now.

MR. HODSON: The whole area, the concrete, was it contaminated?

MR. QUIGLEY: There was contaminated concrete in that area; correct?

MR. SILER: I don't think that's true, Wendell. I think what you're talking about is there was an area, and this happened when the Navy did, they used to fill up any kind of receptacle that they could find on the island that they had decided to abandon with green sand. And there was a part of the foundation that was right to the far side of Building 531 that did have some green sand in it. That green sand was removed last year, and so that has all been taken care of.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you.

Another question. On these trucks that are leaving, taking out this contaminated dirt. Now, I'm not sure if I'm right here, I was looking a year ago when we talked about this, I asked a question about hauling this contaminated dirt off the island. At that time they were taking it to the H1 landfill -- or am I wrong? -- because they couldn't take it off the island due to public outcry?

MR. FARLEY: Not true.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. SILER: The Navy and Weston have decided to use the H1 landfill to consolidate a lot of the waste areas, but Lennar Mare Island does not dispose or send any material that we excavate to the H1 landfill.

MR. QUIGLEY: Ash, thank you. And the last question, will these numerous trucks that are leaving have some kind of, some form of a tarp or something over them --

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

MR. QUIGLEY: -- so stuff is not spilling off?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

MR. HODSON: Yes, every truck that leaves the site is tarped.

MR. FARLEY: In fact, there's -- if you go by there tonight or tomorrow, you'll see that there's actually tarping racks that we actually use to tarp the trucks before you leave.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you very much.

And the last thing. Those people over by where you took the big building down, that's done now, are -- hopefully that's some of the dirt that you're going to use for backfill, those people have been looking at those hills since they bought their homes, and I know that they'll really be appreciative.

MR. FARLEY: You're talking about the dirt at 866?

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: I have a question. Neal, could you talk about the concrete? You said that we had a concrete pad that had green sand underneath it. Could you talk about how you segregate concrete or clean off concrete or whatever so that when you have a pile of concrete rubble so people have some confidence that there isn't contamination? Could you go over your process and describe that a little, please?

MR. SILER: Well, just to let you know that it wasn't underneath a concrete pad, it was actually in a basin or what looks like a basin that was full of concrete. Usually what they do is they'll take everything out that they possibly can, they actually scrape down all the sides, and if they can't get everything they try to vacuum some portions of it out.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Well, thanks everyone. Right now we have -- thank you, too, David. Right now we have an open public comment period. I know a lot of us spoke, asked a lot of questions. Is there anymore questions out there, general comments or questions? Okay. And then now we have a ten minute break, though I -- is there -- could I convince you folks to maybe either skip it or shorten it to five minutes?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What time is it?

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Right now it is nearing 8:45.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Five minutes, is that okay with everyone? All right. See you in five.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Marie Dreyer)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. You know what happens, I start naming names specifically, like, "Chip Gribble, would you please take your seat? Dwight Gemar, Brian Thompson, Steve." See, it works.

All right. Well, since I was a half hour late, I can get you guys back to your table on time. Does anybody have any changes they would like to make on the May meeting minutes? And if you do, if you don't want to make a public statement about it, you can always get changes or corrections to either Michael or me, and in this case to Marie or me.

And the only other thing I will note on these announcements, administrative announcements, is that we did receive an application this last month from Jim Mitchell, Touro University PR Director, to serve on the Restoration Advisory Board. And the nomination committee did meet. And the decision that we made was one that we've made over the years in a number of cases where we believed that there wasn't a category that the person quite fit in for the Restoration Advisory Board. We meet together as regulators, members of the community, and the responsible parties for the environmental cleanup. So it used to be the Navy had the entire responsibility for the cleanup. And now we have Weston Solutions and Lennar Mare Island to both share a portion of the responsibility of the cleanup for Mare Island. So Jim Mitchell and Touro did not quite fit into those categories.

They may in the future if they acquire property that they need -- from the Navy that they take the lead in cleaning up. And because they are involved as a potential major developer for the island, we felt that that was more of a reuse issue and less of an environmental cleanup issue at this point. And that they have political and financial interests that might not make them a kind of equal player here in the RAB process.

So we welcome Jim and anyone else from Touro who would like to be here to be a part of the process and also to even join the committees that we have. So I just wanted to let you know that. And Jim has received that notification.

The next item would be going to the focus group reports. And in quickly going through them, Wendell, do you have a report from a community focus group or any news that you want to share relevant to the RAB?

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: I did -- the questions I've already had answered was about the dirt, the backfill dirt being removed. And they have answered my questions on the contaminated cement, if it's taken off the island or if it's stored in an area on the other side of the island, which it is not, and the trucks being covered when they leave. So I can report back to them, and I appreciate everyone's time and thank you.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Natural resources, Jerry.

MR. KARR: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Except that you have a cold. Wish you health.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula, technical focus group.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes. All right. Well, Gil's not here, we'll wish him health. And no one from the city?

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well then, Lennar update. Steve, you want to give that? And I wish you health as well.

MR. FARLEY: So we have a handout tonight which shows some photographs and some information in the map of the EETP.

Let's start with the photographs in the upper left corner is a photo actually taken this morning of work that we're doing out at UST 231. So this is additional work above and beyond what Dave talked about, the slot trenches, this is sort of getting to the heart of the matter at UST 231.

Right below that is a photograph of some work that we've been doing for a fuel oil pipeline, FOPL or F-O-P-L stands for Fuel Oil Pipeline. This is near Building 121 which is just on the south side of the power plant. You can see the pipelines there. And those are largely fuel oil pipelines that are in structures called utilidors. Utilidors are sort of U-shaped concrete tubes that are open on top, and the pipelines are supported on small steel stands or structures inside the utilidor, and then they have concrete lids that go on the top. So if there is a maintenance requirement -- and this is all when they were active -- if there's a maintenance requirement, they can just pop a couple of those lids to get access to the pipelines. They can also use them for inspections. But it still provides traffic rated coverage for the pipeline. So that's some work that we're doing for the fuel oil pipelines near Building 121.

And in the upper right, not exactly exciting, but just to try and make an emphasis here about traffic controls. For those who either live on the island or have spent some time driving around the island, you know that people drive like mad-men and -women down those streets. It's amazing to me that nobody has been seriously in a car accident or hit. We put a lot of emphasis on safety, CH2M Hill does. And we have a formal process for traffic controls, traffic control plans. You can see that we have actually a flag person there. The person in the background is also another flagman. You think we have enough signs; lane closed, lane closed, lane closed, prepare to stop, cones. There's actually a lighted sign that's just in the back of or out of view here. So a lot of emphasis on traffic controls. The way these cones are set up are to allow for trucks leaving the site -- which would be on the right-hand side -- to leave the site in a safe manner so they could head north on Azuar Drive.

In the lower left corner, status of some of the major documents that are in place. The only real change really is, and I didn't mark it here, but -- cause it happened at the eleventh hour literally, one additional UST is closed, so that brings that to 80 instead of 79 Underground Storage Tanks.

Technically it's not closed, but we got comments back today on the UST Site. That was a site where there were some PCBs, the Navy did some thermal treatment to try and destroy the PCBs. The agencies had concerns about dioxins and purans, and we went back and did some sampling and confirmed that those things either were not present, or I think in one sample they were concentrations of order of magnitude below the fairly conservative cleanup levels for dioxin and purans. So we're now going to go back and prepare a formal closure letter requesting closure of that site.

A couple of other things going on. If you look in the middle where H2 is, Dave talked about the UST 231 and 232 Site. Moving up the map, the cleaning and flushing of the IR-1A line. IR-14 is

the old industrial wastewater pipeline system, and we had a small section that hadn't been cleaned and flushed before. We just finished that earlier this week. The Crane Test Area is the small sort of, I guess, chair shaped area in yellow. We're just finishing up some soil gas monitoring within the Crane Test Area. We believe that's going to be complete sometime early next week, if not actually by tomorrow.

UST 839, just above the B IA or Installation Area B, that's a site where we just completed some groundwater monitoring, got the results back, it all looks good, and I think we'll proceed with a closure letter for that site.

Building 527, indoor air sampling. This is a PCB site. It's a large, you can see from a scale here that that building is a couple hundred feet long. Large building, PCB site inside. We plan to do some indoor air sampling and request that the agencies, in particular DTSC, and Mike Wade and Barbara Renzi, the two toxicologists from DTSC, are going to come out and do a site walk sometime in the next week or two, finalize the approach to doing the air monitoring inside that building, and then we'll probably do that sampling sometime in the latter part of July.

IR-15, the green box that's along the waterfront, that's an area that I think I reported last time we had a lot of groundwater monitoring wells that are going to go in there. We've been working with the regional board. And I welcome Paisha to the project, it's never a dull moment. So IR-15 is a site that Brian, if he hasn't already, will probably brief you pretty thoroughly on that site, it's an important site. We have some monitoring wells that are going in there.

And down in what we call the triangle area, which is the area between Dry Docks 1 and 2, we have some -- actually two activities going on there. You can see Building 516 is labeled. There's a old industrial wastewater pipeline -- or excuse me -- sanitary sewer line that ran along the northwest side of dry dock two along the hypotenuse of the triangle area. And we had one small area we couldn't remove the pipeline, it was underneath a vault. There's like, I don't know what the number is, but 42 KW lines running through the area. And we were trying to do some cleaning and flushing and capping. Long story made short, we found some levels of PCBs that we have to remove. So we're going to go back and go the extra mile and remove that segment of the pipeline. We're working very closely with Ion Energy to make sure that it's done safely. The BGN label there -- BGN stands for black granular material, it -- and I can't say this conclusively, but it looks like furnace lime or something like that. And it's been used as a leveling course in some areas underneath asphalt, underneath building foundations. And so we're doing some additional characterization of that material within the triangle area. I think that covers the big picture. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

I'm sorry, let me mention one other thing. We've submitted a number of closure requests to the agencies recently, PCB sites. There's about ten or fifteen PCB sites that we believe we've completed the work on and we expect the agencies to approve closure. We've got several UST sites that fall in that same category, and a couple of FOPL sites that we've actually requested closure on recently. So there are a number of sites that are either in the hopper for closure or will be soon, which are all good news.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Thanks, Steve. On these cones, does the city -- within the city limits, does that double the fine in zone -- cone zones apply within a city limits, do you know? I mean, would it apply here?

MR. FARLEY: You know, I don't know. That's a good question. I don't know about the city fines.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean whoever would be issuing fines, like the police department or whatever, would that apply? It seems like it should.

MR. FARLEY: It would make sense to me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Paula, you did have a question, I think? Or you did something.

f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No. Okay. Next, Dwight. Thank you, Steve. Weston update.

MR. GEMAR: It will be a brief update. The document status lists the documents that are in the pipeline, and it's essentially unchanged from last month. We are continuing to wrap up a biological assessment for IR-05. You might recall that in order to complete the removal of contaminated soil in that area, we're going to have to dig in areas that are populated with pickleweed, which is the preferred habitat for the endangered salt marsh harvest mouse. So in order to get approval to do that, and to set up the guidelines for working in those areas, we have to submit a biological assessment to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service through the Navy, and then the Fish and Wildlife Service issues what's called a biological opinion which provides the requirements for us to do the work. So we are proceeding with that in order to finish up out at IR-05.

In addition, the Navy is also, as part of the Time Critical Removal Action that we're currently working on, there is a potential to have to excavate into some pickleweed over by the Paint Waste Area. So that is also being added to the same biological assessment so that hopefully we can have just one biological opinion issued, and hopefully speed up the process a bit.

And that picture of the salt marsh harvest mouse, Dr. Howard Shellhammer, he's one of the few people that are licensed to handle the salt marsh harvest mice. If you're not a licensed person you're not allowed to handle the mouse or you might be shot, drawn, and quartered, and not necessarily in that order.

And then in H1 it's pretty quiet. We're -- we've just been installing some settlement monuments, but for the most part we're trying to sequence the work to accommodate the soil that's planned to be consolidated from a nearby Paint Waste Area.

And that work is currently scheduled for perhaps starting in late July, depending on the timing of the approval for the work plan addendum that is currently being finalized and will be sent to the regulators probably next week. So that is about it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Would you mind at least telling me what a settlement monument is?

MR. GEMAR: Well, as I explain it in the text, it's pretty simple. It's basically a pipe that is inserted about eighteen inches into the ground at the top of the engineered cap, and it's filled with concrete, and a concrete collar is placed around it. And then a survey marker is placed on the top. And we survey the elevation. And then a year later we survey it again, etcetera. And basically, if the elevation is different, which would be typically lower, it would mean that that pipe is settling along with the surrounding soil.

So we just want to monitor that and make sure that the settlement within the cap area is not excessive. You would expect some settlement to occur over time, so we just want to monitor that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And speaking of the salt marsh harvest mouse, this would be a lesson for our councilwoman Erin Hannigan -- not that she reads the RAB minutes -- but she didn't know

on Tuesday night what the point was in protecting the California Special Species. So similarly we'll point out that the salt marsh harvest mouse is federally listed as endangered only because of its lack of habitat, because we've built 95 percent of its habitat in the Bay, which wouldn't matter at all to anybody, I don't think, except for the salt marsh harvest mouse is the only land mammal that we know of that can drink salt water and live. And sometime along the line we might be very interested to learn how they do that, because maybe we might want to adapt to drinking salt water as well. So they're a little fellow that could mean a lot to us in the future if we last past these fires this summer.

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

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. We have three choices here. The regulatory agency statements. So I don't know if you want to have Brian go first because he's going to be leaving us, or how you want to do that, but --

MR. THOMPSON: Sure, I'll go first.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Take it away, Brian, then.

MR. THOMPSON: So sitting next to me is Paisha, P-A-I-S-H-A, Jorgensen, J-O-R-G-E-N-S-E-N. And he's sitting next to me because I won't be sitting here in a couple of months. I've taken advantage of a promotion opportunity. And sorry to be leaving Mare Island, it's been a good working experience, and would like to stay here and see further progress, but opportunity calls. Paisha and I worked together as consultants before we both came to the Water Board. His background and training is very similar to mine, so I think you'll get a similar perspective. And I'll be sitting close by, so we'll have -- we'll be in communication and hopefully there will be a seamless transfer. I think you're going to be left in good hands. And the transfer will occur over the next couple of months. So I'll probably be here at the next RAB meeting, and maybe not the one after that. I think that's it for that.

This last month we had Linda Rao was working with the Navy on the offshore sampling plan. I've been working a lot with the Navy and Lennar on petroleum from the DRMO area, and some implications for that release on Investigation Area B, and on cleanup with the Navy. And I think that's it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Carolyn? Chip? Carolyn.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I don't have anything to report tonight.

MR. GRIBBLE: I don't have a lot to report either. We've, you know, we lost Bill Killgore in the reorganization and have been working to --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can't find him yet?

MR. GRIBBLE: Pardon me? Bill Killgore was acting as, effectively, another project manager and helping Henry on the Lennar stuff and me on the Navy stuff. DTSC is in the process of trying to backfill that position. In the meanwhile we're scrambling to keep things together, Henry and I. And so I've been busy trying to pick up, reconnect with some of the sites that Bill was overseeing, and I also took a little bit of vacation time.

You know, and I did want to say one more thing about Wendell's concern about trucks coming off the site. And with the tarps and all that, that there is a number of other features that we typically require that Lennar and Weston include in their cleanup actions for trucks that are leaving

contaminated sites. Typically they have requirements to have the wheels contamination controlled so that the contamination isn't trucked in, taken out on the wheels on the tires of the trucks and left onto the roadways.

Also, for what is probably -- what you'll experience more immediately would be trucks coming in with imported soil. And we went through this last summer with Weston where they brought a lot of trucks in with clean fill into the IR-04 site down at the south end of Mare Island. So there were a lot of trucks coming over the roads. They are in and out of that site. The trucks were depositing or dropping clean soil on the roadways, and part of their management practice for that was to do frequent street sweeping to keep that under control as well. So at some point if Lennar is bringing in trucks with clean fill from someplace else, that would, we would probably be requiring that too to manage the dust nuisance that could develop from trucks coming in with clean soil.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thanks, Chip. Now I'll go ahead and give the Navy monthly progress report. Please do either grab a copy of this on your way out or take a look at it now. I'm going to jump into the Section 2 Upcoming Events. As Brian had indicated during his update, the Navy is working with the BCT to finalize the soil boring and soil sampling investigation at the DRMO Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office. It's expected -- assuming we can come to consensus that we'll be out in the field in that area mid-July. We will be out in the field next Monday and Tuesday at Investigation Area F1 doing some natural attenuation sampling. As Steve Peck mentioned in his presentation tonight, we will be out at Installation Restoration Site 17 to collect Passive Soil Gas samples. This is expected to take place as, again, as you heard tonight, in mid-July.

And now that it has stopped raining on us, we can continue on with the TCRA and excavations specifically at IR Site 04, the Horse Stables Area and the Paint Waste Area.

Turning that sheet over to the back. In Section 3 you'll see that the Navy during this past month submitted three documents. The first being a resubmission of a missing approval page and replacement CD for the Production Manufacturing Area/ South Shore Area Final Geophysical Report. The second being an Investigation Area F1 Passive Soil Gas sampling work plan. And the third being the response to comments on the Draft Final Work Plan sampling activities at former UST Sites A-25, A-58, A-296, and Building 655.

We also received comments from the EPA and the Water Board -- I apologize, this is a typo. We received on the draft DRMO non-TCRA completion report. That is the -- instead of TCRA it should be NTCRA, so that's non-TCRA. And that typo was for both bullets that should be non-TCRA for both. And that is it for my update tonight.

I do want to mention, as you know, that next month there are five Thursdays, and so don't forget that it is the last Thursday that we'll be here, which is July 31st.

I apologize, many of you might have heard that the library has changed its hours, so we've since -- well, maybe Myrna can work her magic and try to get us the library again next month. So I do believe, Carolyn, that the plan is to have it at the -- I might get this name wrong -- but the Mare Island conference center; is that right? Right across the causeway there where you first enter.

MS. MOORE: We'll send out maps with the monthly mailing, and send out to everyone whose information that we have to notify that there's been a change of location.

MR. GRIBBLE: Is this a permanent change or just a one time?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I can follow up on that because I actually did come down and meet with the library manager a couple of days ago. And the situation is that, of course, due to the city's bankruptcy, they are cutting costs, and they own this building and they have three tenants in the building, the library and two other tenants. And so they plan to close this building Tuesday nights and Thursday nights beginning at 5:00 O'clock, because they have another library across town that is open till 9:00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and not Mondays and Wednesdays. So that theoretically every night of the week you could go to a library in town up until 9:00 O'clock.

So because of that, for at least two years apparently they will, this building will be shut down at 5:00 on Thursday, every Thursday night. So my request was, which was one option Carolyn had first talked to them about, was to have a city staffer, because the city owns the building, be our host and, therefore, normally Gil. And that would usually work except for this building is -- because it has the two other tenants and because the bathrooms are downstairs, they can't secure the rest of the building, and they have a lot of vandalism if they don't have the building totally secured. So it has to be either totally secured or totally open, and they have to have their security guards here. So the only thing I could realistically say if somebody wanted to donate a security guard service, there might be a possibility, but they'd have to chase people downstairs to make sure they're really using the bathroom for its intended purpose and not for other purposes, destructive purposes. So it's kind of tricky.

So there is just no way, as far as we can tell, that this building will be available to us. So the alternative is the Mare Island conference center. It's very disappointing. They said we were the first they thought of, woke up in the night in terror that we would storm the place or something. But really and truly they just don't see how that could work.

MR. GRIBBLE: I think that the Navy needs to propose that to the agencies if you want to change the venue for this meeting. So can you send us an e-mail or something?

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Sure thing, Chip.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it definitely is a major issue for the RAB, having met here for fourteen years and the library does know that. The only people we could appeal to really and truly would probably be the city, and I don't think we're going to get too far with them given that the, you know, kind of the going thing in town is to declare bankruptcy, then you don't have to do anything.

MR. GRIBBLE: Thanks, I appreciate that information. Are the public members of the RAB -- does the Navy know if the public members of the RAB are agreeable to the venue change?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mean like to another location other than the Mare Island Marketing Center?

MR. GRIBBLE: From the library to --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well of course.

MS. LOW: What you're proposing -- which is the Marketing Center.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't know, we can take a vote tonight. I am not in favor of changing the location, that's why I took my time to go down and speak directly to the library director. But our only resource now would be to go talk to the Vallejo city council.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Unless someone wants to play security guard?

MR. GRIBBLE: If it turns out that this place is no longer available to us, it would be helpful to the Navy and the regulators to know that the public members of the RAB would be agreeable to changing the location for our meetings to the Marketing Center or some other specific location.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean the real problem that I see is that because, you know, not that very many people know about this service we hold, but they do know that they could come here, and they're going to take a long time, I think they'll be thoroughly confused for a few months because this is the common meeting spot in this town.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, I agree that it would be a problem to change it, but I think we would need some feedback from the RAB members or the public members of the RAB that they specifically, at least for starters, would accept changing the location. We also need to know, I believe we would need to know if this is workable for Weston and for Lennar.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: And the Navy.

MR. PECK: I don't know if we can put it to a vote.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: However, these are points well made by the lead regulating agency, and your public participation department would also, I think, be in agreement with your line of reasoning. So I think what we can do is we can agree that the Navy co-chairs can officially notify and request feedback from the other responsible parties as well as the community.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: I second that.

MR. KARR: I have a question, Gil or Chip, excuse me. For your concern, is this a regulatory -- I didn't recognize you without your tie on -- so is this a regulatory procedural matter? Because I'm not sure why you're asking if the community supports it if we don't have any options. You know, the city says you can't --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we do --

MR. KARR: Well, what do we have? What options are there if the city is not going to be open? I'm not in favor of relocating, but if that's our only option, then that's what we do.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, if this place is not an option, then something else has to be done as an alternative. All I'm saying is this is not Myrna's decision to make unilaterally, nor should it be the Navy's decision to make unilaterally. But the success of this meeting -- if somebody is to define this as a successful meeting -- requires the participation of, I would say, at least the Navy, Lennar, Weston, the regulatory agencies of EPA, the Water Board, and DTSC. And in the process before DTSC would want to say we support this change or not I think the rest of us would be very interested in if we're going to change this location too.

And you're talking about the Marketing Center now. Are we going to lose any current RAB, public RAB members? And if somebody has some objection to that, what's their objection and do they have some other idea or suggestion? So I think it's best that we make this.

MR. GEMAR: Is Thursday the only option? Is there any other days, like a Wednesday, that would work?

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: It's something we can consider as -- the RAB committee can consider.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And maybe we can put it on next month's agenda. But for next month we understand these -- this decision takes effect July 1st, so for this next month we would be meeting at the Marketing Center.

And I think, you know, Dwight brings up an even more interesting twist. Do you absolutely have to meet on the last Thursday of every month? So maybe the first Monday is just fine.

MR. GRIBBLE: We've used the Marketing Center in the past on occasion, but not as our permanent, if you will, permanent meeting location. I just think if we're going to make that kind of a change, we should do it with the understanding that everybody --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Those that have been affected have weighed in on the options. Gil's willing to be our host, but the library manager just, you know, put a whole bunch of issues on there about, you know, having the public, and the security guard couldn't approach anybody and tell them that they can't use the restroom. And then they'd have to be down there babysitting the restroom and, well --

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thanks, everyone. Everyone's comments are, of course, noted, and we will definitely think of all that, Chip and Dwight, before we come to a decision. But for now, let's just assume it will be at that location next month unless you hear otherwise through the RAB packets that come out.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Myrna, it's my impression that the meeting next month cannot be held here?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We are meeting at the conference center next month, that's what I said.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Because the library said you guys can't be here anymore?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, but the library doesn't have actually --

I think we need to get out of the library because the poor guy is probably out there trying to get us out tonight. But we can hold the meeting, but the library actually isn't the final word, the City of Vallejo is the final word, and because they own the building they're the ones shutting the building down. So I think it's worth taking Chip up on his idea that we do need to make sure that we've considered all alternatives, and that we would not be impacting our mission or our purpose here.

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Thanks, everyone. Have a good night.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We've adjourned for tonight. Oh, there is one more public comment period. Anybody -- there was something on the agenda that you did not get to -- I mean that you'd like to talk about that wasn't on the agenda?

(No response.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR DREYER: Okay. Meeting adjourned.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:24 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Installation Restoration (IR) Site 17 Update: Phase 1 Fieldwork – Navy
- Underground Storage Tank (UST) 231 Remediation Update – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island

Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island

Mare Island RAB Update June 2008 – Weston Solutions

Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard June 2008