

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES  
HELD THURSDAY, October 30, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, October 30th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 9:04 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

**RAB Community Members in attendance:**

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Chris Rasmussen
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski
- Jerry Karr

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Liz Barr (Navy)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City)
- Jim Mitchell (Touro)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Paisha Jorgensen (Water Board)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Ed Aromi (CH2MHill)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)

**Community Guests in attendance:**

- Jay Anast
- Dijj Christian
- Russ Farnell
- Victor George
- David Godsey
- Stan Golovich
- Wendy Plank
- Jim Porterfield
- Lester Rich
- Bill Stephens

**RAB Support from CDM:**

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

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, we'll go ahead and get started. Thanks, everyone.

Welcome to the October, 2008, Mare Island RAB meeting. I'm Michael Bloom, the BRAC Environmental Coordinator and the Navy Co-Chair.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Paisha Jorgensen with the Water Board.  
MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble with DTSC.  
MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen, Weston Solutions.  
MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Napa Solano Audubon.  
MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill representing Lennar.  
MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth, City of Vallejo.  
MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, RAB member from the City of American Canyon.  
MS. DREYER: Hi, Marie Dreyer with the Navy.  
MS. BARR: Liz Barr with the Navy.  
MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.  
MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston Solutions.  
MR. GOLOVICH: Stan Golovich, former employee of Mare Island, and currently live in Benicia.  
MR. GEORGE: Victor George, California Dry Dock Solutions.  
MR. GODSEY: David Godsey, resident of Vallejo.  
MR. PARNELL: Russ Parnell, Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific Square, the Iowa Group here.  
MR. MITCHELL: Jim Mitchell, Touro University.  
MR. AROMI: Ed Aromi, CH2M Hill.  
MS. PLANK: Wendy Plank, American Compliance Services.  
MR. RICH: Lester Rich, Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific Square.  
MR. PORTERFIELD: Jim Porterfield, ex-Mare Islander.  
MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen, and I'm a resident of Mare Island.  
MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, resident of Mare Island.  
CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, We'll go ahead and get our first presentation going. It's going to be given by Liz Barr with the Navy, and it's on the Former North Building Ways Investigation Area A2 giving a CERCLA and Petroleum update.

**II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Former North Building Ways, Investigation Area (IA) A2, CERCLA and Petroleum Update***  
**Presentation by Ms. Liz Barr, Navy**

MS. BARR: Yeah. Thanks, Michael. There's not a microphone. Okay. Today's topic is the Former North Building Ways located in Investigation Area A2.  
CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And for those of you, Liz is back.  
MS. BARR: Yeah.  
CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And we're glad she's back.

MS. BARR: Thanks. I'm going to give the site location brief history. I'm going to give an update on the CERCLA process, the finalization of the [Remedial Investigation] RI, and the next steps for a no action proposed plan and ROD, and then a petroleum update which I understand Mark gave in July. So this will be pretty brief. And then open up for questions.

Here's the site. The red shows the Former North Building Ways. This is located within Investigation Area A2. Investigation Area A2 goes up to there, the green area and the red box. The Former North Building Ways is the only CERCLA site within Investigation Area A2, it's about 40 acres. Investigation Area A2 is 60 acres.

Here's the picture looking at Mare Island Strait, and you can see some remnants of the former ships building activities. And another picture looking north.

Here's some site history. As I mentioned, Former North Building Ways is located within Investigation Area A2. It consists of upland and tidal wetlands. The site was primarily used for ship assembly during World War II, and because of the past activities there could have been contamination to soil, groundwater, and the sediment.

Now for the CERCLA update. We started the RI collecting samples in 1997 and '98. We collected a lot of soil, groundwater, and sediment samples across the site. We found hits of petroleum hydrocarbons, PCBs, and PAH's. We also analyzed for but did not detect VOCs, volatile organic compounds and semi-volatile organic compounds and pesticides.

This map shows the sampling grid. As you can see, there was sort of a grid structure, and then around areas where we thought we would find contamination there were more samples collected. The grab groundwater samples were spread pretty much throughout the site. The sediments were obviously in more of the wetland areas. Results did indicate that we found TPH, PAH's, iron, and lead. The detections were found mainly in the top three feet of soil. Because the concentrations of contaminants were sort of spread sporadically throughout the site, we figured they did not come from point sources, and we conducted a human health and ecological risk assessment. The onshore risk ecological risk assessment was base wide, and both documents concluded there was no risk to human health or the environment.

Based on the '97 and '98 results, we collected more samples in 2003, stepping out for TPH motor oil, iron, and lead. The iron and lead step-out samples showed that there was not an iron and lead problem, those concentrations were less than the comparison criteria.

We did find TPH motor oil, and that's being handled under the petroleum program that we're going to talk about in the second half of today's presentation, and that's the presentation that was also given in July.

In 2006 we did take additional samples for PCBs. We found that there was – actually that slide is – that one slide was incorrect – the 593 we did have one hit – I thought I had changed this on the presentation – and we are planning to taking three confirmation samples at the building 593. And we are planning to do abatement. This PCB work is being done under the PCB program in accordance with TSCA. So this is incorrect. Both of those building 593 and 643 were former electrical stations, now they're vacant.

So the 2002 Final RI had a series of comments. We thank Marie Dreyer and the agencies for working together on that. We had several meetings to go over responses to comments. One comment was redoing the onshore ecological risk assessment which was base wide and making it site specific. We added eight new ecological receptors, mainly birds. And redid the risk

assessment and we updated the toxicity reference values, because those had changed over the years. And the new ecological risk assessment showed that there was no risk. The revised Final [RI] was submitted September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2008. The conclusions are that there were no point sources identified.

Contaminant concentrations were similar to background. No unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. And the TPH and PCB concentrations are going to be handled under the separate programs under the petroleum program and the PCB program. We've received Water Board concurrence on this document, and we're anticipating receiving DTSC and EPA concurrence shortly.

So that's a big accomplishment, the RI is finally done. And the next step is we're moving forward with a no action proposed plan. The proposed plan will be a short public document that summarizes the previous investigations and presents the remedy for the site, which will be no action because there's no risk to human health or the environment.

We're planning on submitting the draft proposed plan to the agencies in November, and then in the springtime there will be a thirty day public comment period on the proposed plan, and a public meeting about the middle of the public comment period.

Once we finalize the proposed plan then we'll move forward with the record of decision. Like the proposed plan, the record of decision summarizes all of the previous documents and also includes an ARAR section, an Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Regulations section. Because this is a no action ROD, that section will probably be pretty short. And then the ROD will also include Navy responses to public comments.

And the next slide shows the schedule. Again, the public meeting will be in the middle of the public comment period.

And onto the petroleum update. As I mentioned, there were hits of motor oil that were detected in 1997. So in 2003 we collected additional samples, and at seventeen locations there are TPH motor oil concentrations that exceed the 1,000 milligram per kilogram screening criteria. This is based on 48 soil samples that were collected at depths of zero to five feet below ground surface. And based on these results, we're planning a hot spot removal at these seventeen locations.

This figure shows - at the back there might be a larger figure - the areas where we're going to be doing the hot spot removal. At this time we estimate about 3,000 cubic yards of soil. Of course, that will change when we're out in the field and we're actually seeing what the contamination is and the confirmation samples.

The cleanup approach: We're planning on excavating from these seventeen locations. The initial excavation depth will be about three feet below ground surface, then we'll take five samples, four confirmation samples from each side wall and on from the bottom.

We're going to have on-site and off-site laboratory analysis to determine if we meet the cleanup criteria. This is based on the Tier II cleanup values. If the concentrations are greater than the screening criteria, then we'll excavate two more feet in that direction and continue with confirmation sampling until we're done.

So right now we have issued the Draft PCAP, Petroleum Corrective Action Plan. We received water board comments on that, and we're working on the responses to comments. We plan to issue the final report in early December, and then begin the field work afterwards. Once we're done with the field work we'll issue a closure report.

And that's it. That's the little one. Any questions?

MR. RASMUSSEN: Liz, in this area offshore, are there wooden pilings that we use for piers and boardwalks?

MS. BARR: There are off the shore area.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Are there any – what's your policy to deal with these wooden piling to have them removed?

MS. BARR: Not as part of this investigation. So I don't think there are any plans to deal with that. I don't think there's an environmental component.

MR. RASMUSSEN: The reason why I asked this question is it was pointed out to me that what's starting to be seen around San Francisco Bay is that pilings are – down at the level of the sediment are rotting away, and then they break free and float to the surface and you have logs floating around in the Bay creating hazards to navigation.

There's nothing that anyone's aware of here about dealing with old wooden pilings floating around in the Bay?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, the Army Corps is the cleanup team.

MR. QUIGLEY: Or the City of Vallejo as far as dredging and stuff.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Just a question.

MS. BARR: Any other questions? Okay.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The Coast Guard – the Coast Guard every year –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you use the microphone?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No, I'm just telling him something – they collect logs out of the river every year and they use the south pier.

MR. GRIBBLE: As I understand it, the Contra Costa County – was it a Contra Costa County Grand Jury report? -- earlier this year about the abandoned vessels, which I think really kind of falls into the same category, a similar category found that it's a significant problem in the entire Delta, and that there's only limited funding or monies available county by county to fund that kind of abatement.

And if you're interested I can tell you where you can find it, or just go to the, I think it's Contra Costa County and Google for a grand jury report on abandoned vessels in the Delta.

MS. BARR: David Godsey.

MR. GODSEY: The Former North Building Ways does not have any piling structures that extend out into the Bay at all for Mare Island Strait. As a matter of fact, ships used to tie up along the bulkhead line there. So there are none extending out into Mare Island Strait.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I just have a couple of questions, Liz. It looks like none of these sites that you're going to do removal actions on are actually in the wetlands; is that true?

MS. BARR: I'm not sure if that's true. I imagine that that figure is correct, so –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So how did that happen?

MS. BARR: Where we're doing the TPH removal is based on the concentrations where we found the motor oil exceeding the screening criteria.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So did you do any sampling in the wetland areas? These areas?

MS. BARR: I'm not sure. I believe that the initial sampling grid as part of the RI included the full suite of analysis, so that's earlier in the presentation. I can show you up here.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It appears you did.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, according to this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So maybe some natural attenuation going on there or just sort of all floated back out to the Bay. All right.

And then you mentioned 3,000 – about 3,000 cubic yards and – that you're planning to remove, and a timeframe. And can you tell us who your contractor is or if you've selected a contractor yet?

MS. BARR: Yeah, we do have a contractor. TN and Associates is doing the Petroleum Corrective Action Plan and the removal action. And we estimated 3,000 cubic yards just based on the previous sample results what the volumes would be and also for bidding purposes. However, when they're in the field if the confirmation samples come back that we need to excavate more, then we will.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And is that material then going off-site or is that going to a landfill?

MS. BARR: Yes, it's for off-site disposal.

MR. GRIBBLE: By the way, I notice we have some of the ADR people here, they might take note that in that report some of the vessels that are abandoned are – it's not just recreational vehicles, but some of them are commercial vessels, steel hulled vessels. Steel, I see dollar signs.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you mean the report?

MR. GRIBBLE: They're waiting to be picked up and cut up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mean the Grand Jury report?

MR. GRIBBLE: Grand jury report, sorry.

MS. BARR: Okay. Any other questions on A2 Former North Building Ways?

(No response.)

MS. BARR: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Liz. Neal, you're up.

The next presentation will be given by Neal Siler – actually the next two, with Lennar Mare Island. The first one will be on the Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6 in Investigation Area C2. And we'll talk about an Interim Removal Action Work Plan Addendum.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6 in IA C2 – Interim Removal Action Work Plan Addendum***  
**Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island (LMI)**

MR. SILER: Okay. The first presentation I'm going to make tonight will be on the former Industrial Treatment Plant No. 6, and this site is known by a number of names. It's also known by the lead and fill soil south of Building 1310.

And what I'm going to talk about here is give you a little bit of history, background on the site. We're going to talk about our proposed interim removal action, and then give you an idea of the schedule when we're going to implement this removal action.

Okay. To give you an idea of where this site is located, it's located really in Bagley Street right south of Building 1310 and just to the west of Building 208 in the heavy industrial section of Mare Island. And how this site was discovered, there was a removal action at the former industrial wastewater treatment plant. And when they started digging it up they found that the materials that were surrounding it were this very, very heavy oxidized metallic debris. And when they started testing it, it had these very, very heavy levels of lead. And when they started looking at it they found out it went much more extensively than they thought it did, so they did some excavation work and did some investigative work also.

So the next slide shows you an example of this debris, this metallic debris that you see. As you can see, it's heavily iron stained. When they started looking at the samples to see what was the constituent of this that potentially could be of concern. They found lead, and they also looked at some other things. They looked at TPH. They looked at volatile organic compounds. They looked at semi-volatile organic compounds, PCB's (polychlorinated biphenyls), organo chlorine pesticides, a whole suite of potential constituents including metals. But the ones that really stuck out were lead and polynuclear aromatic compound or a PAH hydrocarbon that was benzo(a)pyrene.

So this is what they came up with when they were looking at the characterization of this material. They found that the constituents of concern were lead. You can see the maximum concentration is 31,000 milligram per kilogram. And in this area of the island where you have industrial reuse, the cleanup level is 800 milligram per kilogram. And then they found a number of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, but the one of concern specifically was benzo(a)pyrene. And they found it at 1.3 milligram per kilogram. And the cleanup level for that is .21 milligram per kilogram.

So the next slide shows the distribution, and it shows the area where we found these really elevated levels of lead specifically, and those are what the purple dots, I think they're pink more on your handout -- or reddish on the slide itself, but they show up pink or purple up here on the screen.

So what's going to happen is that we're going to take out this material. We had tried to meet the cleanup goals that we have for this area, which is 800 milligrams per kilogram lead, and .21 milligram per kilogram benzo(a)pyrene, and if we find any other PAH's or polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons we'll clean those up to the industrial cleanup levels that are promulgated at this time.

So we're going to be planning on taking out about 2,700 cubic yards of this material down to a depth of eight feet. And if you take a look at the map, which is the next slide, that's the extent of the material that we're proposing to remove at this time. And of course, that could grow depending on what we find in the sidewall samples and the base samples as we take them.

But that's the proposed area that we're planning on taking out at this time.

So the schedule and the path forward, we submitted the Interim Removal Action Work Plan back in September. It's being reviewed by the agencies. And we plan on implementing this work next month in November, 2008. And probably in the next few months after that we will prepare an implementation report that will go to the agencies.

So that's the conclusion of this presentation. Does anybody have any questions?

Thank you. Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: You said the cleanup -- Henry does this so I'm not -- for DTSC, so I'm not following it that closely. But you said the cleanup goal for lead is 800 milligrams per kilogram, that's a U.S. EPA 2004 PRG.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: Was there no --

MR. SILER: And the problem is that there have been actually new U.S. EPA levels, screening levels that are published, and those are what we call regional screening levels. And although there is a screening level for residential lead, there is no screening level published for commercial industrial properties for lead.

So we're going back and using on that 2004 level. And that seems to be something that's been accepted by DTSC and the Water Board, depending on the type of removal action that we're proposing.

MR. FARLEY: We, in fact, have had a lot of discussions with Henry about that, and he's never expressed a concern about using that number. He's basically supported it.

MR. GRIBBLE: You know, when I ask those kind of questions it's not to challenge you guys, because that is -- Henry for DTSC is the project manager for that -- I only ask that for clarification and a point of information.

MR. FARLEY: And, Chip, I didn't mean to come off as defensive. What I was trying to just express was that we have talked with Henry and worked pretty closely with him. And it's a frustration for everybody with these numbers that keep evolving.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, one thing I want to thank you for, Neal and Steve, CH2's there on the corner, for actually giving us some data, some numbers. Sometimes I've complained about that you've had the concentration levels but you haven't had what you're shooting for - for the cleanup levels in your reports. And this was instructive. So thank you.

And then my final comment, question, two of them. On your last slide, your removal volume, what's bank cubic yards?

MR. SILER: It means that's what's actually in the ground right now. As we take it out it will actually fluff up, it will be more as we get it out on the surface. It will end up being more than 2,700 cubic yards. But if you take the limits of the excavation, you know, length and width, the depth, you end up with 2,700 cubic yards.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I thought it was something to do with the local economy or something.

MR. SILER: Well, if we could trade it in for money, we would.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Lead. And so this is not an unknown -- this is an unknown then in your ESCA or your cleanup?

MR. SILER: It has kind of evolved over time. At one point it was considered to be an unknown, but right now CH2M Hill is taking it back and implementing this program as a known, under the known program.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, for those people who don't know what known and unknown mean in this little question and answer Neal and I just did, maybe I could at least give a lay explanation of that. That is that there was an \$85 million or so grant from the Navy to Lennar to manage and conduct the environmental cleanup for the property that they received in a fee title transfer. And so that number was based on the characterization of the properties as they knew them at that snapshot in time. And there was a provision for finding surprises or unknown environmental cleanup issues that would kick in some other money other than that money that came to you, huh?

MR. SILER: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that kind of more or less right? You can add onto that.

MR. SILER: Yeah, whatever's in the, what's called ESCA or the consent agreement, the ESCA is the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, that was between the City and the Navy. And then there's another agreement called the MIRA, which is the Mare Island Remediation Agreement which is between Lennar, Mare Island, and the City.

There are certain financial tools that we use to make sure that when we are scoping out this program, that everything is covered. And so there are actually two insurance policies. There's what's called a remediation stop loss policy, which is for the known conditions, that it provides money for any overages on the known conditions to make sure that those are remediated at that time. And there's also another policy called the environmental liability or ELI insurance policy, and that's for the unknown conditions. So there are a lot of tools that we use to try to make sure that this cleanup goes along from a financial standpoint.

Anything else on that one? Then I'm going to move right along to the next presentation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wendell, this is on the agenda because you brought it up the last time.

**IV. PRESENTATION: *Environmental Conditions at Building 84, IA D1.3***  
**Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, LMI**

MR. SILER: Okay. There we go. There it goes. At the last meeting I wasn't here, but this topic came up and so we thought it would be a good time to talk about it. And this deals with Building 84 and what we want to do is talk about the environmental condition of Building 84. And how this came up is that my boss, in his infinite wisdom, let it slip one time that there's a potential that this building may need to be demolished to meet the type of criteria for environmental cleanup. So that's why we're going through this. That's not something that is a done deal at this time, but it's something that could happen and I just want to explain to you why there's a potential for that to happen. So what --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe you should also explain why anybody would care.

MR. SILER: Well, it's a historical building, and I'll get into that. I think it was built in the 1800's, and it was used as the Navy brig for a long time. It's actually a very beautiful building, and it would be a loss if we had to actually knock it down to be able to reuse that area. But what I'm going to talk about, I'm going to talk about the Building 84 Area. Kind of give you a little bit of idea about the environmental sites that are on that property, and I'm probably not going to dwell too much on the conditions that we've already cleaned up, but I'm going to talk about some of the conditions that we really need to look at to be able to justify cleaning up that site for the reuse, which is residential at this time.

So, as I mentioned earlier, this facility was the Navy brig. It was in use for a long time. There's an original building that's a very beautiful building on the site. It's a brick building. You can see it there in the next slide, that's the slide of it.

But it's in an area that's designated for residential land use. So we need to meet unrestricted criteria, which is the most stringent criteria that we would clean up the site to, as far as for reuse by human beings.

So this site has a number of different conditions that we have to look at. There are some polychlorinated biphenyl sites or PCB sites. There are three of those. There are underground storage tank sites, three of those. There's a fuel oil pipeline that runs through it.

Now, some of those sites have been closed, but some of those have proved to be very challenging, and just their existence is a real problem for the building and how we can remediate those sites.

So just to give you an idea of where these sites are located. If you remember the big giant building that used to be right over here, Building 866, that I've taken all of the rock and crushed it, and I've actually constructed models of the Hindu Kush, the Himalaya, and the Corcoran Range on the site, that's where that is right over there. So it's right across the street as you go west across Flagship Drive. And so here's Building 84 right here. This is the original building. And then there's an add-on building which is 84A which is this building back here. Now some of the sites that we're looking at here, there is a PCB site that runs all the way along the floor of the building. There is a FOPL site, this little FOPL site right here. There are a number of underground storage tank sites. There's the Building 84 North site, and the Building 84 Courtyard site. There's another PCB site -- there's actually two more PCB sites, there's this site and 84A, and then there's this site which is the PCB mezzanine site which sits right here.

Now the sites that have been closed are this FOPL site, this PCB site UL#01 right here, and 84 North. Now, this is kind of an interesting UST right here because we thought we had closed this UST, we had done a number of investigations on this UST, looking in this courtyard, and you'll see a picture of where we thought this was, and really thought that this didn't exist.

But while we were doing some of the remediation for this site, and there's a little anteroom that's on right here, and lo and behold we found this, an underground storage tank there which we believe to be the 84 Courtyard UST. And then we found some additional surprises as we worked at that site. So that gives you an idea of where the site is located and some of the conditions at the site.

So I'm going to go two slides beyond right now and talk about the PCB site Building 84 AL#01. And this site in itself may be the most problematic site and the most difficult site for us to close to be able to reuse the building. For some reason, and don't ask me why, but while they had the prisoners in there the floor got impregnated with PCBs. And we don't know how that happened, but that's what is in the site. So what we've done is we did a number of removal actions to remove those PCBs. So let's go to the next slide.

And this here is just kind of a little schematic of the floor. And what we thought we had to take out in this building were these small little sites that have like a little black dot in them, they're kind of gridded off, like here, here, there's one here, and there's one here.

But as we did that, we found out that as we moved out we couldn't achieve cleanup goals in the site. And again, if we want to reuse this building, and we really would like to reuse this building, there actually is a volatile component of PCBs that we have to meet. Not only do we have to meet the residential cleanup level in the soil, but we have to make sure that PCBs in the indoor air meets the

criteria to be able to reoccupy the site. So what we did a number of times, we went in, did these removal actions, you know, went back in, took PCB indoor air samples, and no matter what we did we couldn't get it down to the level that we needed to reuse the building.

So what happened was -- and we did this in stages. We've actually removed the entire floor and all the soil from underneath this building. And when you walk into this building the first step is a lulu because you drop down about three feet, and you drop down about six feet in other places. So we did this removal in four stages. And we did a number of different things besides just removing the floor and going back and taking indoor air samples. In fact, one of the things we did, like these fluorescent lights that you see here in the ceiling, these tubes, they have PCBs in it. And we found those in the building. We removed all those.

Then we went and we got a scissor lift and vacuum cleaners, and we scrubbed and vacuumed every horizontal surface on the site. We removed additional amounts of material in the soil that was underneath it resulting in the entire removal.

And every time we went back in and took indoor air samples, these levels here, even though we were meeting the criteria which was .22 milligram per kilogram in the soil, these indoor air samples are not acceptable for residential occupancy, and they're not acceptable for commercial or industrial reoccupancy.

And at the time we did this the level we were shooting for was 3.4 nanograms per cubic meter of air. That's the residential level. That's been raised with the 2008 regional screening levels to 4.3 nanograms per cubic meter.

And at the time we did this we were looking for could we possibly use this building for commercial purposes, is that there was no commercial industrial screening level for air. So we actually went back and did a risk assessment and calculated one, and we came up with 7.6 nanograms per cubic meter of air. Now, the new standards that have been published that do have a level it's about 22 nanograms per cubic meter of air. But as you can see, the only one that meets this criterion is this one right here. And one of the real interesting things is, if you take a look at this and you go back in time to see when we did these removals, is these results keep going up. And why they keep going up we're just not sure. We've had a lot of comments from people at the regulatory agency saying, well, you didn't take out enough of the material in the soil. But every soil sample we have is below the .22 milligram per kilogram.

So I've asked them where I should remove more soil, because you gotta tell me now because everything in here meets those criteria. So they've kind of gave up on that and had to agree with me. So that's probably the most difficult site that we're going to have to be able to close to be able to reoccupy and reuse this building.

And as I mentioned to you, while we were doing these soil removals to meet these cleanup levels, we went into this one little area, and I thought we had solved this problem with the Building 84 courtyard tank, we couldn't find it in the courtyard, did a lot of sampling in that area, did a lot of geophysical investigations in that area, couldn't find the tank, thought we had solved it, went into a little anteroom that's off that you'll see here in a moment on the slide, and lo and behold, we found this tank. So this is the area, the courtyard that we thought the tank was in. And this is the original building right here. This is Building 84, that's the original wall. This is 84A from this point off to the left of the slide right here. There was this little anteroom that's sitting right here, okay.

So we went in there, found the tank, removed the tank, and lo and behold we found another tank that was below this tank. So we were able to move that top tank out. We looked at this tank underneath it, and these tanks are actually interconnected. And this tank was filled with gravel and abandoned in place at the site. Now the problem is that here's that original wall right here and we're in that little room, to be able to get this tank out -- and it's much larger than that little tank that we had on top of it -- I mean we're going to have to take out the walls in this room, there's no way we can get that tank out of there.

Plus the fact that this is this original wall right here, we don't know how far this tank goes underneath this original wall. So there's the other challenge that we have here. And this right here shows you a picture of these tanks. You can see we found it right underneath this little utilidor right here. It's hard to see in the slide and it will actually look a lot better if you look on your handouts. But there's the little tank right there, there's the same little space when it's removed, and here's the lower tank.

So the next site that we're going to be dealing with, and we're still going to be doing some remedial action at that UST 84 Lower Tank, we're going to have to do something there, is the PCB Building 84 Mezzanine site. And this was discovered in 2007, we were walking up in the mezzanine level in this building, and we found some oily patches. We started sampling these oily patches, and we found that there were PCB's in this oil. And the highest concentration we got was about three milligrams per kilogram. Again, if we're going to go ahead and reuse this building for residential reoccupancy, this has to be down to .22 milligram per kilogram. So we found about seven areas where we found the soil -- or I mean this oil on the concrete. And what we're going to propose to do is remove these areas.

So here are the seven areas that we're going to remove. Now, the problem is, with removing this mezzanine level, is that this mezzanine ties into all the structural columns in this front part of the building right here. And actually let me go back to show you exactly where this site is. Yeah, if you look here, it's in this area F that's right here to the front of the building. This is Flagship Drive right out here.

So it's a mezzanine that's sitting right here. That's right above this area F right here. But the problem is that the mezzanine is the structural support for that portion of the building. So we've had structural engineers look at this, and I can probably get away with maybe removing these entire three by three foot patches right here, but once I start -- see, that one gets really close to a column -- or I start taking out this entire mezzanine level if I had to do that, I'm going to lose lateral support in the building and I can't guarantee that the building will stay up at that time.

So what we're going to do is we're going to actually -- the first thing we're going to do is scabble these seven areas, make sure that we capture all of the dust that comes off of them, and then we're going to go ahead and sample and see if we can meet the cleanup criteria. We could go as far as taking each of these areas out completely, but beyond that we're going to have a structural problem with people staying on this thing and people being able to safely occupy this portion of the building.

Now, the last thing that we found as we were doing this work, and this again ties into this PCB site AL#01. As we were digging the floor out we found what we call black granular material. So we kept seeing it in the material and in the side wall, and it's very, very high in lead. Not as high as what we found at Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6, but high anyway. And it's about 840 milligrams per kilogram. We also found, as we were testing this material for off-site disposal, it

had organo chlorine pesticides in it. So we had to go ahead and dispose of this stuff as hazardous waste because of that, and it actually kicked it up to another level.

But the problem is -- and you can't really see it here, I didn't have a really good slide I could show you with -- is that it is directly underneath the foundation of the building. So I may have to excavate this material out underneath the bottom of the foundation, and when I do that I can't guarantee that the building will keep standing.

So it's all around. If you go in this building and look in the sidewall of the foundation you can see this material in there. So what we're going to have to do, we're going to have to go out and investigate this. And in fact, we don't know how far out outside the building it goes. So we're going to go in, we're going to advance twenty soil borings, take samples at two different levels. It seems to be concentrated in the upper four feet of this material, of the soil. We're going to take samples to see if we can delineate the lateral extent of this material to find out exactly how much we'd have to take out. Because to be able to reuse the site for residential purposes, this is all going to have to come out.

So as you can see, we've done a lot of work at the site, but we still have some work that we're going to have to tackle to be able to either reuse the building or come up with an idea what can we do and what's the ultimate disposition of this building.

Now, we've been working on this site for about five years, and we hope that we can save the site, but I can't guarantee it. And once we get to those points where we start making those evaluations, it could well be that this building, we just can't save this building.

So that's the end of my presentation. If anybody has any questions, I'd like to take them right now.

MR. KARR: Neal, have you tested any of the bricks or mortar in the walls?

MR. SILER: You know, we haven't.

MR. KARR: Is there any weathering of -- perhaps from that as this air continues to come back on you?

MR. SILER: Well, what happens with the air is that if you're standing outside the building, and even if you had all the doors open and everything else like that, there's enough of an air exchange where it's not a problem for you. But the problem is when you get in the building and you shut all the windows and all the doors, then this air starts to accumulate, and it potentially becomes a health hazard while you're in there. That's something I thought of too. And one of the problems with PCBs is if you get dust in the air and it gets in the dust and it starts impregnating the surfaces, okay, it can actually get into the surfaces, and you can possibly wash the walls but I don't know how I could ever wash the walls to get it out of there or even do anything to extract it to get it out if it is impregnated in the walls, because that's something I've thought about too. But we've tried to do as much as we could with all the surfaces in the building to go ahead and vacuum them down and try to clean them off. And even after we did that it's still coming in, we're still getting it in the building.

MR. RASMUSSEN: But it's still a fact that you don't know where this is really coming from.

MR. SILER: Yeah, that's right. Maybe it is coming from this PCB mezzanine site. And that's one of the things we're going to do is we're going to go in and take those areas out, we're going to take those areas out, and then we're going to do indoor air sampling again to see if that solves the problem. But, you know, I can't guarantee that until we get those results back.

MR. COFFEY: Neal, do you know what was in those USTs?

MR. SILER: You know, I think those were kind of unknown USTs and -- Steve, I don't remember. The lower one we have no idea because it didn't even show up on any map. Now the upper one it was only about, I think about 660 gallons. You know, when you see something like that it's probably some sort of fuel oil tank, something like that most likely.

MR. FARLEY: It was tied to the fuel oil pipeline that was showed on the earlier figure.

MR. SILER: And I would guess it was probably -- at one point both of them were probably tied into the fuel oil pipeline system.

MR. COFFEY: How old were they?

MR. SILER: That I'm not sure to tell you the truth. I'm sure we could probably find out the upper one, but the lower one we have no idea, it was a total surprise.

MR. GRIBBLE: Let me help Mike out here with the question. I think what you really mean to say is what are the results of the analysis of the interior samples from the tank and the soil?

MR. COFFEY: The gravel.

MR. GRIBBLE: outside of the tank when the tank was --

MR. SILER: Yeah. And we actually took samples in that, and I think all we really found was TPH. We actually did six borings outside the tank. I wish I had a better shot of that, I don't have it here. We actually did six or seven borings around the outer tank to see if there was any contamination outside of the lower tank especially, we drilled bore holes, and everything we got back was below the Tier I screening levels for residential reuse.

So that we could reuse, but to be able to put the proper infrastructure in there that lower tank has got to go, it just can't stay there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And this lower tank is five by twenty?

MR. SILER: Well, that's what we think. We're not sure actually how long it is because we're not seeing the end of it as it goes into the original wall of Building 84.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can't you cut it up?

MR. SILER: It's a possibility. We might be able to cut it up and get it out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ask these ADR guys, they cut up ships, they know how to do that, it would be a piece of cake.

MR. SILER: It has to be floating, though.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, it does not, it does not, I learned that Monday night.

MR. FARLEY: We'd have to move Building 84 to a dry dock.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There you go, that would clean up the air. And that way you can get all of this black granular material out of there. So what the hell were they doing with these prisoners? I mean this sounds rather dreadful.

MR. SILER: Maybe it was the precursor to Abu Ghraib.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, yeah. Yeah. Let's stash black granular material and load it up with organo chlorine pesticides. I really have one other question, I'm just looking for it, your papers came apart here. How did you come to decide that this should be a residential site? Because of its, the view or --

MR. SILER: Well, this was part of the original land use plan that this area would be residential. And what we're trying to do is actually remake this into condominiums. And I can't tell you how many we were going to put in there, that's something that I just don't have a real good handle on, but I know that we're trying to reuse the building and put condominiums in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I take it we're not going to see this building on our RAB tour?

MR. SILER: We can go see the building on the RAB tour. The only trouble is that first step as you go in is a lulu.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're going to let me go in first, right?

MR. SILER: I'm going to push.

(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's pitch black in the building, you can't see a thing either.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You don't think I'll come prepared with a flashlight, huh?

MR. SILER: Oh, I'm sure.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Is it economically feasible to move the building?

MR. SILER: You'd have to take it apart, it's brick.

MR. COFFEY: Unreinforced?

MR. SILER: Unreinforced masonry structure. And even then if the PCBs are in the brick, you know, it's real problematic, even if you moved it someplace, that you would be able to reuse it.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: But it was reaching residential standards that you had the problem with, right?

MR. FARLEY: In the air.

MR. SILER: Right. But again, as Chris had mentioned, we're not really sure where this is coming from. And maybe it is in the PCB mezzanine, maybe it's something we've missed. I can't imagine we've taken the entire floor out to have met these goals. The only other thing I can think of is maybe something impregnated the walls. I just don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. It seems like it could have done that, and that brick can be, is very porous. The other thing is maybe this makes the agencies rethink the levels of PCBs that are, you know, the cleanup goals for indoors of buildings, that even that small amount is still giving you high hits. But it is strange that it keeps on getting higher. You've had some other -- oh, it was that other underground storage tank where the soil gases kept getting higher and higher.

MR. SILER: UST 231.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, 231. Yeah. And there wouldn't be any sources outside that are somehow migrating through the soil because of the soil structure?

MR. SILER: You know, I mean we've looked at that, but that soil is really tight. If you get in there, it's like a really tight clay soil. You may see some of this black granular material, but even around it you're going to have these real tight clays that are around it. Yeah, it's really an enigma.

Any further questions?

MR. RASMUSSEN: I'm sorry, Neal, maybe you mentioned earlier, but the brick, has the brick been tested to see what's impregnated in it?

MR. SILER: I don't think that we've tested the brick. We haven't tested the brick, and that's something that we could do also. But then again, I just don't know how to clean that brick to be able to try to reuse it. It's just so porous.

MR. RASMUSSEN: What I was thinking if it turns out that it's in the brick maybe you have to say the building is toast and just give up on it.

MR. SILER: And that's a potential issue. We're trying to save the building and do everything that's practical and reasonable. And in fact, I really think we've gone a little bit beyond that to try and save this building, we're still going to try to do it, but I can't guarantee we'll save the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wasn't there an experiment under Building 866 where they tried to cook PCBs? Maybe you could go put a tent over it like they did and just t--

MR. SILER: The only trouble with that is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- rebake the bricks.

MR. SILER: -- that creates dioxins and furans which are more dangerous than the PCBs.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, details.

MR. SILER: There's always something, I know.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I just wanted -- just to follow up on Chris' point, because of the historical significance of the building being the first brig on the West Coast, and its time and everything else like that, the time of construction, we have these pretty extensive agreements with the state and everything on buildings that we'll keep. And if we can't fix this building to be used for something or another, then we've to go back and reopen those agreements. And when you start opening up those agreements you just open up Pandora's Box because, you know, it's never one for one or X number of feet for X number of feet. It's well, let's keep something else, you know, something else. But it's always much more, something else much more. So we'll probably have to make some agreements to save some other buildings if we can even make an agreement. I'm not saying that we can tear it down, I'm just saying that if we have to tear it down we will probably have to find other buildings of somewhat equal significance. And quite frankly, we've already identified all of the buildings of significance, so we're probably going to look at some lesser significance and bring 'em up.

MR. RASMUSSEN: But that just seems pretty intense.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Chris, you really should be using the microphone, everybody else has.

MR. RASMUSSEN: But that strikes me as being pretty intense to have agreements that are structured that way. If you have a structure that's filled with material, if this turns out that the brick is contaminated and this building can't be saved because of that or shouldn't be. In fact, it would be

best if it were hauled away, then why would the state hold your feet to the fire about trying to create some other space? It just doesn't make sense, it's challenging to do this.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I think, I think probably it's because you have one group of people that are experts on PCBs and all this other, and you have other groups of people that are experts on historical significance, and not necessarily are those two talking to each other. So somebody will have to help talk, you know, will have to run between 'em.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hey, Gil.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I gotcha.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll just make one last comment, I promise you. What about the possibility of just playing leave the darn building there? What's it going to do to anybody sitting there?

MR. SILER: It probably wouldn't do anything to anybody just sitting there, but you could not go in the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you could look in the windows, you could make a museum out of it.

MR. SILER: But nobody could go in there to see what's in the museum.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But so they could go look in the windows, you know. You weren't going to go in there when there were prisoners in there anyway so, you know, just pretend it's a brig.

MR. JORGENSEN: Put some mannequins inside.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, what's the big deal?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Talk about opening up Pandora's Box.

MR. SILER: One of those old nuclear facilities where they have the mock towns. Are you volunteering to --

MR. GRIBBLE: No, that would require that we monitor, and I don't think I'd like to stand there all the time and watch to make sure that nobody's going in there.

MR. SILER: I mean, yeah, that would be part of the problem if somebody got in there or something else and wanted to get in there, I mean it would be impossible to try to regulate that.

MR. GRIBBLE: But the other stuff, maybe it's time to invite SHPO here for a meeting and a conversation at this forum or some other forum.

MR. SILER: And we may get to that level. And like the agreements that Gil talked about, there are mechanisms when something like this just can't be saved, you're going to have to go ahead and you're going to have to make that evaluation and show why it just can't be saved.

MR. GODSEY: Neal, have you looked at encapsulating the interior surfaces?

MR. SILER: You know, and I think that's something that we looked at. But believe it or not, we have some of these PCB sites, and that's the problem with this PCB and indoor air, it's all over the place, and nobody has a really good handle on it because I've got some sites that we've cleaned up to industrial standards, you go in and do the PCB indoor air and they pass, you have some sites that are encapsulated and they don't pass, and you have to do more encapsulation. And you have one like this where we, as far as we know we've cleaned up everything that was at the site down to residential levels, and we still can't get the indoor air down.

So this whole thing with PCB and indoor air is not well understood, and it's kind of like you have to like try to see what's going to work. But that is possibly something that we might be able to do.

Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yeah, I was thinking, is there some way of sealing the bricks?

MR. SILER: Yeah, and that's what Dave was talking about is encapsulating the brick. We might be able to do that, we'd have to look at it though.

MR. COFFEY: If it's the brick.

MR. SILER: Yeah, if it's the brick. If it's not the brick then I don't know what.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Maybe it's coming out of your black granular material.

MR. SILER: It might be. But the problem is we've tested that for PCBs and there's no PCB's in the black granular material.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe it's acting as the vehicle for which the material, the PCBs could come.

MR. COFFEY: This place is a conduit from hell.

MR. SILER: It's a gateway.

MR. COFFEY: That's right. We know where the prisoners went.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thanks, Neal. Next is our first public comment period. Is there any public comment?

MR. GOLOVICH: Stan Golovich again. I've seen lots of images of the western shoreline. Several of the ponds appear to be without any vegetation, so I did some homework and I found out there's an agreement to maintain these in a non-vegetative state. I also know that the city has signed an agreement not to ever use these for upland disposal or dredge spoils.

So I got to thinking that maybe it would be a perfect site to entertain some alternative energy technology such as solar or vertical access turbines, and there would be some, you know, net type of use for that type of platform. There would be some foundational elements within the bottom of the pond, and I'm interested in finding out more about the regulatory requirements for this type of use. Or transitioning from whoever has trusteeship now to some other entity.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't know what the rules are.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I can take a stab at it. Those lands are deeded to the City, granted to the City of Vallejo by the State of California legislature through the California State Lands Commission, and the property is to be used for public trust uses though the grantee extinguished one of those uses. So that's an issue that I don't think has actually been resolved yet. And then you have some other interim type of agreement, I think, for management of those ponds for a time with Weston Solutions the City does, to -- because one of the purposes -- well, the end results of extinguishing the public trust use of dredge material disposal was that you might try to think of some other use for it such as the pond, such as in mitigation wetland bank and mitigation bank.

But I would think that if that isn't a viable opportunity, business that doesn't make business sense to use those ponds for that purpose, that they are seasonal wetlands under the Army Corps' jurisdiction, wetland delineations, but might be that something like solar could be used there. I

mean it's being proposed on other lakebed -- or used on other lakebeds and reservoirs and wineries and places like that. So in terms of it being a public trust use, it would qualify. But it would just depend on what kind of agreements are already in place between the City and Weston, and how long those last. And you might talk to Weston off the record or outside of the meeting here. That's my thought on that.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, it's my understanding that they're supposed to be maintained in a non-vegetative state, and I guess that's a question I have to -- Weston, is that -- have you been keeping up with that because I haven't --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Stan says they have.

MR. GEMAR: We've been disking them every year. We're coming up on an annual event. So, so far we've been doing that, yeah.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Any other public comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As all the players will recognize me as one of the newcomers, there may be a few others, for the benefit of them, and I may have dozed off for part of our presenters, but we haul off all this stuff, and I presume there's something in the contract that says the contract is going to fill up those holes and verify that it's cleaner than the stuff that's left?

That's basically it.

MR. FARLEY: It's a good question. We have a document that is one of the overall controlling documents on the island, and it's called the soil and groundwater management plan. And one of the things that that document requires is that there be characterization of any soils being imported to the island, for example, for backfill. And there are requirements for not only the frequency of sampling, but also criteria for organics, and for inorganics like metals, that must be met before the stuff can be brought in on-site. And when we do that, when we plan on bringing materials in, we coordinate directly with DTSC and get their approval for import of that material to the island.

So there's a formalized process that we've been following to make sure that we all know what the quality of that soil is when it comes in on-site.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Any other public comment?

MR. GRIBBLE: Actually, Steve, that's partially -- you're partly correct and partly incorrect, sorry to tell you. But --

MR. FARLEY: Tell me which part I'm incorrect on.

MR. GRIBBLE: And so we do this with the three, the three entities that we have to deal with for the environmental cleanup, with Weston, with the Navy, with Lennar, that if any of them want to bring in soil, import soil for backfill on a site that we're trying to resolve for environmental contamination, that we look at that very carefully, they've got to sample it, and we look at the results very carefully, and we consider that before we say it's okay to bring it on that site that we're trying to close out for environmental contamination.

But on another site where we're not involved in environmental remediation, it's either clean to begin with or we've cleaned it up and we're done with it. An example would be the residential area by the school site, we're not involved. And that's the developer and their compliance issues with -- with other laws or whatever. But we're not involved in any cleanup or monitoring. If you are a developer in someplace else that they want to build a new set of tract homes, and you're grading

and you're going to build and bring in some fill, we're not involved in that. You don't come to DTSC and say, "Hey, we want to import this soil, these are the results, what do you think?" We don't do that. Unless it's from a hazardous waste site, in which case we're going to be looking at it because it's coming from a hazardous waste site. So there is a potential, and it really is incumbent upon not the agencies, we're not involved, but upon the developer who is handling that soil.

And it does happen, by the way. There was an incident in the city of Berkeley, in I think it was the seventies, some developer had a lot of extra soil and they offered to give it to the city for their landfill. And the city very gratefully accepted that soil, and they put it out at their landfill, and wouldn't you know it, nothing would grow out there. And eventually they went out and tested, as I understand it, and they found that it was that high in PCBs that you couldn't grow anything. So it was contaminated soil that somebody had unloaded on the city, and I'm not sure who wound up paying for that, I'm sure the city had some cost associated with it. But those kinds of things do happen. That's clearly illegal. That's all I can tell you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Any other public comment for the first go-round? All right.

With that, we'll take our break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

## **V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, folks, let's go ahead and get started. All right, everyone, we'll go ahead and get started. First on the agenda is administrative business and announcements.

Should I go first? All right. Myrna doesn't have any, so I'll take the floor. First, if anybody has any comments on the minutes from the last RAB meeting, please get them to Myrna or myself.

Second of all, we have a RAB tour that's going to be taking place on Saturday, November 15th. The RAB members should have received a flyer, hopefully, in the mail.

I actually have a sign-up sheet for those that know they're going to come just so we'll pass that around, but just so I can get a number, at least a tentative number.

MR. QUIGLEY: What time is it?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It begins at 10:00. It should be on your flyer.

MR. COFFEY: Generally runs how long?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: About probably three hours. And so we'll be touring some of the sites. So that's November 15th. And then our next RAB meeting which would have normally been November 20th because the last Thursday is Thanksgiving so it was moved up to November 20th, we have moved that to December 2nd, the first week of December. It's actually on a Tuesday. It's on Tuesday, December 2nd. So hopefully that's all right with everybody. Do I hear any objections to that?

MR. RASMUSSEN: I'm going to miss it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You out of town?

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: I have to wash my hair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Would you please use the microphone.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You got that, didn't you? So that will be Tuesday, December 2nd for the next RAB meeting. With that, I have no other announcements so we'll go ahead and go to the focus groups.

## **VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS**

### **a) Community (Wendell Quigley)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And Wendell, community.

MR. QUIGLEY: Just two things. Gil told me that he'd be buying lunch for all of the RAB members that attended on November 15th. And we'd like to do a fundraiser to buy Gil some new shoes.

MR. COFFEY: The city won't pay for it.

### **b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Natural resources, Jerry.

MR. KARR: Nothing to report. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Jerry.

### **c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Technical, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: First of all, I am looking forward to the 15th and the tour on that -- I'm looking forward to the tour on the 15th. And I have a question about -- I remember when, you know, the planning was stages for the turning things over to the developers and there was these insurances and we were talking about them a little earlier about is this known or unknown, is it covered by insurance or -- with AIG tanking, did that affect that money?

MR. SILER: The insurance policy is not with AIG, it's with Zurich.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well yours is.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Theirs isn't, theirs is with AIG.

MR. JESPERSEN: Kind of a two part answer. The money that the Navy paid the City is in a trust account, so essentially there's a fiduciary that holds the money in escrow and we're paid from that escrow account periodically depending on the work we do. Over and above that, at the start of the project we did pay for some insurance products, as Lennar did, but chose some different people, and our products are through AIG. I'm sure some of you folks have seen some of the difficulties the insurance and financial industries have gone through in recent months, including AIG.

However, the insurance vehicles are highly regulated, they're kept in a separate part of the company that there's very limited ability for the corporate entity to access. So essentially, from what I've heard from a number of different people from AIG at a relatively senior level when I've been on conference calls, they've essentially said, "Even if we wanted to touch it, we're not able to touch those funds." So we're still fine.

MS. TYGIELSKI: And now I've got to try and remember my third question. I guess I'll just pass the -- I'll just pass on it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks. If you remember we'll let you speak again.

**d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next is Gil, city report.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right.

**e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Steve, Lennar update.

MR. FARLEY: So there's a one page handout, I hope everybody's got one; if not, they're on the table right there. Let's start with the photographs that seem to kind of draw your attention. I'm going to start on the upper right, some examples of drilling we're doing at Installation Restoration Site 15, site IR-15. You can see the location on the map.

But the interesting thing about these photos, this is a couple of shots of a sonic drill rig. A sonic drill rig instead of using a spinning action to drill actually uses a vibratory technique to drill down through the soils. And we're actually using this inside Building 225. I think the thing that's interesting about the photo on the lower right is that we actually had to cut a hole in the roof of the ceiling of the room to get it inside and get it all set up. So we've had to really work very hard at logistics to get the drilling done inside these buildings because of the groundwater contamination that's underneath this area.

Upper left, a couple of photos of some work we're doing for FOPLs, Fuel Oil Pipelines -- I just love saying FOPLs -- Fuel Oil Pipelines. Just upper left is some work that we're actually doing inside Building 85, which is one of the historic buildings along the waterfront.

And then the other photo here is showing some of the trenching we're doing on the south side of the old power plant Building 121.

A couple of other things to draw your attention to on the map. We've got a number of different rectangles and squares and circles and such. Those all represent some of the primary areas that we're working on. The ones in blue with a blue circle, those are all PCB sites, polychlorinated biphenyl sites, and we're just wrapping up the final sampling or just received approval, or another one, the 637 AL#01 we've just completed all the work and we're just now getting ready to prepare the implementation report to summarize the work that we did. In the H2 Area there's a couple of USTs, underground storage tanks, 243 One and Two, and 231 One and Two. Those are locations of some former tanks that we removed or were removed. We've done some pretty extensive soil excavations out there, and we're waiting now for some buildings to be demoed in that area in order to complete the work.

Down in the lower right corner USTs M57, 1310, 686 and 102, those are all locations where we've started or will very soon start some soil excavations to remove petroleum contamination in those areas. In the lower left corner of the handout is a listing of a number of the major documents that are either in review or public comment periods coming up or other documents that are coming up soon. I won't go through all the details there, but just be aware that these are all major documents that are in the process of being reviewed by agencies or coming up very soon.

Environmental site closure status, we list there the PCB sites, the UST sites, and the Fuel Oil Pipeline sites that are closed, just sort of an accounting. And the only change from last month is

another four PCB sites were closed by the agencies. So we're really getting up there in terms of the PCB sites, 442 of the 570 are now closed. So that's the big picture. I'd be happy to entertain any questions anybody might have.

Thanks.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thanks, Steve,

**f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next, Cris, Weston update.

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks. We've also got a one page handout here that hopefully everybody's got. And first on the agenda is the document status of a variety of documents we're submitting to the regulatory agencies or planning to submit in the upcoming months, so I won't belabor that. And I'll move right onto the update on IR-05. And we've had several excavation areas within the northern portion of the site backfilled, after obtaining approvals from the regulatory agencies that the confirmation samples have met the cleanup criteria. And we're still waiting on a biological opinion that's under development by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we need that to allow for the excavation of some remaining soil hot spots within the wetland portions of IR-05. The biological opinion will give us the authorization to proceed with the work and specify the requirements to minimize potential impacts to the salt marsh harvest mouse.

Moving onto Investigation Area H1, we noted last month that the schedule for completing the remaining portion of the cap, that would be the landfill cap, has been extended into 2009 to allow us to consolidate soil from the IR-05 site after the receipt of the biological opinion.

And we're also, as you can see in the picture there the bottom left-hand side, beginning to install a portion of the perimeter access road around the completed portion of the cap. I think last month we had a presentation on the status of the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall, and that's located within the mudflats on the western shore of Mare Island. If you look at the inside of the map there on the right hand column, as requested by the regulatory agencies, Weston has completed some additional sampling in September within a larger area at the treatment plant outfall at 31 locations to better characterize the site. We're currently doing an evaluation of the residual ecological risk at the site, and we've got a meeting schedule with the agencies in November to discuss what the path forward will be.

And then, finally, an update on the Western Early Transfer Parcel, San Pablo Bay Trail. We've had some drawings and interpretive panel displays updated in preparation for construction of a public access trail to a portion of the western shoreline of Mare Island. The trailhead is tentatively going to be located within the northeast portion of Investigation Area H1, and the trail will be constructed along levees of the former dredge ponds. The trail is a requirement of the remedial action plan that was approved back in 2002, I believe, for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, and it's required to provide safe access to the area while minimizing potential impacts to wildlife. We've filed for a site development permit with the city of Vallejo to proceed with installation of the trails since the majority of the trail is going to be on city owned property. And we're hoping that the installation of the trail is going to occur early next year if the weather is going to allow it.

So that's all I've got for our update. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Cris.

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

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next our regulatory update, Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, we've been busy trying to keep up with the Navy on the IR-17 development or cleanup plan, and also spent time focusing on the offshore area near the dry docks to support the ADR interest in trying to get the dry docks reopened.

There are issues with the sediment there which that it's an offshore area that, for which the environmental characterization has yet to be completed, and in lieu of the Navy having completed that work at some point in time, it's our position, and I believe it's the Navy's, that anybody else is welcome to come in there and complete that to expedite their interest in lieu of the Navy not having completed their work yet at that point in time. And so we're more than willing to work with ADR or anyone else that has some interest in trying to dredge or access some part of the offshore area.

I have two questions here, one for Weston and one for Lennar since I got the microphone. On this trail is this a -- is this pretty final at this point or is it still being -- are all the parties -- have all the parties bought off on this trail alignment?

MR. GEMAR: Well, the city will go through their own CEQA evaluation of it for the trail, so I mean it's still possible that there might be an objection of some type. But for now we're going through the city's process for the -- through the development permit process.

MR. GRIBBLE: And then I had a question for Lennar, I guess that would be Neal. So I don't know if you'd talked about this at this agency meeting the other day, but the article, was it a few days ago about the -- some of the Lennar parcels on Mare Island may be auctioned off as part of the bankruptcy in the course of the bankruptcy resolution proceeding. And we have no idea what that might look like in terms of cleanup, but we've got some thoughts, and I wonder if you can comment on that or you've got any thoughts on it?

MR. SILER: There are no plans to auction off any of the parcels on Mare Island at this time. Okay. Where that came from, it came from a filing from Barclay's when they were exercising one of their rights to be able to liquidate the assets of land source. And that article was actually in Builders News and the Wall Street Journal about two weeks ago, so it wasn't picked up here in the local paper until, I guess, what, last Monday or Friday, whenever it was.

But what they didn't do was they didn't file the other documents that they had to file to go through with that. And our understanding is they have no plans to do that at this time. So there are no plans to auction off any of the Lennar Mare Island parcels to anybody.

MR. GRIBBLE: Is it fair to say that somebody is considering it though?

MR. SILER: No.

MR. GRIBBLE: Not even being considered?

MR. SILER: No.

MR. GRIBBLE: I think that's an important thing for you guys to make it clear at this point, because it has raised some concern internally with some of the agency people, not being sure what that might mean for us. So, thanks. You might want to take the next opportunity when you meet with Henry to go over that with Henry, but I'll talk to him.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thanks, Chip. Paisha, the Water Board.

MR. JORGENSEN: Nothing major to report. Just working on closure reports that have been submitted for USTs and FOPL sites, trying to knock some of these off because there are a lot still remaining to be closed. Other than that, we don't have any more comments.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thank you, Paisha, Chip, do you have another comment? Nope. Okay. Next is our --

MR. FARLEY: Michael, could I -- two things real fast. I just want to take a second here while we're all sitting here to thank Paisha for cranking through documents and, at a minimum, getting us comments so that we can make progress on moving things forward. And also helping us rigorously in dealing with the Geotracker program and making sure that we have all of the right documentation in the right place and we're checking off all the boxes. It's very much appreciated. And if you haven't picked up on it yet, we're very excited about having you on the program. So thank you.

The other thing I'd like to do real quick is to introduce somebody who's very important to the program today and going forward, and that's Mr. Ed Aromi who -- Ed, could you do a quick stand up for us so everybody knows who you are? I've introduced Ed to a couple of folks here tonight. I'm anxious for everybody here to meet Ed. Ed is going to be an extremely important component for this program. He comes from 25 years of experience in leadership roles, not just 25 years experience, but leadership roles on very large, very complex environmental projects. Most recently Ed comes from the Nuclear Business Group where he was a senior vice president for projects in that arena. And if I could impose on Ed for just one moment, could you just give us a couple of seconds of greeting to the rest of our attending audience here?

MR. AROMI: Well, in this season it's a risk to give a politician the mike. You can't be a senior vice president and not be a politician. Thank you. It was important for us to make the introduction tonight because I'm coming to Vallejo and to Mare Island to be here for the next year and a half, two years. We're driving with Lennar very hard to get the work that's our scope done for Lennar.

We've been working very hard on developing schedules that we believe are implementable, and I was asked by the company to step up as the corporate executive sponsor who could be here.

Chris Shea, who some of you already know, has been involved recently, but he couldn't make that transition, has other obligations, and they caught me between the United Arab Emirates and here, and I chose here, and willingly.

So I look forward to working with everybody. And it's my intention to be at every RAB meeting that I can and be part of this. And we're looking for housing here in Vallejo. Unfortunately I do horses and I just moved fourteen and a wife and family and father off to Akin, South Carolina last December, and I cannot pick them up immediately and move, but I can move. And I have been traveling back and forth routinely, but I'll be here full-time during the weeks, and traveling back home for the next year and a half until we get this done.

So, thanks. Thanks for the opportunity.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Next are the Co-chairs reports.

## **VII. CO-CHAIR REPORTS**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Myrna, you go first.

MR. GRIBBLE: He does have a really nice hockey program, ice rink, ice facility.

MR. AROMI: I'm not a hockey dad.

(Thereupon occurred simultaneous discussion.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. On those notes, my report is just actually a bunch of dates for you to write down. First of all, I'd like to send the RAB's greetings, get well wishes to Bob Palmer who's out with some surgery and some health issues. And we really do want him to get better and be back on the scene. He's been a great support.

The Mareislandpreserve.org, [www.mareislandpreserve.org](http://www.mareislandpreserve.org), has a button on the home page for the interview that I did on "Eye on the Bay," with that team, and you only have to watch about the first five minutes and then you go do something else because that's all that I'm on. I got as far as Slaughterhouse Point before they kicked me off of the boat. And so that's an easy place to go watch that show. If you missed it for goodness sakes --

MR. FARLEY: But, Myrna, I'm assuming you talked for a half hour and they just --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, two days, Steve. Two days.

MR. FARLEY: I rest my case.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Two days.

MR. FARLEY: Myrna, I was being kind.

MR. COFFEY: There's some major editing going on there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually one day I didn't get to talk, all I got to do was -- the B footage, where the chapel and the art ship and all that are. No, I got to talk incessantly -- Brian Hackney can equal me easily. But, yeah, editing, the power of editing. Put these dates down. For any of you who would like to come out or invite your family, friends, let the world know that the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve, the Naval Ammunition Depot, the cemetery, and all those good places are actually open during the day on the following four Saturdays, November 8, December 13, January 10 and February 14.

And, of course, Kenn Browne, Sierra Club, one of our RAB members will be giving a shoreline hike, maybe somebody with the Navy, since Bob's out, should coordinate with him on November 8, December 13, and January 10. And then he'll be giving hikes for the Flyaway Festival which is the next date you should put down, the first weekend in February, February 6 through 8. And there's a chance that we'll be back in the building we've been using for the last seven years. So stay tuned on that.

And the last thing is I would like to thank Weston Solutions, Lennar Mare Island, and Kennedy Wilson Properties, and lots of other good folks -- including Jim Porterfield, who else was there? -- for the support that you gave us to put on the Lost Boats of Mare Island Memorial on October 11.

And I thank Larry Maggini with Weston Solutions for just an incredible job at putting together a real tribute to the crew and the yardbirds who built the seven boats that were lost during World War II, the seven submarines built at Mare Island. Out of the 23 that we built, seven are lost at sea. And we had a really, really wonderful memorial service on October 11, the 65th anniversary of the loss of the Wahoo. And so we have a little movie coming up very shortly on the events of that day that you can pick up on a DVD.

But you can also go to [www.mareislandlostboats.org](http://www.mareislandlostboats.org), and that's the beginning of our website on that topic. That's all my announcements.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Myrna. Next we'll do the Navy monthly report. We've been out in the field a lot this last month. The first event I'll talk about is where we're continuing our investigation at the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, or what we call the DRMO area for TPH or total petroleum hydrocarbons. The objectives of this particular investigation include determining the lateral and vertical extent of the TPH contamination. We're looking for possible preferential pathways for the migration, and we're also looking at the chemical nature of the petroleum. The field work activities included some direct push borings, exploratory trenches, and some vacuum borings and potholes.

So we began it on October 20th. It is anticipated to go through November 12th. And another one that Chip mentioned on his update was our field work going on at Site 17, the Building 503 area that began around the end of September and is pretty much complete. There are a couple more monitoring wells that we're going to be getting some samples out of. We expect that to be completed by November 7th. With that, data is being collected to support our engineering evaluation and cost analysis, or our EE/CA that's currently being prepared. In the fieldwork we completed 32 soil borings, we took samples from 14 existing monitoring wells, and we installed four temporary wells.

We also installed 41 active soil gas canisters where we sampled for soil gas. And we have some pictures on the brochure for that. If you turn the page you can see the documents that we submitted. The Navy submitted four documents since last month to the regulatory agencies. And we received a decent amount of comments and/or concurrence letters from DTSC, the Water Board, and EPA.

And our next BCT meeting will be on December 2nd.

That's my report. Any questions at all? And one other thing?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I do have one question. Regarding a comment that Chip made earlier about the Navy not having scheduled your sampling of the sediment yet in the river. And Chip said something about California Dry Dock Solutions, if they wanted to reuse the dry docks and they wanted to dredge they could, you know, just go do the sampling and work themselves.

But I've noted that on IR-17, the Building 503 area, and then even the Building Ways, it seemed to me like you kind of expedited that work, and maybe that's just a misperception of mine, to assist the city and Touro University in resolving those cleanup issues so that they could move forward with their development.

So it seems to me like -- first you could answer whether that's true or not or if I just made that up. And then, secondly, whether -- if there was enough pressure or public interest whether you might also rank higher your sediment sampling to also accommodate a reuse.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, actually on Site 17 we did accelerate the schedule. We were planning to go out in the field, so that was already set. What we accelerated is the documentation for that. So for instance, the EE/CA or the -- what I just mentioned, the engineered evaluation and cost analysis coming out, shortened review times, things like that. We're working with the agencies to get the documentation for that. But the fieldwork itself was already planned.

As far as the offshore is concerned, and let me go back to the Former North Building Ways, that was nothing accelerated on that, that was just what was presented tonight the Final RI, that's been ongoing for quite some time. And same with the petroleum work that Liz talked about.

For the offshore sediments, or Investigation Area K as we call it, we're actually in the field. We were out in the field in September and we actually kind of reported before we went out in the field on that. And we're going back out in the field to do work for our remedial investigation doing the long core sampling in December. The work plan for that just went out. So we're continuing on with our remedial investigation work on schedule at the offshore.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And the only other thing that I forgot to say about the Lost Boats Memorial is that you can also purchase a book that Larry has put together, Larry Maggini, on the seven submarines lost at sea that were built during World War II here or served.

And that's for \$25. And, of course, I didn't bring any with me tonight, but I certainly have them, and I also have that book and a bunch of other documents he put together, including the medical records of all of the submarines during World War II, who got ill, what happened on every single boat. That's on a DVD, and that's for \$10.

So some of you who are interested in that topic, you just contact me and I'll hook up with you to get you that material.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thanks, Myrna. With that, we'll go into our final comment period. Any public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. If not, we'll -- oh, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I remembered the third thing. The thing that Stan brought out about using -- the idea that Stan brought up about getting the dredge ponds used for solar energy, solar, I would think that that could bring an influx of money into our little cleanup project. I imagine that would have to be negotiated too. Does the Navy get it or Weston or State Lands or the city? I don't know.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thank you. With that, we'll adjourn.

Everybody remember the RAB tour, those that are coming, November 15th, 10:00 o'clock, and we'll meet at Building 535.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:04 p.m.)

#### **LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Former North Building Ways, Investigation Area A2, CERCLA and Petroleum Update – Navy
- Presentation Handout – Update on Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 6 (IWPS No. 6) Proposed Remedial Actions – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Building 84 Environmental Conditions - CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island

- Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update October 2008 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard October 2008