

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD TUESDAY, December 2, 2008**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Tuesday, December 2nd, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:04 p.m. and adjourned at 8:41 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)
- Kenn Brown
- Jerry Karr
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy RPM)
- Janet Lear (Navy RPM)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Scott Blount (Weston)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Stephen Quayle (CH2MHill)
- Ed Aromi (CH2MHill)
- Tim Graves (CH2MHill)
- Jim Mitchell (Touro University)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Paisha Jorgensen (Water Board)
- Carolyn d'Almeida (EPA)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Josh Bernardo (Solano County RM)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Stan Golovich
- Russ Farnell
- Lester Rich
- Bill Stephens
- Jim Porterfield
- Marilyn Long
- Benjie Ballesteros
- Diji Christian

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Kathleen Soloaga (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll go ahead and get started. Welcome everybody to the Mare Island RAB meeting, the December RAB meeting for November. Anyways, I'm Michael Bloom, the BRAC Environmental Coordinator with the Navy and the Navy Co-Chair.

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

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And I'm Gil Hollingsworth, representing the City of Vallejo.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Community Member.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M HILL.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Vallejo resident, Napa-Solano Audubon Society.

MR. JESPERSEN: Chris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Caroline d'Almeida, EPA.

MR. BROWNE: Kenn Browne of Vallejo with the Solano Group of the Sierra Club.

MR. JORGENSEN: Paisha Jorgensen with the Water Board.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble with the State of California Environmental Protection Agency.

MR. FARNELL: Russ Farnell, HSMPS, that's the Iowa group here.

MR. RICH: Lester Rich, Historic Ships Memorial at Pacific Square.

MR. STEPHENS: Bill Stephens, USS Iowa.

MS. LEAR: Janet Lear with the Navy.

MR. GOLOVICH: Stan Golovich, ex-Mare Island worker.

MS. BALLESTEROS: Benjie Ballesteros, resident Mare Island, community member.

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

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston Mare Island.

MR. QUAYLE: Stephen Quayle, CH2M HILL.

MR. KAISER: John Kaiser, DOD Program Manager, Water Board.

MR. AROMI: Ed Aromi with CH2M HILL.

MR. GRAVES: Tim Graves, CH2M HILL.

MR. BLOUNT: Scott Blount, Weston Solutions.

MR. MITCHELL: Jim Mitchell, Touro University.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. BERNARDO: Josh Bernardo, Solano County Resource Management and Site Mitigation.

MS. WONG: Marilyn Wong, USS Iowa Project.

MS. DREYER: Marie Dreyer, Navy RPM, presenting the first topic.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll go ahead and get started with our first topic. It is going to be given by Marie Dreyer with the Navy, and it is an update on the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, or the DRMO area, and it's on the petroleum fieldwork that we have recently completed.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) Petroleum Fieldwork Update*
Presentation by Ms. Marie Dreyer, Navy

MS. DREYER: Thanks, Michael, and good evening everybody. One thing that I recall, one of the comments, from the RAB tour that we had last month, November 15th, was that when we visited some of the Navy sites, it was commented that there wasn't a lot of visible signs of active fieldwork going on. So, in putting together tonight's presentation, I want to promise you that it will be loaded with pictures so you can see the actual fieldwork that happened at this site, which is the DRMO, which stands for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office.

This site, as you've probably seen many times, is this triangular area which is located at the corner of Dump Road and Azuar Drive about four blocks south of G Street, which is the street right outside this building here. Tonight's presentation will focus mainly on the TPH Program that we're currently managing at this site, and with that, I will review some of the past TPH investigations, go over the most current investigation that we just finished last month right before the RAB meeting, and also outline some next steps at this site. In 2006, we discovered what we now call the OSB, just an arbitrary name that we named this box that you see here. It stands for oil sump box. When we discovered this sump box, we also discovered a 6-inch perforated pipe that was attached to it. And what we found, both within the pipe, the box, and in the soil around it, was this thick, black, gooey, molasses-type substance, which we have since later identified as Bunker-C fuel.

And let me point to the map here, and, in fact, let me circle it, if you choose to come up here and take a look later on. This is where we found it. We found it right on Azuar Drive, about midway or halfway down the site that we're calling DRMO. Having found it on Azuar Drive and now being the main contaminant of concern that we have come to associate with the DRMO, our next logical step was to try and figure out, well, how widespread is this contamination?

So, in 2007, we performed a follow-on TPH investigation to answer that specific question. And for this investigation, we dug some trenches, both on Azuar Drive and also on Dump Road. And the thinking there, or the reason why we put the trenches on Dump Road, as well, was to see if any of the contamination that we are seeing on Azuar Drive had maybe gone through the DRMO somehow, found a preferential pathway onto the Dump Road site. And we found, after performing this investigation, that indeed it had, or at least we were seeing pockets of this TPH both on Azuar and Dump Road, and we are seeing a couple different things.

For the most part, we are seeing that this TPH contamination really wasn't mobile, at least not within the soil type that's present in the DRMO area. We are really just finding it in the cracks and fissures of this soil in that area. But where it touched this metallic debris layer, because the void spaces within this metallic debris layer were so large, it provided a good opportunity for this thick, black molasses, Bunker-C fuel to migrate through other areas of the DRMO. Having identified this correlation between the migration pathway of the TPH in its preferential pathway to go through this metallic debris, we decided in the early parts of this year to do a geophysical survey of the DRMO to see just how widespread the metallic layer – the metallic debris layer was at the site. So, here is

our little site worker guy, and he's got an electro magnetometer with him. This device is able to survey to depths of about 15 feet, and in total our survey encompassed about 10 acres.

So, in 2006, we identified this free product, this TPH; in 2007, we performed some trenching to identify the lateral extent; and then in the early part of this year, we did this geophysical survey. Having done all of this, we stepped back and figured out, what more do we need to complete the picture to fully characterize the extent of contamination at DRMO? And that is what our fall of 2008 field investigation -- the reason that we did this investigation was to more fully answer, that question.

And in doing so, it was a very robust investigation, and it had five main objectives: The first was, we wanted to perform some forensic fingerprinting analyses on the different areas of TPH that we had encountered so far. Basically, we wanted to see if the samples from Dump Road match with the samples on Azuar Drive, that kind of thing, to see if maybe they had originated from the same, you know, parent source. Secondly, we wanted to identify the vertical extent of this contamination, how deep within the earth does it go? Third, lateral extent. How widespread is this problem? And fourth, we wanted to confirm the geophysical survey results. And fifth, we wanted to identify any other potential pathways.

Now, I already mentioned that this stuff likes to travel through the large void spaces provided by the metallic debris, but does it also like to travel through, pipelines or utilidors, that kind of thing? Oh, backing up a little. I just wanted to, kind of as a side note, to let you know that the numbering here, it wasn't just randomly picked. It actually corresponds to this figure, which is enlarged over here. This figure shows our various sampling locations for this fall 2008 event. And basically, what you will see -- I know it's fairly small in your packet, but if you come up to this figure, you will see some pink dots, and every pink dot is a sampling location. Written on top of the pink dot is its associated letter, how we kept track of which location we're looking at. And then next to each dot is a number, or series of numbers, which match up to the reason we're taking that sampling, whether it is one, two, three, four, or five.

So, for Category 1, those were the samples -- sample locations targeted for forensic analyses. We collected forensic samples for forensic analyses from 5 maintenance holes and 16 direct-push boring cores, and I will describe those a little more later.

What you are seeing here is one of our crew members pulling up a sample, obviously, from Location BB, and the slash 1 just means it was meant to be -- or this sampling location was targeted for Category Number 1, forensic analysis. Next, you see a close-up of the baler that was used from the prior picture and a picture of the sample container that we used to obviously collect the sample and ship off to the lab.

Category Number 2 was to collect samples for -- to delineate the vertical and lateral extent of the contamination, and we met this objective by pulling 47 cores using a direct-push drill rig, which is what you see here.

Basically, this is a dual-pipe system that gets put into the ground, and within the inner pipe is an acetate sleeve, and the outer pipe kind of just serves as a stabilizer for the earth around the core surrounding the acetate sleeve, and you pull that out and you are then able to visually inspect these cores and identify, you know, where the TPH layer might reside, that kind of stuff.

In fact, this gentleman right here is sitting right back there. This is Stephen Quayle, himself, hard at work. And then the two pictures next to Stephen are two examples of the kinds of conditions we

saw. First one, obviously, a clean core sample, no TPH present, and here are some TPH lines running through that core sample.

The next was Category 3. Oh, let me back up. So, when you take a core sample, you are really only able to see this much of the earth. You are not really able to visually go out there and see is this site, in fact, clean? So what we did for all of the samples that came back clean was, we went out and did some confirmatory trenching. And I would say for, what, 99 percent of the trenches that we did for confirmation trenching did come back clean. And one cool thing about trenching, obviously, is you are really able to see a nice profile of the earth, you know, including that debris layer that I keep mentioning.

Category 4 was to confirm -- are the geophysical results of the survey that we performed early this year. We used the direct-push drill rig, again, to meet this category, this data quality objective.

Category 5 was to identify any other potential pathways. As I said, there's that metallic debris layer, but what else is a preferential pathway, maybe, for this contamination?

So the different types of other potential pathways that we looked into were, you know, pipelines, utilidors, that kind of stuff. But when you are working around such sensitive infrastructure, you really just can't go in there with a direct-push drill rig. So, instead, we used a vacuum-boring rig, which allowed us to more surgically create a trench around these pipelines and, thus, not disturbing the infrastructure.

So, basically, what I mean when I say that is, for example, here is a layout of the various results that we got from this vacuum-boring activity, and in three of these pictures, you can identify the utilidor, or pipeline, that we excavated around. Here is one, here is one, here is one, and there's one. And, you know, like I said, there's a variety of results, from full-blown TPH, you know, contamination present at the bottom, to just a light sheen on top of water, to nothing at all. And, again, that debris layer present right here in the middle. And, in fact, we definitely knew it was there, 'cause when we opened up our vacuum-boring stuff, we were able to identify some of the metallic debris that we had sucked up.

So what are our next steps? Well, as I mentioned, we completed our fieldwork investigation on November 14th, so now it's a waiting game for the laboratory to get back to us with the results of the cores and forensic samples. Once we get those back, then we'll review, validate the data, we'll update our conceptual site model, or CSM, as appropriate, and then we'll update our TPH Tech Memo, which we published in draft form in April of 2007. We plan to update that with our current findings to date into a draft final and submit that in March 2009, followed by a final version in April of 2009.

And so you may have recalled last month, for Halloween, Liz showed you a picture of her little baby girl in her Halloween costume; so for Christmas, I'm showing you a picture of my little baby girl in her Santa Claus costume. And I wish everybody happy holidays and thanks for listening.

Any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Don't get any ideas, Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I noticed that on your board, samples along the eastern side of Azuar, what you all might know as Cedar, that it -- you have basically a line running -- I'm going to call it north-south. What happens if they come back with TPH in them? Do you go out there and take more to see if that progression of your product has gone east?

MS. DREYER: We've actually -- oh, sorry. We actually did perform some sampling on the eastern side of Azuar Drive, so all of these -- all of these pink dots that you see over here, and, in fact, two confirmatory trenches also were sampling points.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Right. Yeah, but what I am trying to find out is, suppose it's gone further east. If you got -- if each one of those red or pink dots came out positive --

MS. DREYER: Mm-hmm.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- would you have to go back out there and do more sampling to determine how far the contamination has gone into that area?

MS. DREYER: Oh, yeah. Absolutely. I mean, that would be part of our delineating our lateral extent.

MR. RICH: Do you currently have a more definitive definition of the metallic debris?

THE REPORTER: Could you please state your name for the record.

MR. RICH: I'm sorry. Lester Rich.

THE REPORTER: Thanks.

MR. RICH: What was the metallic debris?

MS. DREYER: Oh, what kind of material does it consist of? Oh, my gosh, everything. Stephen could probably tell you better, but, at least in my few visits to the fieldwork site, it was anything from rebar, to -- I saw a car bumper being pulled out. Um, I don't know if you would like to add more, but ...

MR. QUAYLE: Large ship pieces, bulkhead-type things.

MR. RICH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. QUAYLE: We have seen -- along Azuar Drive, we have seen the largest bulk metal debris, and we have seen ship parts and pieces, and we have seen, you know, strange wheels off of things and such.

THE REPORTER: Would you state your name, please?

MR. QUAYLE: Stephen Quayle.

THE REPORTER: Thanks.

MR. QUAYLE: And along Dump Road, we have seen more machine-shop type debris, sheets of metal with circles punched out of it, stuff like that, grinded up metal.

MR. RICH: Okay.

MR. KARR: Yeah, I had a question. How have you confirmed or determined that this oil sump is the only source of the material? What did you do to determine that this material was brought there and dumped and didn't migrate in from somewhere else?

MS. DREYER: Um, hmm. I almost want to turn it over to Steve. It --

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Go ahead.

MS. DREYER: You don't mind?

MR. FARLEY: Not at all. There's been hundreds of borings in wells and trenches installed out in that area, and the primary evidence that the oil sump box is the most probable source is the co-location of the oil around the oil sump box, it's migration along preferential pathways to the north and south, utilities and that sort of thing. And the oil sump box, itself, was actually a structure that looks like it was -- I mean, I don't know that we ever found any technical design drawings, although we did find some rather crude drawings that showed how it was constructed and what it was used for.

And when you look at the oil sump box when it's in its original state, the inside of the pipeline was full of oil, and it actually was cut up a couple of times. The pipe was down near the bottom. The pipe was actually below the water table, and the Navy came back and actually cut the pipe on the north side and plugged the hole.

The photograph in here of the oil sump box will actually show the concrete plug. And then two holes were chipped in the concrete right through the rebar, around the rebar, and then some metal grates were bolted, sort of Rube Goldberg style, were bolted to the outside of that thing so that the holes would be above the water table. So even though it's not the only source, it is likely the prominent source of the oil along -- at least for the area along Azuar Drive.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MS. DREYER: Right. And part of our Data Quality Objective, Category Number 1, the forensic analyses is there to help us sort of figure out, you know, could there be potentially another source? Are the fingerprints, the chemical analyses of these various different samples, are they the same? If they are not, then perhaps there is another identifiable source that we haven't yet identified.

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, this may not be as current of you as integrating all the new information that you probably have, Steve, but there were not too many months ago where we were looking at -- we were, and still are, looking at this, that this was just a surface discharge or -- at least in addition to the oil sump, a surface discharge at somewhere west of Dump Road and probably, or perhaps, multiple source areas, that is, just going west. And you see evidence of that, and it's to the far left of that in spots that -- to the far left and to the far south of that, of that figure that Marie is standing by. And that -- you are saying that's not -- that's not correct in your --

MR. FARLEY: No, I was actually fairly careful to qualify my comments about the distribution along Azuar Drive. So the question I was answering was, what is the source of the material along Azuar Drive? The prominent source of oil along Azuar Drive is most likely the oil sump box. Out to the west, we all know that there were oil sumps out there. We all know that there was lots of different activity that has probably occurred out there, some of which could have been associated with surface deposition, but I don't believe there's any evidence that there was surface deposition along Azuar Drive where the oil sump box is located.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You have on this drawing a large or a very large area that has a yellow line on it, yellow double line, it looks like.

MS. DREYER: Mm-hmm.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How is that connected to this project?

MS. DREYER: That line basically just delineates what is the EETP, or Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, and what isn't. So to the right would be EETP property, and to the left would be Navy property.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So it looks like you sampled inside the Crane Test Area?

MS. DREYER: We did, right up here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's because you, in those trenches across Dump Road that you did previously, you found the product across the street?

MS. DREYER: We did.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or it went under the street?

MS. DREYER: And it was a combination of that, and we had had several working group meetings with the agencies, and we requested we perform some sampling in that area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then you have sampled also further to the west along Dump Road and way out. Can you talk about some of those? I see there's -- looks like there's samples up to the northwest of the Crane Test Area. You didn't mention any of that in your presentation, or didn't talk about that. Can you talk about that?

MS. DREYER: I -- for the specific sampling locations A, H, and M, I will turn it over to Stephen. But I do know that at least these brown-looking logs above A and above H did come back without any TPH present.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then there's also some down in this area, too.

MS. DREYER: Correct, and they also came back without TPH. We trenched them and weren't able to visually see any TPH contamination.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Just for the folks who are here that don't do this every day, I wanted the opportunity to point out the importance of this particular parcel and why we are spending so much time on it. Azuar Drive, this parcel basically blocks our development of everything north of it because our utilities have to go through this area. We have done all kinds of studies to try to divert the water lines and the power lines that are necessary for the development of everything north of that area, and it always comes back the same. It's just economically not feasible to do.

So, in developing the north end of the island, where we are hoping and trying to put together not only the Cancer Treatment Center but the Touro University Village to get the power and water that we need up there, we can do temporary lines by going overhead with electricity and running with our secondary lines of water; but when we reach build-out of those areas, we have to have that main corridor of Azuar -- we need the big pipes in there to bring water up to the north end. And we can't put the utilities in until we know the extent of the contamination and then clean up that contamination, so we're spending an enormous amount of time and everything.

I think of this as probably the blockage that is just -- the environmental blockage that is keeping us from going ahead with completing the negotiations for the development of the north end of the island, 'cause we've got to get past this stage before we can finish that up.

MS. DREYER: And we absolutely are trying to stay on course definitely with this site and let everyone know our schedule, for sure.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And the Navy has in every step of the way been helping us with this. I am not trying to say, you know, "we" being the City, or "we" being Touro University, the only people. Everybody in the room who are represented here have been working and trying to solve this problem.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As has the Restoration Advisory Board for that matter. This site has been challenged for a hundred -- a hundred years or so.

MS. DREYER: Legacy.

MR. FARLEY: How long have you been on the RAB?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I actually --

MR. FARLEY: You were an embryo when you were on the RAB.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, a hundred years. I didn't -- if you listened carefully, Steve, I didn't say that I was here a hundred years ago or that the RAB was. I said it's been an important site to clean up for at least a hundred years. I'm curious about how Bunker C would have gotten there, what the purpose of -- I mean, was it -- and that oil sump box, I mean, if this was a long-term use as a DRMO scrap yard, where Bunker C would have come into the equation there, or whether that was a transitional use after the site had been used for something else.

MR. FARLEY: It's a great question, and -- I am assuming it's okay if I --

MS. DREYER: Oh, absolutely.

MR. FARLEY: -- take this one. Okay. For me, the oddest thing about the -- well, let's start with the simple part. Bunker C is the most common fuel that was out here. It's the stuff that flowed through all of the fuel oil pipelines and that sort of thing. But as far as the oil sump box goes, what's very odd about it is, it had a steel lid on it. It looked like a regular old manhole lid. So every time you had to pop -- if the conceptual model is that they would end up with some waste oil of some kind within the DRMO, say they drained a tank or they somehow ended up with stuff they had to get rid of, to go out to that oil sump box and pop this steel lid every time and pour stuff down there, when it's on the other side of the fence -- and I have looked at historic air photos of this area, and I don't see any, you know, direct pathway or direct route or roadway, either permanently or temporary, that led from anywhere within the DRMO out to this oil sump box. It's an enigma to me.

I don't quite understand the functioning of or use of that oil sump box, but everything that we see suggests that this oil sump box was the primary source, at least along Azuar Drive. Like Chip was pointing out, there are different modes of deposition out there. And for the stuff along Azuar Drive, it looks like the oil sump box was a primary mechanism for the stuff to get down in the subsurface.

The irony is -- at least from my experience out there, the irony is, is that were the metal debris layer not there, the problem would be one one-hundredth of what it is, probably. And I don't know -- I doubt if that was a design consideration. I can't imagine the Navy going out and looking for a metal -- "Oh, we found a metal debris layer, let's," -- but it's an unfortunate, you know, sort of happenstance that this stuff -- that where the oil sump box and a perforated pipe were installed was right through this metal debris layer that is, like Marie said, it is really the mechanism that allows the stuff to move horizontally. And it doesn't move -- it's largely confined, in terms of the mass that's out there, it's largely confined to the 3 or 4 feet-ish of this metal debris layer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So it was, actually, a dump, probably, before it was a scrap yard or--

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, this area --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- a reuse?

MR. FARLEY: The edge of the original 1959 island is just immediately to the east, or to the right on that map, just to the right of Azuar Drive, and it sort of wraps around south of the sports complex and goes farther to the east. But the old shoreline was right along in through this area. And I think probably what happened is -- and you can look at some of the old air photos, and you can see the way the Navy developed, at east portions of the island, they just basically -- it looks like they pushed material out in front of them to cover the wetlands area, and I am sure that they pushed this stuff off the edge of the original island. And I can imagine they must have had a tremendous amount of metal debris, and it probably provided a good substrate on which to move equipment back and forth and that sort of thing.

But the real point is, is that it's unfortunate that the oil sump box is co-located with the metal debris, because it really is the mechanism that allows the stuff to migrate horizontally.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just have one other question. Jerry has always told us about -- in the past about how thick and -- well, you also mentioned that how heavy Bunker C is and how it's got to be actually warmed to move. So what do you -- how was it going through pipes? Were they steam-heated, or it was heated as it was moving, before it was moving?

MR. FARLEY: You know, I don't know. Does anybody here know if the FOPL lines -- I don't know that they were heated. I haven't seen any evidence that the FOPL lines themselves had any heating systems. I am assuming it was just pushed through with pumps. And when we pulled that oil sump box out, I mean, molasses is actually an understatement. The stuff is somewhere between cookie dough and molasses.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So what would a -- what mechanism would have -- would it have used? Did it just, over time, like drizzle through this -- the weight of it just kind of fell through this metal debris? I mean, it wasn't floating or moving like through the water table or anything. It's just sort of sitting there.

MR. FARLEY: Well, as I mentioned before -- can you put up about the second slide?

MS. DREYER: Sure. Do you want you -- you don't want to see my dog anymore?

MR. FARLEY: The one with the oil sump box in it.

MS. DREYER: Sure.

MR. FARLEY: So, if you look just below -- just below the bucket, you will see a black hole; and down farther, you will see a gray -- oh, well, you see the rectangle, the square hole? And just below that, you will see -- looks like a little bit lighter concrete. That actually, the lower part is where -- is actually sort of a homemade concrete plug. That is where the perforated pipe used to actually connect to the oil sump box.

And the hole above, the square hole above, is this one that they chipped in the side of the oil sump box. And just based on how it all looks, it's pretty evident that the pipe was at one time connected to the oil sump box. And after some period of time they said, this thing ain't working, and they came back and put these holes in the side and put the steel grate on the side to keep sediment from coming in. And I don't know if the water table rose, over years, to above that perforated pipe, or if there was something else that was going on, but that pipe is generally below the water table.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. FARLEY: At least when we pulled it, it was well below the water table. That other hole up higher is above the water table, and I think the movement of this stuff was largely just driven by hydraulic head. The stuff largely wouldn't go below the water table, even though the water table goes up and down all the time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you, Steve.

MR. GRIBBLE: So I wonder, why hasn't the Navy or the consultants gone to some of the refinery people here, you may know some of them, and try to get more familiar with this fuel and how it -- how people actually used it or moved it and things like that, mundane things like that, just to answer the question, "How did you get it through a pipe?" Let me finish. And why not go to some -- try to get some old shipyard workers, who may have some familiarity with using this stuff, to really get those kinds of insights. And I don't mean somebody who used to work at a shipyard who can make up answers, either, and you might know what I am referring to there, but somebody who --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or who you are referring to.

MR. GRIBBLE: -- used to work with this stuff, who really has an understanding and a familiarity with it. Why don't we have that kind of contextual information in our historical research? It's easy enough to do. More money, perhaps.

MR. KARR: Well, one thing, a fuel like that, movement is, you know, it's relative. If you need to move it and transfer it in a timely manner, you have to heat it, tanks are generally heated. Pipelines are steam traced to keep it to where you can move it from A to B in a relatively short time, but it's not a solid. It's always moving.

So, regardless of how cold it is, it's not like stone. It's flowing at a very, very slow rate. It's migrating on the water. And this could be tank bottoms from cleaning tanks. You know, I have no idea how they -- anytime you go aboard a vessel, barges have to be cleaned, because this stuff builds up over time in spaces.

So, if you have fuel barges and they need maintenance, have to be cleaned out, you have the fuel tanks aboard ship and you have to go in and modify them, do repair work, they are typically steamed out to melt it, to get it moving, to pump it out. And, I mean, it looks like this was an oil septic tank. You know, it just -- take it out there and dump it, and that's the way the refineries used to do it, too. I mean, that was before the government saved us from ourselves. That's the way we did things. And so it's always moving. It's just not moving the way you want it to if you are trying to transfer it from here to there, if you are trying to move it from a fuel tank aboard ship to a boiler, atomize it and get it in there where it will burn, it takes a lot of attention. You leave it alone, it's going to move and migrate anyplace it can find gravity or a void, that's where it's gonna go. Just like tar, you know, La Brea Tar Pits, they are the same thing. They are always wandering around and moving, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Interesting.

MS. DREYER: Thanks, everyone. Great discussion. Learned a lot.

MR. GRIBBLE: Jerry, you earned your pay today.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Marie.

MS. DREYER: Thanks.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Next up is Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island. He is going to give his presentation on an update of Underground Storage Tank 1310.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Underground Storage Tank (UST) 1310 Update*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island (LMI)**

MR. SILER: Okay. I'm going to go quick here; otherwise I will have complaints because of the time, so I probably won't go over every slide in every detail. I will just try to focus on some of the salient slides. But what I am going to do here tonight, I am going to briefly describe this site, which is the Building 1310 Underground Storage Tank site. I'm going to summarize some of the work to date. I am going to discuss a removal action, additional removal action that we recently proposed to the regulatory agencies. I am going to summarize some of the work completed to date and give you an idea of the upcoming schedule.

So you can see this Underground Storage Tank site is right behind Building 1310, which is this big building right here, right in the alleyway that separates it between 1310 and Building 206, which is this building right here.

Okay. The current and future land use is commercial/industrial. The site is actually within the original boundaries of the island as mapped on the 1859 survey map. The geologic materials at the site are unconsolidated natural deposits consisting of clays and silty clay. It's most likely the bay mud. It goes -- extends down to a depth of about 20 feet. We normally see groundwater in this area at a depth of about 5 to 6 feet below ground surface. In this area, the flow direction is to the east, and that's consistent with the regional flow direction, which is generally toward the strait, which is to the east, northeast of the site.

Okay. This gives you an idea of the tank, itself. As I mentioned, it's in this alleyway between Building 1310, which is this building over here, and this is Building 206, 206A, over here. And, of course as everything on Mare Island is never easy, there are a lot of underground utilities that run through here. The tank was about 1800 gallons capacity. It was about five-and-a-half feet in diameter, about ten feet in length. And that was the tank right there, to give you an idea of where it was. This is the excavation that was performed back in 2003, and we have the tank, and I will be describing that a little bit in the next slide.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hey, Neal?

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We were -- can you orient people who were at least on that tour --

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- to where we are? I figured it out, but I have asked for you to have these non-aerial photos and you guys are -- don't seem to be remembering that. But I just figured out where you are talking about, that little alley, if you could tell us.

MR. SILER: Okay. When we were on the RAB tour just a few Saturdays ago, we stopped at the -- what was called the Industrial Wastewater Pump Station Site Number 6, and it was right here. This is Railroad Avenue right here; this is Bagley Street right here; this is XKT's Works right here, Building 390, 388, 386, right in this area right here, so we were actually standing right in this area right here. And, in fact, if you go down there now and try to go to the, you know, northeast or the southwest along Bagley Street, you can't, because we have actually got the excavation for the

Industrial Wastewater Pump Station Number 6 all the way across Bagley Street right here, so that's the location of where we're at.

Okay. This site has a long history. It started back in 1997. When the Navy first tried to find this tank, they had some historical records that showed it was there. They tried to use a magnetometer to find it, and they couldn't find it. When the site was transferred to Lennar Mare Island, we came back in and used a different geophysical technique, ground-penetrating radar. We were just looking for a disturbed area when we used that, and we actually found where the tank was located. Now, we went back and did an Initial Removal Action in 2003. We removed the tank, itself, and had an excavation that was about 12 feet wide, 42 feet long, and down to 12 feet deep. We took the sidewall samples. We didn't find any of the constituents of concern, and those are: Petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel, petroleum hydrocarbons as motor oil, and polynuclear aromatic compound. And the principal one we found was benzo(a)pyrene.

Now, as we didn't find those in the sidewall samples, there were a couple of bottom samples that we found. And, again, there's a fuel oil pipeline, because this was a fuel oil tank that went right through the middle of the tank. We found some hydrocarbon that's diesel and motor oil that was above our cleanup level, or screening level, and so we knew we had to do some additional excavation there.

And it was kind of interesting because they went back and at one point where they had petroleum hydrocarbon -- you will see this on a slide, as we move along here I will show you all of the concentrations -- that they knew that it was above the Tier 2 screening level, and they went back in and took some additional excavation, they excavated some additional material but then didn't take another bottom sample, so we're going to go back in and remove that area now.

Now, what came out of this was, we had some reports that were prepared, and it was proposed that the fuel oil pipelines segment, that it be addressed under the Fuel Oil Pipeline Program and not under -- as part of this Underground Storage Tank. And then we also wanted to go in and look at some groundwater, additional groundwater data, and we actually did four quarters of groundwater monitoring in 2005. Now, we submitted those to the agencies. They agreed looking at the fuel oil pipeline segment as part of the Fuel Oil Pipeline Program. We have been updating that. There's actually going to be a new submittal that's going to be coming out here in the next few months.

But they had some additional concerns about the underground storage tank, and, as I showed you, and I will show you on the next slide, all of the utilities that went through there -- and these dashed blue lines here, you can see one that is right here and one right here, those are storm sewer lines. This green dashed line that is right next to this one storm sewer line is actually a sanitary sewer line. There's the FOPL segment. And they were concerned about these lines being preferential pathways for the movement of the fuel oil. So we went back and we did some additional work, we're going to be doing some additional work with those.

So the next slide I'm going to show you just talks about some of the cleanup goals, and there are different cleanup goals for the surface to 3 feet, 3 to 10 feet, and 10 feet and below, and these are the cleanup goals: You can see diesel, 500 milligrams per kilogram in the upper 3 feet; motor oil, 2500; benzo(a)pyrene, .13 milligram per kilogram. If you get below 3 feet, then you have slightly higher levels.

So what we propose to do, and I will show you this on -- as we go back, we'll look at the slide -- is that we propose to excavate two additional areas. The one area that I have talked about where they

had the diesel above the Tier 2 screening level, gonna go back in, take some additional samples in that area. And there was another area that we had some high content of petroleum hydrocarbons with diesel and motor oil and then some benzo(a)pyrene. And, again, what we want to do is evaluate those utility corridors, want to take a look at the depth of those in relation to groundwater and then take a look at the backfill. If we see any staining or any signs of contamination along the backfill, then we go ahead and collect the backfill material and test it for the constituents of concern.

So this slide shows you the proposed areas of excavation. The red dots, these two areas, are the locations where we had constituents of concern that were above the cleanup level, so we wanted to go around those areas.

So the next slide is some pictures I took this afternoon, just to give you some ideas of what it's like to work in this corridor. This is probably, at most, about 20 feet across, in this alleyway between it. This is looking actually to the southeast. This is the XKT Building right back here. This building over here is 1310. This is 206 over here. And because we're so close to Building 206, we started out by actually excavating some very shallow holes in this area right here. This is the southernmost hole. The excavator right here is actually sitting on top of the northernmost hole; but to be able to go back and excavate the southernmost hole safely, we had to backfill that back in so that could sit on that and then drive this trench box. And you can see this trench box here, and you can see it right here. And the reason for that, we're so close to Building 206 right here, we don't want the foundation to be compromised so the building will collapse on the people that are working in the alleyway here and the equipment.

Now, what this slide shows you right here is, right here, you can't -- you can barely see it, but that's that sanitary sewer line. That was the green dashed line that you saw on that one figure. And right here, you can see just kind of it daylighting right there. That's the storm-drain line, and it looks like it's vitrified clay pipe. It has a bell-and-socket junction, it looks like, right here. And the actual -- they've taken some samples in the upper 3 feet of these west walls and the north and south walls, and those look pretty clean. We don't have results back yet, but it's going to be very difficult for us to actually get samples right along this east wall here because of the potential for the building to compromise the foundation.

Now, what they also found, when they got down to about the level of this pipe right here, they did see some free-phase petroleum hydrocarbon. They have excavated that out. They are going to be looking down these backfill materials in these lines. I talked to the people who were out there today. I was out there, obviously, when I took these pictures. And the sand looks pretty clean, but if you look right here on the water right there, and you can see a sheen on the water. And then when Paisha's out there tomorrow, he will be able to see this for himself.

So, as you can see, we have actually started the excavation. We hope to be done with it about the 19th of December, and we would be able to backfill probably the 22nd, 23rd. That's what we're hoping for. Now, those four quarters of groundwater monitoring that we did in 2005, we supplemented that with some data from 2006 and 2007; but because we have this free-phase hydrocarbon and we're seeing sheen on the water, it's most likely that we're going to have some additional rounds of groundwater monitoring in the future after we complete the excavation. And then what we hope to do, if we didn't find any additional groundwater impacts, we hope to have this Revised Request For Closure completed in April 2009, but it's problematic whether we'll have that finished at that time or not. We'll have to see what the groundwater results tell us.

So that's the completion of my presentation.

Does anybody have any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. What did you cut off the corner of that photo?

MR. SILER: I didn't cut anything off the corner of that photo.

MR. FARLEY: I think it's blown out from the flash.

MR. SILER: I think it got blown out, yeah.

MR. JORGENSEN: Neal, in that picture with the product in it, is that gravel from backfill?

MR. SILER: Let's go back up. Whoops, sorry about that. Yeah, you know, that gravel, you know, I think that -- do you know where the gravel came from?

MR. FARLEY: You know, I haven't been out to that site, so I don't know.

MR. SILER: Yeah, I am not sure. I asked them about that. They said what they are really seeing around these pipes is this sand. I have a feeling that may be from the initial backfill of the excavation that was done back in 2003. It's -- predominantly, when we do these things in these industrial areas, this gets backfilled with, you know, 3-inch gravel, so I have a feeling that's what that is.

Chip?

MR. GRIBBLE: So now that you -- now that the tank was found -- in 2003, is that right?

MR. SILER: 2002 --

MR. GRIBBLE: 2002?

MR. SILER: -- we actually did the survey and then we excavated it in 2003.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. What's the date of the tank installation?

MR. SILER: That, I am not sure. I couldn't tell you.

MR. GRIBBLE: 'Cause at one point we had some of the basic information for some of these, enough to know that there was a tank somewhere in the vicinity, so there was some records to build on to start with.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: And I'm also wondering, do you know what that historical tank usage was suggested to be, 'cause we really didn't know. And what did you -- did you find anything that suggests what the tank actually was used for, at least in its latest, you know, use?

MR. SILER: Yeah. Well, probably its latest use, for some reason, they were storing -- it was part of the fuel oil pipeline system. And if you noticed that one fuel oil pipeline segment was right here, so it appears to have gone right -- fed into the tank, or it fed the tank somehow. Now, exactly what they used, stored the fuel oil here for, I couldn't tell you.

MR. GRIBBLE: And did you find any of the abrasive sandblast grit in the vicinity as you --

MR. SILER: Did not find any abrasive sandblast grit in the area, any green sand at all. Now, this -- in these two excavations, A and B, actually, they -- when they did their initial excavation yesterday, they actually removed -- cut, capped, and removed these two sections of the fuel oil pipeline that weren't taken out during the original excavation, which was right in here. And this was a flushed line. It was clean, so it didn't have anything in it, so they just cut and capped and removed this.

MR. GRIBBLE: And I am also curious, I wonder if you could tell us how many of these UST sites that were at one -- initially, when you got the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, there were so many -- what was the word? I am not sure what it's called.

MR. SILER: That were Known Sites?

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, I think there was another name. Not known, unknown. There was a -- Not Located was another predecessor term, perhaps, Not Located UST sites, or former UST sites, that you inherited. And I am wondering, of that number of unlocated UST sites, potential UST sites, how many of those did you then subsequently find that there actually was attained, that you found attained, or some evidence of?

MR. SILER: Yeah, and that's -- I couldn't tell you what the exact numbers were. When the property was transferred, there were 79 identified Underground Storage Tank sites. Now, since that time, we have found an additional 23 of those sites.

Now, there are a number of them that showed up on the Known list, but every time we go back in to take a look at it, we can't find a tank. Underground Storage Tank 102, which is down by NIHB3, which is down by 1326, we've got a lot of maps, historical maps, that say there was a tank here. And whether that was an above-ground storage tank, an underground storage tank, we just don't know.

But we actually went in and looked for it, did geophysical investigation, couldn't find it. Actually did some excavation work, found some petroleum hydrocarbon contamination but never found a tank. At that building, we went inside the building, took samples, you know, took some borings inside the building to see if it may be that the building was put on top of the tank, and still couldn't find it. And we're going to be doing an excavation out there.

In fact, we're starting doing an excavation at that site real quick, you know, real soon. And this is another one where there was a record of the tank, but the Navy didn't find the tank and then we went back and took a look at it.

There's been a few where we've even gone in and done some work, couldn't find the tank; you know, were able to, you know, get a closure request submitted to the Water Board and DTSC; and then gone back later, when we've done some infrastructure, and actually found tanks that looked like might be the tanks that we were originally looking for. So, I mean, it's hard to say, but it's -- in any kind of incarnation, you know, we found some tanks, so ...

MR. GRIBBLE: Thank you.

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Neal. With that, we'll go into public comment period, our first public comment period.

Is there any public comment?

(No response from audience.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No? Okay. With that, we'll go into our break.

(Break taken from 8:05 to 8:18 p.m.)

V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. On the Agenda is Administrative Business and Announcements. I will say, if you have any comments on the last RAB meeting minutes, please get them to myself or Myrna.

Myrna, do you have any administrative business?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: (Shaking head.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No? Okay. We'll move into the Focus Groups. And first is Community, which is Wendell.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: Nothing this evening.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thanks. Next is Natural Resources, Jerry?

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

MR. KARR: No, nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Technical, Paula?

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Gil, City?

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Let's keep it rolling, nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Steve, with the Lennar update.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Sorry. I do have something. We have a handout. I hope everybody has one. If not, they are over here on the table.

Let's start with the photographs. Upper left corner is the south side of Building 85, which is one of the sites that we stopped at on the RAB tour. The doorway here is the doorway that we were standing in during that site walk, and this is one of the trenches that we're putting in or have put in for removing one of the fuel oil pipelines and investigating the contamination around that pipeline.

Immediately below that is a former tank location called M57. "M" typically stands for "marine," so this was a tank that was associated with some former marine activity, and that tank location is on the west side of former Building 866, if everybody remembers where 866 was, right along the new parkway. And then in the upper right is another tank location where we're doing some excavation, UST 686-1. That's down on the east side of Building 390. And so those are just some examples of some of the work that we're doing right now, a lot of tank work, a lot of fuel oil pipeline work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that green sand?

MR. FARLEY: It's not green sand. It did come out a little green, but it's not. It's clay, bay muds. You can see some sort of stratification in the M57 excavation, a lot of silts and sands in there.

Let's talk a little bit about the documents in review. We have a lot of major documents that are in review: Soil Gas Report proposing a methodology for evaluating soil gas data. That's something that the agencies are looking at now. Response to Comments on the Final IA-C1 RIFS Report. We're trying to get that document finalized; and then a Fuel Oil Pipeline Work Plan, or FOPL Work Plan, for the C2 area.

We have an upcoming public comment period probably after the first of the year for the Crane Test Area Remedial Action Plan. That's an important decision document that we're working on right now.

Some upcoming documents: The IR-21, or Installation Restoration Site 21, that location is inside Building 386. If you look in the sort of yellow part, you will see a big C2. Building 386 is shown in gray. IR21 is inside that building. And then the FS/RAW, or Feasibility Study/Remedial Action Work Plan for the black granular material in the Building 108, IR-09, IR-12 Area, that's in C3, that's commonly referred to as the triangle. It's the area that's bounded by Dry Dock 1 on the north and Dry Dock 2, as Myrna points out, on the south, so we're working on that document, as well. And then the IR-15 FS/RAP, or Remedial Action Plan, another very important document. And you can see IR-15 is just north of Ways 1. That's an important site that we're working on right now.

In terms of environmental site closure status, there aren't any changes here from last month, but most recently we have received closure of a couple of additional USTs from the Regional Board, so thank you Regional Board. So that takes us up to about sixty-three or four closed UST sites. And I think that's probably the big picture.

The only other thing I will mention here is that UST 1310, in sort of in the middle of the figure, is the location of the presentation that Neal gave. Immediately below that, you will see a blue dot, which is the location of pump station -- Industrial Wastewater Pump Station Number 6, which is the location of one of the RAB tour stops from a couple weeks ago.

So that is all I have for this month. Be happy to answer Myrna's questions -- oh, sorry.

Any questions, of course.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: IR-21, what's the contaminant associated with that?

MR. FARLEY: Primarily TPH and some lead. It's inside the building, so it's TPH and lead.

MR. GRIBBLE: I am curious about the black granular material, FS/RAW. What do you have in mind for that, and do you have some idea of where you want to go for that triangular area, as a whole, for remediation?

MR. FARLEY: We're actually working through those issues right now, and we don't have any decisions yet. So we're actually performing the feasibility study now, is what we're doing.

MR. GRIBBLE: Not that you have a decision, but what are you thinking, and what are the options, and what are you discussing?

MR. FARLEY: We're at such a preliminary stage, I hate to say anything and have it not be accurate. Maybe next month we can give a presentation or at least talk about the alternatives that we're evaluating.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Shoving it all off into the river on a high tide --

MR. FARLEY: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- storm event?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Steve. Next up is a Weston update. Cris?

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Okay. We also have a handout here, as well. First off is just an update on the status of various documents we've submitted for Agency review, and there's really no change to report this month. You can see the three documents we have in the queue for review right now.

Moving on from that, we have got an update on the status of our work at IR-05, and we recently received approval to backfill the remainder of the areas that had been previously excavated to remove soil above cleanup criteria there, and we have just completed that backfill activity.

The Navy and Weston are also still waiting on a biological opinion that's been developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service that will allow excavation of some remaining soil hot spots within the wetland portions of IR-05, and that will give us the authorization to proceed with the work and specify what requirements we are going to proceed under to minimize potential impacts with the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse habitat in the area.

One of the things we would like to discuss, it's something we're kind of proud of, and that is we recently surpassed 200,000 injury-free work hours here in Mare Island for our crews. Essentially, our guys have been working on the Western Early Transfer Parcel under the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement that we signed back in 2002, and we have been working on Investigation Area H1, the Western Magazine Area, IR-05, and the overall general Western Early Transfer Property.

And in addition to that, we have also been working injury free under a separate Navy contract at multiple sites at Mare Island, which includes the Production/Manufacturing Area, the South Shore Area, Marine Corps Firing Range, the DRMO site, and IR-04, and we have completed over 200,000 hours of work in the field without injury. And the Navy's ROICC office in the Bay Area was nice enough to recognize us with an award, their Safety Through Awards and Recognition designation for the performance of the work that was recently been completed DRMO site. And to kind of celebrate that, we had a barbecue out here on the site for our workers on the site, some members of the Navy, the ROICC office, and I saw Gil out there, as I recall, and some of our support staff to kind of celebrate the good work you guys have been doing out there. You can see their photograph there on the upper right-hand side, Gil and some folks from the ROICC office and some of our guys there with the award.

And then finally, update on the Sanitary Sewage Plant Outfall. We have submitted an evaluation to the agencies of some additional sampling that we had performed in September. We are proposing some additional step-out sampling for seven more locations to determine the lateral delineation of two samples that had some elevated mercury concentrations. And right now, our thought is that if additional samples confirm a rather limited lateral extent, we would like to propose no further action, given the potential damage to natural resources that's out there. It's a very difficult site to

access. There are some sensitive habitat areas. But once we get the confirmation samples, we, of course, will submit those to the agencies and follow up with some discussion on what we plan to do.

And that is all I have.

Any questions?

(No response from audience.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Cris. Next we'll go to our regulatory updates. Chip?

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

MR. GRIBBLE: We have been -- the last month, we have been focusing on trying to process the IR-17 project to accommodate the City's and Touro's redevelopment interest up in the north end and working through particularly challenging offshore sediment sampling plans to complete the characterization for sediment in the Mare Island Strait and the south end of Mare Island sediments. We haven't gotten that resolved with the Navy, but we may -- hopefully we're making progress, and hopefully we're getting close to resolving it. That's where we have been focusing the last month, in particular.

MR. JORGENSEN: In addition to working on IR-17 and offshore, like Chip said, I have been bombarded with closure requests for USTs and FOPL lines, so I am working my way through lots of those and hopefully getting them closed out when they are appropriate.

Other than that, looking for a Christmas vacation.

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

VII. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, thanks. Next is our Co-Chair's Report. I will go first. The first thing on the Navy monthly progress report is our RAB tour that we had on November 15th. You can see a fun, smiling group at the bottom left corner of the -- our group shot there.

I do want to thank everybody, obviously Marie and Janet, for presenting for the Navy; Neal, much thanks for your narrative of your sites, very good; and Dwight, with Weston, same to you. So, I think overall, everybody had a really good time, and we were blessed with the weather.

It was a great day.

So, there are some pictures. One picture at the Lennar site, Site 15, and one at Site 17 in the Navy and the DRMO site that Marie talked about. In addition to that, the fieldwork mentioned that the Navy completed this month was the work that Marie just went over a tiny bit ago at the DRMO, or Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office area. She really got into depth on that, so I won't really get into that.

And in addition to that, as Chip just mentioned, we completed our Phase 2 sampling at IR-17 on November 14th, and we're waiting for the data to come in. And as soon as we get it, we'll go into the EE/CA and we'll be having a meeting on that very shortly, a public meeting on Site 17.

Some of the documents that we submitted, we submitted two documents since last month, the Draft EE/CA for IR-17, and just recently, the Draft Proposed Plan for the Former North Building Ways Area.

We received comments from DTSC, from the Water Board, and EPA on the offshore sampling, the SAP and Quality Assurance Project Plan. And we had our BCT meeting today, and another very nice picture of your Co-Chairs at the RAB tour.

MR. QUIGLEY: Must have been the drinking party.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was after the RAB tour, yeah. Yeah, Michael is jealous of that T-shirt I had on, that I said he hadn't worked for the Navy long enough. It was from the environmental -- Secretary of Defense Environmental Program.

Oh, let's see. These are the kinds of things that the Community Co-Chair gets calls about, or e-mails about, so I want to thank Weston's Larry Magini for helping me out the best he could on this question. The question from the California -- it was an official question from the California Military History Museum through -- specifically, from the Army Corps of Engineers. They wanted to know what I knew or if I knew anybody who knew anything about Hamilton Field Bombing Range in San Pablo Bay in 1930. Trick question.

What we do know is that it wouldn't have had anything to do with the Navy, because the Navy -- Mare Island lost out on -- after a five-year battle, lost out on being a Naval Air Station in about 1927, so that went to Alameda.

And we did learn that -- eventually learned that the Army Corps, itself, at Hamilton Field, the cleanup team has documented test bombs that they found at Hamilton Field, and they believe there are probably some in San Pablo Bay, somewhere down there, that were either filled with sand or concrete, and that's -- but I was pretty much able to confirm that, you know, the Navy wouldn't have had any association with the Hamilton Field Bombing Range.

The Flyway Festival, a couple of you mentioned that. It is coming up the first weekend in February, so that would be February 6, 7, and 8 this year. And that's our 13th annual event, though I always like to put a plug in for the Navy, that they actually helped us put together an event prior to that one in January of '96. Our first Flyway Festival was in November of '96, and the Assistant Base Commander, John Becker, was our host for that first event, so that is actually 14 events ago, coming up. And if you wish to sponsor, volunteer, get me a license agreement for the use of a building on Mare Island for it, talk to me afterwards, or we can e-mail or phone exchange, exchange information.

Second Saturdays at the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve are hosted by ArcEcology, and Sierra Club is very often also a participant in those Second Saturdays. And I just want to make sure you have some dates down: December 13, January 10, February 14, March 14. Those give you some Saturdays to invite your friends and family and come out to the south end of Mare Island.

And I am not sure that Kenn is going to be giving walks on the next two or three to the south shore, but we will have the 98 acres open from the gate to the top of the hill on those dates, and those are winter hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., with a Christmas carol sing-along in the Magazine at the Visitor's Center on December 13th at 2 p.m.

And then I want to use this opportunity to also thank Weston, who brought over some gravel and rearranged the entrance to the Visitor's Center at Magazine A167 so that we don't have a gigantic mud puddle there, and hopefully it will drain right off and away to the Bay. And thank Jim Porterfield for his alternative that worked very well this last winter in hand-spreading a huge few loads of mulch, but Weston replaced that big giant hole that had been filled with mulch, they replaced it with gravel, and I really, really appreciate that. I think it'll work very well this winter.

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

MR. FARNELL: I've got one. Yeah, I may have missed it earlier, but mainly for Steve there. IR-15 is on the list here of the significant upcoming documents, and I possibly could have missed it, but basically what was the main problems in that area, and what kind of defines the boundaries, if you could, please.

MR. FARLEY: I caught the first part. What was the second part of the question, what defines the boundaries?

MR. FARNELL: Yeah, what defines the boundaries, and then, of course, what was the main problem in there? I just see DTSC and Water Board.

MR. FARLEY: The primary problems at IR-15 are chromium and solvents, tetrachloroethylene, trichloroethylene, dichloroethylene, and chromium, largely in groundwater. There were some dip tanks inside the building, they had a plating shop inside Building 225, so all of the activities associated with those operations resulted in the release of various contaminants that I have described in test soil and groundwater.

A lot of the soil problems have been resolved by excavations, and we're now working on developing a feasibility study to address the groundwater contamination that is migrating east of Building 225. The boundaries of the site were initially identified by the Navy as part of their Installation Restoration Program, but our investigations don't stop at the boundaries of that originally identified site.

If we need to go farther, for reasons to get to the limits of the contamination, we'll go outside those boundaries. But the short answer is, the Navy identified those based on some methodology some number of years ago.

MR. FARNELL: Okay. That is basically what I had in mind.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Any other public comment?

(No response from audience.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. With that, happy holidays everyone.

Our next RAB meeting will be January 29th. We'll see everybody there or beforehand.

(Whereupon, at 8:41 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)