



FINAL MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

HELD THURSDAY, March 28, 2013

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, March 28th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:12 p.m. and adjourned at 9:10 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)
- Maurice Campbell
- Paula Tygielski
- Michael Coffey
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Steve Farley (Weston Solutions)
- Carolyn D'Almedia (U.S. EPA)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- David Geist (Lennar Mare Island)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Jim Durkin
- Jim Porterfield
- Mike Franklin
- Trina Mackie
- Mike Chamberlain
- Philip Marshall
- Mark O'Brien
- Fred Ousey

RAB Support from CDM:

- Randa Chichakli (CDM Smith)
- Wally Neville
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Welcome, everyone, to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board. We start with introductions. I'm Janet Lear. I'm the Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator for the Navy, also the Navy co-chair for the RAB.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, and I live in Vallejo and I'm the community co-chair.

MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen, I'm a Mare Island resident.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm Maurice Campbell, a Vallejo resident and community RAB member.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I'm Paula Tygielski, community member of the RAB from Benicia, California.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island.

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

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito, California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Carolyn d'Almeida, Federal EPA.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MR. MARSHALL: Phil Marshall, citizen.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with Weston.

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mark O'Brien, citizen.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mark Chamberlain, Trihydro.

MR. FRANKLIN: Mike Franklin, citizen of Vallejo.

MR. DURKIN: Jim Durkin, citizen.

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

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey, Envirotech Services.

MR. GEIST: David Geist, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. CHICHAKLI: Randa Chichakli with CDM Smith.

MS. MACKIE: Trina Mackie, I work on Mare Island at Touro University.

II. PRESENTATION: *Additional Removal Action at Building 742* Presentation by Ms. Janet Lear (Navy)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we'll start with the Navy presentation. And we still have our travel restrictions on, you're stuck with me again. You're going to get tired of the sound of my voice. I'm tired of the sound of my voice.

MS. TYGIELSKI: We're fine with the sound of your voice.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You're sweet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We appointed Paula to say that for us.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: How much did you pay her?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just an appointment.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So tonight I'm going to be giving a presentation on additional removal action at Building 742, former degreasing plant. We'll talk a little bit about the site background. We did a previous non-time critical removal action at the site, so we'll go over the field work for that. We'll talk about some of the sampling results that we've obtained since that field work. And as I mentioned, we're going back out there to do some more work, and we'll talk about what that consists of, and the path forward. And then take some questions.

The Building 742, former degreasing plant, is a Navy-retained condition within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. The degreasing plant was just south of the building and that's the focus of this presentation. There's also a manhole just downgradient of that, and all of this area right here is part of the Navy-retained condition as well. Building 742 was used as an ordnance machine shop from 1941 to '72. And the former degreasing plant, which was located, as I mentioned, just south of the building, was operated during the same time frame and was used to clean metal parts generated at the ordnance machine shop. It consisted of two degreasing tank pits and two lye tanks. The wastewater from these activities was discharged to floor drains and connected to sumps. The tanks were removed and the pits filled in 1971, and the COC's at the site are chlorinated hydrocarbons.

The basis for the first removal action was that low levels of volatile organic compounds, VOC, specifically vinyl chloride, were detected in the groundwater at the site. And the goal of the removal action was to reduce the vapor intrusion risk for future workers in that area. In 2010, the first removal action consisted of soil excavation and application and injection of oxygen release compound, followed by installation of both soil gas and groundwater monitoring wells, and monitoring for about five quarters. The next figure shows the green area which was the former degreasing plant. This is the area surrounding the manhole I mentioned. And this is an area of crushed storm drain. All the green areas were part of the initial removal action. Excavation in these larger areas and along this storm drain and also some injection points here, these dots where the oxygen release compound was injected. As I mentioned, after that first excavation activity there were five quarters of monitoring performed at the site, and additional confirmation soil samples were taken after the excavation was completed. And those were all analyzed for our chemicals of concern, chlorinated hydrocarbons.

So based on the post removal action monitoring results, we still have one well near the manhole that still exceeds cleanup criteria for vinyl chloride, and there is also one soil gas probe in that same area that exceeds project cleanup criteria for trichloroethylene as well as perchloroethylene. You can look at the back of your packet for the larger figures. This is the groundwater well right here where we have the exceedance. And this is the soil gas location right here. They're both in the area of the manhole.

So we still have, as I mentioned, low levels of volatile organic compounds, in the subsurface. And the goals are the same for this phase of the removal action which is to reduce vapor intrusion risks for future workers in the area. We plan to go back out there this summer to do some additional excavation focused around the manhole area. And the additional excavation for this summer is this area within the darker line here. Part of the reason we think that we still have

some issues out there is there were some pipelines that came across the excavation. And during the first removal action we just dug around those so there was some soil left in that area. So this time we're going back and we're going to cap those lines and do additional excavation in this entire area going a little bit deeper with a more thorough job since the pipelines won't be in our way.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Isn't that kind of costly to go back and mobilize again?

MR. COFFEY: I was thinking exactly the same thing.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Why wasn't it just done right the first time?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The age old question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, my goodness, I didn't even have to finish my question.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Unfortunately, the fact of the matter is the BRAC office is in San Diego, we have contractors that come up and do work, we're not always able to be there, and we weren't expecting them to leave anything in place, but now we're dealing with it. Mistakes happen and we just move on and make the corrections as necessary to do the right thing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could I just ask you at this point then, now that your confession is over, thank you. What you said you capped those pipes, where are those pipes coming from? Are they a source, do you think? I mean, a continued source out of the building or --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: No, they are just incidental in that they are not used for anything right now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But the pipes just prevented the work from being completed in an absolutely thorough way.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah. I don't think they knew the pipes were there. I'm not really sure, this isn't a project that I've been heavily involved in. But they did leave some soil around the pipes, and we think some of that soil is part of the problem. So we're going back out there, we're removing the pipes in that area, cutting the cap on either side, getting all that soil out, plus going deeper. And we think that once we do that, the small area where we still have a problem will be resolved. That's the plan.

So after that work is done, we'll do some additional monitoring at the site and then if concentrations of the chemicals of concern are below the action levels or the cleanup goals at the site, then no additional actions will be needed. And then if there are some detections, we'll monitor for a while to see if it goes down on its own or if we need to do additional work. So the report summarizing the results and the follow-up sampling will be issued late this year or early 2014. So I'm ready to take questions. Maurice.

MR. CAMPBELL: I see you're using the term ORC. Is that zerovalent iron that you're using?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: No, it's an oxygen release compound, it's not iron at all. It's a proprietary blend in this case, but the idea is to stimulate microbial activity to help the degradation of the vinyl chloride down to its breakdown products.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Being done at your IR-15 site; right?

MR. SILER: Well that's what the zerovalent iron is in the permeable reactive barrier.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right, that's what I thought.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But aren't you also applying this proprietary --

MR. SILER: We're not putting in ORC.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, you're not? You weren't ever?

MR. SILER: We have anaerobics, so we are using something else to break those down.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a question. Gil Hollingsworth representing the city of Vallejo, got frantic the last time you gave a presentation about this building saying that it was one of the most -- well, I shouldn't say that, almost every building along that waterfront he has proclaimed as urgently needed for development. But that is one of the buildings that he did identify as urgently rentable, leasable, usable. Is there any reason why -- and he believed that your carve-out here was preventing the reuse of that building. Is there any reason why that building couldn't be leased today with just this carve-out, this activity going on outside that doesn't seem to be related to the inside of the building? I mean, anyone in the whole room could answer the question, if you can.

MR. SILER: Well, to answer your question, there are still some unresolved issues, and as Janet had mentioned there's a soil vapor issue that they have to look at and vapor intrusion that they'll be looking at. In addition to that, there are still a number of sites inside the building that have not been signed off yet and approved by the regulatory agencies, and there's a few that we're still doing some work at. There's about five PCB sites we're still doing work at at the buildings.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just PCB's?

MR. SILER: Just PCB's at this time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And so is this an imminently usable building?

MR. SILER: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean this summer?

MR. SILER: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Next fall?

MR. SILER: No, it's not.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 2017, 2097?

MR. SILER: I think it will be sometime within the next few years, but it's not something that's imminently usable.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Just wondering.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Any other questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Do you know when that building was last used by employees before they left Mare Island? Was that used in the nineties?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I know that it was used as an ordnance machine shop until 1972, I don't know if it was used after that or what it was used for, do you?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jim does.

MR. COFFEY: Jim does.

MR. SILER: Supposedly it was the CIA's building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, that explains a lot.

MR. SILER: So that's the anecdotal information that it was the CIA's building when they were doing all the spy submarine work here, and they were doing different kinds of modifications to submarines to use them in various espionage activities throughout the world.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And C-I-A also stands for central industrial area which was the description of the shipyard itself.

MR. COFFEY: I thought it was the Culinary Institute of America.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's you Napa Valley people. Yes, Jim Porterfield.

MR. PORTERFIELD: If you buy a copy of "The Blindman's Bluff" book from the Mare Island museum and read about it, the majority of that project work that you couldn't see was done inside that building. The stuff that you can see on the submarine was done in the dry dock undercover.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, you could take a close look at that building. People pointed out to me, and maybe Jim was the one, that wherever you might have been able to get access on the second level has got a barbed wire fence attached to the building itself. Not a fence, a barbed wire -- is it so that -- have the copper thieves gotten into that building yet?

MR. SILER: Oh, yeah.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: There's not a building they haven't gotten into.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, how do you know that? I know there's a building they haven't yet gotten.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Chapel?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Don't tell them.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Any other questions? Comments? No. Okay. Thank you. So next up is Neal Siler.

III. PRESENTATION: *Planned Upcoming Field Activities Spring/Summer 2013 Eastern Early Transfer Parcel*

Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

MR. SILER: The title of my presentation tonight is Planned Upcoming Field Activities for the 2013 Field Construction Season which will be spring through fall of 2013 on Lennar Mare Island's property which is the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel of Mare Island. I'm not going to talk about all of the activities that are upcoming, there's about 30 sites where field work is a component, but I'm probably going to talk about 8 to 10 of those sites that we're hoping to get done this year. And the reason we're trying to get some of these sites done during the summer season is that, there's field work that we want to get done and move along, and it's very important for us to do. We're going to look at some of the Investigation Areas where it appears that if we do a little bit of incremental work we'll be very close to closing out those Investigations Areas.

And we're also doing some activities to be able to get the information that we need to develop a Remedial Action Plan for the Investigation Area. And we have two left: Investigation Area C-1 and C-2. And our plan is to get those Remedial Action Plans completed by the end of 2013. So we're trying to focus on those issues right there.

Now, the sites I'm going to talk about are in various stages. Some of them are in the planning stage still. Some of them we're just going to be doing investigations, going out and doing that, talk to the regulators, doing the investigation to be able to find out the information that we need to move forward. And some of them we're going to actually be doing remediation on. We have approval from the regulators to move forward. So there's a little bit of everything that's mixed up in here. So in addition to that, we're going to be doing sites at known condition sites. We're going to be looking at some of the unknown sites. And there's one of them I'm going to talk about, which is a voluntary cleanup, that we're going to be doing this spring and summer.

So the known sites that I'm going to talk about are the IA-K sediments that are underlying a portion of the IR-03 area. And I know that sounds real mysterious, but once I start talking about it, it will all become clear. We're going to be doing Industrial Pump Station 4 and T-2 oil water separator investigation. And if we can get to remediation, we'll try to get to that also. We're going to be doing Installation Restoration Program Site 21, and the Building 386/388/390 area storm sewer investigation remediation. We're going to still be implementing the groundwater monitoring program that we have implemented over the years through 2013, but we've actually modified that program a little bit, and we do that at three sites: Industrial Pump Station 4, T-2 oil water separator, and Installation Restoration Program Site 3 which are right next to each other. And then Installation Restoration Program Site 15 which is further down along the shoreline in Investigation Area C-1. In addition to that, we're going to be doing some underground storage tank work. And basically it's going to be soil gas survey work at UST 243. And the reason we want to look at that is, if we can get this work done and we can start moving forward to getting a comprehensive risk assessment, we may be able to close Investigation Area H-2 out within the next year or so. So we're going to be trying to concentrate on that also.

And then some of the unknown sites that we're going to look at. We're going to be looking at Building 637 area. We've already done a lot of remediation in that area, but we want to continue with that program through the spring and summer of this year. And again, that's another one that if we can get all the contamination removed from that area, do the groundwater monitoring, that's the one that we feel we can be able to move forward and close out Investigation Area B.2-2. In addition to that, there's some work that we're going to be doing at some PCB sites in Investigation Area C-2, Building 688, PCB site UL-01. And then the Building 742 PCB sites -- that was a timely question that you asked, Myrna, because I'll talk about some of the work that we'll be doing inside Building 742.

And then the last site is a voluntary site. And Building 781 -- and those of you who live on the island, you've probably seen this -- this is the former electrical substation that's kind of a very green, blocky looking thing at the corner of Kansas and Azuar Drive. And we're going to be actually finishing the remediation off in that building to remove the land use covenant and then we'll be able to demolish the building. And after that I will be open for any questions that you would have.

So the first site is the known conditions site. It's the IA-K sediments underlying a portion of Installation Restoration Program Site IR-03. And if you look at this site, it's very interesting

because the edge of the wharf is usually considered to be the edge of the quay or the quay wall, quay and wharf are used interchangeably. But for some reason in this area the quay wall actually indents and it's this black dotted lining that comes here and then goes back out along the edge of the wharf. And if you look at this in plan view right here, as you're looking underneath this, you can see here's the quay wall itself right in here, and then it actually slopes down as you go out toward the Mare Island Strait. And if you look at the photograph right here you can see here's the edge, and you can see in here where it indents. I couldn't get close enough in here to take a look at this. But the reason that this site is important is that it has implications for both the Navy and Lennar Mare Island to try and close out this area. And so what we're going to do here is we're going to characterize the sediments that are between the quay wall and the edge of the wharf itself. And this comes from work that we did at Installation Restoration Program Site 03. And this large purple area is the excavation we did in the source area. And this was associated with a lot of petroleum hydrocarbon storage. There were a number of above ground storage tanks down here. You can see these are all fuel oil pipelines that run through the area. If you move back across Weissman Avenue right here, there were four underground storage tanks, 693, 07 through 10, and there was an entire aboveground storage tank complex. But this is believed to be the source of the petroleum hydrocarbons that we're seeing in this area.

Now, as we started excavating this area out, and we removed about 3,000 tons of material out of this area, there were some features that were very unique that we weren't able to remove. And if you can see this kind of brownish structure right here. As we got down to about 9 feet below surface, there's an old wood deck that's underneath there. And if you try to remove that wood deck you're going to undermine the entire structure of the wharf in that area, so it's very difficult to move it out. As we started looking above and below this deck, we took samples above and beneath it -- and everything in here we've actually been able to remove TPH -- we did find some minor areas, and it was very sporadic, underneath this wood wharf that had some high levels of TPH. I think we had about 7,200 milligrams per kilogram of diesel, and the highest motor oil was about 4,800 milligrams per kilogram. The diesel is above the standard we're cleaning up to, the motor oil is below. But as you start moving out to the edge of the wharf, we started taking additional samples. And we found out that there were still some high levels that we were seeing both above and below the wood deck to the east of the quay wall. I think the highest diesel was about 13,000 milligrams per kilogram, the highest motor oil is 12,000 milligrams per kilogram.

Now, the way that some of the agreements are structured for the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel is that IA-K is actually a condition that the Navy has responsibility for, and it's defined as being anything that is east of the quay wall, those sediments are Navy responsibility. So instead of trying to partition this out and say, who did what, who did this, we've agreed to actually partition this work. And so what we've agreed to is to actually take samples in this area, grid it out, be able to characterize the lateral and vertical extent of the petroleum hydrocarbons in the sediment from the edge of the quay wall to the east here, all the way to the edge of the wharf. And then if there's anything that goes out beyond the edge of the wharf the Navy will do that, and they'll also be responsible for any remediation that would take place in the sediments from east of the quay wall out into the strait. We're actually going to remove some of these wells from the monitoring program because they've been non-detect ever since we've started monitoring in there. We've been monitoring since 2011.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But those are behind that?

MR. SILER: They're on the west side of the quay wall. And that's where our responsibility is. So anything east of that would be the Navy's.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. I just wanted to note also -- it goes back a ways -- but there was this idea that the Navy would transfer property to the city of Vallejo, and the State Lands Commission staff came in and evaluated where there was land that would revert back to the State of California. And I guess I had a part to play in showing that at low tide that wharf is back there, and so that's why there's a jog inboard of the quay wall on this public trust claim. So it's kind of fun to go way back many, many years ago and see you working on that project now.

MR. COFFEY: Neal, is there any concern that the old wharf is a source of contamination?

MR. SILER: Well, there's some sediments under there that we're looking at. And again, it's sporadic. Sometimes you drill below it and there's nothing there.

MR. COFFEY: There's nothing there? Nothing as in open area?

MR. SILER: Open area. And if you find something, sometimes you'll find sediments, but they won't have very high TPH, they'll be below the cleanup levels. And then you'll find these little pockets where you'll have certain areas where it is high, like I said about 7,200 milligrams per kilograms diesel in there, and so we have to look at that area.

MR. COFFEY: So what's the answer?

MR. SILER: I'm not sure what the answer is. And it may be something, hopefully we don't have to go back in there and take a look at that. It may be something that could be in situ that we may have to do, but we'll have to take a look at that as we move forward.

MR. COFFEY: So that could be a huge project eventually.

MR. SILER: I don't know that it's that huge. I think the vast majority of the petroleum hydrocarbon source, which is this entire excavation area here -- you take a look at this, I call it the scorpion -- there was a lot of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted material taken out of here. But you're seeing these little pockets, and it's real strange, you see these little pockets. And it doesn't seem to be a lot of material.

MR. COFFEY: Sounds like seepage.

MR. SILER: We're going to have to take a look at it. But it's going to be really hard to take that thing out of there, because if you do take it out of there you're going to undermine the wharf.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah. And that could be a real problem.

MR. SILER: That could be a real problem. Okay. The next site is Industrial Pump Station 4, T-2 oil water separator. This is how the industrial pump station looks today. This is what it looked like, that's the actual pump station right there before they did remediation back in 2005. So what we're going to do here is do an investigation to see if there are multiple sources in this area for petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated solvents which are our constituents of concern. We're going to look at the data that we get through a multiple soil boring sampling, soil, soil gas, and groundwater program. We're going to install some additional groundwater monitoring wells in the area, and integrate those into the existing ground water monitoring program. And from that information we hope to develop and implement a Remedial Action Plan. And the reason we're seeing this is the Industrial Pump Station 4 excavation area, and this was probably about 1,500,

2,000 tons of material. And this was a really deep hole, it was about 20 feet deep. It is impressive as to how deep it was.

And we were able to show that the petroleum hydrocarbons in this area had been taken out, but we're still seeing something here, some residual source that's either coming through here or is in this area of petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated solvents. We hope to see if there is something possibly around this area that we missed, or something between here and the T-2 oil water separator, which is right here, because you can see we still have this high petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations in some of these downgradient wells that we're trying to make sure meet the cleanup goals for the site as we move forward. This next slide just shows you the vinyl chloride that we see at the same site. It doesn't seem to be encroaching on the wells that are closest to the strait, but it's still an issue as you move upgradient.

So the next site is Installation Restoration Program Site 21 and the Building 386/388/390 storm sewer area. And again, this is an investigation moving toward remediation. We're going to look at petroleum hydrocarbons, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. We're going to advance soil borings, install some groundwater monitoring wells in the area, and develop and implement a remedial program. One of the areas we really want to focus on is this part of the storm drain right here which is between Building 386 and Building 382 here to the southeast. But supposedly this storm drain, the integrity of it was very, very bad, and they thought there may have been some holes in it. And if you look at the soil data that we were able to get from this area back in the shallow boring in 2007, I think you had 7,800 and something like 5,800 milligrams per kilogram diesel and TPH in here; but what really concerns everybody is this groundwater number right here for diesel and motor oil that was taken back in 1998. You had 54 million parts per billion diesel, and you had 150 million parts per billion motor oil and that's indicative of free product. So we really want to take a look at this area. We'll do some borings, probably do some trenching, and that would be the focus of the investigation in here. But we'll probably look at some other areas in the storm drain system also, and we'll be installing some monitoring wells downgradient to see what's going on once we are able to effect a remedial program in this area.

So as I had mentioned, we've been continuing with the groundwater monitoring program here. In 2012 that was the first year that Lennar Mare Island and another contractor had been doing the work, and we were able to evaluate a lot of the data, and actually modify that program. This is the T-2 oil water separator Industrial Pump Station 4 site. This is the IR-03 site. They're very close together. We were able to get three wells -- because they haven't shown anything over the two years plus that they've been monitored -- so we removed those from the program. We added some additional wells on a one-time basis to evaluate. And depending on what the results are in the first quarter, we may go back and do some additional monitoring of these wells. But the main thing we did here was we removed some of the natural attenuation parameters that we were looking at, sulfate, nitrate, chloride, methane. It's really not showing us anything, we're really not seeing any trends, we just don't see how that's going to help us moving forward.

And then at IR-03, it's right to the south of that. I've already talked about these wells right here. We're still looking for the main constituents of concern, the petroleum hydrocarbons and the CVOC's up in this area, petroleum hydrocarbons down here. But the largest area where we had a change was in the IR-15 area. And we used to monitor 27 wells on a quarterly basis, but we've been able to get that down to 16 wells on a quarterly basis. We removed five wells from the program entirely because they weren't showing us anything over the entire time period, and we

have had non-detects in them the entire time period that we were doing the monitoring. And if you'll look at these green wells those are the wells that we're going to continue to do on an annual basis. But if you take a look at the purple wells, we're going to continue to do those on a quarterly basis. Now, the annual event is always in May of each year, so we're going to do the entire suite of these wells in May. But as we go back in subsequent months, in August, November, and February, we'll just be doing the subset of these wells in here also. And we've done this with the advice and consent of the regulatory agencies, the Water Board and DTSC. We discussed this with them and it was approved by them.

So now, underground storage tank site 243. This is an area that is going to be developed for residential reuse moving forward. We had a very large underground storage tank. There was underground storage tanks 231 and 243 in this area. When we went back and looked at soil gas, we still had some high soil gas levels that we wanted to deal with. It's not only petroleum hydrocarbons, it's chlorinated solvents also. So what we're going to do is fill in some data gaps with an additional soil gas survey, look for petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated volatile organic compounds. The characterization of the soil gas will be to the east and the northeast. And the goal is to gather enough data so that we can do a cumulative risk assessment to show that the risk in this area is very low from indoor air or soil vapor getting into the residential properties that we want to put into this building. But just to give you an idea of some of the concentrations. The residential tier one level for soil gas for gasoline is 10,000 micrograms per cubic meter of air. There's a couple of these areas -- there's one right here -- it's pretty high, it looks like it's 7 million. There's a number of areas here where you have 20,000. So we want to look at some of those areas and fill in some of those data gaps and verify those high numbers as we move forward.

The next site, again this is going to be another residential area, that last site I looked at, underground storage tank 243 and the Building 637 area, this is going to be in an area that's designated for residential reuse. Again, this was the old railroad turntable site and refurbishing area. There were quite a number of sources in this area. There were hydraulic lifts, there was the turntable, there were some underground storage tanks. And what we're going to do is we're going to continue the remediation. We've pulled out about 5,000, 6,000 tons of material out of this area, but there's a few areas where we had verification samples that we still have to go back in and do some additional work. We're going to install groundwater monitoring wells. Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring program to make sure that we are able to monitor the contamination, if there's any residual contamination going forward that could potentially be a threat to our planned development of the area. So this is the area. See, this is the largest excavation right here. There's another large excavation over here to the west. This was the main turntable area, hydraulic lift area. There were a few more hydraulic lifts over here. There was a former fuel service island out here. So we've excavated out a lot of this area. Where you see the red we're going to incrementally go out, remove some additional area, and continue that until we're able to meet our unrestricted land use cleanup goals moving forward.

So this site is Building 688 PCB site UL-01. This was a site that was originally thought to be able to be closed as just a paper closure site. But as we started looking more and more at the work that was done in the past and what was residually left on the site, we found out we needed to do some additional work. So we're going to do some additional characterization. We're going to characterize portions of the transformer pad. We're going to scarify/scabble portions of the transformer pad. We're going to remove some surrounding asphalt. And collect confirmation

samples moving forward. So this is the site. It's an active electrical substation. We've done a lot of work in this area. You can see that the Navy did a lot of work in this area beforehand. But there's still a few areas like this one right here where you can see we still have 17.19 milligrams per kilogram. The commercial industrial cleanup level for PCB's is 0.74. We're going to try to scabble these down. There's 1.8 here. There's actually an asphalt right there, that's 5.34 and 3.39, those are on the pad itself. We're going to scabble and scarify those down. Janet, I'm not going to take this 0.75 down to 0.74, I'm sorry.

MS. NAITO: I understand.

MR. SILER: And then we're going to remove some areas of asphalt. There's an area down here. There's a few small areas up here. There's a couple areas around here. And also remove any underlying soil that's above the cleanup goal, and be able to get concurrence for commercial industrial reuse of this area.

Building 742 is another PCB site. We have approval to move forward. We had approval from the EPA. We just received approval from the Department of Toxic Substances Control this week, so we're going to move forward on these. There's four pits in the southern floor of Building 742. We're going to come in, pressure wash these pits. We're going to collect confirmation samples. And depending on how the confirmation samples come back, we're going to evaluate as we move forward on these sites. And the reason is there's been some cleanup work done in the past, actually washed these before back in 2004, took some confirmation samples. The confirmation samples met the alternative cleanup requirements in the consent agreement final order with the EPA that would be able to close these sites for industrial reuse, and to have an industrial land use covenant so that you could only use this property for industrial purposes. But we didn't know anything about soil and groundwater outside the site.

This was one of these difficult sites that we always call the Mare Island factor that you never know what you get until you start doing something in the ground. We had a plan to actually look at the four sides of each of these pits, to collect soil and groundwater samples. But as we did that, we found the concrete was 7 feet thick around the pit, so it was very, very difficult to get through. So we had to go back and take a look at going through the bottom of these pits. And you have your confined space, because UL-03 and UL-06 are about 8 feet deep. These two are a little easier to get into, UL-04 and UL-05, they are only about 3 feet deep. But as we did that and looked forward, we found that we didn't really find anything in the surrounding soil and groundwater outside the pit, so it looks like whatever PCB's that affected the interior of the pits, they haven't got out in the outside. And the reason that's kind of important is there's been a couple of instances where one of the deep pits and not the other is filled up with water. There was a question whether that was groundwater or not. We've gone into the pits, we've inspected the pits, we can't find any sign that water is gushing in there, until you punch through the bottom of the floor and then it starts coming through. But once you plug that up it doesn't seem to come through there. At one time, back in the early 2000's, one of the pits was filled with water, somebody thought it was groundwater. They flushed the water out of the pit. It has never filled up again. But the other deep pit has filled up again. So it kind of makes it strange, if it's groundwater you'd think it would be in both of the deep pits. And actually when we've taken samples of the water inside the pits and outside the pits there's no PCB's in it, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you have a roof leak?

MR. SILER: I think that's probably what it is. It's probably the roof leak.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. SILER: I think you're getting infiltration of water that's coming in there and coming through there, to tell you the truth. So we're going to go back and take a look at these. We'll try to get these remediated. And last, but not least, I know this is dear to a lot of people who reside on the island's heart --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Even some of us who don't reside.

MR. SILER: I'm sorry to say it has to go. I know it's beautiful, and I know that you'd like to keep it here, but we're going to basically do some additional characterization, we're going to look at a vault underneath here, we're going to characterize that material as we take this down; do whatever remediation we have to do; demolish the building. And again, this has a low occupancy land use covenant on it. Once we do that, clean it up to the unrestricted land use standard, we'll be able to pull the land use covenant off that and you will have unrestricted land use in this area.

So those are the sites that we're trying to move forward this summer. Again, if we can get more done, we'll do that. And if anyone has any questions right now, I'd like to answer them. But our goal is we're going to have a meeting on April 9th with the regulators to try to talk to them about the plans we want to put forward, and then develop those plans as we move forward. We're going to try to get those plans in and get those completed sometime in April. Get them into the regulatory agencies sometime in May. And then hopefully between May and October we'll be able to complete these field activities as we move forward. So if anybody has any questions, I'd like to answer them.

MR. COFFEY: Demolition of the building isn't going to take the trees out, is it?

MR. SILER: Yes, the trees will go.

MR. COFFEY: They can't be saved?

MR. SILER: They're too close and you're going to screw up the root system.

MR. COFFEY: Bummer.

MR. SILER: We tried. We tried to see if we could save them, but we just can't. Jim.

MR. PORTERFIELD: One question. Approximate build date for the building?

Mr. SILER: Which building?

MR. PORTERFIELD: 742, when was it constructed?

MR. SILER: 742? You know, I'd have to go back and take a look, I couldn't tell you off the top of my head. I think you're talking in the, probably in the forties, fifties.

MR. PORTERFIELD: It seems to me I remember there was a lot of poured concrete and putting in the windows and stuff, it looks like that style. It had to do with ordnance in that building. Most World War II ships that were coming in for repair, the pits were probably to set up the 5 inch, 30 inch gun mounts on. That's what they overhauled major in that building in there came in, split hydraulic hoses, all that kind of stuff like that.

MR. SILER: Anyone else? Chris.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Neal, do you have any method in mind for the demolition of the green monster?

MR. SILER: Well, yeah, the method is just to knock it down basically.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Knock it down?

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Any consideration to trying extensive grout?

MR. SILER: To get rid of the building? Well, we want to pull the building out, the building has to go.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah, extensive grout.

MR. SILER: I'm not sure what that would be. Because it's just basically an old cinder block building, it just has cinder block walls.

MR. RASMUSSEN: It's cinder block?

MR. COFFEY: It looks like concrete.

MR. SILER: The walls itself are cinder block. There's a little brick structure inside there, looks like a little brick room they had in there, that the vault and the floor itself are concrete, there's asphalt in some areas.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah, I was thinking it looks, as Michael suggested, it looks like concrete.

MR. SILER: Well definitely the floor's concrete.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I mean the walls are concrete.

MR. SILER: If you look at it, it's cinder block. Get real close to it.

MR. COFFEY: That should be an easy teardown. Why would the trees have to go?

MR. SILER: They're just too close to the foundation of the vault, that's the problem. Cause we actually looked in at one time to try and move the trees. We looked at that and it just didn't look like that was feasible.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, if you don't have the right equipment it's not feasible, like some cities have these things that cut --

MR. COFFEY: I was going to say, it looks like a canary palm that's off to the side.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: And I know that the canary palms are usually rooted along the top of the ground.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yep.

MR. COFFEY: And if it's intertwined into the foundation I can see why it would be difficult to do. But cost effectively, pulling a tree out like that would probably cost \$10,000 or \$15,000. That's a shame with a tree that old.

MR. SILER: Yeah. I left that up to our demolition experts, and they said they tried to save it. We had people come out and look at it, arborists and a couple other people, they felt it was too close, it wasn't able to be saved. So we tried.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is there a possibility of replacing these trees by putting in new trees?

MR. SILER: Well we're going to put in new trees as we move forward with the development, but we're probably not going to do anything immediate right there. Any other questions? Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Neal. So now we have come to our first public comment period. Do we have any comments?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Ten minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are at administrative business. And as always, if you have any comments on the meeting minutes, please get those comments to myself or Myrna. And Myrna has a couple of other items.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Neal, you might have to help me on this one.

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't recall when it was, if it was our last meeting or the meeting even two months before that where you requested, and I don't know that it's timely any longer, but where you requested a letter of support for your application to the EPA for --

MR. SILER: The north island?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. SILER: I think that time has passed now, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it?

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well then --

MR. COFFEY: Never mind.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Never mind, exactly. Thank you, Mike. Was that a motion? Was that a motion? Is there a second?

MR. COFFEY: Never mind.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, item B will then be scratched. Now, well I'm not going to forget about C. Discussion and community members of the Restoration Advisory Board to write a letter to the city of Vallejo and to the U.S. Navy requesting a path forward -- you see the longest, I'm not as good as Mr. Siler and Ms. Lear are at making sound bite presentation topics -- requesting a path forward for transfer of the Naval Ammunition Depot housing prior to the Production Manufacturing Area and South Shore. For some reason, and I have not been able to

go back into the 19 years of records that I might possess or that we might have in the federal depository library at John F. Kennedy or the Restoration Advisory Board library, and find the documents that I believe were there that showed the housing as a separate parcel. It used to be called something like transfer parcel 7B. And now it seems to be all seven, or something like that. Anyway, what I've been told by the Navy, is that the houses not part of the separate parcel from the Production Manufacturing Area and the South Shore.

But in January of 2009 a tech memo was prepared and approved by Cal EPA, it was prepared by the Navy and its contractors. And Cal EPA, DTSC gave its blessing to no longer pursue munitions as an issue of concern on the housing area. Now, that makes it seem to me like there was some separation of those three areas. It was also very specifically written up -- if we go back to that tech memo we could probably find that pretty easily -- was written very specifically to address the issue of the housing being designated as one of the next phases of transfer property into the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve, what we call it today. Might have been called regional park at that time. Actually, it wasn't. And one of the reasons to get the housing rolling sooner than the Production Manufacturing Area in terms of transfer and the historic South Shore is that what has been presented to us by the Navy is that federal sequestration is taking place or is in some process or some aspects, and that's reducing San Diego staff's time to travel -- I suppose it's also reducing your ability to hire contractors and we saw in the November presentation, that the budget has plummeted, maybe it's even worse in terms of what's getting appropriated to Mare Island cleanup. So it could be that what was a 2012 date for transfer of those properties or that parcel, or however it's been designated, is now slated to be a 2017 transfer, and it could go on to 2097, my new date for everything to be cleaned up at Mare Island.

So this is the concern. This is the issue. And this is the reason why this is on as an actual vote, a request. The houses at the Naval Ammunition Depot is on the National Register of Historic Places as a district, as are the buildings, as is the cemetery, and as are the historic Naval Ammunition Depot magazines A1 through A15 or something like that, okay? So being on the National Register of Historic Places as a district that then contributes to the Mare Island national historical landmark highest ranking national park historic site in America makes those houses, the cemetery, and the historic magazines something precious to the American people. They were designated that way in 1975. That means they matter more than some other historic properties do or some properties we don't consider historic. And the houses -- I don't have to tell people like Mike this because Mike already is in this business of construction and, you know, house, building, maintenance and restoration, all of that. And probably all of you live in a house, a wooden house, or have seen wooden houses before in your lifetime, and they just don't last forever just sitting doing nothing. Buildings mostly like to work. And if they don't, they fall into decline. They can fall into decline if you live in them and you don't do anything with them. But desperately, indefinitely, wooden buildings like to work. They like to breathe. They like to have someone to check to make sure the windows aren't leaking and bees aren't in the walls and copper thieves aren't stealing all their guts. And I think it's the right thing to do to get those houses sooner than later -- what is it, 17 years we just are coming up on in a couple of days? I don't know if it's 17, 16, 18 years since they were mothballed. And they need to come into the park, also because they need to provide revenue. There's a good potential that they can as part of the park plan.

So while the Navy might be doing an adequate job now, which I don't feel they are, they have five new roofs on of six built houses, but the downspouts are rusting and everything's full of

leaves, and it's just generally, you know, the paint is all peeling off, and the systems are failing, if they haven't already failed. And it just seems to me that it makes sense that those houses be carved out or that parcelization be remade. Partly because we'd also like to see that land come into the public trust under the swap that the State of California and the city of Vallejo have made.

So is that a long preface to why I'd like to have you, as community members, discuss and vote on a letter that you would have input to that I would draft and we can send to the city of Vallejo and the Navy asking them to consider pursuing the transfer of those properties. Now, they have environmental cleanup issues, but nothing left of CERCLA. They have apparently lead based paint and asbestos, which the Navy does not recognize as their cleanup responsibility. So one of the simple things, one of the drivers for the tech memo resolving the munitions issue didn't appear to be any other CERCLA issues was that there could be a license agreement made prior to any type of transfer, and that those environmental cleanup issues could be addressed through a non-profit, or through a company and a non-profit teaming up, or the city and a company or whatever, and getting that cleanup done so that the transfer could actually take place because, of course, DTSC couldn't sign off on it without that being done.

The other reason to have a license agreement ahead of that transfer is that would allow some organization who has the license to go in and do an evaluation of what needs to be done on those houses to get them back up to the level that they should be as National Register and national historic landmark properties, whether it's the cultural landscape or whether it's the exterior or the interior; start budgeting, start raising money, start raising public awareness. And so that's the other reason to pursue this, even a license, which I think is really the only option right now because transfer isn't possible. So any discussion among the community members? Although the rest of the Restoration Advisory Board can advise us of what you think.

MR. COFFEY: I think you need to team up, I mean, instead of making it just us, petitioning the city and the Navy. To broach the subject with maybe the National Historic Register, the state, whoever administrates the property, whoever is going to have a financial responsibility for the buildings. Because I think just our voice is going to be a whisper in the wind. And I think that we need to beef it up a little bit with some kind of support behind us. At least a letter of support.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, the letter could describe or include that. I think no one is making a move right now because it's just convenient to have it just sit there.

MR. COFFEY: Well, everyone's afraid to do anything these days that has a financial commitment to it, especially the city of Vallejo.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well except for the Navy. The Navy is bearing the entire burden through BRAC of maintaining this property, and the property is falling into decline and the Navy is burdened.

MR. COFFEY: There's also a time critical type of thing too, because, like you say, these building can fall into disrepair very quickly and when they're gone, they're gone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: That's why I say it needs to be emphasized that this is time critical. And cannot stand to sit around and wait for things to get better in 2017 or 2020 or whenever,. So I agree that we should probably make some type of a voice, but we should gang up and say that we need to have some kind of a universal support.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you think that that letter should then go out to a broader, you know, like to the State Lands Commission?

MR. COFFEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because that's part of the settlement agreement.

MR. COFFEY: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And to our State Senator?

MR. COFFEY: All persons concerned.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Hey, put it in letters to the editor to the paper so that everybody knows about the issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Other thoughts?

MR. COFFEY: Social media or social networking too helps, you know. You can get it out there if anybody wants to put it on their Facebook pages these days or any of that kind of stuff, anything that gets out there. It seems to me you see things in the media all the time garnering support through the smallest of things. Any and all.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess I thought to come here first because we know that the complexity of the issue, that it's been lumped together with this massive cleanup that these houses are not a part of, they've already been cut out of that huge and ongoing and forever and ever going digging to China, you know, munitions issue that's on the shorelines. And we know that the issue about the other contaminants that aren't being addressed by the current owner. So I guess I thought we could start here. But I agree with you, at least, you know, that it needs to get out there as broadly as possible to build the support and to build the better understanding on the part of the public as well as decision makers about what the issues are.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The Navy has no difficulties with carving out or subdividing parcels if that is the request of the recipient, which in this case would be the City. And we have done that before, we have carved and subdivided parcels, and I'm sure Lennar has done on their property. So we can do that, but we just need the ultimate recipient, in this case the City, to have a voice in this and to say that, yes, this is what we want. It's a cost to us and we're not going to do it unless the recipient says that they will take it.

MR. COFFEY: Is willing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it's also a cost to you to continue to hold the property. And I'd like to know how much money it does cost, for example. I mean, that's what our letter is going to, as far as I'm concerned anyway, should ask, not just -we'd like the property, but how much is it costing them to take care of it right now.

MR. COFFEY: I'm not so sure that's a great idea.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You don't think so?

MR. COFFEY: And the reason being then is what if it turns out to be less than the cost of the City taking it over? Then it becomes the lesser of two evils.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's always going to be less. If the City -- city being us, does not want the property, then we need to find out from the Navy what their plans are for maintaining the property, because it's about ready, it's at the level where it may be getting complaints to the

overseeing agencies, like the State Office of Historic Preservation. They have a responsibility as owners of the property, of the National Register, National Historic Landmark Property to maintain them.

MR. COFFEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And so, you know, I don't think that the houses should necessarily come to the City, the State, and to private parties in complete decline which is where they're headed now.

MR. COFFEY: And then they're useless.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, because they are useless. And there was an appraisal done for the land swap for the City and the public -- or state lands based on a certain appraised value. So I don't want to take up more of our time tonight, but I want to hear from you or a vote regarding how you think we should proceed.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have a couple of quick questions. Wasn't there a conveyance agreement? And if there was a conveyance agreement with certain specifics, do we know what those were?

MR. COFFEY: Not without research.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What do you mean by conveyance agreement?

MR. CAMPBELL: How the property is conveyed from the Navy to the City.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, there absolutely is, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: And so how was that area discussed or written about, et cetera? So we have an understanding, if it was part of the conveyance, why, in fact, has it not been released to the City?

MR. COFFEY: The whole transfer parcel hasn't been yet. Because, like she was saying, it's been lumped into one giant issue that has other issues to be dealt with first. What she's hoping to do is to separate this from them.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Instead of transferring it, they lumped it in with all that area that needs ammunition cleaned up off of it.

MR. COFFEY: And that could be years and years and years and years.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm one of the newer people on the RAB here, so I haven't been around for 14 years so I'm not clear on this. Other RABs I can talk specifically about certain subjects. So what you're saying is we want to subdivide this particular area and request the City to take it and have something done; and you're requesting the RAB support in doing that, because otherwise it will fall into complete disrepair and be useless to the community?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I think the other thing that's important to stress is that if our purpose as a team focused on getting property cleaned up, a cleanup making a reuse possible, if that's our purpose and if that is the goal of the whole CERCLA environmental cleanup effort and the BRAC process at Mare Island, and we have these issues where the federal government is becoming less and less able to throw money at projects -- the housing area is over 7 acres. Now,

it doesn't sound like much, but I think the Navy transferred some really tiny little parcel in 2010 or something, maybe less than that. Every acreage matters in this BRAC process to show that there is progress being made. And that's 7 acres of virtually pristine land. It has no conditions on it that are known except for lead based paint which we know is easy to clean up, it's been done all on Lennar's property; and asbestos which we know that the technology is there to address it.

MR. COFFEY: I think it's also a good addition for the RAB to address reuse, because we seem to be so focused all the time on just cleanup, that we do need to every once in a while focus on reuse too. Because we do have to look for what's going to happen after all of this is done, and we do need to bring that into our focus.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And all the planning documents are done for what that property is supposed to be, and if this is just a thing where everything's kind of quietly -- nothing's being done while these places fall into decline, it just seems like a great opportunity for all of us to win.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I feel like I have to respond to this. First of all, I think Myrna mentioned that we have replaced the majority of the roofs of those buildings.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just the houses, not the buildings, not the majority of the building.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Sorry, the houses in the housing area which is what we were talking about. A lot of the roofs have been replaced recently. There are plans to do additional work on the houses. As we talked about when Charles Perry was here to talk about the budgeting process, getting money for these kind of things has to go through that same kind of budgeting process. We do have some funds in place to do more work on the houses later this year. That doesn't come out of the environmental budget, that is compliance type money, so it's a different pot. But that is the plan. So I just feel like I need to address that issue. I personally think it would be fine with the Navy to transfer that property sooner than the rest of the parcel. And I don't have anything against that, but I am concerned about the implication that the Navy is neglecting --

MR. COFFEY: No. No. No, there's no implication.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's obvious it's not being cared for like it could be.

MR. COFFEY: Only because it's not being used. Like you said, a house needs to be in use in order to be maintained.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's right.

MR. COFFEY: Even if it's just a general airing out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was 100 percent mothballed, ready for sitting there for a while when the base closed. It was meticulously mothballed and it is very professionally mothballed. However, 16, 17, 18 years later those houses are in desperate need of maintenance much greater than what's being done now, and that does not even count the cultural landscape which is, itself, part of the National Historic Landmark. So there's no accusation, you don't need to take it personally, but it just needs to have a path forward which is what we're talking about here. And it is an environmental issue that is preventing the transfer, let me remind you of that. We're not looking for this just because we'd all like to go scouting through the houses. They have environmental issues that are keeping the transfer from taking place and we're at a stalemate and I think there's a way to get around it. And I'd like to ratchet up the issue, and if the public and the politics says no, not now, well then, we'll honor that.

MR. COFFEY: But at least we have to try.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I have no objection to the motion.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then is the discussion enough, can we just take a vote to initiate a letter that you, all community members may edit until we get it the way we want to sign onto it to send to the Navy and the City of Vallejo and the State Lands Commission. Those are the three responsible parties.

MR. COFFEY: Show of hands.

(Members motioning.)

MR. COFFEY: Go for it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. That's it. Thank you.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are now at the focus group reports. We don't have a community focus group right now.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Maybe next time.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Maybe next time, okay. Jerry's not here. So then we have the technical, Paula.

a) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: Which has nothing to report.

b) City Report

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you. The next would be the City report. And I'm sure you're all aware that Gil retired, and there was supposed to be someone from that office to talk to us about that and to let us know their plan for replacing him as well as -- Myrna let me know that Ursula is leaving as well, and so --

MR. COFFEY: Who?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Ursula, the economic development director.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, geez.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And they're also looking for, I think, a temporary replacement for her. So hopefully by the next meeting we will have something more official from the City on that particular issue. And then we have Lennar update.

c) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)

MR. SILER: Okay. You all should have the 11x17 figure that documents the update of the work that Lennar has been performing or is going to perform. And many of these sites that are on here I talked about tonight in our planning for field work for the next construction season. But we actually were able to get a number of PCB sites cleaned up over the last few months, and they're right now in the documentation phase documenting that cleanup. Particularly if you look in the upper right-hand corner of the figure, Building 69, UL-03, we completed the scabbling, took the confirmation samples, and they all came back meeting cleanup goals. And the same is true of

Building 483, S-3402, 592 also. And so we're working diligently on getting those reports out and getting those sites closed out.

One of the major things that we do every March, actually since 2006 since we actually recorded land use covenants, is actually do the annual inspection for the land use covenants. And that includes Investigation Area D-1.2 commercial area, the Investigation Area B.2-1 commercial area, and there are also eight PCB sites that we're going to close with industrial only reuse LUC's that are in IA-C3. So we did that inspection in March, and I actually gave electronic copies to the regulators tonight and the Navy to push those forward. And the hard copies will be coming out tomorrow or early next week so they'll be able to receive those also.

Upcoming field work. We're, again, as I talked about tonight, looking at some of the larger jobs. Building 637 excavation area, hoping to get that done. A number of PCB sites, 87, 91, 225, 742, UL-03, UL-06. And we hope to move those forward in the next few months. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you explain what this above and below photos regarding 637 is? What does this mean?

MR. SILER: Yes. In the upper left-hand corner, Building 637, we started doing a lot of work in the summer of 2012. As I mentioned, we removed over 5,000 tons of material from that area. We had to stop and procure additional funding to move that forward. The bottom photograph, 637, that's the way the site looks like right now. And as we move forward we will continue to excavate additional materials and close that site out.

MR. COFFEY: Going to put a diving board in there?

MR. SILER: That area affectionately is known as Lake Sheila.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To go with Neal's fence across the street. I just wanted to know that's kind of a sweet thing for me at the Flyway Festival, because the festival building that we used this year again was right nearby, was that at sunrise on Saturday morning geese came out of Dwight's pond -- right? -- and flew past Neal's fence, and landed in Sheila's pond. And no one but me, I guess, well, no one else was there at sunrise, would have known that that pond was there because it's down so low. You know, we had done the site visit --

MR. SILER: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- and it had that marsh growing in it, tulles, and the geese just landed down in the pond. It was a great way to start the festival that morning.

MR. COFFEY: Where's the pictures? Where's the pictures?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You couldn't see anything, they were down in that hole.

MR. SILER: That's it for our update.

d) Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Weston update.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. Well, hopefully everybody had a chance to grab the update on the table. Again, all the activities related to documents. The Navy has one document under review from Weston which is the Draft Feasibility Study for IR Site 05, Dredge Pond 7 South, and the Western Magazine Area which are all toward the bottom of the background photograph there. And then we also have three documents that the agencies are chewing on; two of these have to

do with either the ongoing or future O&M activities out at Investigation Area H-1, which is primarily the old landfill area. And then we also have the second of the Five Year Review Reports for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, which includes the former dredge ponds and tidal marsh.

And then the agencies were busy over the last couple of months and they approved four documents. A big one was the Remedial Investigation Report at the bottom there. And then also a couple of wetland monitoring reports were approved. As well as the Annual Report for the Western Early Transfer Parcel. And then the Navy also approved a couple of internal munitions related documents which are called After Action Reports, for the sites at the south end of the island, IR Site 5, and Dredge Pond 7 South, and then the Western Magazine Area. And the only field activity in the last couple of months was we completed our first semiannual groundwater sampling event for Investigation Area H-1 which is 29 monitoring wells. So by eliminating the bottom two paragraphs for the next report, we will be unveiling more of the background Mare Island report. So my goal is to keep shrinking this text to the upper left corner so that only Skaggs Island is shown or is covered.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Beautiful. Beautiful, Dwight.

MR. GEMAR: But, so we're uncovering almost all of the background photo as we complete our reports.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Very good.

e) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito, Elizabeth Wells, Carolyn D'Almeida)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Regulatory update.

MS. NAITO: I don't have a whole lot to report. I've been reviewing documents; the Navy keeps submitting them, Lennar keeps submitting them, and Weston keeps submitting them. And I am very grateful, in looking at the list that is on the Navy's back page that most of them go to Carolyn.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I guess that's my segueway. So, yeah, if you look on the back of the Navy's report you can see what I got, and this week I got five letters out on those. So I'm working my way through those. So I've got more to look at.

MS. WELLS: Now it's the Water Board. So I wanted to say thank you to Janet for providing a report for the Water Board. I had to fly unexpectedly to a funeral during the last meeting, where in Chicago it was one degree. But I wanted to say that the report for tonight is that the RAB members should have received the tentative order for Building A258 soil treatment facility, and we have made it through the public comment period, and it's going to go before the Water Board the 10th.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you're urging us to all show up and to comment.

MS. WELLS: As an uncontested item we are hoping it will be approved and then we will rescind one order that's on Mare Island. And then we're going to start working on some of the other orders, that historical orders that sort of got lost in the fray, and try and bring the site up to date on where we stand with Water Board orders. So that's my report.

MR. COFFEY: Okay. Approved.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So co-chairs report. First I wanted to note that there is a field schedule update that was on the table over there that just lists the various field activities that we have planned for the summer and early fall. Most of these were discussed at the last RAB meeting when I went through all our upcoming work. Also on the sheet you will see the dates when we expect to get into the field, as well as the remedial project manager and phone number of said project manager. So you can always call me with questions, but you are also free to call them directly.

So for the last month the Navy has been primarily working on PCB sites as well as continuing the munitions removal action in the Production Manufacturing/South Shore Area. We are down, I believe, to eight PCB sites that we still need to do a lot of work on. I may be a little bit optimistic, but I think that's about the right number. So we continued working on that.

The intrusive investigation on the South Shore continues. To date 22,000 anomalies plus have been investigated, and of these, 540 munitions and explosives of concern have been recovered. There are a few buildings left that Battelle did not get to before they left earlier last year. They'll be coming back within the next couple of months to finish those off. And hopefully we'll get this one wrapped up this fall -- Dwight, maybe?

MR. GEMAR: The field work, you know, should be done by basically the end of the spring, the field work.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Dwight's always very optimistic, so take that with a little bit of a grain of salt.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we did recover a large number of munitions documented as safe, 8,000 plus. And here is a picture of one of those items. I believe we figured out that's the bottom ring of a propellant container of some kind. Does that sound correct, Dwight?

MR. GEMAR: Correct.

MR. COFFEY: I would like to note that, in a Good Friday mode, that that reminds me of a crown of thorns.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right, there. Came from Mike.

MR. COFFEY: The good Catholic boy that I am.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And as Carolyn pointed out, there is a long list of PCB reports that the Navy had submitted over the past month. Ten of those are Draft Site Closure Reports, eight Final PCB Site Closure Reports. In addition to those we have four additional documents, one of which is the Work Plan for Building M162, and then the Proposed Plan that we spoke about earlier before the meeting. We have received comments or concurrence from the Water Board on two documents and DTSC on two documents. I'm sure we had something from --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Five letters.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- so I don't know why they didn't make it on here.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I'm always overlooked.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I'll yell at somebody when I get back.

MR. COFFEY: The power has so gone to your head.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I know it, huh. Well, they're making me come up here by myself so -- poor me, huh, feel sorry for me?

MS. NAITO: We need a conference phone.

MR. COFFEY: You could be just a speaker in the middle of the room, you know. At least we come, you know. So you're not alone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

MR. COFFEY: That would be really sad.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So our next BCT and RAB meeting is scheduled for May 30th.

MR. COFFEY: Considering you have funding through what, September?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay then. Well, you know that we have this ongoing, I think it's a problem and I think it could be addressed if we sat down and tried to figure out how to address it. I'm just salivating over things like 8,840 MDAS items, that would mean items that aren't actual munitions and explosives of concern, but just some component that it's my understanding is just like going into the scrap bin. And it's discouraging, as you've heard me say now going on almost five years next week, to do munitions education and information to the public, we have a flyer the Navy and their contractors have put together. I think by now we've given out as many as a thousand of them since May. There's great interest in the fact that a little known fact of most of the public in the Bay Area and the world is that the Navy's oldest ammunition depot in the Pacific is right here on Mare Island. People are interested in munitions. It's not something I grew up with, I grew up with nurses and they didn't shoot guns and things like that. But it's just a reality that we have this really cool place.

Now, in the news, and may they rest in peace, and we're thinking of the Marines who were injured this last week at Hawthorne Naval Ammunition Depot in Nevada, a truly tragic event, and of course they were working with live arms, and to date, as your report says, they're unfuzed, unarmed items that have been being found. I think probably I'll still say that being around for the last almost 19 years, as Paula and I have been, and others of you, many, many, many, many years, there's -- I don't think that I would be misspeaking to say that we understand the significance of the work that you're doing, the Navy's doing, its contractors, in cleaning up the ammunition depot. I don't think that any of us thinks that you should go faster and it be unsafe, or that you should turn over anything that's unsafe. But I think it is that incident at Hawthorne and the fact that people are coming to our park, coming to a site where there is a munition manufacturing history, people are interested in munitions, they're surprisingly interested in bunkers, maybe cause of "Days of Caves." But I think it's really hampering us -- and you've heard me say this before, I'm not going to go on a whole lot longer -- it's really hampering our work to not be able to have, again, a path forward for the acquisition of historical items, being aspects, components of the munitions items or the actual munitions items to be able to just do a good job of historical interpretation.

You can't have the Mare Island Naval Ammunition Depot National Register Historic District, one of four on Mare Island contributing to the National Historic Landmark, the highest ranking National Parks gives historic sites in America, and just have flat pieces of paper to tell the story, or even cultural debris associated, thank you so much for gathering it and giving it to us. It doesn't quite hold the same level of, you know, people's understanding of this place in history as it would to have munitions items. I sent out for -- I didn't know that I was going to be getting

things from the U.S. Navy museum. I've been there, it's at the Naval History Center at the Washington Navy yard founded in 1812. But I was able to acquire -- what are these? -- 20 millimeter.

MR. SILER: Forty.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- and fifty caliber shells at the Navy History Museum bookstore. I mean, like, good God, I mean I even have a receipt for it. I did not acquire these on Ebay or at yard sales. And they're selling these for \$4 each, and these are \$2.50 each. How is it that these can be acquired at the Navy History Museum in Washington, D.C., and I can buy them or someone can, and we can't have something like this on display at our little homemade museum? So if it has to do with money, then this is what else I was able to get from the Navy History Museum gift shop. These are pencils, United States Navy. And I'm thinking that maybe you will like to buy some and we can get the money together to make a museum. What do you think?

MR. COFFEY: Pencils?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Pencils. We gotta start somewhere. So that's about the extent of my conversation as the community co-chair. I'm just discouraged in almost 19 years in this capacity and we can't get it together to find, to sit down for maybe a day and just work out how these items can safely come to those of us who are actually on the ground doing the work. We know that you have sent collections to two other museums in town. We know that that was before 9/11. We know you have various procedures, some confusing procedures. But again, I think if we just sat down probably we could work it out, just like the houses, I think we could work out a plan. So, you know, I think this is really cool. I might order a few thousand of them because I think people are going to want them. They could be great pencil holders I think.

MR. COFFEY: Mini vases.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or mini vases, yeah. So I think that's the only thing for now. Except we are coming up on our fifth anniversary on April 13th of being open for the last five years, and I think that's really exciting, and I really appreciate the work that all of you have done to make the reuse of the land possible, not just as commercial and residential property on Mare Island, but as public access property, and we really truly do appreciate it.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I remember the very first, and it used to be called UXO. It was a UXO presentation. And I remember asking the man giving the presentation, was anything found of historical interest? And there was stuff from the Civil War.

MR. COFFEY: I remember that too. I was particularly interested by that one because he said it was a very rare find. I remember that was a button or a fuze or something like that that he said there are only like two or three known left in the world.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, it's in a scrap bin.

MR. COFFEY: Probably not, but --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or in somebody's pocket or it got sold.

MR. COFFEY: But Janet, why not? Why won't the Navy let us have any of that kind of stuff for display?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: As far as munitions items, it has to go through a process.

MR. COFFEY: It doesn't work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Let's get it started.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: As far as the other items, I know that Dwight is keeping good care of all of those items, and when we have an avenue to get that over we will. I wanted to talk to Myrna a little bit off-line about it after the meeting.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In the meantime, if anybody wants to buy these -- I'm going to mark them up -- these are \$15, and these will go for \$10. And the pencils, I think, a dollar.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Instead of \$4 and \$2.50?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, they had to get flown out from Washington, D.C.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Did they get on a plane? Did they let you on a plane with that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I didn't think that was a good idea so they got shipped private, you know. But the pencils got on the plane. They got on the plane. And so the pencils are a dollar. So -- thank you for your donation.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, everyone, for coming.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:10 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Additional Removal Action at Building 742 - Navy
- Presentation Handout – Planned Upcoming Field Activities Spring/Summer 2013 Eastern Early Transfer Parcel – Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island Draft Navy Field Schedule
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard March 31, 2013