

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2005**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 28, 2005, at the J.F. K. Library, Joseph Room in Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:07 p.m. and adjourned at 9:15 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance during this month's RAB meeting.

RAB Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Kenn Browne (Community Member)
- Jerry Karr (Community Member)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)
- Michael Coffey (Community Member)
- Jim O'Loughlin (Community Member)
- Gary Riley (RWQCB)
- Jerry Dunaway (Navy Co-Chair)
- David Godsey (Navy)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston Solutions)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Bob Bancroft
- Marti Brown
- Neal Siler
- Tommie Jean Damrell

RAB Support from CDM:

- Regina Clifford
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Good evening, everybody. Welcome to our August -- looking ahead, July RAB meeting. I know that Myrna is busy with something to do with the chapel, I'm sure Gil knows about that. So she might be a little bit late tonight, so why don't we just go ahead and get started.

We have a good presentation tonight to review or get an update on what is our biggest cleanup action going on right now for the Navy, and that's the Marine Corps firing range that you've heard about quite a few times over the past couple of years. Before I get too far into that though, it doesn't look like our regulators are quite here yet, but we have Gary. We do need to, during the break, set aside some time, maybe Gary can participate, to review Marti Brown's RAB application so that we can consider her membership after the break.

MR. FARLEY: Jerry, I talked to Chip earlier, he won't be here tonight.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: So maybe, Gary, you can substitute?

MR. RILEY: Sure.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Do you know if Carolyn will be here?

MR. RILEY: I don't know.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well maybe you, me, and Myrna.

MR. RILEY: Sure.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And if there is another community member, we lost Diana Krevsky to our membership committee. If there's another community member that would like to participate in the membership committee and discuss Marti Brown's application during the break today, maybe you can consider that during the presentation and let me or Myrna know during break. With that, why don't we jump into introductions and then we'll go into the presentation.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Wally. I don't think I introduced myself. My name is Jerry Dunaway, I'm the BRAC environmental coordinator for the Navy here at Mare Island, and also the Navy's co-chair for this Restoration Advisory Board. So thank you for the introductions. With that, why don't we bring up Dwight and we'll kick off the presentation for tonight.

(Attendees introduced themselves as requested).

**II. PRESENTATION: *Progress Report on the Cleanup and Redevelopment Activities at the Marine Corps Firing Range Site*
Presented by Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston Solutions and Mr. Steve Farley,
CH2M Hill.**

MR. GEMAR: Thanks, Jerry. The topic today is an update for the Mare Island Marine Corps firing range cleanup that Weston Solutions is performing for the Navy. Just as a refresher, this is an aerial view of the rifle range which is the long rectangular part of the photo, and then the pistol ranges are to the left. There is two main objectives. One is to remediate the primarily late contaminated soil that occurred as a result of the operation of the rifle range and the pistol range. And the second alternative is to perform a screening operation to remove any radiological or munitions items from an old outfall area that is associated with the adjacent dredge pond, which is shown in the upper left corner of the photograph.

And you might recall that, the folks that have been on the RAB for some time, that the dredge ponds were a source of munitions contamination due to the fact that the ships, especially in the World War II era, dumped a lot of small ordnance off their ships in the, from the piers. And when the Navy dredged the channel or the strait, the Mare Island Strait, they pumped not only sediment, but also these ordnance items into the dredge ponds. And then they would settle out right at the end of the pipe where they entered the dredge ponds, and those areas are called outfalls.

And so we're going back to finish the cleanup of one of the larger outfalls in terms of being a producer of munitions. One of the first activities that Weston did was to basically continue some

work that had been started under a previous contract that the Navy had with another firm. And during that work there was fifteen stockpiles that had been generated due to excavation of late contaminated soil from the rifle range and the pistol ranges. And that amounted to a little over 20,000 cubic yards. And so Weston sampled those stockpiles for the leachability criteria that was assigned for those soils in order to determine whether they could be transported to the investigation area H1 location, which is about a half mile to the north which is where the former landfill is.

And all of those samples passed the leachability criteria, and so they were approved for movement from the rifle range to the containment area within investigation area H1. And again, you might recall that the containment area is now surrounded by a slurry wall and the groundwater extraction trench. So we're placing the late contaminated soils within that area, and we hope that we'll be able to use those soils later for building the subgrade for the presumptive remedy for the landfill which is to put a cap over that area.

So once the existing stockpiles were removed, we then completed the excavation of the grids that are shown in red. These were grids that were previously characterized by the, by the contractor that was working on the rifle range. And so we dug up those areas, did confirmation sampling, and continued those excavations, where appropriate, until the cleanup criteria was achieved.

We also sampled quite a numbers of grids which are shown in yellow. These are grids that for one reason or another were inaccessible to the previous contractor, and so those grids had not been sampled. So Weston performed the sampling in those grids. There was 39 grids that have been sampled to date, and we still have another seven to go because they are still located in areas that we can't get to. And only two of those grids required excavation. But for the excavated grids, the 47 out of the 49 that we've done to date, we've generated a little over 12,000 cubic yards. And that material was also sampled and transported to investigation area H1. And this just shows a photograph of a typical soil loading operation. The excavator is perched on the stockpile, and the 35 ton off-road truck parks up next to it, and the excavator loader loads the soil on the truck, and then that's transported to area H1.

And this photograph shows a, excavation of a contaminated grid. This one happens to be the slope of the backstop behind the rifle range target area. In your photos you can probably see it better than here, but there's a concrete wall structure to the left. That's where the targets were raised and lowered for the marksmen. And when they shot up, of course, the projectiles would go through the targets, if they hit 'em, and hit the backstop.

And so that area was pretty heavily contaminated with lead. In some cases I believe the deepest grid was, we had to excavate seven feet of soil. So it's possible that they built the berm in stages in some areas to accommodate for the large amount of small arms fire that was hitting those berms. So all of this work, with the exception of a couple of grids in the pistol range and the rifle range, are now clean, and all that soil has been transported to area H1.

So the next phase of the work that Weston has started on has to do with the 4S work. And this is, again, the material that we know has the potential for explosives or munitions of concern, basically projectiles with high explosives such as the 40 mil and 20 millimeter anti-aircraft ammunition. But also in these outfalls we know from past experience that there's also some

radioactive luminescent dials that used to be on board the ships, so that in case of a power failure they could see placards and whatnot. So they contain a small amount of radium.

So we survey the soil first before we dig it up and look at about the top foot surface of the soil to remove any radiological items. So that's done. And then we excavate the soil and mechanically screen it through a three quarter inch screen. And anything that's of interest, in our case a 20 millimeter anti-aircraft projectile is slightly larger than three quarters of an inch. So that, those munitions items in addition to any large scrap or debris are removed from the soil. And then the soil can be transported to area H1.

Once we dig up the soil we're going to do a geophysical survey to determine if we have any metallic anomalies, or basically anything metal that's still in the ground of interest. And if so, we'll go to those areas and continue to dig. And any recovered items we are going to eventually be thermally treating those in the old ordnance disposal range. That's on the west or the south side of the island. And as I mentioned, we're going to be treating or -- transporting all of the screened soil after the munitions have been removed to area H1 for use as fill material. And this is a flow chart of the mechanical screening operation to remove munitions items from the soil.

Starting from the left-hand side. The soil, if it's too wet, it will be conditioned or basically dried and, to make it easier to screen, because wet soil doesn't screen very well. Once the, if that's done, then the loader operator takes a scoop of the soil and places it on top of a six inch grizzly screen, which is basically a screen with fixed slots six inches apart, and anything bigger than six inches falls off that screen. Any material that's less than six inches goes under an electromagnet, and this is a bell type electromagnet. So as material is pulled up to the magnet, a conveyor belt removes the material. And as the belt reaches the end of the magnet, of course the magnet loses its attractiveness and it falls off into a bin which goes into what we, or what I've labeled here as reject material, which is the red box. So once the material has gone under the magnet, it then goes through a couple of different screens, one a two-inch screen and then a three quarter inch screen.

Anything under a three quarter inch screen goes into a another magnet, and then goes into a screened soil stockpile. Anything that's under the three quarter inch size goes into a, what I've called here a clod reducer, but it's basically a shredding machine. It will shred soils clods or metal if there's metal in the screen. And that's necessary because a lot of the soil in Mare Island, of course, is all clay, and the clay tends to form large clods, especially when it's wet, so it won't go through to a screen plant as is. But if you run it through a shredding machine, it will basically size reduce it. And then that is fed back to the conveyor system that goes again under the magnet and the screen plant.

Any material that's taken out by the magnets and/or anything that's six inches or greater gets reviewed by our ordnance specialists. And they determine whether the scrap has any munitions in it. And if so, the munitions, of course, have separated, and the scrap is certified as being munitions free, and then that metal is recycled. And here's the picture. Again, your handout might be a better picture of the screening plant. Off to the left, the kind of orange looking machine is the soil shredder.

The green machine in the center is actually the soil sifter. And on that machine there's the two magnets that I mentioned. There's a collection bin between the shredder and the screen for the large, for the debris coming off the first magnet.

And there's another bin off to the right that collects anything that comes off the magnet for the material that's less than three quarters of an inch. And then you can see the conveyor on the end is discharging the screened soil, which at that point has no munitions of concern in it and it's ready to be sampled and transported to area H1.

And here's just a closer picture of one of the bins. This happens to be the in under the secondary magnet. The magnet itself is the, kind of the blue piece of equipment, and it actually sits perpendicular to the main conveyor. And again, it runs material off to the side. And you can see a piece of plywood is sitting there that, just to keep the material from getting flung too far, we want it to hit the plywood and fall into the bin.

And we've got some other photos of the actual debris that we collect. This is the first bin that collects the large metal metallic debris or the ferrous debris, and you can see that there's a lot of, you know, a lot of debris. This is probably from no more than a half a day's run time. So a lot of debris, a lot of metal comes off that first magnet. And then conversely, as you would expect, we don't see a whole lot of metal in the soil that's less than three quarters of an inch. Really this is just nails and bolts, things like that.

And then periodically, once or twice a day, whenever the bin is getting near to be full, we transport the bin into a separate sorting area behind the concrete structure that I pointed out by the rifle range berm. And they basically take this material, shovelful by shovelful, and because there's still some dirt associated with the debris, they put it on a, just a small screen that you can see on the ground, and they literally go piece by piece through the debris. And if there's any munitions items, of course those are taken out, and anything that's just metal scrap is put in a separate bin.

And here you can see some examples of some munitions items that have been recovered to date. As you can see, they're pretty badly deteriorated. And I'm sure not many people would even recognize them as ordnance. But the UXO specialists know what they're looking for. So on the left, for example, are two 20 millimeter anti-aircraft projectiles. Again, the casing is not associated with these items, just the business end.

There's an inert 1.1 inch projectile next to it. And then to the right was a 40 millimeter projectile, 40 millimeter anti-aircraft projectile. And the little box on the right just shows how many items of both, live items and inert that we've collected to date. So far we've collected about eighteen live items from the soil that we've screened and sifted so far. So overall the status is that we have completed the mechanical screening for MEC, or munitions and explosives of concern of the existing 4 South outfall stockpiles.

Similar to the stockpiles that were already existing for the rifle range cleanup, there were a couple of piles that were existing from a previous attempt to screen the material. This was primarily the reject material that didn't go through the screen and so it was placed in a stockpile. So that's the material that we have just recently completed screening. We've had a few challenges. Mainly there was some non-routine shutdowns early on from the equipment. The

shredder sheared a pump shaft off and so that had to be replaced, and of course it happened to be a part from Mercedes in Germany, so that took about a week to get that part.

Also another thing that gives us a little bit of headaches is non-metallic debris, like I mentioned here, three inch quarry spalls. The previous contractor used these three inches quarry spalls which are basically just angular rock that are used for bridging wet muddy areas. And unfortunately a lot of that rock got scooped up and put in the reject pile.

And the shredder, you know, handles metal very well, but it's not designed to crush rock. But more importantly, if a piece of rock bounces off a conveyor belt and gets caught in the return conveyor to the roller, it will lodge against the roller and basically stop the machine. So one little three inch rock will basically shut us down if it gets in the wrong spot. But we've managed some of that by doing more routine shutdowns, basically once an hour we shut down the plant for about ten minutes or so, let the guys go up and clean the screens, look for anything hanging off the conveyors or that might cause us a problem. And by just taking that down time, it really helps in the long run because we have less shutdowns. So on a good day we do about 500 cubic yards a day. And we've selected a couple of RAD buttons to date, as well as the munitions items that I've pointed out. And those munitions items are now in the magazine building A-180 on Mare Island. And finally just to, looking ahead. What we're planning to do is we, now that we've completed the screening for the existing stockpiles, the next step is to go to the actual outfall area itself and the levee that is adjacent to the outfall, and to start excavating areas that we know have a lot of debris associated with them.

And so we're going to be digging those areas and screening those again through the same piece of machinery that I just described. We'll be doing that in August. And once we do that we'll be doing a confirmational geophysical survey again to look for any remaining metal items in the soil. And if we find them we'll investigate those. That would be likely done in early September.

We do have some temporary wells that we're going to install to check for the current conditions of groundwater around the site, and that will also likely be done in September, as well as perform just general site grading just mainly for drainage purposes, and to fill in any holes so that there are no safety hazards. And then we'll hydroseed the disturbed areas just prior to the rainy season in October. And then the after action report we will prepare and submit that in approximately the November timeframe for the agencies for their review. So that's what I have, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. KARR: Dwight.

MR. GEMAR: Sir.

MR. KARR: You mentioned earlier that some of the areas you hadn't tested yet, sampled yet were inaccessible?

MR. GEMAR: Uh-huh.

MR. KARR: And why is that? What makes them inaccessible?

MR. GEMAR: When the previous contractor was working they started in the fall, and they got hamstrung by the wet weather, so it was physically underwater in some areas because it's a flat,

low lying area there in the rifle range floor. And in some cases the grids are not accessible because they were under existing stockpiles. So until you remove the stockpiles, you can't sample underneath them. So now that we've removed the stockpiles, we'll be able to sample those grids.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. GEMAR: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Dwight, so you --

MR. O'LOUGHLIN: On page four there's a flow chart. I was just curious as to -- oh, Jim O'Loughlin. On page four there is a flow chart showing a six inch grizzly. Is that some kind of a sorter or --

MR. GEMAR: Right. It's a stationary screen as opposed to the vibratory screen that's downstream of it. So this is just basically a big hopper with a deck over it that has six inch wide slots. And so when the soil is dumped onto that slotted screen, anything that's less than six inches falls through into a feeder that feeds the other part of the screen plant, and anything that's bigger than six inches just slides off the deck. So it's just a stationery screen.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN: And what were the, what type of buildings were those? There's some red roof, red tile roof buildings there, were they residential or classrooms or?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Marine Corps barracks.

MR. GEMAR: Oh, yeah, the Marine Corps barracks, yeah, off to the right. That one, yeah, that's the Marine Corps barracks. Yeah, that one right there.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It might surprise you that I don't remember what I was going to ask. It might be a great relief too. On page five, the ferrous metal, there is a nice photo of it all in a pile in the corner. Then do you hand sort that for ordnance?

MR. GEMAR: Yep. That's taken over behind the backstop area, and it's dumped on a, this asphalt pad area. And they shovel it just, you know, like say shovelful by shovelful onto that screen, and go through every piece.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What else, when you've completed this project -- maybe, Jerry, you can answer this question -- what else needs to be done for this to make it, this property transferable? Oh, and I remembered the other question. You said that you had the 4, had the outfall pretty much all screened, is that true?

MR. GEMAR: The existing stockpiles that had come from the 4S outfall.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you hadn't started on the remainder of 4S?

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I was curious to know, and so you answered my question there, was how much debris you will have ended up getting out of 4S since you thought that that might be the biggest outfall yet, the granddaddy of them all.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So it will be interesting to see how that develops.

MR. GEMAR: Hopefully we've got most of it. I mean certainly more munitions came out of 4 South than all the other outfalls combined, and that was definitely the big kahuna. And hopefully the previous work got most of it, and we're just getting the tail end. But as I understand, Jerry, there was a money shortfall, and so the work just didn't, couldn't get completed basically.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yeah, why don't I talk about it? Yeah, the Navy had made several attempts at getting to this site. SSPTS, the organization that Weston later acquired, they made an attempt in the late 90's and into 2000 to clean up that site. And they took out a substantial amount of material that brought it down to where we then started to go back to the site and clean up again with Foster Wheeler back in 2003. That was interfered with by the heavy rains that started up because we really didn't get out there until about November. That's the reason why there's so much water in some of the areas where Dwight said we couldn't sample at that time. And really the problem there wasn't necessarily funding, but the process that Foster Wheeler developed for the screening operation really only got us to about maybe a hundred cubic yards per day. You can see that Weston is closer to 500, so we're doing much better here. We spent a lot more money with the Foster Wheeler contract, and that's why we decided let's take another crack at this with someone else.

And so that's kind of where we're at today. We're working with Weston to hopefully get to the end of it. What will be left after this work is done, a lot will depend on how much is left at 4S. If we can get all of it out, that would be great. But we're not really banking on that.

We may have to have land controls in the event that we can't get everything out of there, and that would be necessary and would be memorialized by taking the site through the remedial investigation and feasibility study process. The feasibility study would evaluate alternatives to address residual at 4S. We think the rest of the Marine Corps firing range would be able to be closed clean, but it's the 4S outfall site that we believe will need additional work. And so we would take it through the RIFS process and then a record of decision to close those. And of course, we're also discussing early transfer of the site, so that may be done by others too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you. I'll just ask you a couple of more questions about that site. Can you refresh my memory, is 4S intended to go to the State Lands Commission, or will that become property that would go to the city and be transferred to, I expect, Lennar?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: That site straddles the state reversionary property that is part of the dredge ponds, and we believe that Weston is actually interested in getting that back to help support their dredge ponds operation. The other part, I'd say the core portion of the 4S outfall is part of the recreational park that's in the city's reuse plan. And I believe the intent for that, even though it's on state reversionary land, I believe the state will provide that property to the city somehow to be part of that recreational park.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: They've already done that.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And Gil just confirmed that they have done that, they've quit claimed it to the city.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You can't quit claim it, you still have it.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Not quit claim it, but they would give up their reversionary interest.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: They signed an agreement saying that they would not, they would not impose their rights.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You have to use the microphone, Gil. You have to use the microphone.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And so with, upon the transfer of the property, or when we get the property ready for transfer, I believe we would then do a transfer directly to the city. And it would be part of the park. And you'd have to ask Gil if they plan to convey the park to Lennar, I don't know that.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: In minutes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: There's your answer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But then Lennar would convey it back to you once they repaired it as a park, right?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Eventually.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All their parks are going to move to the --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, eventually.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- city or to its managing entity.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, all right. Okay. Well, the only other thing that I will say besides thank you very much, Dwight, I know I came in late, but this is a really well put together presentation, once again, from Weston. I think any other presenter should be using this as a model, because we like pictures that have captions on them. Very good work. Very graphic and also verbally, or I guess in writing, easy to understand. And go back to this one photo on page four of the outfall mechanical soils screening operation, it looks like a very serious train wreck.

But the only other thing that I would just mention is if the area is slated for a park, and I suppose that Lennar is going to hop right on that, why do you have to prep it with, why do you have to hydroseed it? Why couldn't you, it doesn't look like it's going to drain off or impact any storm runoff or erosion. I mean that is, that's construction management practice, but it seems like very shortly they'll be doing their own form of hydroseeding.

MR. GEMAR: Well, I would guess that the eastern side would be developed pretty quick, but I would think the western side might have a little bit more time involved. So I think the hydroseeding is there, again is just the best management practice to avoid a lot of superficial erosion.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yeah. And we are making Weston do that. It's also not just for storm water, but winds can generate a lot of dust, and we don't want any of the new housing occupants to say that we're causing dust and they have to clean their house every two days.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If they clean their house every two days, they can come clean mine the other six days -- four days. I also wanted to point out on page six that I'm really pleased to see that you're continuing to use the Navy's resources in these chairs. The American tax dollar really efficiently being stretched, and I'm very pleased to see that.

MR. GEMAR: I'll turn it over to Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Dwight. Okay. I'm going to talk about the work that we've done on behalf of Lennar at the far eastern end of the Marine Corps firing range. It's an area that is outside of the portions of the Marine Corps firing range that were being evaluated by previous contractors. And so the purpose of the effort is to support infrastructure development.

So, and I'm not sure how many folks here know about that, but basically Lennar has a major parkway that they intend to install or construct on the very far eastern end of the Marine Corps firing range. And so the purpose of this investigation and effort was to fundamentally collect some soil samples, determine if there were any concentrations of constituents, particularly lead, that required remediation as part of a fossil and lease review revision form process that would ultimately lead to the ability of Lennar to go in and install some infrastructure at the far eastern end of the Marine Corps firing range.

So the area that is, that was evaluated is the area shown in green at the far end. If you compare that back to some of Dwight's drawings, you'll be able to see where the end of the Navy's sampling grid was, and this picks up basically at that far eastern end of the Navy's grid. It covers about two and a half, 2.4 acres, and it's located, the eastern or, excuse me, the western end of this area is about a hundred and fifty feet or so east of the 500 yard firing line on the firing range. So it's outside of the operational portion of the Marine Corps firing range. This figure is intended primarily to give you a perspective of where the area is relative to the rest of the Marine Corps firing range, and to give you an idea of the sampling grid. It's a fifty foot sampling grid, and we'll talk about the details here in a second. But it's a fifty foot sampling grid, and there are sample locations inside each and every one of those sample grids.

I have hard copies of these figures if you want to take a look at the specific details after we get done. Samples were collected on a fifty foot grid during three investigative and removal action phases during May, June, and July of this year. A total of 74 samples were collected from 54 locations. Most of the samples were collected from within a foot or so of the ground surface. Some extended down to about three and a half feet.

All 74 samples were analyzed for lead, and 19 were analyzed for Title 22 metals, and 17 were analyzed for the other constituents here, VOCs, SVOCs, and PCBs. The analytical results showed that lead exceeded the target cleanup level of 200 milligrams per kilogram in 11

samples. And those concentrations above 200 ranged from 210 to about 1,200 milligrams per kilogram.

There were also other metals that were detected as well as PCBs, etcetera, but all of those came in below the U.S. EPA Region 9 PRGs for unrestricted use for the soils. So fundamentally the lateral and vertical extent of the lead concentrations greater than the cleanup goal were defined by the field investigation, as were the concentrations of other constituents that were under the cleanup goals. ABM was also encountered in the southwestern corner of the study area, and I'll show you that in just a second here.

MR. KARR: You're getting a little away from me on the acronyms here.

MR. FARLEY: I'm sorry, Jerry. What can I help you with?

MR. KARR: Anti-ballistic missiles.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Remember, and you may not know, but the County Board of Supervisors, remember, for Contra Costa County, fine themselves a dollar for every acronym they say. The first county in probably the nation to do that.

MR. FARLEY: ABM --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We could make all the money I spend on this food stuff.

MR. FARLEY: Forgive me. ABM stands abrasive blast material also known as green sand. Does anybody not know what green sand is?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Marti wouldn't.

MR. FARLEY: Green sand is sort of a generic name for essentially sandblast grid. It's little glass beads that were used by the Navy for years and years and years to sandblast ships, peel off paint, rust, that sort of thing. And you find it in lots of places at Mare Island. It's typically used for fill material, materials around pipelines, underneath foundations of various structures and slabs. Shall we go over the PCBs, VOC's, etcetera? Polychlorinated biphenyls, they're a contaminant that's commonly in transformer oils. VOCs, volatile organic compounds. Things like solvents and such. SVOCs, semi-volatile organic compounds. Things like pesticides and PAH's or --

MR. GEMAR: That will be a dollar.

MR. FARLEY: As I started to say it I had a dollar going right out of my mind.

MR. COFFEY: On the table. (LAUGHTER.)

MR. FARLEY: And PRGs, PRGs are preliminary remediation goals. Those are numbers that are established by U.S. EPA, in this case for soils, that establish levels for different kinds of future land use that are protective of those land uses. In this case we used residential preliminary remediation goals as the, as the criteria for the, for evaluating the data.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Steve, I just asked Jerry where PCBs would have come from and some of these other things, and you want to tell them what you told me so that I'm not just gossiping?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, one practice with oils was for dust control. And yeah, they were used, PCBs or polychlorinated biphenyls were used often in transformer fluids, but sometimes that oil would get mixed with other oils, and then those oils may be used for dust control. That probably would have been a more probable scenario for how polychlorinated biphenyls would have gotten into this area. I don't think we had a vast network of high voltage electrical transformers in this area.

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Jerry. Okay. Based on the data that was generated as part of the characterization phase I just described, there were a number of areas that were identified requiring remediation. Those areas are shown actually on the next slide in the purple areas. Those are the cells in which lead exceeded the target cleanup level of 200 milligrams per kilogram. So in those areas, approximately 940 cubic yards of lead contaminated soil were removed in July of this year. Most of the cells were excavated to about a foot to two and a half feet. Most of 'em were less than two and a half feet, but there were one or two that went down as far as two and a half feet. And one of the things that we used in the field to try and make sure that as we went through the excavation process we got all of the contaminated soil, is we used a device called an XRF, or an x-ray fluorescence, x-ray fluorescence tool that basically allowed us to measure in the field, with a fair amount of accuracy, to measure in the field the level of lead in the soil. So that when we decided that we were done and we collected our confirmation sample, we had a high probability that our cleanup level had been achieved, and our confirmation sample was going to come back having met the target cleanup level of 200 milligrams per kilogram lead.

So again, the figure here shows, the main thing I want you to see here are two things. One is the purple areas, those are the cells in which lead was at concentrations greater than 200, and those are the areas that we excavated down about a foot to two and a half feet.

And the area in the bottom of the figure, the sort of, I don't know, duck shaped figure, that's the area where abrasive blast material or green sand was found at a fairly contiguous block. It was found underneath a structure and then underneath one of the berms. So all of that material was removed as part of this excavation process.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Steve, I have a question for you. Those purple squares are right on the edge. So that's on the edge of the property line, or do you have your property that you already have the title for goes right up to that edge, so you have probably lead adjacent to it? What's the story there? All those squares that are right on the edge of the line.

MR. FARLEY: All of those areas, the areas on the right and to the south, those are areas that Lennar has, and those areas had a sample within the cell in which the lead concentration exceeded 210. Those areas were all excavated, and now the concentrations are below 210.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right, but they're right on the edge of somebody else's, of your property or -- I mean how, what's their -- did you sample outside of those areas?

MR. FARLEY: There's only one sample location that was outside of the, the area on the top and the right -- well actually, the boundary of the green area is the fence line of the Marine Corps firing range. So we went up to the fence line with our excavation, but it's outside of the Marine

Corps firing range, so there wasn't any need to go out and do additional characterization outside. On top of that, like I said, the confirmation sample concentrations came in way below the 200 PBM number.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but I got -- I read you there. But on the right hand side of those, of that line, the eastern side of that fence line where you've got all that purple which meant that that was above 200.

MR. FARLEY: It doesn't mean that the entire cell was above 200, what it meant was that in the middle of that cell --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Somewhere in that cell you found --

MR. FARLEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So who, are you, I assume that your parkway is also going to be on the other side of that fence?

MR. FARLEY: No, the parkway is going to go right in this section, and this is overgeneralizing, but the parkway is going to go through the green, green area this way.

MR. GEMAR: There's a pointer, Steve.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There is a pointer over there, Steve.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: It's actually right up there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's right here.

MR. FARLEY: The parkway is going to go right through here. And the west side will be about here, and the east side will be about here.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Now, I had a conversation with Sheila about this, and what I recall her saying is that, yeah, several of these cells that were excavated did go outside the Navy's property boundary and included soil from the eastern early transfer parcel. What I recall Sheila telling me is that they either have done or plan on doing similar -- well, I believe because the area has been closed, right?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: D-1 or D-2 RAP has already been closed, they did an assessment of that area up to the Navy's property. So that area has been evaluated and regulatorily closed.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not to belabor the point, but your duck down there with the ABM, had that already been regulatorily closed as well? I mean it's outside of the fence looking thing there.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: That was underground green sand that was discovered in the course of doing the sampling, the sample borings, and so it was not known to exist down there at the time of closure. But when the excavation or the discovery of this green sand was found, Lennar and CH2M HILL made the effort to find out its extent and then take it all out.

MR. FARLEY: In fact, this right here is one of the berms, and so the berm actually extended up into here. And when the samples were collected in this area, and when the, some of the concrete was removed in this area, it was, the green sand was found and it was, it was largely associated with the former berm. So it was, as Jerry said, it was, if not several feet, you know, eight feet or so below ground.

Okay. So the main thing I want to convey in this is, as I said before, the purple areas are the areas in which the data demonstrated that some action needed to be taken relative to lead. And then, of course, the duck area for the green sand. Okay. This is actually a repeat so we're going to skip over this. The confirmation samples that we collected were submitted to an off-site laboratory. Analytical data came back. The confirmation samples came back with concentrations ranging from about 15 milligrams per kilogram to about 170. Those numbers are below the 200 milligram per kilogram number which has been set as the target cleanup level. And that is on a point by point basis.

That's a very conservative approach. Usually what occurs is that exposure point concentration, which takes into account the distribution of data and applies the standard deviation to the data and the mean of the sample of the sample set is used. In this case we went on a point by point basis and everything was below 170. And in fact, we did a -- I was sharing with Jerry earlier, we actually went through and we did a calculation of the exposure point concentration. And an exposure point concentration is a number that represents the concentration that one would be exposed to if they essentially lived at the site in this particular case.

And that concentration came out to be 59 milligrams per kilogram. And if you compare that to the 200, you can see how conservative the cleanup was. On top of that, the ambient level, the average or background level, if you will, for lead in soils and fill soils at Mare Island just happens to be 59 milligrams per kilogram, which I thought was kind of interesting. For our green sand removal, there were about 1,300 cubic yards of green sand or ABM that was removed as part of this action as well.

So conclusions are basically that we met the objectives established, which is the target cleanup level of 200 milligrams per kilogram. We've done the work that needs to be done. We've written a tech memo that summarizes all the work that we've done, summarizes all the data, and we've submitted that to the agencies. We met with them this week. Actually went out and collected some additional samples for some of the cells based on some concerns that Chip Gribble had. I actually should say DTSC had. And went back out, collected those samples, got 24 hour turnaround. They came back below 100. And so we've modified the tech memo and resubmitted that back to the regulatory agencies for their final approval.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If I'm not mistaken, Steve and Jerry, isn't sandblast grit actually nickel slag?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's why it's of concern. It's not just metals or tributalyn or whatever else was blasted off the ship, but it was the actual material that was also used is actually high in nickel, yeah?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Dwight. Yeah, this sandblast material was called green sand, is called green sand, and it looks green, that's why we call it green sand. It came from a place called Nickel Mountain up in Oregon, and was a local supplier for this type of material. And even if it was not used for sandblasting and did not have the paint particles in it, it had characteristics that made it somewhat hazardous by itself.

A couple other points I'd like to make on this work. We had not expected to find any contamination in this area working with the regulators to define our removal action at the firing range. The regulatory agencies agreed with us, this area is not really a high priority area to look in, sample, and incorporate into the overall sampling plan for the site.

But my guess is if we had gone back after the removal action and completed a remedial investigation, we probably would have been asked to take a few samples out there, and would have most likely encountered what Lennar and CH2M HILL found.

So we appreciate what they did kind of in advance of what we most likely would have done anyway. In addition, we took all that waste, it was on our property, even the stuff that kind of was outside the property boundary. We took that on and basically managed it as part of the rest of the waste on the Marine Corps firing range.

So with that, any final questions about the Marine Corps firing range? We're making great progress and we're on track of finishing before the next rainy season which is great news. If there is no other questions, why don't we take a break?

And for the membership committee, why don't we meet around the corner of the table over here. If there's a community member that would like to participate in that, kind of replacing Diana Krevsky's role, please come on by. Thank you. Let's try and get back here, let's say, at about 8:15.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

III. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes, Jerry Dunaway)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, thank you all for coming back. We have a few additional items beyond our normal administrative business on the agenda. First off, we have our meeting minutes from last June's RAB meeting in your packet. If you have any comments or corrections, please forward those corrections to myself or to Myrna or to Regina.

We have a membership consideration for Ms. Marti Brown. She has been visiting our RAB for the past few meetings and is interested in joining the RAB. And we think she's a great candidate. The membership committee definitely supports her membership, and we'd like to offer that to a vote to the community members that are here. Although a few of them have stepped out of the room.

MR. COFFEY: Jim left.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: But in the spirit of understanding Marti's background and her interest in the RAB, Marti, would you like to come up to the microphone and introduce yourself and

describe your background and your interest in this Restoration Advisory Board? The switch on the top of the microphone, if you switch that towards you, I think that will turn it on.

MS. BROWN: Can you hear me?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MS. BROWN: My name is Marti Brown and I'm a resident of Vallejo. I've lived here for about two years. And I'm also a city planner with the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency. I've been with Berkeley for a little over three years. I'm relatively new to planning. And before that I worked for SBC in marketing, and I was a cartographer before that. So I've had a couple of career changes. Trying to find the right one. So I am interested in working on this issue. I think, I've been drawn to military base reuse for some time in different areas, from school projects when I was in graduate school and a contract worker with Levine Fricke for a while, and they had a military base reuse like planning component or division. And one of the things I guess that I'm so drawn to is that rarely do we get large tracts of land where we get to do planning. And, you know, it can be really, it's a chance to do something from sort of the ground up, especially in such a densely populated area like the Bay Area.

So while I realize that the RAB doesn't do land use planning, what the RAB does do actually impacts what kind of policy and planning. And so it seems like an important body to have some kind of voice about what happens in terms of land use policy, and that's why I'm interested in the RAB.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Marti. If there's any questions, maybe some folks could ask Marti questions if they have any?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I was just going to say that your travels and changes in career remind me that my neighbor switched about five years ago from being a forensic technician to a marine biologist, so I think she could relate to your switches.

MS. BROWN: Wow, that's different. That's a big jump.

MR. KARR: It's all dead stuff.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, thank you, Marti. With that, for the community members on the RAB, I believe one, two, three, four, five members. For those members, is there a motion to accept Marti as a new member?

MR. KARR: I so move.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Is there a second?

MR. COFFEY: I'll second.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll second.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Second.

MR. COFFEY: We all second.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. All in favor raise your hand. (Members raised hands.)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Any opposed? (No response.)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you.

Okay, it's unanimous. Thank you, Marti. (APPLAUSE.)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: We'll have a name plate and you can come up to the table.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Now you have to move up and pick your seat.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: The next item is that next Tuesday, August 2nd we have a focus group meeting planned hosted by Lennar. And they will be talking about work they have been coordinating for the City of Vallejo on land use controls management. And that will start at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday at Lennar's offices. It's on 690 Walnut Avenue. If you need directions to that, why don't you talk to Myrna or myself after the RAB meeting. We'll also put out a reminder e-mail, hopefully before the end of tomorrow with more specifics. And I've asked Sheila if there were any type of agenda items that they want to give folks a heads up on. Hopefully we'll get that out before the meeting. Hope to see you all there on Tuesday.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jerry, can I just comment on that? We did have quite a discussion with Sheila about exactly what this focus group meeting is about. And I'm not quite sure what they'll pull together for this meeting. But Gil, we understand that you and various members of the city staff, IT department -- and what is that? Information technology? Hmm, almost had to pay a dollar there -- have been really working on this with Lennar and with the regulators.

And I expressed, on behalf of the community members of the RAB, that we felt that if it was going to be a useful discussion, that we really did want to have the folks who are trying to get their arms around this topic there, whether they have a clear path forward, whether they really have a good vision about how they're going to package these land use controls and make them practical for the public as well as the potential landowner and the regulators to use.

They may not have to have everything settled in their minds, or their technology may need to be refined, but it would be really constructive and instructive, I think, to have decision makers or people in the process actually there rather than just Lennar and us and them saying, "Well, we'll get back to you all. So that's, we don't have an agenda at this point, but I really did encourage Sheila to try to, you know, corral folks so that we can have a hopefully productive conversation. We tend to in these focus group meetings, we find that the people who host them find it pretty useful to pick our brains. But that's just what I wanted to bring to people's attention. And she's also offered that they're going to be providing food, so that's always an incentive too.

MR. COFFEY: Pizza and beer.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Myrna. Why don't we go into the focus group reports. Jerry, natural resources.

IV. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (need to select a new group leader)

Currently vacant. Report not given.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

MR. KARR: Nothing really on natural resources focus, but I'm going to have to beg off from next month's RAB meeting because my bride Theresa and I will be in Oregon celebrating our 40th wedding anniversary on August 28th. (APPLAUSE.)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Jerry. Paula, do we have any technical topics we need to hear from you on?

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: There was no meeting this week, or this month. I just wanted to mention the meeting on August 2nd, but you've already done it.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Paula.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I just wanted to note along those lines that many months ago, many years ago we talked about, we actually met with at one time a contractor who might be able to help us get some of the TAPP like grant money rolling to review some of Lennar's documents. And I have been in contact with that individual, Gail Edmonston Watkin. And her mother has been ill with Lou Gehrig's Disease, but she thinks she's able now to come back on board with that. So Lennar can expect, I think, a proposal from us shortly in terms of getting that person on. And we'll expect that we have tens of thousands of dollars in the bank to spend on her. But it would be, I think the way that the Weston and the Navy have done this, and Sheila talked with us quite a bit some time ago again about this, that they would be contracted directly to you, but their work product would be the RAB's. They would be serving the community members of the RAB in the independent review of those documents.

And for those of you who weren't here back then, and I guess that would only be Marti, that was something that we negotiated in kind of a good faith way from both Weston and Lennar because the Navy already provided that, provides that money in a limited way through a mechanism they have called TAPP grant's. And I'm not going to spell out the acronym right now -- technical assistance to --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Public participation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I was going to say people and places or something like that. But in the spirit of cooperation, not required I don't think by any particular statute, Lennar and Weston both offered to continue that type of a funding mechanism to provide independent, assistance with independent review of some of the documents. And we've just been very slow to take Lennar up on that offer. So we're going to try to get that off our list of things to do.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. Why don't we move to the city report. Gil..

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you. City staff, being me, have been very frustrated for some time at people that stand up in public meetings and what have you and say nothing's going on at Mare Island, blah, blah, blah, blah. We started several months ago an effort, which we call our major development update. And it's a document that we put out of my office every two months, and it covers all of the developments, not just Mare Island, but each one of the developments throughout Vallejo. And every other month this comes out. It's in a formatted form. The reason it's formatted is to keep it as simple as possible. I like to tell the people who are writing this, just put down the facts and let's not make it pretty. It covers Triad, it covers the waterfront, it covers the Solano Fairgrounds, plus Mare Island, the Mare Island, the dredge ponds on Mare Island, the eastern early transfer parcel. There is a short one pager on the north area.

My, the reason I'm bringing it up to you tonight is that if you don't know about this, it's well worth your while to call it up. It's on WWW.CI.VALLEJO.US -- excuse me, .CALIFORNIA.US. Once you get to the city's web page you go to community development. From community development to economic development, and there it is. And while you're there you will note that there are a large number of documents there for you to go through, literally thousands and thousands of pages of documents that are currently being reviewed. And I wanted to go through those for just a moment with you. CO-CHAIR HAYES: We'll trade you straight across, Gil. The Navy and Weston and Lennar also produce that volume.

The downtown specific plan EIR, EIR means environmental impact report, I don't owe anybody any money. That comment period, that particular document has been on the streets for some time. It has closed. The comment period has closed, and they are now producing the final copy which will then get another review, but. So the specific plan environmental impact report is moving along very well for the downtown project.

For the waterfront project, again these are not Mare Island, these are just stuff over on this side -- I just want to make sure that you all know these, that the environmental impact report is out for comment, and that document closes out on August 10th. So it's right around the corner, and if you wanted to say something about the waterfront EI -- environmental impact report, now is the time to do it. And the Mare Island specific plan amendment environmental impact report, that's a pretty long title, but the specific plan amendment, which is a fairly extensive document that changes the existing specific plan, this is the amendment to it, and it has been, it has cost well over a million dollars to develop this amendment, it is, the EIR associated with it is going to be out on the 5th of next month. So that's next week sometime. That will go for a 45 day comment period closing on April 12th. So that's --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You might mean September 12th?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm sorry, what did I say?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: April.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: April, oh, my gosh, that's more than 45 days. Yes, that's September 12th, I stand corrected. Those three documents are on WWW.CI.VALLEJO.CA.US. And then you go over to the community development department, all the departments are listed there. You know you click on one, work your way through some pretty pictures, and you get over to economic development which I do for a living, and that's what they do. We have one other document on the street that is a very much important to us, and that's the Mare Island dredge pond environmental impact report. That was released on the 22nd of this month or last week. It is out for comments, and it will close on September 6th. I would remind you that this is the second time this has been out. We've, we put it out some months ago, and I can't remember, and we had massive amounts of comments. And because of all those comments we said we had to make so many changes to it that what we need to do is rerelease this for a second draft comment period. So it's out for a 45 day comment period today. We have not got that up on our website yet. I looked at that today to make sure. So it is up on Weston's website which is WWW.MAREISLAND.ORG, Mare Island being one word all run together.

And in the next few days, you know, when our people catch up, it should be up on our website. If you don't want to wait for the the website, you can always come here to the library, they get a copy of everything, check it out from them, and read it. And if you don't want to do that, if you want your own private copy, then you can go to our planning division, which is on the second floor of City Hall, and either read theirs or buy one from them. Which it's very thick so it might, it's, it's three volumes and I would say it's that thick easy (speaker motioning.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Gil, I don't mean to keep interrupting you, but I just want for the record for people to actually know that what you referred to as a Weston website, we're very proud to have Weston actually maintain it for us, but it's actually our website, the Restoration Advisory Board's website. It's a joint project of Weston, Lennar, and the Navy, along with the Restoration Advisory Board. So just so it doesn't sound like it's only a Weston site. And you're actually welcome, the city is actually welcome to contribute to that too. Anything that has environmental ramifications or work being done on Mare Island, submit information to Weston, they've got a contact, and they look for new material to be uploaded monthly on that. Hopefully I didn't interrupt your train of thought too badly.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You did, but that -- Once again, I wanted to point those out because it is very important that you have the opportunity to look at these documents. I know, as an example, when I sat down to read the Mare Island specific plan environmental impact report, I sat down on Monday morning at 8:00 o'clock, and I finally finished it about 3:00 o'clock on Thursday afternoon. So it's not something that's easy to read. Technical, extremely technical.

But I believe, I would say the Mare Island dredge pond EIR is the best one I've seen in the twelve years I've worked on the base, and I think it's going to be necessarily the level for everybody else to reach.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I agree, best one I've ever seen produced.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And is there any questions? Back to you.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Yeah, thanks, Jerry. Okay, I have a handout, I'm hoping everybody grabbed one, if not they're over at the table at the sign-in sheet. Start on the left-hand side of the handout. You'll see a blue line that kind of snakes around with some dots. That represents the industrial wastewater pipeline system or installation restoration site 14, IR14. We've been working on that pipeline system, cleaning and flushing the inside of that pipeline for a number of months now. We've completed thousands and thousands of feet of cleaning and flushing. We have a few thousand feet of pipeline left to go. We're hoping to complete the work sometime in the next four to six weeks, including demobilization from, of all the equipment and such. The good news is that things are going fairly well. We're able to flush the existing water and/or the small amount of debris that's in there, and/or use a tool called a flailing tool. It's sort of a gadget that you put into the pipeline and it spins as it moves down the pipeline with little chain links on it. And it just beats the daylights out of the stuff on the inside of the pipeline, then we're able to flush the stuff out. So it's a very, very useful tool for sort of removing the sort of encrusted materials on the inside of the pipeline, it works very, very well.

The photograph, in fact, that's in the middle of the right-hand side, the lower one with the guys working, is one of the locations where we just completed some of the cleaning and flushing. It's the B-4, and that's not an acronym, that's just the name, the B-4 line. So that's IR14. It's been a very, very long process, but we're making good headway and hopefully we'll wrap it up fairly soon.

On the right-hand side there's a series of sort of mini tables. They highlight some of the things that we're trying to track or are tracking in terms of documents, milestones, public comment periods, issues of concern, those sorts of things. In the top left-hand side, documents in review, a couple of things to highlight there.

The draft remedial action work plan -- or excuse me -- the draft remedial action plan for investigation area IAB. That's been out there for several months, went out on the 16th, it's still in the hand of the agencies. The interim removal action work plan for industrial wastewater pump station number four, the public comment period actually ends today. So if anybody has any comments or concerns about that, just be aware that the public comment period technically ends today.

The last thing listed there, the tech memo for infrastructure development, that's the document I mentioned a little while ago. We prepared to present all the findings and conclusions of the work that we've done at the far eastern end of the Marine Corps firing range. And here's a draft copy of that report. As I mentioned, we went out and collected additional samples, and are going to reissue that document in final form tomorrow.

Upcoming documents. The land use covenant implementation plan for IA H2 and IA D1.2, those are documents that are in progress and are actually some of the, it's sort of the driver for why we're having the focus group meeting. And it's, it's, those are good examples of documents that are driving a lot of the discussions between Lennar and CH and the city and the RAB and other members. So those are documents that will be heavily influenced by, I expect, by what comes out of the focus group meeting.

In terms of milestones. On the right-hand side there we've closed in the last month eleven PCB sites, polychlorinated biphenyl sites. PCB sites, by the way, in case you folks haven't heard this before, they're typically little tiny sites. They're transformer pads or areas where there was a little spill of oil, and so concrete or asphalt was contaminated with PCBs. So there's, if you look down below there's something like almost 600 PCB sites, but most of 'em are of the size of maybe a transformer pad, five feet square or something like that. So a number of those have been closed. We also closed one underground storage tank site. A running tally of all those closures is in the box, the little mini table directly below. We're well on the way to getting through all of the PCB sites, which is really nice.

And then real quickly, upcoming public comment periods. The IA C3 remedial action plan, that was on hold pending some additional characterization around the dry docks. That additional characterization was completed. Based on that characterization, we found that we had to do some additional excavation work. That work has also been completed. An example of that is in the upper right corner, the photograph in the upper right corner.

The, we resubmitted the remedial action plan or RAP to the agencies about a week ago. And what we're expecting is that the process leading to the public comment period is going to take three to four months. So we're hoping that we'll see a public comment period in November of this year for the IA C3 RAP. And then lastly, the interim removal action work plan for underground storage tank site 742 is a document that will be in the repository tomorrow or Monday at the latest. This meeting is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can you point that out on this map?

MR. FARLEY: UST 742 is on the, is in IA C2, it's on the right-hand side of C2 or the island. Look right here. It's about halfway between the dry docks and the finger piers to the south. Okay. That document will go into the repository, if not tomorrow then certainly by Monday. This meeting will satisfy the requirements for the notification, and then there's a twenty day public comment period for that work. So we're hoping to begin that work sometime in late August. And I think that's it. Any questions? Jerry.

MR. KARR: Help me remember, Steve. The IR14 pipeline, is that being cleaned for reuse or abandonment?

MR. FARLEY: I don't expect it's going to be reused. I don't, there's no plans for the pipeline to be reused. It's being essentially cleaned so that it can be abandoned in place without having to do anymore work. We're basically cleaning it to the point where the flush water comes out meeting drinking water standards.

MR. KARR: Thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: A question about that whole system. I assume this pipeline, even though it's clean on the inside, must have some sort of contaminants that have leaked somewhere along the line or has sand grit as bedding material in some cases. And what, how is that affected by just leaving it in place for future workers or land use controls or those kinds of issues?

MR. FARLEY: Let me take it in two steps. In addition to the work that we're doing right now for the inside of the pipeline, the Navy performed pretty extensive investigation of the soil around the pipeline. I think samples were collected on about hundred foot center for the entire length of the pipeline. Now, in some cases we've gone back and done additional characterization for various reasons, maybe there was a UST, an underground storage tank nearby for some other site. So we may have done additional characterization along the pipeline. But the data don't show any, you might expect there to be some massive leaks in that thing over the years, but there isn't any evidence in that data to support that conclusion. So we handle the pipeline on a case by case basis. And it's part of the remedial investigation, feasibility study process, RAP, remedial action plan process. So all the data associated with the soil surrounding the pipeline are evaluated in the normal remedial investigation feasibility study steps, including risk assessment. And to date there haven't been any areas that I'm aware of, except for perhaps some small areas where investigation needs to be done or actions need to be taken, with the exception of the pump stations.

The pump stations are typically the areas -- and those are shown in the circles on the handout. The pump stations are typically the areas where actions need to be taken. And not in all cases, but they are the areas where they, where the, most of the problems associated with IR14 are associated. In terms of the green sand, the process for the green sand is if we encounter it during excavation or some other kind of field work, we remove the amount of green sand necessary to complete the work, but we don't, in most cases we don't chase the green sand down the pipeline. It's noted, there's abrasive blast material or a green sand log that's maintained and tracked so that everybody knows where the green sand has been located.

And as far as the, sort of the financial process, there's an insurance policy in place for the quote unquote known unknowns, which green sand is one of those, that takes care of occurrences of green sand as they're encountered in the field during either development or construction or remediation, those sorts of things.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you. I only have one last question, it has nothing to do with anything that I see on your report. And that is that a gentleman told me the other day that he observed the removal, maybe you or maybe some other organization connected with Lennar had removed a section of the above ground steam pipe and was expecting to remove more of that, and that it has asbestos surrounding the pipe, but that when it goes underground it is bedded in coal dust. And is coal dust considered a contaminant of concern? And do you expect to remove that entire system or just occasional places like apparently he referred to recently?

MR. FARLEY: Neal, do you want to address the work done? I think, I think what you're referring to, if I could, is the work done by one of Lennar's contractors in removing some of the above ground piping and some of the tanks out there. But I've not heard of anything about any kind of subsurface coal, tar, dust, or anything of that sort.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you have now.

MR. FARLEY: Up until now I hadn't heard. But thank you, Myrna.

MR. SILER: Yeah, from what I understand is that there is, one of our contractors, Pacific States, is going to be removing a portion of the steam pipe above ground. I don't think that they're going to be removing any steam pipe below ground at this time. I haven't heard anything about coal dust, but I'll go ahead and check that out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So when they remove above ground it does have asbestos in it and they do treat it?

MR. SILER: There are some sections where there is asbestos, and when it's removed it's done according to the Bay Area Air Quality District guidelines for removing asbestos material.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know, this brings up something that this is the second time that I've heard of another contractor other than CH, which our expectation with the early transfer was just that CH was your prime contractor and generally you were going to be using them. But this is the second time now that another name has come up and they aren't at the table and they're not in the report.

So if Lennar has other contractors who are doing work for them that it falls under the, in the environmental cleanup arena, I think it would be helpful for us if they could, that could -- that a report about their work would also be coming from Lennar on a routine basis.

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It would be helpful.

MR. SILER: Glad to do that.

CO-CHAIR: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I had one quick question for Steve. The UST at 742, is there a reason why it's an interim removal action as opposed to, I guess, a typical corrective action through the Water Board?

MR. RILEY: It is a corrective action. It is a corrective action being taken pursuant to the underground storage tank regulations. It's an artifact of the way the original early transfer order from the regional board was written in that it uses the term interim removal action to be synonymous with the corrective action, which is the normal name for a, when an underground storage tank leaks, leaked petroleum, the process that it undergoes is called corrective action, and the corrective action plan is the work plan that says how that will happen. So it is a corrective action plan for all intents and purposes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: So it is your decision document versus DTSC's?

MR. RILEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you. And so with that, actually I think we're going to jump to Weston's update if there's no more questions for Steve. Thank you, Steve.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Okay. First off, I'd like to discuss what we're doing in terms of the area H1 wetlands mitigation status. The Navy had requested the Fish and Wildlife Service to start working on the draft biological opinion for the planned final remedy of H1 which is Endangered Species Act.

The Navy has given us a target date of having that draft done by early August, which will allow the final document to go out by the end of the month. And that's important to us because there's a wetlands area, wetlands X that has some habitat for the endangered salt marsh harvest mouse, that we'd like to do some trapping and passive relocation of mice if they are encountered there during that particular month, which would allow us to go forward with some issues that are going to be associated with destroying those wetlands and relocating them as part of the presumptive remedy for the area H1 landfill cap.

Moving forward. We had a big milestone in July. After almost four years of effort by Weston, we completed the final remedial investigation document for area H1. The agencies are currently doing a final QC check to make sure that we've incorporated all their comments and their responses to their comments over the past four years.

DTSC did inform us informally that they have some issues with the closure of some suspect UST sites and PCB sites within H1. And they would like to address that in the final version of the documents. So we hope both the regional board and EPA will give us some timely feedback and allow us to wrap those remaining issues up.

We're also moved forward based on the remedial investigation document with taking a look at some human health ecological risk maps for some hot spots that are located outside the containment area and would be delineated to allow completion of the final draft feasibility study and the draft remedial action plan record of decision and closure plan.

We've got a followup conference, as you can see, scheduled for the first part of August. And right now our target is to have the draft feasibility study and draft remedial action plan out at the end of August or early September.

You may recall back in April we received what's noted as a call-in request from DTSC for a RCRA closure plan for the area H1 RCRA landfill and surface impoundments. And under the presumptive remedy assumption, the waste in the landfill would remain in place and we would cover it with an impermeable cap and soil cover.

We received some communication from DTSC a month or so ago which we brought up to the RAB that indicates that there may be some potential significant costs and public access issues based on DTSC's decision at the time to extend the RCRA equivalent cap across the entire 70 acres of area H1 as opposed to just the 25 acres of the RCRA landfill.

We've decided to look at both approaches. The original approach is just the RCRA equivalent cap and RCRA access limitations over the 25 acres versus the entire 70 acre site. We're going to look at both of those options as part of the feasibility study. We are also trying to schedule some meetings with DTSC and potentially do a RAB focus group to go over some of our rationale for why we think it's more appropriate just to do containment over

the 25 acre property, both fully protected for human health and the environment, and allowing the general public to have some type of access to the balance of the property.

Let's see. And an update on the containment system and the groundwater pump and treat system. Today we've pumped over six million gallons of water from the extraction trench. You can see there we've lowered the groundwater elevations within the containment area twelve feet lower than outside the slurry wall. So that's a good indication the slurry wall is doing its job, it's keeping water from migrating inward. And because of that, it's keeping any contaminants from migrating outward. So the system is working as designed.

We've been sampling the water we're pumping and discharging into the flood storm sewer, and so being sure all the discharge has met our permit requirements for discharge to sewer. And finally, the Marine Corps firing range which Dwight went into a lot more detail than that little paragraph there, so we'll just stop at that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I had an opportunity or I took an opportunity to go out to take a look at the site to try to better understand this whole landfill cap design issue. And Dwight was gracious enough to take me on a brief site visit. And you know, we haven't been to wetland X when it actually had water in it, and what's really impressive, is it is quite a little wetland, yet it seems quite impervious to the draining action of your pumping system. It just perched up there above the rest of the containment area, and it's still, at this time of year, because of those ample rains we had and the amazing thing about clay soil, it's still just sitting there in the wetland. So I hope that it dries out enough by August 29th for you to even get in there and scurry those little mice over to their new home.

MR. GEMAR: It's almost dry now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It is almost dry now?

MR. GEMAR: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wow, how quickly it changes. And I think that for those of you who aren't, and us who are not bird nerds, like this guy here, and wetlands, and aren't fully versed in wetlands, you can see how valuable seasonal wetlands are to wildlife, that they remain throughout the year even as late as now providing fresh water habitat. So it is a very interesting site there.

And I just, I do have to continue, I feel like I need to continue to go on the record on this issue with the landfill cap design. And note that I did write an e-mail, a pretty extensive, I thought, thorough e-mail trying to explain more fully to DTSC, the Department of Toxic Substances Control Public Participation Specialists Department why the public deserved a focus group meeting on this topic.

I'm happy to see that you're going forward with developing some technical basis for two different scenarios, so that it's a little easier for us as members of the public to understand the differences in what they're requiring of the Navy and Weston now as compared to what we initially believed when the funding scenario was developed.

And also, regardless of whether the City of Vallejo at this very moment in time believes it's possible for it to manage the area as a park or a public access area, I don't believe that just sort of a, however the city makes its decisions it doesn't always make them in a public venue, but the RAB we've sort of, at least I've made a big effort, and I think the rest of my community members will support me in this, that we've really worked hard with the Navy and with the regulators and the other participants on the RAB to ensure that this is the democratic process in the Restoration Advisory Board.

So I would hate to think that the reuse plan, which is normally what drives our environmental cleanup, and the cleanup makes reuse possible, would be right now so confusing that we couldn't decide what would be the best remedy based on the final use of the property. I think even if the City of Vallejo decides that a plan it had in concept in 1994 is too ambitious for it now, it doesn't mean that this property should just then be fenced and off limits to the public. There's many, many cases throughout the country, millions of acres managed by private non-profit organizations that are, have been demonstrated to be fully capable of managing natural lands and for passive recreation purposes.

And I would hate to see that the city, and whatever arrangements it's made with Lennar, I'll be interested to see the specific plan amendment, how that addresses the area H1 area that is slated in the previous specific plan as a public community park, I'll be interested to see, you know, how you're going to address that issue.

But I think for, the Department of Toxic Substances Control is getting an unclear message from the City of Vallejo, and possibly from Lennar since Lennar is doing the specific plan amendment for the city on properties it doesn't actually own. I'd hate for them to be seen getting this confusing message.

Because actually, as far as I know, the document that we worked off of in terms of determining environmental cleanup goals is still the Mare Island reuse plan and the specific plan as adopted in '99.

So if there's brand new news, then I think the public needs to have a way of weighing in on that. Otherwise, as the Reservation Advisory Board I feel like we have a responsibility to ensure that the area is cleaned up to a standard or contained or whatever the measures are that we decide on, to allow, that can help the city fulfill its goals as described in its planning documents.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, I'm not going to let that pass. I assume that the city became the bad guy because you don't have Chip here to pick on, so I'll pick on him. The city isn't the one making the decision, DTSC is making the decision.

And the short answer is DTSC has said to me, "We have never allowed public access to a garbage dump site. We will never allow garbage site, or access to it." And that's the bottom line. So we have to plan around that.

If he wants, you know, if you get it closed, you know, it's going to be DTSC that makes the decision. Now, you know, there are, there are other ways of doing it. You can go out there and dig up everything that they've done and take the \$55 million and haul it off to the

garbage dump, and dump it in the garbage dump, and that would do it. The problem is, ain't anybody going to pay for that, so we have to find out where we'd get the money to do it.

But back to the original thing, it's not the decision of the city. The city wants to put a park out there. The city wants to put a park out there with lighted fields. Now, that lighted fields thing might get bit because of the rats, and we already discussed that, it was well documented in last month's things about the love life of that rat. But anyway, we're not the one making the decision. We would go ahead and make it into what we were going to make it into. But DTSC isn't going along with us. So you know, I think we're the pressure ought to be put is at DTSC. And in fact, we're doing that through our lawyers, through Lennar's lawyers -- excuse me, Weston's lawyers, and the other people. But it appears to me they get the last vote.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, actually in a democracy, Gil, and you know the military I'll admit --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Are you including DTSC in a democracy?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Good.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I'm not. Nor the City of Vallejo. But actually -- nor the military actually. So we have this strange process we're in right now in the middle of no man's land. But I just want to point out one thing. Here we don't call 'em garbage dumps. We distinguish between, and you're really new to the RAB so I'll let you off on this one. But we distinguish between hazardous waste units and class one, I think it is, landfills versus traditional garbage dumps which are baby diapers and stuff like that, non-hazardous material. I don't have kids, I'm not sure about that. So we distinguish between a standard landfill and a hazardous waste unit.

And you are right, there is a hazardous waste unit, it is permitted that way, and we are attempting to close it there. But it's only 25 acres, as is noted in Weston's report here, 24, 25 acres.

And so while we could, I could, some people might be able to live with fencing around that; and DTSC is absolutely correct as far as I can tell, they have never allowed a children's playground or a soccer field or baseball field on a hazardous waste unit.

However, their, what we're talking about in this report that Weston has just given to us, is they're talking about now coming around with brand new information, they don't have any scientific information to base their decision on, they haven't provided us with any. But they want to come around and actually cover 70 acres as if that extra 45 acres is exactly like the 25, when we know that it's not. It's not the same material, it wasn't permitted that way. So that's what we have a concern about.

Here we had a community park plan for some ninety acres that we could live with. I think I could live with a, their rationale for not using the 25. We may make it a butterfly park or something. Or what was that? A pit bull sanctuary. I got him. But it's this extra 45 that it

isn't just about whether the people could go dancing and prancing through the posies there or not, or whether you could have a baseball field there, or whether the mice, or as you call them rats, would benefit from that; it's, it also involves a tremendous amount of money, as you mentioned earlier about digging it all up and hauling it away. The Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement, which the city and Weston and the Navy entered into, and I know we're, I'm taking us overtime again, but we've got to get this in the record, maybe DTSC will read it and then bring a prepared statement for the next meeting to counteract what I've said.

But the point really here is that that's going to be a tremendous extra cost to cover an additional 45 acres that was not in the Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement estimate that, the guaranteed fixed price that was settled on. And it leads the community to believe that we have a 70 acre nightmare instead of a 25 acre nightmare. And you know, there are people, Lennar just sold them homes, that are living right next door to that property. And I think they would feel a lot more comfortable if they had a passive recreation area. And if you don't want to put lights and mess up the mice, that's fine, but it someplace else, I'm okay with that. But they shouldn't have to look at a chain link fence, we shouldn't have to, as taxpayers, pay the additional money, to be covering up a petroleum site with a chain link fence and a, an impervious, a specialty cap. And we should be able to go out there and at least hike up to the top of the hill, I think.

And there isn't, no one's proving to us that, I mean like that soil's going to be, that oil site's going to be like 16 feet below grade before it even gets a cap on it. So it seems to me like that's a pretty protective measure already. So all we really need is for DTSC to come to the table, suck it up, and come talk with us about where they're headed, why they came up with this decision, and then let the community advise. That's what the RAB's about. You know, it's not -- it's a novel Democratic kind of thing where we get to talk about the solution before the decision gets made.

What the city could do, Gil, is not cower before DTSC, but say, "Hey, we don't think this is, this fits well with our plan for that area," and stay firm with your reuse plan, your reuse scenario, and then worry about who's going to pay for the park later. I don't think the Navy's ever going to be able to transfer it, so the Navy might have to run it as a park, huh? So that's enough on that topic unless anybody has anything else to weigh in on here.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, thank you for the discussion on that. I know we've all heard a lot about it. I do think that the focus group meeting will be critical, and hopefully DTSC will come with the right people.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well the only thing I have to report as the community co-chair is that I'm still attempting to get them to come to the table on that. They tell me that my letter was kicked up to higher management, and that there will be some type of a letter response, and they hope for a date to be selected to offer us soon.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I hope that comes true. Thanks, Gil, for your very important feedback on where the city's position is on that. Thanks, Cris, for your Weston update. With our regulatory update we have Gary, so it's all yours.

g) Regulatory Agency Update

MR. RILEY: I just want to touch on, Steve talked about the twenty day public comment period on the interim remedial action for UST 742. What that's coming out of is, as you know, the RAB's always had the opportunity to review the documents that Lennar has put together, they go to Myrna and to the technical committee as well as to the library. I mentioned that, I believe it was at the last RAB meeting, that the Water Boards statewide are attempting to reaffirm their commitment to public involvement in Water Board cleanup processes. And one of the ways that that happens under the regulation is any corrective action plan, which is this plan to deal with the leaking underground storage tank, in the regulation says there's a minimum twenty day public comment period for corrective action for a leaking UST. So I believe it actually states twenty to thirty days. So if the RAB feels that for underground storage work plans like these that twenty days is inadequate, we would certainly entertain a thirty day public comment period.

These tend to be the smaller sites, small UST sites, as differentiated from the interim work plan for the pump station number four that Steve was talking about, which is also a petroleum site under the Water Board's regulation. It's not an underground storage tank, it's a pump station, in other words petroleum. So in that case we asked for a thirty day public comment period, and that's what's coming to a close right now.

So hopefully that explains kind of the distinction. And through the, what the regulations call notification at a public meeting like this one, what Lennar is doing is just providing notification that the document is available and what's happening. So we're attempting to be extra diligent with the letter of the regulation and just formalize the opportunity that the RAB has already had to comment on these documents. So I'll leave it at that in the interest of time.

V. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Any questions for Gary? If not, I think that leaves us with our co-chair reports, and I think, Myrna, you already gave your report. My report is on the Navy monthly progress report like this. If you haven't seen a copy, I think there's one or two left on the table. No, I think they're all gone now. And we have the U.S.S. Carl Vinson on the top there. It's home ported in San Diego. It's not there at the moment. But I believe that's Point Loma in the background. You heard about our Marine Corps firing range during the presentation. And we've got a picture of that.

The picture of the bottom right-hand side is a DRMO site. CH2M Hill is under contract with the Navy directly and is doing that removal action. We had a public comment period just expire earlier this month. No public comments were received, and we are moving forward to sign the action memorandum and begin field work in early August.

We took this picture courtesy of Steve and some of his folks helping us out, getting a picture of the before shot. You will probably see this site go through much change over the next few weeks, and we hope to be done before the end of November. We have some other sampling work going on across the base, and you can read more about that. Documents and regulatory review. We actually had a very active month. We list eight regulatory comments received during July and the end of June, actually also received Gary's letter so there's actually nine

comments. Gary sent a letter recently approving or concurring with the final action memorandum for the DRMO site. So that is good news. And we'll support that cleanup.

More significantly is for Section 4.0, we're talking early transfer once again. We have the meeting scheduled with the City of Vallejo and Lennar to start talking about that, resume discussions on that next week. We're meeting with Weston on their dredge materials disposal facility and some leasing issues here. We may want to see how early transfer can maybe be addressed in that discussion too next week. With that, that's the end of my report. If there are any questions for me I can help answer those. If not, I believe that's the end of our meeting. So with that, meeting adjourned.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:15 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Mare Island Marine Corpo Firing Range Cleanup Progress Report, Presented by Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston Solutions.
- Presentation Handout – RAB Update Marine Corps Firing Range, Presented by Mr. Steve Farley CH2MHill
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update July 2005
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update July 2005
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 2005