

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2005**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, September 29, 2005, at the Holiday Inn, Caribbean Room in Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:02 p.m. and adjourned at 9:08 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)
- Marti Browne (Community Member)
- Jerry Karr (Community Member)
- Jim O'Loughlin (Community Member)
- Michael Coffey (Community Member)
- Gary Riley (RWQCB)
- Carolyn d'Alemda (EPA)
- Henry Chui (DTSC)
- Jerry Dunaway (Navy Co-Chair)
- David Godsey (Navy)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Michelle Trotter (DTSC)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Frank Gray
- Tommie Jean Damrel
- Gina Kathuria
- George Leyva
- Diana Krevsky
- Larry Magini
- Neal Siler
- Todd Berryhill
- Alexa Stamets
- Susan Young
- Tiffany Leyva
- Dijji Christian

RAB Support from CDM:

- Darlene McCray (CDM)
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to our September Restoration Advisory Board meeting in our new temporary facility here at the Holiday Inn.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Hopefully it lasts through -- hopefully it will last through our meeting, it's not too temporary.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Yes, we'll make it through at least this meeting. And the reason why we're here is because the library is undergoing a remodeling of a sort, and so they're closed for the rest of the year essentially, at least for our purposes. We'll hold our October and the early

December RAB meeting over at the Mare Island conference center. It just was not available tonight, so that's why we are here tonight. My name is Jerry Dunaway. And tonight we have a couple of interesting presentations and we'll get into that after we get through our introductions here.

(Attendees introduced themselves as requested).

**II. PRESENTATION: *The Amended and Restated Mare Island Specific Plan*
Presented by Mr. Todd Berryhill, Lennar Mare Island.**

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Wally. With that, why don't I just turn it over to Todd and have him go through his presentation. He's going to do a, kind of a summarized version of the restated Mare Island specific plan. And the reason for this presentation is really to focus on those areas where the specific plan affects environmental cleanup. And hopefully we'll learn a little bit about that tonight from Todd. And we just saw Carolyn from EPA come in, so welcome.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Good evening.

MR. BERRYHILL: Good evening, RAB members. Thank you for allowing us to come this evening and present what we're doing. Let me first tell you quickly what the whole concept is. It's a specific plan amended and restated. I'm going to give you a little bit of background just off the cuff to let you know what's going on here. You may or may not know this, so just throw a shoe at me or something if this is all repetitive to you. But, you know, the base closed in 1993. Actually finally closed in 1996, '97. During that process they did a reuse plan with a community group, a Futures Committee was formed, and they came up with a reuse plan which was adopted by the city council. They eventually turned that into a specific plan, and then that went through the CEQA and NEPA process. And in 1999 they had an EIR EIS certified with the local agency, which was the City of Vallejo.

We got involved with the project, as you know, in 1997, and became aware very quickly that a new entitlement document was going to be necessary. The existing specific plan from 1999 was very much a programmatic shot at Mare Island. It analyzed the reuse plan, but a lot had changed. And we needed to be a lot more, pardon the expression, a lot more specific with the specific plan. So we undertook the process along with the city to amend and restate the 1999 specific plan.

It's taken a few years. A lot has changed. There's been settlement agreements with the State Lands Commission. There's been, you know, discoveries for environmental conditions. There have been land use changes necessitated by the city and necessitated by a lot of different things. And so that's what we try to address with the 2005 document.

And I have a very pared down presentation tonight. I promised the co-chair that I'd only speak for five minutes or so, my normal dog and pony show, and you know, focus, of course.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Talk faster.

MR. BERRYHILL: Yeah, I'll talk fast. Focus on, as Jerry mentioned, anything that may have changed in the new document that might impact environmental cleanup or situations. So without

further ado. I think it's important to always note the reuse goals. This is probably sort of our, you know, guiding principles out here. What we tried to do, because it was a community based goal and they've really been, we've been, reemphasized throughout the process in the 1999 document in the city. And again, when I say us, it's really the city's document. The city, again, wants us to reemphasize these goals. Create jobs and other economic development opportunities.

Create a self-sustaining multi-use community. And by that, the real meaning is the challenge was to make Mare Island not be a draw on the general fund for Vallejo. The City of Vallejo is having, you know, financial challenges, I'll say, and the idea was always to make Mare Island self-sufficient. Multi-use community means exactly what it sounds like. The ideal has always been a sort of multi-faceted community with the residential. Lots of different residential types. And with the commercial, lots of different types of that sort of commercial product also.

To give you an example on the commercial side. It had always been the idea to keep, to maintain heavy industrial uses, uses that collaborate with maritime, for example. You know, building things, putting it on barges, shipping it off, that kind of thing. On the other side of spectrum, you know, what I call class A office buildings with professional services, you know, architects, engineers, lawyers, that type of thing. And on the commercial side that will be, of course, a majority of reuse of existing buildings, but there will also be a component of new construction as well.

And I guess it would be A to Z on the residential side to make a truly well-rounded community, from attached apartment style homes all the way up to single family detached homes on, you know, good sized lots. Preserve and enhance the history of Mare Island. That is critical. That has always been sort of the premise of our planning, our engineering, our architecture. To be respectful of what we have. We have a, which is a very important national historic landmark, and a district that's in the National Register of Historic Places.

So in the federal pecking order, that's a very important sort of thing to be, it's the equivalent of Mt. Rushmore or the Empire State Building or the Golden Gate bridge or something like that. So it's very important. The use of a variety of innovative and economic development tools. That's important. And these last two have kind of been completed but we keep them alive, it's provide retraining and educational opportunities, and provide readily accessible and easily available human services. And I just wanted to quickly talk about what we've done to date, because I think we've made a heck of a lot of progress. You're probably mostly aware, specifically the environmental stuff, but also on the economic front which is equally important. More than \$50 million has been invested in Mare Island to date, and that's just by us, by the master developer. 75 businesses today call Mare Island home. That equates to 1,700 permanent jobs, and I can only guess, you know, maybe five, six, eight hundred more contract jobs, temporary jobs, construction jobs, that kind of thing. That equates to two million square feet of leased space that is revenue producing. Three out of nine of the environmental investigation areas have been closed. As you all know, we hope to close two more in the next couple of months. We've done multiple building renovations. Currently there are, 130 homes have sold. This is a little bit old as I look at it, because I think about fifty or sixty people are actually living on Mare Island now. Roughly 466 home sites have been approved through the tentative and final map process. I'll quickly talk a little bit about what the Mare Island specific plan does. As I mentioned earlier,

what it really did is it sort of codified the reuse plan, and it was, you know, a vehicle to go through the CEQA process, etcetera.

So it established a vision for Mare Island as a special mixed use employment and residential district for the City of Vallejo. It set goals focused on job placement and economic revitalization. These all kind of tie to the goals that I mentioned earlier. Provide a general summary of city required actions and references. Establish development standards and designated land use based on the 1995 reuse plan. As we all know, actually I guess -- I think the last time I checked there were something like seven or eight different ways we could cut up Mare Island, you know. Different agencies use different designations for the real estate. But when I say designated land uses, that's mostly a reuse area as we call them. It goes from one to thirteen essentially. I think you all are fairly familiar with that.

And of course, it relied on Navy inventory and condition reports for making land use and development program recommendations. That's important, because what we're really doing out here is redeveloping over the old footprint that was there. That makes the most sense. For instance, you know, west of Azuar, which was traditionally and historically the residential area, for the, actually 99 percent of west of Azuar today in the plan will be residential as well. And the uses, the heavier and the lighter uses, and I use that term meaning heavier uses are industrial uses, things that, manufacturing, assembly, that kind of thing. And the lighter uses are office and things of that nature. And that's going to be roughly very similar to what it was.

Of course, when we -- when we change the use of the base to the private sector, there's probably going to be more office type jobs and things like that, so it can't match exactly. But for the most part, you know, the administration area will be an office area. So it matches up pretty well. The importance of the 2005 specific plan, again it amends, it restates, and it further supports the 1999 document.

So what it amends is, and I just threw a couple of examples in here, and I'll get into some more just kind of off the cuff, and I'll take questions also. But some of the important points of how the, I guess it would be the new concepts are the creation of historic guidelines and historic design guidelines. What that means is that's really a, almost kind of a play book for how to treat the historic resources. There are something like 502 historic resources in the National Register District. And so we, the City of Vallejo and Lennar helped create this sort of play book in how to treat those resources, how to rehabilitate them, how to build adjacent to them, how to relocate them if they need to be moved, and how to demolish them if they need to go away.

The design guidelines really just take that sort of a step further and really get into, again, how to design new buildings adjacent to historic buildings. You know, how to rehabilitate buildings according to the Secretary of Interior standard, which is a federal standard on how to rehabilitate these historic buildings.

There are several land uses changes that the 1999 -- excuse me -- that the 2005 plan addresses. For instance, the land plan was one way in 1999, and it had to change for some reason in 2005, and so that is all addressed in the 2005 document. Inclusion of a master utility plan. That's important. How, again this goes back to the earlier document which was very much sort of a programmatic look at things, sort of a 30,000 foot look. We've gotten much more specific since we've really dug in with our team of engineers and whatnot, and designed these systems.

It just wasn't feasible or it didn't make sense for the agencies in 1999 to do that kind of level because they hadn't really -- they hadn't chosen a developer yet, and the timing wasn't right. But now it makes sense for us to do that kind of work now.

It restates and further details the '99 plan emphasizing the original goals. I keep going back to that, I apologize for my repetitiveness, but it's very important. And it details the required preservation actions dictated by the Secretary of Interior Standards. I keep going back to that also because that's incredibly important in all of our planning and engineering and architecture out here is respectful of historic resources.

It supports the '95 plan. It continues its emphasis on job creation and economic growth as is consistent with the city's general plan. And the co-chair tonight asked me to really focus on the land use changes, so I've got a couple of examples out here. And I guess I'll say to start with, the land use changes between 1999 and 2005 aren't real severe. There's only a few land changes. I mean it might seem like it, but it's really not. All the commercial's staying in the commercial area, all the residential's staying in the residential area. I'll focus on a couple of examples here of specific changes, and we'll get into that. But for the most part, it's a pretty easy change.

Reuse area ten is probably, as far as numbers go and what not, is the biggest change. That reuse area is the southern portion that hasn't been transferred yet, as you're probably aware of. Originally in the reuse document it called for 750 home sites down there in the southern part of the island. After that was adopted, the city and Lennar and several agencies negotiated for quite some time with the State Lands Commission and finally came up with what's called a settlement agreement with the State Lands Commission. And they put that portion of Mare Island into the public trust. And so that precluded anybody from doing residential down there, so we needed to redistribute that residential.

That residential got redistributed in reuse areas six, eight, and then small portions of the other parts of the island which I'll get into. But that was probably one of the most important shifts of land uses in the change. Of course, reuse area six and eight, which are essentially west of Azuar, those got densified, if that's a word. We put more residential there. The city has always been sort of keen on the number of 1,400 residential units, they feel that that is a good balance.

Because the planning concepts today are pretty well recognized that to have a successful new commercial area, it really helps to have a residential area adjacent to it, so you can really establish that mixed use community. That's what all the smart planning today calls for, and it allows people to be able to walk to work and things of that nature.

So what the city wanted to do is reestablish that 1,400 homes, and six and eight got the bulk of them because of the environmental condition, and it had always been programmed for residential. Earlier on it was residential, therefore the cleanup was much less, was much easier.

The third bullet here, increase commercial square footage. And I just kind of bulked these together. Reuse areas two, three, four, and five. I've got a slide I'll show you that really compares every reuse area and every land use classification between the '99 plan and the 2005 plan. But the bulk of the new numbers are in these reuse areas.

And what that is, it's sort of a combination of two things. It's a combination of a much broader retention program of historic buildings. And I'll speak to that a little bit. In the 1999 plan it was

very, like again, I go back to, it was very programmatic up here, and it wasn't clear how this square footage was going to be accommodated. For an example, they might take reuse area four, which we know as the historic core, it's where the hips weighs are located, it's where the officers' mansions along Walnut Avenue are located -- it kind of does this, and I'll show you on my map in a second.

In the reuse plan it said there was 35,000 of non-residential square footage there -- excuse me, in the 1999 specific plan it said 35,000. Well, it roughly measures, just with the existing historic buildings which are components of the national historic landmark, almost 40,000 square feet. So one of two things was either, was the plan back then; either massive demolition of historic resources, or it was just a typo, they forgot a zero on it. And I think it's probably the latter, because nobody would have wanted to destroy these national -- or excuse me -- national and local landmarks. There are several instances like that, and that causes for the increase. Also, let's take reuse area two, for example. It was very non-specific about how this square footage would eventually come to be, whether that was existing square footage, whether that was new construction, there was no talk of demolition or anything else. So we've gone back through and been very specific how much square footage in our entitlements will be existing square footage, and how much square footage will be new construction. We called out building by building which buildings will stay, for example.

So you'll see, the 1999 plan says about roughly 5.8 million square feet -- oh, thank you, Myrna -- 5.8 million square feet, and the new plan calls for roughly eight and a half million square feet. It's something like 2.7 square feet of increase. But when you really distill the numbers, it's roughly 50/50. Most of that is preservation, and then there is a little bit of new construction. It goes from -- again you can't tell if you're not sure about the '99 plan, but we're going to have about 1.6 million square feet of new construction. And the remainder will be increased, expanded retention program.

And then a change which is interesting is 129 potential live work units in reuse area 3B. This is something that we programmed, and essentially we've got the growth component for Mare Island, a residential, like I mentioned, 1,400 homes. We placed a majority of those. We have some left over, and we would like to use those to help us rehabilitate historic buildings. That's a -- we want to keep as many of these buildings as we can, and it's difficult to make financial sense out of them for commercial uses right now. A lot of these buildings lend themselves to what might be sort of interesting live work units or lofts or things like that. And we're trying to use this as a tool to enable us to rehabilitate and save more of these buildings.

So one area we've targeted for some live work units is 3B, because that's got a neat collection of buildings. It's got the coal sheds which -- excuse me for one second here -- the coal sheds which could make neat sort of dwelling units, and there are several other large buildings. Even building 267 and then 85, 89, 91, and 93 which are the brick buildings that wrap around that big glass building right on the waterfront. That's got great proximity to the waterfront and it could lay out really well for residential.

But I can't emphasize enough this is extremely preliminary and it's just sort of a placeholder. We know the existing land uses will have a land use restriction on that for residential. There would have to be discussions with DTSC, and there may have to be additional cleanup, and there might have to be concessions on both sides, so --

But again, this is very preliminary, but it's just something that we've been thinking about. And so we have asked for that entitlement in the document. Whether we can actually do that or not is a different story and it involves, you know, multiple different agencies.

So the conclusion. The specific plan provides for continuing the reuse of Mare Island. It's critical that we process this SPA so we're able to continue our work that we're doing out there, installing infrastructure, rehabilitating buildings, doing environmental remediation, etcetera.

It's critical for the creation of jobs, the economic expansion and, of course, broadening the tax base in Vallejo. So I've got some questions, and I'm also going to bounce out of here and show you just a couple of spreadsheets that I was playing with today to get ready here tonight.

And you've got that map there with you. What I did with that map is I just quickly tried to layer three different sort of classifications. The first is the reuse areas, and that's sort of what I live by. And I know Sheila and Neal and everybody else sort of lives by the investigation areas, so I overlaid the reuse areas, the investigation areas, and the IR sites on the map there.

And I kind of -- I broke down this spreadsheet here, three different land use types. One is commercial, one is residential, and One is just raw land. Raw land can be used for open space, developed recreation, or passive recreation. And so in the commercial you see, it's essentially when you go down here at the bottom in the red here I did the net changes. You can see that the big changes are in -- let's see here. See the box? Yeah. Are in the reuse areas I was talking about. Two, three, and five essentially. And a little bit in four. That four ties very much, I think, to that rounding or that zero error, but the other ones are just really a densification of commercial uses there. But again, it's the same type of uses in there, it's just gotten denser.

Reuse area A. Actually this is, needs to be changed because the only building in reuse area building A66 which you may or may not know is being torn down right now. So that will go back to zero or maybe just a nominal square footage. You can see the residential. The big changes here are, of course, reuse area six and eight which have bulked up. Ten has decreased. Reuse area three is the 129. That's what I was talking about, the potential live work units. And then spread out here, reuse area four has 22 residential units. That is an increase. Originally they called for probably just the mansions. We would like to even see some of those old brick buildings possibly be used for residential reuse on the second and third floors. When I say the old brick buildings, I mean the old fire firehouse which is 99, 99A, and building 65, those buildings right in that historic core there.

And then the land, of course. This is in acres now. It hasn't changed dramatically. The net over here is a decrease, and let's see why that happens. Reuse area one is a net decrease -- oh, that is a relocation actually. Most of those acres were Mork Field which is being relocated to reuse area three, I believe. So you see a lot of these balance out. Big gains here in some of the residential areas. Six has got a lot of parks. Five. Reuse area seven, that was, that was made a little bit smaller. That's the Marine Corps firing range because we had to grow reuse area six and eight a little bit to accommodate the residential. And the last thing I have on here which might be good for our discussion, I can point it out on the big screen, is the map you all have in front of you.

So I tried to limit my comments tonight to really the changes in the -- in the -- I'll just flip this around -- the changes in the land uses. So I'll just open it up for questions now if anybody has any questions.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Maybe this isn't a question so much as it is a concern. I see reuse changing for like area 3B where you're now saying 129 potential live work units in this area. There are PCB sites in this area that EPA has signed off on as closed under industrial scenario.

MR. BERRYHILL: So we would --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And we thought that there was going to be a covenant covering the whole area saying that it was going to be industrial.

MR. BERRYHILL: To the best of my knowledge -- I'm sorry, to the best of my knowledge there still will be a covenant covering that as non-residential.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: But you're going to have live work units in an area that's non-residential?

MR. BERRYHILL: No. No. We're going to have the ability to do live work units through the city. We'll still be prohibited from doing that because of the land use covenant. We will have to do one of two things.

We'll have to either do additional cleanup to bring those to a residential standard, and more than likely that will probably be on our own dime. Or negotiate with the DTSC to maybe meet in the middle somewhere, maybe only have second story uses or something like that. But again, I can't emphasize enough it's not something that we've even approached the agencies with yet, this is just a planning tool.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Okay. Because it's confusing. It's like why are we doing all this work to sign off on these cleanups for industrial use when you're planning to come back and change the reuse? Why don't we just clean everything up to unrestricted use now, especially with these PCB sites?

MR. BERRYHILL: Well, I don't think that we're ready to make that commitment, the financial commitment that these are even going to work and be able to be marketable or anything else. We're trying to essentially leave the proverbial door open. So we'll have done the planning, but that's as far as we've gotten. There's still several steps we'd have to go through to be able to do residential.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And I see you also have IR 15 which has got hexavalent chromium in the groundwater, and PCE and PCE in the groundwater that's going right out to the strait. And what's proposed right now is monitored natural attenuation, meaning you're not going to clean it up, you're not going to do anything. But you're thinking about putting houses in here?

MR. BERRYHILL: To tell you the truth, I'm not a cleanup expert, but I just go back to what I just said is that -- you want to answer, Sheila? Do you know better?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well we would not, at this point the development plan isn't far enough along to determine even where this might be possible if we wanted to clean it up further. So just like

we did with building 866, once we realized that we wanted to demolish that building, we came back and asked you to help us to determine what we needed to do to allow that to happen. So what will happen in this case is if our land planner says, "Hey, this building looks great," they'll come to us and say, "Is that possible from an environmental standpoint?" And we'll look at it, and if we think it's even reasonable we'll talk to you and to DTSC about it. And if it's not, we'll just tell them forget that building.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well you'll be talking to DTSC about it and not EPA, because once the next transfer goes through EPA goes away.

MS. ROEBUCK: Fine. But whoever is responsible we'll talk to them.

MR. BERRYHILL: Are there any other questions?

MS. BROWNE: I was wondering, was there -- for the historic guidelines, was there some kind of public participation process that guided the development of those guidelines?

MR. BERRYHILL: Yeah, we -- again, the city really is the author of them, along with us. And we went through a process with the design, or excuse me, the Architectural Heritage and Landmarks Commission, and we had many public sessions with them to go over, you know, drafts and back and forth, and those were all open to the public.

MS. BROWNE: And they were involved in deciding some of the buildings that are getting demolished?

MR. BERRYHILL: Up until the eleventh hour we were.

MS. BROWNE: And they signed off on everything and thought it was a great idea?

MR. BERRYHILL: Technically no. Actually this month we're going to get -- to ask them for the recommendation of it. But again, it's a process, we've been working with them. There's a whole process that we went through starting with the federal transfer into, to Lennar. We had to comply with Section 106 which is the National Preservation Ordinance and things like that. And part of that was a community input, part of that was working with the certified local government to draw up these documents. And the process probably took three or four years, you know, going back and forth, actually visiting every building.

Earlier on, you know, it was very, the identities of all these buildings were very sort of up in the clouds. You know, we really got through and analyzed them for their historic integrity, their mission integrity, their adjacencies, structural integrity, everything.

And we went through with the Landmarks Commission and really kicked the tires of every single one of these buildings, and came up with what we were comfortable with. We even took it so far as to even make it into sort of a classification system. And we looked at the buildings through a number of different ways. You know, one for like character types. One for the different material types. Different uses. And we tried to categorize them from A to Z as best we could.

MS. BROWNE: Thanks.

MR. GIBBONS: How does this affect land use in the regional park?

MR. BERRYHILL: It doesn't much at all. If you go back to --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you repeat his question?

MR. BERRYHILL: Yeah. How does this affect the land use in the regional park? The changes, as I think there's really no change. The regional park is reuse area twelve. If you go here, it's the same acreage. And we've got, I hate to say this, but very little description of the regional park in either document. It essentially says that it's going to be developed recreation. They actually say some uses there. They say equestrian trails, hiking trails, things of that nature, and that's kind of about it. And we're leaving it up to the, the park -- what's the name of your group? The park --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Task force.

MR. BERRYHILL: Task force, excuse me, to come up with a plan for down there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Jerry was just asking me to comment, to have you comment on the next steps. And the comment period did just close on Monday, correct, for the EIR?

MR. BERRYHILL: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But you have a planning commission hearing, you have a city council hearing, and the public is welcome to make comments at that time, which will also be a part of the administrative record and be taken into consideration, will they?

MR. BERRYHILL: All that Myrna said is accurate. We had a 45 day public comment period that ended on Monday. Now we will address and respond to the comments we received, and we'll publish those with a final EIR. We'll have hearings before the planning commission as well as the city council. The planning commission hearing, I believe, is scheduled for November 6th. And the certification hearing with the city council is scheduled for November 15th. Is November 6th a Monday? Or is it the 7th? It's the 7th.

MR. RILEY: It's the 7th.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Do the legal caveat that I always do at meetings.

MR. BERRYHILL: What?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Do the legal caveat that I always do at meetings.

MR. BERRYHILL: The legal caveat that Gil always does at meetings, subject to change.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Always check the city's website too as to when the meetings are and what the agenda is, because nothing ever stays the same, it just does not stay the same.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Todd and maybe Gil, can you tell us, I know you talked a bit about how you came to the, some of the historic decisions, or the decisions you made about historic properties. Can you tell us whether -- I think some of the comments that I've heard are that there was insufficient notice of preparation of this document to the federal and state agencies. And I'm

curious to know whether DTSC and the U.S. EPA and the water board were notified of the notice of preparation of this document, because it's my understanding that a lot of the federal agencies and state agencies weren't aware of that NOP.

And then the second thing is, how did -- I'm just curious about how -- you talked about your, your numerous conversations with the Architectural Heritage and Landmarks Commission regarding the historical, but no one ever came to the Restoration Advisory Board where we might have talked about some of the difficulties that Carolyn brought up.

And also, no one came to the Regional Park Task Force even though you do have a, your organization has a membership on it. Because we might have told you things like we wouldn't, we are not intending to recommend --

MR. BERRYHILL: I can't remember all these questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- intending to recommend equestrian trails. And just -- I mean I'm not going to use up our whole time tonight talking about issues not relevant to cleanup. But I'm just saying how generally did the city and your, and their contractor address the specific areas, besides chatting it up with you and the Architectural Heritage Commission?

MR. BERRYHILL: I want to address the specific areas, but I'm not sure. Let me start with how we notify the public, how the city notifies the public. It's a prescribed process, it's statutory, it's state law. We started with a scoping session, a notice of preparation on the scoping session, and that went out to a broad based mailing list.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I didn't get that, so who would? Did these guys or --

MR. BERRYHILL: We've got five or 600 people on that mailing list. Of course it's published in the newspaper. It goes to the State Clearinghouse. There's many ways to know about that. We had a scoping session meeting. That was probably a year and a half ago or so.

And then the process starts again when you produce a draft EIR. Everybody who's on the mailing list is alerted. Again it's published in the newspapers. It goes to the State Clearinghouse. The final draft document goes to the State Clearinghouse during the public comment period.

As far as I know -- I mean take, for example, early on we did the scoping session. You know, several people mentioned that they weren't on the list, so we put them on the list, we actually extended the period at that point to give them time to look at the scoping documents, and we haven't heard anything from, I haven't heard anything from any state agency and I don't know, had Gil -- we met today, you would have told me if you heard something. Have you heard anything? As far as I know, everybody knows. We got comments from many state agencies --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The requirement is that we send it to the State Clearinghouse, and then these guys, it's their job to go out and find out what's out there. It's not our job to go hand and feed 'em. So they, that's -- we paid the State Clearinghouse to make sure that these people get it. If they don't get it, you know, it's the State Clearinghouse.

MR. BERRYHILL: And we've gotten, I can think of a half dozen comment letters from state agencies that we've got this round, so I know a lot of 'em know about it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well yeah, because some of us told them.

MR. BERRYHILL: I don't know how they found out about it, but they commented the last time around too, they're on the mailing list. And what was the second part of your question?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just how, what organizations you met with besides the Architectural Heritage Commission to come up with your findings? You didn't meet with the RAB or with the Regional Park --

MR. BERRYHILL: Well the findings, we're really, we're executing on a reuse plan that the community drew up. Like I mentioned tonight, there are very few changes. The biggest change, of course, is a settlement agreement that happened in 2002, which I would assume most of you are aware of.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But that's not the question I asked. You're not answering the question I asked. You spent a lot of time with the Architectural Heritage Commission, but how did you go about deciding what other organizations you were going to talk with?

MR. BERRYHILL: Well, I think the city, again they're the author of the document, and they met with everybody they felt they needed to meet with and everybody they were required to meet with.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The planning department?

MR. BERRYHILL: Yeah. Any other questions. Jerry, everybody, thanks again. And if you have any questions in the future, I'm available, Sheila and Neal, whomever, just give us a call or e-mail.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thanks, Todd.

MR. BERRYHILL: Sure.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Todd. I imagine information about this can be found on the city website, so if there's --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I never checked the specific plan.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just the plan, not the appendices.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, I don't, I don't deal with -- because this is a planning document, this isn't a, you know, it's a planning document, it's something a planner uses.

MR. BERRYHILL: It's all available at the city too. They'll hand you anything you want over the counter.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, it's just --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For a fee. For a fee.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Just like everything else, the library and this and that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The library is closed.

MR. COFFEY: This week.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's why we're here.

MR. COFFEY: This week.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Do the other city libraries have the document?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't know. Once again, I'm not a planner, you know, two different worlds. Economic development, we put a building on every square foot of the world; and planners, they think about parks and trees.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Even if it's empty.

MR. BERRYHILL: If anybody has any questions, 648-4326 is the main number of the planning department, and they can tell you where you can get the document, when, etcetera.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: You want to repeat that number again?

MR. BERRYHILL: Yeah, 648-4326.

MR. FARLEY: It is available on the web.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But not the appendices.

MR. BERRYHILL: The appendices aren't.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, thank you again, Todd.

MR. BERRYHILL: Sure. Thanks for having me.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Munitions Investigation Work Plan, South Shore and Production and Manufacturing Area*
Presented by Mr. Larry Magini, Weston Solutions, Inc.**

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And we'll be doing a transition to the next presentation. And while that's happening I'll just talk a little bit about what this work is about. This next presentation is on the munitions investigation that the Navy is planning to conduct, hopefully by the end of this year, possibly being pushed off into next year depending on how we can resolve comments with regulatory agencies. And what this is is the work to go back out to the southern part of the island, the production manufacturing area and the south shore magazine and munitions storage area.

Those two areas had undergone a series of cleanup efforts through the nineties. And in 2000 we finalized the removal action out there. And we documented all that, it took a couple of years to finalize the documents for that. Now we want to go back out there and kind of take a quality check to see how all that cleanup work went, given a lot of new technology that's been developed in the past five years or six years.

This cleanup business for munitions has really jumped into light speed as far as getting technologies to get the work done more effectively. So that's what this presentation is about. Larry Magini is with Weston Solutions. Prior to that he was with SSPTS. And prior to that he was with the shipyard. So he knows the base very well. And let me turn it over to Larry.

MR. MAGINI: Okay. We're going to continue another chapter in the Mare Island ordnance story. Tonight we're going to talk about the proposed munitions investigation project that we're going to be doing here shortly.

Well, let's go to plan B. If you have a copy of the handout we can probably use that to continue here while Sue tries to feverishly figure out what's wrong. We were joking before we came about this, we had problems printing the document tonight because of similar problems.

On the first sheet there it shows a view of the southern part of Mare Island. The two areas we're talking about, the former production manufacturing area, which is on the lower part of the Mare Island Strait, and the south shore area which is just around the corner along the Carquinez Strait.

Okay. The third slide. Okay. Production manufacturing area. This was established in 1857 shortly after the shipyard, and its initial purpose was to store the munitions of the ships as they went into the shipyard for repairs. They were off-loaded when they came in, and then the munitions were overhauled and put back on as the ships went out. Continued through several phases of development.

One was in 1936 when munitions manufacturing operations were incorporated into the facilities operations. And control was transferred to Port Chicago in 1945. And then that later became Concord Naval Weapons Station. And the facility at Mare Island stayed open until 1972 when it was closed. The property was transferred to Mare Island Naval Shipyard, and Concord continued to use it for the overhauling empty shipping containers for ordnance. So it continued to have an ordnance presence, but to a lesser degree. Essentially part of Carquinez Strait. And there were a number of buildings built on that, including the handling pier, pier 35, which you can see sticking out into the Mare Island Strait on the previous slide.

The history of munitions and explosives of concern, and we will call that MEC from here on, that's the latest Navy and Army Corps buzzword for things that might explode and hurt you if you encountered them. The preliminary assessment of Mare Island was done in 1994. It identified various munitions areas of concern on the island. And south shore and production manufacturing were two of those based on their prior use. And also on some of the actions that happened there.

There were numerous emergency response actions that happened between 1990 and 1995, and I had the dubious distinction of being the one that started most of those as the shipyard explosives safety assistant manager.

But the south shore had three response actions that we had to get the Mare Island base explosive ordnance disposal team to respond to. And they were at two separate locations. One of those locations required over a month of EOD presence to do an emergency response action, just to clear the items that were apparent on the surface and at lesser depths. And the site was located near dike fourteen, which I'll show you on the slide in a minute or on your handout probably.

The production area had four response actions between 1993 and 1995 at three different locations. And numerous items were located there to a lesser degree, not nearly as many, just discrete items that were handled quickly.

Oh, good. Okay. This slide shows the location. You can see there's two locations on the south shore, and three locations in the production area. And these were locations where munitions response actions occurred before anything else. This was before we got into the CERCLA cycle. And the next step, because of the ordnance PA there was a UXO, unexploded ordnance site investigation that was initiated by the Navy. And this was completed in 1997 by SSPORTS. And it consisted of visual and geophysical surveys of the ordnance areas of concern that were identified in the PA, except for the offshore areas. And the anomalies that were discovered during the UXO site investigation were documented in the report. The later intrusive investigations that were done in each of the ordnance areas of concern essentially went in and investigated the anomalies to determine whether or not they represented ordnance.

The south shore investigation was completed between August, '97 and May of 1999. 1,326 anomalies were investigated, and that has resulted in the recovery of 1,687 MEC items. And PMA was investigated between 1998 and 2000, another thousand anomalies investigated, and here only 265 items are recovered.

Okay. The next slide. This shows a picture of one of our UXO technicians, Stan Wykens. And he's putting some of the recovered items into a munitions can to take to the magazine for storage. The production area was kind of notable in that we found a relatively few number of items, and all the items were relatively large projectiles. So none of the 20 millimeter, you know, the really kind of dangerous smaller things that are typically found in other areas.

Okay. At south shore kind of a different story here. 1,687 items recovered. And you can see in the bottom note there, 90 percent of the items were found at the same area, dike fourteen, that the EOD team spent a month at previously for the response actions. Many items, smaller items in south shore. We've got 20 millimeter, 40 millimeter, 1.1 inch. These are the same types of items that were found in the dredge ponds. They are light anti-aircraft rounds. Most of the items were found in discrete locations along what used to be the historical shoreline. So we believe that they were intentionally put there by someone at some point. They were actually stacked up in piles.

Okay. This shows the locations where live items, live MEC was recovered during the intrusive investigations. You can see there's several locations in the production area. This cluster down here on south shore is where 90 percent of the items were found, most of them in this one spot just west of dike fourteen. It's kind of notable also, and this will play into our selection of geophysical survey instruments, that all of the items we found in the production area were ferrous, which means they can be found with a magnetometer. The only place where we found items that were not ferrous, like fuses and primers and things that are made out of brass, essentially was along the south shore shoreline.

Okay. It gets to our scope of work for the project. One of the things that we're required to do is develop a conceptual site model. And this is, in a sense, a living document. It incorporates all the relevant information on MEC, and it's something that we would put together, in fact, we have put together. It's one of the appendices in the work plan.

It will be updated as we do the geophysical surveys, and hopefully do some more historical research as the project progresses. It will have information in it that reflects all the recovered MEC that we found, where it was found, how it was put there, land use history, you know, whatever conditions might be on the site, and it will also do an analysis for exposure pathways, now potential receptors.

In the case of MEC it would be, mostly involve human receptors, it wouldn't involve biological receptors for the MEC itself. And I might note that this doesn't address the chemical contaminants that will be addressed as a separate issue. It primarily concerns MEC items, explosive hazards, physical hazards. The objective of the conceptual site model is to focus the investigation, identify any data gaps, incorporate data quality objectives and survey techniques that are affected for the items that we're looking at, and help identify any items to human health or the environment that might exist because of the MEC.

The geophysical survey that we're proposing will be a full coverage digital geophysical mapping survey. And that means that when we get done we'll have a data record. That's one of the items that the previous work kind of fell short on. At the time there wasn't as much reliance on the types of instruments that we have now that can record anomaly data, position data, and things like that. A lot of the items that were used previously were real time estimates that depended on operator proficiency.

So this will result this time in a record that can be maintained and analyzed and reviewed by whoever needs to look at it. The instruments that we're proposing in using were basically two instruments. The third that we'll talk about in a minute is kind of a spin-off on one of the previous two.

The first is Geonics EM-61 Mk 2. This is an electromagnetic instrument which means it can detect all metals. It doesn't detect just iron like a magnetometer would. It's interfaced with a real time kinematics GPS receiver that simultaneously records anomaly or data position as it's being used. And this can be used within a, you know, a few centimeters to be able to locate the anomalies after the fact for investigation. The EM-61 will be used in areas where non-ferrous MEC items are likely. And this would be predominantly, as we talked about before, the shoreline area of the south shore where we found a lot of fuses and primers made out of brass.

The other instrument is a Geometrics G-858. This is a magnetometer type instrument, meaning it can detect only ferrous objects, iron and steel objects. It also uses the RTK GPS system interfaced with it. And it will be used in areas where predominantly ferrous items were found, which is everywhere except the south shore shoreline areas.

The third instrument is a GeoVizor, and this is a system that was developed by Matt Gifford. This is a system essentially that uses a geometric G-858 system, the sensor and electronics, and it's interfaced with a hybrid laser ultrasonic GPS location system. And it accumulates data with really high data density. And this is really important because we're proposing to use this under

the buildings. And this is an area where previously we haven't been able to do any surveys because they're made of concrete with reinforced steel in it, and that presents a problem when you're using instruments that are designed to find metallic objects.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Plus you're too tall.

MR. MAGINI: Yeah, that's -- I don't plan to do much of the survey myself, we're going to find some really short people like Sue. (LAUGHTER.)

MR. MAGINI: But anyway, Matt's developed the system, he's done some preliminary studies, it's been looked at by the Army Corps of Engineers with pretty favorable results. We did kind of an abbreviated prove-out last summer, and it looked like it can do the job for us, so we're hoping it will work out. And again, its use will be applicable to building footprint areas. A lot of the buildings on the south shore and the PMA are built, elevated off the ground on pilings. And those are the buildings we're talking about.

The ones that sit right down on the ground with a crawl space obviously we wouldn't be able to use it under, but there are quite a few that it would be applicable to. This is a picture that shows the production area, geophysical survey areas. And we've broken it up basically into three different areas. And this was based on data that relates to the previous shorelines. And also to the previous use, in the case of the purple shaded area, which is installation restoration site four. And also on where the ordnance was found previously.

The purple shaded area at the top is installation restoration site four. And it's kind of famous as being called the green sandy beach. It's where sandblast sand and associated contaminants were disposed of. And the primary concern there is contaminants and soil contaminants from the sandblast. It was also looked at by the UXO SI, and also had some anomalies that were found there and investigated by the subsequent intrusive investigation. And no ordnances has ever been found there, ordnance or ordnance related debris. So we don't think it's a problem, but it's going to get looked at again just to confirm that.

The area below it, it looks like a mustard color on the screen. This was the PMA hillside area as we're calling it. This was the area that was, it was filled in at some point, but the historical shoreline, the time period when it was the historical shoreline was so short and the time period was such that we don't think that there's anything buried there.

And if you look at the, your handout back to the figure where we found ordnance, most of the items that we found were along the green area, which is the PMA shoreline area, and that's the area we think really has the potential for having additional items because of its history and the fact that we found everything there so far.

And the two red buildings you can see at the top. There were three buildings that the Navy wanted us to look at as far as the building footprint areas, and it's kind of like a sampling. We want to see if the thing will work first, and possibly it will lead into more surveys later. But we're going to do the two buildings in the PMA and also the one on the south shore, and you'll see that on the next slide. Okay. This is south shore. It was divided up into two areas; the yellow area against the hillside is the area that we did not find non-ferrous ordnance in. Everything that we found that was ferrous was down there along the shoreline.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That was non-ferrous?

MR. MAGINI: Nothing was found in that area that was not ferrous. Everything found on the hillside between the yellow and the purple was made of iron and we could see with a magnetometer. The only area that we're proposing use of the Geonics, the EM-61 would be in the purple shaded area. This is the area where we found a lot of non-ferrous items, brass and fuses and primers. So we're going to do that area with both instruments. The M-61 is good and can see non-ferrous but it can't see items as deep as the magnetometer can, so we're hoping to get both things going for us there and find deeper ferrous items for us also.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Larry, would you point to us again? There's two areas of purple there again.

MR. MAGINI: This area is purple, it has kind of bar coding through it, cross-hatched or whatever. And that represents the offshore areas that are accessible at low tide.

Because of the items that have been found on the south shore, the large numbers and types of the items, and because some of them have been found along the beach below the high water mark, and there seems to be some kind of action there, you know, wave action or tidal action or ferry action or whatever, that's moving the things around, exposing them; we think that it's critical that we go out there and find items that, you know, people could be exposed to. So we're going to go out and do a survey and see what's out there. We're probably going to overlap to some extent the offshore survey, so we're going to be really, really sure that we find everything. But this is a pretty dynamic area, so it will be interesting to see what's there.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Do you want to describe those gaps?

MR. MAGINI: Yeah, the gaps, I think there were some on the other figure also. They represent areas that have endangered -- not wildlife, plants.

MR. COFFEY: Pickleweed.

MR. MAGINI: Pickleweed, things like that that we're kind of restricted from. And they're not really of great concern because they're the kinds of areas that probably nobody went to start with to throw anything away, so -- And the project work schedule. The draft conceptual site model and geophysical investigation work plan, which is this thing, has been issued to the agencies for their review on September the 9th. And the Navy has asked for comments, replies by, back to them by 11/14.

Assuming that happens -- the other item I didn't talk about also included in the work plan is the geophysical prove-out plan. And this is important to validate the instruments, the techniques, and also the operators that we're going to use for the surveys. We're proposing to put, install a new geophysical prove-out area, probably on south shore. And this will be probably on the order of a hundred by a hundred feet, and it will have items placed in it that are representative of the types of ordnance that have been found in the two areas, and they'll be in different orientations and depths, and they'll be surveyed again so that we know precisely where they're at. We'll take the instruments down there, and then they'll do a survey of the area. And this will be a blind survey. The operators won't know where the items are at. They'll come back with the data and then we'll do a comparison to find out how good they are. And that's how we'll hopefully

demonstrate that the things are capable of doing what we want them to do. That's proposed for November. And then assuming everything goes well with the review and the counter-replies and things, work plan approval in December, and the survey starting shortly after that.

And again, this is all dependent on the weather. The surveys that we're going to be doing, especially under the buildings, it's going to be dependent on the ground being dry and the people being able to crawl under the building, so that may not be a good timeframe and it could conceivably slip somewhat. Are there any questions?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: After you run all those three machines through there and do all that, to what depth can you stand up and say we know for sure there is no projectiles of any type? And what depth will you be, say, a hundred percent?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You can never say a hundred percent.

MR. MAGINI: It depends, and there's no guarantees, that's the first two opening lines.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well if I was DTSC the first thing, that's the first question I'd ask. Okay.

MR. MAGINI: Yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, let me ask the second one then. Do these machines work around the rocks that are in the ground down in the southern area, that has been the concern since day one.

MS. YOUNG: What do you mean look around the rocks, look under the rocks?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

MS. YOUNG: Can they look under the rocks?

MR. MAGINI: It depends on what the rocks are made out of. If the rocks have a lot of metal in them or there are, you know, sometimes the rocks are magnetic, it will depend. That's something I can't answer myself. I don't know if a geophysicist could until he knows the area.

MS. YOUNG: Some of the equipment, Gil, have a, kind of like a conical range that they can detect material from, and conceivably it can look under a rock, but only to a limited depth. All the instruments only have a specific capability as far as depth. And a lot of it is dependent on the size, the dense, and the mass of the ordnance that you're looking for.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the soil.

MS. YOUNG: And the soil. And if you're looking for a huge item, the eight inch parrot rounds, the 16-inchers, the 500 pounds, the magnetometer will find that within three meters. But typically what we're looking at is somewhere between ground surface and four feet, some of the equipment that you're looking at like the EM-61 has a limited depth of around four feet effectively. And it, again it depends on the size of the item that you're looking for.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the position of the item.

MS. YOUNG: And the position.

MR. MAGINI: It depends on the orientation. It depends, you know, how deteriorated they are. It depends what's around it as far as background. And no, we can't guarantee there isn't a twenty mil at four feet.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, you know, in the January, February timeframe when we were negotiating an early transfer of that area, DTSC, as I understood it, their concern was they wanted to look down to twelve feet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Twelve feet?

MR. MAGINI: If we have a 16 incher at twelve feet, then we might be able to see that.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well I may have been wrong.

MR. MAGINI: But smaller things, no, it's not possible.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, I got one other question. How does that, this survey, how does this geophysical survey work into an early transfer scenario?

MR. MAGINI: The survey is the first step in essentially a two step process of what we're trying to do for the second time. The second step would be the investigation of what we find because this doesn't include the investigation, it's only a survey. So we, we're going to pick anomalies that we think might represent MEC, but we're not going to know that in December or January. We're just going to identify additional anomalies that somebody is going to have to dig up.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay. So the last question I have is how, what kind of a contract are you working under to do the survey?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: It's a direct contract with the Navy.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So it was not a competitive bid?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Oh, it was a competitive bid. It's what we call a multiple award contract where we have multiple contractors submit bids, and we use not just price but value, how good is the proposal qualitatively that they are submitting, to make our choice.

MR. KARR: You guys aren't from Halliburton then, huh?

MS. YOUNG: Gil, some of the -- what we're doing right now, a lot of it is so, it follows what the old SSPORTS group did, I was part of SSPORTS as well. And when SSPORTS did the original survey, they pretty much did almost a one hundred percent survey of that site.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: To four feet.

MS. YOUNG: To four feet. And most of the anomalies, and a lot of the anomalies and a lot of the items that were found were done during the intrusive investigation and were dug up and

disposed of accordingly. What this survey will do now is, one, it's a comparison in terms of how well the other survey was done because, like Larry said, the equipment has changed, technology has changed, and the advancements have changed.

But also you have to remember that there are land use controls down there. So this survey isn't going to guarantee that there is no ordnance, no one can ever guarantee that a survey is one hundred percent sure and an area is void of all ordnance, but what it will do is give the agencies and, you know, the parties involved an idea of what's in the area and what kind of, whether development or activities or reuse is applicable or appropriate for that area.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, it just seems like, to me, since we had to sit through those meetings in January and February at DTSC, and they told us that it was unsatisfactory what was, that four feet was unsatisfactory, just seems to me that we waste a whole bunch of money and time. We ought to go back and find something that will go down deeper.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, Gil, the technology just isn't there. That's the exciting and fascinating thing about ordnance right now. I mean you just cannot -- there are some things in environmental cleanup you just can't do, and ordnance is --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I know. And what we're going to end up with is a CC&R, land use covenant, as you call them, over the top of it that says nobody can go down there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, we're not. You know, that's one of the reasons why some of us have stuck so religiously to a project that didn't seem to have, to feel like it was going anywhere, and that's the Regional Park Task Force. Because those of us who serve on it as well as on the RAB, and that's the majority of us who have stuck around, understand that that property can be reused, but that it's going to have to have the type of use that it's going to have to have is going to be quite different than what some people might imagine.

For example, the specific plan saying equestrian trails. We might not want Equestrians dashing across that beach, partly because it's a conservation easement area, but partly because horse hooves are very, very, destructive to erode, they're very erosive.

You're not going to want -- and I've used this as an example and I got really criticized in one of our first regional park meetings because I was putting a damper on people's dreams. But I've suggested that, for practical purposes, we've written in the draft report that it wouldn't be a suitable location for a yacht club because of the need to do substantial dredging. Not only for the cost, but because they would have to have an EOD team on, watching every scoop of mud. It's not going to be suitable probably for skin driving for about twenty reasons. But one of 'em would be that it wouldn't be a smart reuse of the property.

But I'm confident with the Navy, the Navy teaming up with the community; they will have to have land use controls, including public education in perpetuity here, that we can have our bomb museum, that can serve that purpose.

And similarly to the way we've worked with the trail along the dredge ponds, we can have a pretty high level of confidence that if we play by all the rules that will be set up on this property, that it will be usable by the public. But not for every use that everybody could dream.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well once again, and not speaking for the folks that aren't MEC people, but if DTSC tells me in January, February that what's been done isn't good enough, and what's been done has already looked at four feet, it just seems like to me you're wasting money to do four feet again. I don't know. It's not worth a discussion, but if it was my money we wouldn't be doing it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's new -- but it isn't, it's Federal money so it doesn't matter, right? It is, well, I -- these guys should answer. But I think that we don't understand, or everybody doesn't anyway, that they're using brand new technology in some cases that just simply wasn't there. And while they did a really dandy job to four feet, this is a way of confirming that and making DTSC at least feel good about the four feet.

The twelve foot thing is an outrageous idea that they ought to bring out and vet right here in this meeting sometime. That's an amazing --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, that could have been something thrown out at a meeting. And I may have it wrong too.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But it's not impossible to believe because they think that they -- that you can sift the entire world and make it safe for everybody, that's because that's what regulators really dream of. But is it practical? I mean, I guess that's what they dream of, I don't, I'm not a regulator. Henry, you want to go there?

MR. CHUI: No.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, really I wonder. I just question in my mind. Now, maybe we'll get lucky. Maybe they'll say, "Four feet is fine, let's go."

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the other problem that you have is, and the reason to do this, I think, is that you've got, if you were going to do an early transfer, you'd have to have that property characterized sufficiently to be able to do a guaranteed fixed price unless you have some other, your early transfer proponents have another method that they were going to fund that early transfer cleanup work based on.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I'll get to that in a little bit. Are there any other questions that Larry could help answer, or Sue?

MS. ROEBUCK: I have one question.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Sheila.

MR. ROEBUCK: And that is, you may have already mentioned this, but you said that 90 percent of the items, the MEC items were recovered near dike fourteen. Do you have a hypothesis as to why that is?

MR. MAGINI: Well, I was the one that found -- I wasn't the one that found it, but I was the one that looked at the site and called EOD when the items were first found. And when we first started digging the hole the items were like stacked together vertically. I mean they weren't dumped haphazardly, somebody had actually stacked 'em, put 'em in the hole, and covered it up.

And the range of items that we found there, we found everything from 1864 fuses through 1950, you know, head stamp cartridge cases. So it looks like somebody at some point cleaned out all the garbage that they had in a magazine or something and piled it up in a pile and covered it up. It wasn't, I don't see any other way it could have been put there.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Diana.

MS. KREVSKY: How are you integrating your survey from the offshore that was done last year with this work plan? Is it connected or --

MR. MAGINI: I'm not that familiar with what's proposed for the offshore, but I know that we're overlapping some of the areas, and that's, I think, kind of critical, especially on the south shore because items tend to move around.

And if we were to go like to the high tide mark and the offshore people want to the same mark, you know, two days later there might be some stuff that wasn't there the day before that one of the two missed. So I think it's critical that we do the offshore area, you know. And I mean we're doing a fairly good portion of it, we're doing what, four or five acres offshore.

MS. YOUNG: About five acres.

MR. MAGINI: and that was mapped out by us one day of where we could walk. And so hopefully we got everywhere that, you know, somebody could walk and have access to something.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: We do have a different contractor doing the offshore work, and it's not that we're not integrating the work, we see it more as just duplicating the work to make sure we capture the problems in that area. And plus we are using different technologies with the two different contractors.

MS. KREVSKY: They overlap.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: They overlap significantly in an area that we know there's problems, and so we wanted to make sure we have coverage there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jerry, in addition to the Navy having some type of requirement for some type of public education in perpetuity, you will also have some sort of relationship with an EOD team, I assume, over a period of time into the future?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Correct. By law military munitions have to be responded to by DOD in whole. Here in the Bay Area, for the North Bay area we have the EOD teams out at Travis, and so that's who we have a relationship with for responding here at Mare Island. Outside of the emergency discoveries or, say, unexpected discoveries by parties that are not doing munitions cleanup, we would use them. But if we are doing a cleanup where we know we're looking for munitions, we'll be prepared to respond to that. Just on the -- thank you, Larry. I think the questions are done. But on the questions that Gil raised, I think the way one can look at this is you really need to do a good look at the site conditions there to make some decisions.

For munitions there's kind of a three step approach which is not too much different than cleaning up a chemical site. You have to do some investigation and cleanup. By doing that, and doing the best you can do, you then see what you might have left and impose land use controls to be protective of what those residuals might be.

On top of that, and probably more importantly for munitions, is an education program to make people aware of what those covenants are, what those residual potential risks are. And that education component's probably something that's going to be much more robust than, say, a chemical site cleanup. And so we have to do this work before we can even get out of step one to see if the cleanup work has been effective. We've done numerous efforts at cleaning up this area. What we're doing now is taking the best technology that's out there and seeing how well we did, seeing if we have to do more or if we can do more. And then from there go into the land use covenants and education programs.

So that's kind of the goal of what we're doing here. We just want to take another hard look at the site. And through the CERCLA process there's also something called a five year review. There's no doubt in my mind technologies will improve over several years from now, and we may find technologies that will detect down to twelve feet and can be more confident at some point in the future. Today we just can't. I think what you're seeing is really another first for Mare Island. We were the first to do offshore underwater munitions research, and detection technologies; here we're looking like we're getting into another area of a first for the detection for underneath buildings. And so we're trying our best.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just want to give folks one example of a place where there is public access, and it is limited public access with a robust education program, and that's at Kaho Lave bombing range in Hawaii. And that property was actually transferred to the state of Hawaii, was it not, this last couple of months?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I believe so, I believe it was recent. But the Navy does again have ongoing commitments, obligations there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And in that case it's a historically cultural important site to the native people, and that was -- and this is something, Gil, that I think is very important for you to know the next time you have to sit through one of those meetings, maybe this January and February with DTSC. What we know about Mare Island is that it was never a bombing range. So I think Larry can confirm that we haven't ever found any live --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well, we have found live, but what we haven't found is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Fused, fired.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: fused, fired, and failed, which is the form of --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Of a dud.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: A rough definition of an unexploded ordnance. So all the years that the term UXO has been used here has really been inaccurate. What we have here is abandoned or discarded military munitions, not unexploded ordnance.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And it has -- while it has high explosives in it, it could, they could harm you, they aren't so sensitive to movement, right?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: What's missing with the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You want to explain some of that?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: -- with the discarded munitions is that the fuse isn't -- the munition isn't armed with a fuse and an intermediary explosive. MR. MAGINI: Most of the items, the larger items, especially things larger than twenty millimeter, they're designed so that they require some action of, you know, being fired out of a gun to arm, either spinor acceleration or, you know, something like that. And nothing we've found has been of that type. So conceivably if you wanted to make one of these go off you'd have to try really hard to do it, especially the larger items. They're not something you can just look at or, you know, probably touch in passing and have something bad happen to you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then in one of the classes that Dwight and I were actually in, and I think Chip was, too, on ordnance, there are, of course, stupid genes, and those are all carried, according to the DOD's trainer that day, by men. And the only way they can be, actually manifest as stupider is to put them in a camouflage outfit. And the stupid gene is manifest by anytime you see something on the ground you pick it up.

MR. KARR: And taste it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well no, you get our your -- well maybe. I don't know.

MR. KARR: Bite on it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then if you don't figure out what it is by just picking it up and looking at it, you get out your knife and scrape it.

MS. KREVSKEY: And don't ask directions. (LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well you don't ask directions, yeah. So my point here is that the DOD recognizes --

MR. COFFEY: Is this profiling? Geez.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's out of the DOD. I mean all I'm doing is repeating what they taught us.

MR. FARLEY: Very loudly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Well I could turn the microphone off maybe, or you could kick me.

MR. FARLEY: You don't need the microphone. (LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But the good news is that, what Larry said is that you would have to try really hard to get the ordnance at Mare Island to do something. It's still not a good idea to pick it

up, but it isn't so sensitive that you have to turn your cell phones off to ride your horse in the park.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: We are running a little behind on this topic, but it's a good topic. We hope to have a report in February. If not then, it will probably be more like springtime. And we'll be able to show some results here and talk about the next steps. As far as early transfer goes, what this will do is just provide additional data for folks to consider and evaluate. It won't give all the right answers for how much this will cost, but it will give more information than what we have currently. So with that, why don't we take our break and try to get back here say around 8:35. Thank you.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes, Jerry Dunaway)

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: We have some administrative business to go through. The August 25th meeting minutes are in your packet. Any comments or corrections, please pass those on. We moved the November RAB meeting because of Thanksgiving, so for two month planning ahead, that meeting will be on December 1st instead of in November.

And for both the October 27th and the December 1st RAB meetings, those will be held at the Mare Island conference center. Again, the library is closed for some remodeling.

Our Navy BRAC office moved over the weekend. And it's been a lot of fun, wish I could do it again. But I sent out the new address for those who need that, it's in an e-mail. If you did not get that, I'm not even sure I know the address, 1455 Frazee Road.

MS. DAMRELL: Suite 900.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Suite 900 -- thank you, Tommie Jean -- San Diego, California, 92108. It's in your RAB mailing packet. And that's all the administrative news I have for today. Why don't we jump into the focus group reports. We don't have a community co-chair yet, but we do have Diana Krevsky here who is visiting us, our previous community co-chair, but I won't put her on the spot.

MS. KREVSKY: Thank you.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Natural resources, Jerry Karr do you have any reports to make?

MR. KARR: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Paula, I didn't see Paula, I don't think she's here today. So let's jump down to the city report, Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: In the next thirty days we only have one really item that is going to be coming off the meetings are items that are going to come off. And that's under the dredge

pond EIS EIR there is a planning commission public hearing on October 24th, that's the current date.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's been moved, hasn't it?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's been changed. It was the 17th, I think. But before that it was the 7th, and before that it was something else. And in our business the only thing we know that's constant is change. So anyway, that's the only thing that's really going to happen. The rest of the thing or what we're working on is the waterfront, and that has nothing really to do with Lennar except, excuse me, with Mare Island except it increases the value of Mare Island.

MR. COFFEY: That's subject to debate.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's probably something --

MR. COFFEY: Real debatable.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: That's it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Increases the developer fees to the city.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Steve, how about the Lennar report?

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Jerry. There are some handouts, there's a map and some schedule information about reports. The table over in the corner where the sign-in sheet was kind of jammed, so the handouts are here right by Kenn Brown. If you didn't get one, let Gary Riley know and he'll hand one out to you.

MR. KARR: The lovely and talented Gary Riley.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He impresses his boss.

MR. FARLEY: Let me start with the two single page spreadsheets. They show the reports that we've issued and the things that are in review. It's about a 60 day sliding window, and we prepared that last month. I've done it again this month, which was originally paired -- prepared at Myrna's request. I think what we may do is skip next month, and then issue it again every other month on a going forward basis, because it does cover about a 60 day window. Let me draw your attention to the map. There are some photographs on the map and then some other information down in the lower left corner. Everybody's probably looking at the photographs, so let's start there.

In the lower left corner we show a forklift moving a transformer. That's over at building 516 which is in the triangle area over by the dry docks. We're moving a pair of inactive transformers from on top of a vault at building 516. We're then going to remove that vault, and remove the floor inside the building as part of the PCB action at building 516. The other photograph on the left-hand side is over by building 523 which is the sports arena. We're doing some over excavation there to remove some shallow, and when I say shallow I mean in this case about two or three feet deep, soil containing some unacceptable levels of PCBs. Not twelve feet.

The other photograph is inside building 680. It is -- there's two photographs there. Let's start with the one where all of the firemen are. The work that we did inside that building was sort of a housekeeping activity, but it did involve doing some confined space work, which means that there was some limited egress and exit from the vault. The fire department on the island was notified prior to doing the work which was required, and they came out to inspect the work that we were doing. Well, you can imagine when I drove up to the building and saw fire trucks and such. Yes, my heart jumped in my throat. But I'm happy to report that the fire department was very pleased with what we were doing, how the site was being managed, etcetera, and it went off very well. The work that we did, as I mentioned, was sort of housekeeping.

The, in the photograph with the orange pylons there is a steel, a set of steel plates on top of a pit or a vault that's below the floor slab level. And what we did is we went inside there to remove a lot of debris that had accumulated inside that vault.

Well, it's funny you asked that question, Mike, because one of the things that I saw in the photographs that I took that was prominent were bottles. And –

MR. COFFEY: No kidding, old?

MR. FARLEY: Yes. But the Jim Beam labels had worn off of the bottles it was really quite interesting and had some water in there.

So the idea is to remove that material, remove the bottles and the water and the other debris in there. To then go back in after that's all removed and do an investigation of PCBs inside that vault. So that covers the photos. A couple of other things to highlight. We're doing some UST work. I reported last month on the USTs at buildings 243 and 231 which were in the 8 IAH2 area, which is sort of in the center of your figure, and then in the lower right corner of building 742, that work is still going on.

And we've got a number of small activities going on at PCB sites. And then in the upper right corner of the drawing or the map, IWPS number four, which is industrial wastewater pump station number four, we're doing some soil excavation there based on some solvents that are in the soils in that area.

I draw your attention to the lower left corner of the handout, there's a few boxes there that show documents in review, significant documents, upcoming documents, etcetera. If you'll look at the documents in review on the left you can see that we have a number of land use covenant and implementation plans for a couple of the IA's and for PCB sites. Those are very important documents, and those documents are in review right now.

Some significant upcoming documents, implementation reports for IA's H2 and D1.2, land use covenant plan for PCB sites and IA D1.2. And then the draft remedial action plan for IA C3. Those are all upcoming documents. A couple of public comment periods that are going on, you can see in the lower left corner. And then the environmental site closure status, those numbers haven't changed from last month. So the number of PCB sites and UST sites, etcetera, that have closed haven't changed since last month.

In terms of the field program schedule, we have some relatively small scale stuff going on in addition to the building 516 area. We've got some tanks that we're cleaning out and that sort of thing. And that sort of covers it. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

MR. KARR: What was the original use of the vault?

MR. FARLEY: It's not entirely --

MR. KARR: Electrical?

MR. FARLEY: No, it's just an open pit. And what's interesting about this, if you look at the photograph in the upper right corner with the orange pylons, that's a steel plate on top of the vault. And they would anchor pieces of equipment there to fabricate pieces of the ship and that sort of thing. And I believe underneath there -- and Jerry, you might know better than I -- underneath there is a series of pipes and -- not pipes, water pipes, but pipes to hold up that part of the floor while they're doing fabricating. It's sort of like, it's sort of like the deck of a lathe, if that makes sense.

MR. KARR: I just wondered. It was not an electrical vault or anything like that?

MR. FARLEY: No, it wasn't an electrical vault, it's just an open space.

MR. KARR: Just general information.

MR. FARLEY: Large manufacturing. Building 680 is the biggest -- ahh, everybody knows what this one is.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I wouldn't know anything about their operations in that building. Dave, do you know anything? Probably just water from the heating operations.

MR. FARLEY: That makes sense. Yeah, that floor does have holes in it between the steel plates, so that makes sense. It's probably just to catch the water like Dave said.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And hide the Jim Beam bottles.

MR. FARLEY: The photographs are quite interesting.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Steve. Dwight, you're going to do the Weston update, I take it?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah. Cris Jespersen is out of town, so let me give you the update and hopefully everyone has one of these updates. The first item is regarding the new wetland creation that Weston is planning. We have a -- the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service have been going back and forth on the draft biological opinion that's required under the Endangered Species Act for the remedial activities that are planned for investigation area H1 out by the old landfill area. And unfortunately, they haven't wrapped up their discussions yet.

So the final BO has yet to be issued, and most likely would not occur until October sometime at the earliest. So due to the delay in the biological opinion, the weather window is closing for the

ability to trap any salt marsh harvest mice, so we're going to have to delay that activity until the springtime due to the colder weather or the potential rainfall that would not be conducive to trapping. So that is going to have to be pushed off, unfortunately. But we're still hoping that we can at least get the biological opinion behind us here in the near future.

Another set of important documents is the remedial investigation report for H1, the feasibility study and the remedial action plan. The final RI, which has been under development for these many years is almost complete. There's a few changed pages that are being distributed or that have been distributed to the agencies, and they're checking those out. And assuming that those are fine, then they will be incorporated into the document, and then that document will be considered final.

A couple of weeks ago in Sacramento, Weston and the Navy met with some of DTSC's management regarding some proposed remedy alternatives for the landfill containment area, and those would be addressed in the draft final feasibility study that is coming up at the end of October. We got some good input from those folks. And we are also planning on the Tuesday evening next week on Mare Island at the convention building there, in the -- 7:00 p.m. on October, or excuse me, 5:30, right, for a tour, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then 6:00 for the meeting.

MR. GEMAR: Right. There will be a focus group meeting to allow the Restoration Advisory Board to have a similar discussion on what's being considered for the landfill containment system.

And then related to that, on the next item Weston has generated a couple of documents related to the design of the landfill cap. One of them is a geotechnical parameters report that was issued, and comments have been received from the agencies. A second report that describes the proposed cap alternatives for the RCRA regulated units has also been issued, and we're waiting on comments and should get those shortly. And those documents are important because they both serve as a basis for the landfill cap design that would be included in the remedial design report.

Another activity that's been ongoing at H1 is a series of new well installations and old well abandonments. As part of discussions with DTSC, Weston has abandoned by injecting grout and drilling out casings, 48 old groundwater monitoring wells that are no longer needed or are in locations that are not conducive to the long term monitoring for the landfill.

And we've installed 22 new wells and piezometers to measure water level depths, and also to sample the groundwater quality in the area around the landfill containment area. So that work has been completed. Also, under a separate contract, competitively bid and awarded to Weston with the Navy, we're continuing to work out at the Marine Corps firing range, and Jerry will probably touch on that, but I thought I'd just mention that.

We continue to work out at the outfall. This is pond, the historic dredge pond 4 South outfall, the mother of all outfalls on Mare Island. The Navy had, I think, removed about 1,500 items back in the late nineties until they ran out of money or patience. And recently Weston has been awarded that work. And we're out there now and have removed about 20,000 cubic yards, and sifted all that through three quarter inch screens, and run it under magnets to remove ferrous

items. To date we've removed 1,005 live munition and small arms items, including about 520 millimeter anti-aircraft projectiles which are typically the most prevalent munition item out in the dredge ponds. And also a few other larger items, and a couple of hand grenades, compliments of probably a couple of Marines. We've also -- doing rad checks, and we've removed 166 radiological items. Typically these luminescent buttons that were used on board ships, and we've recovered those.

And we're also, as we dig the, to the bottom of the outfall and get down to native clay, we do a geophysical survey similar to what Larry Magini discussed or described earlier today. And so far we've cleared seventeen grids, and we have about another thirty or so to go. And they'll be done in October. And you can see a picture of one gentleman marking lanes and another one pulling what looks like a poorly designed rickshaw, which was actually the EM-61 geophysical coils with a RTK positioning system associated with it. And he was really glad that I took this picture because he wasn't pulling me at the time. So now I get back on and he pulls me around. (LAUGHTER.)

MR. GEMAR: Just kidding. So we've been real busy out at the site.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Dwight. Regulatory agency update. I know Chip couldn't make it tonight, but Henry is here. I'm not sure, Henry?

MR. CHUI: I think Steve pretty much covered all the Lennar stuff, I'm not sure what --

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Maybe we'll let, what happened to Carolyn?

MR. RILEY: I believe she had to leave.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Well I guess then that leaves Gary. So Gary can talk about the Navy.

MR. RILEY: One thing that's happened in the last month, we issued a no further action letter for an underground storage tank that the Navy was unable to locate but the Army Reserve was able to find in their site redevelopment activities down in the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh.

MR. RILEY: Well, in that they were digging up the entire site so they encountered a tank that the location wasn't clear on. So that's how that happened. So we've issued a closure letter on that. And in more exciting news, we're adding to the Water Board's Mare Island team. We have a new remedial project manager for the Navy retained portions, George Leyva, in the corner, who will be joining the BCT and working with the Navy on their portion of the cleanup.

You're not done with me, though, I'll remain to oversee the Lennar cleanup, as well as probably parts of the dredge pond permitting which are outside the cleanup program but the Water Board process nonetheless. And we also have a new manager in our DOD cleanup group, Gina Kathuria after having been an RPM on the site back in 1994.

MS. KATHURIA: Actually, yeah, I was at the first RAB meeting.

MR. RILEY: So coming full circle. And Gina is our new section leader and will probably be here from time to time. We are happy to have her on board as well. So to two new faces from the Water Board. And that's it.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Thank you, Gary. Thanks, Henry. Co-chair report. Myrna, do you want to start?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, you can.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I will start. There's a Navy update out there, there's a picture of a landing craft at the top there. And I didn't think Egypt had such blue water, but apparently it does. The updates we have are, Dwight touched on this a little bit, the Marine Corps firing range cleanup that's proceeding along. Because we're cleaning up and digging up more soil than planned, our projected cleanup now I believe is in October versus September. So about a one month extension there to our work. The DRMO cleanup over towards Dump Road near the landfill actually, that was initiated in the August time frame and really is going into full steam.

Some folks have been by that site on Azuar, and you've noticed the road was closed near the site, and that's because the excavations just happen to be that close to that road where the safety aspect necessitated closing the road. But that is just temporary until that excavation work is completed. And that work is expected to go on through the end of the year. And we did some additional groundwater well installations near building 742 where we've been trying to investigate groundwater issues out there. Jumping ahead. We've had various documents submitted and comments returned to us, but jump to the early transfer. We have been making more progress as we've resumed discussions on early transfer over the past couple of months. And we met with the City of Vallejo and with Lennar, September 1st as well as September 27th - was it just yesterday? Or two days ago? I think it was.

And one of the big changes there is we learned from the city that the early transfer is now intended to be a conveyance from the Navy to the city, and then I believe a quick nanosecond transfer from the city with all the parcels going to Lennar.

Where Weston was involved was the regional park for 7B, and the city is going to coordinate an effort there where Weston, with their projected activities in that regional park area, would be contracted to do the cleanup work, but I guess not taking title to the property.

So that's the recent change that's developed. And we are proceeding along with the early transfer discussions, hopefully meeting with DTSC in October to kind of get some input from them before moving too far down the road.

And we have a schedule right now that projects a, an actual early transfer, the actual event happening about a year from now. And so that's our baseline schedule we're operating from. So with that, are there any questions? I guess I didn't ask if there were any questions to the regulatory agencies, but to the agencies or to the Navy?

MS. CHRISTIAN: I have a question, not about what you were talking about necessarily, but this picture at the top and the explanation at the bottom, do you know if those are still being held every two years, or is this about a long time ago?

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: I don't know. Tommie Jean, is there any history on that picture?

MS. CHRISTIAN: I'm really interested.

MS. DAMREL: If you go to just www.navy.mil they update their photographs almost daily, and so this picture was just downloaded within the past two weeks. And they explain a little bit more about the operations. It's called Operation Bright Star or something, so it is a recent photograph.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Any other questions? Okay. So with that, our next meeting will be held on Mare Island at the conference center, formerly known as the marketing center.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I might have a comment.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Oh, yeah, and then we also have Myrna's co-chair report, sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You thought you were going to get out of that. I don't know that, why does mine sound so really loud? Well, I still like it like you like your cell phone. Okay. Yeah, well, co-chair's report. I just -- I want to remind people again, for those of you who weren't here, that we're already planning for the tenth anniversary of the San Francisco Bay Flyaway Festival January 27 through 29, 2006. And we're saddened, of course, that the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service could not come to terms on the Fish and Wildlife Service staying, so they will not be, have a presence on Mare Island that weekend, but we understand they will be participating at the festival. But the other thing that I wanted to just go back to, and I don't mean to put anybody on the spot, but at our last presentation at the RAB, the guardian trust presentation, I thought it was very favorably received by the RAB members. I recall a round of applause, so I appreciate the Navy bringing them out. And that brings up how we're going to, how are we going to follow up on some of our focus groups? I noticed one thing that we have, we don't have minutes usually from these focus group meetings, and we don't have a follow up mechanism.

So, for example, Sheila, I should have probably e-mailed or called you earlier, but one thing I did mention to you last month was that we'd like to know what progress you've made on the list of ideas that the community had come up with for exploration on land use control mechanisms. And I'm just kind of wanting to put a date, you know, us get a date out there where you can give us some, some reports back on, you know, whether you've contacted Jerry about his offer to put you in contact with the people that do the videotaping of sites and, you know, some of those recommendations that we made. You know, where, what your progress is on those?

MS. ROEBUCK: I can give you -- why don't I --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I don't mean you have to give that report tonight, but we need to be able to follow up on those focus group meetings, because we spent a lot of time on them, and we really pour our hearts out to you, and we are looking to you to respond, I guess, when we hold

these focus group meetings. And that would go for the one coming up with DTSC, and that one would be hosted by our RAB. I want to make that clear, that in that case we're the one who asked for the meeting. In the case of Lennar with the land use controls, they asked for that meeting. So, but then we'll want to have some way to do follow up.

MS. ROEBUCK: Could I follow up on those issues by e-mail to the group, is that appropriate? Or would you rather have a discussion here at the RAB?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think that the e-mail would be a place to start, but I'd like to see it be part of maybe your report or a presentation. That's my opinion. That's all my comments.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: And yeah, just to reiterate, the October 4th focus group meeting is next Tuesday, 5:30, meeting at the marketing center.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The marketing center.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Or the conference center now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or the conference center. Unless it gets usurped by somebody else. If you can let us know, even tonight, for sure that you're going to be able to attend for the 5:30 to 6:00. We'll just go out and do a quick site visit. And some of you can't make it by that time, but you're pretty confident you can make it by 6:00. We had requested this meeting with DTSC in December, December 2 of 2004, so almost ten months -- well actually, it will be ten months later exactly.

So it's with who we hope are significant decision makers at the agency. And they've been gracious enough -- they claim they don't ever do this. That they have thousands of projects to worry about, and that they usually don't bring decision makers to, you know, little small time operations like ours. And so I think that out of courtesy if there's any way that you can be present and, you know, come prepared to express your concerns or your ideas about how the landfill can meet the, what I see is still in the new specific plan, which is the landfill being used, 92 acres is listed in the 2005 specific plan for recreation and open space.

And DTSC has various responses saying they didn't know or they didn't think about that or whatever. But now they're kind of at a logjam trying to figure out how to provide for the land use that we intend, and also meet the regulatory responsibilities that we've also given them. So it will be a very important meeting, and the opportunity you have to talk with decision makers prior to this cap design being finalized. So I think it is very, very important. And I want to really -- not to put Michelle on the spot -- but thank Michelle Trotter with DTSC's public participation department for the work that she's done in helping all of the various players work together to come to this date.

MS. TROTTER: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And thanks to the city and Gil for allowing us to use the meeting space. I think it's a good meeting space and convenient for people. So, see you there.

CO-CHAIR DUNAWAY: Okay. With that, if there are no questions or comments, our meeting is adjourned.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:08 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – The Amended and Restated Mare Island Specific Plan (Lennar Mare Island).
- Presentation Handout – Munitions Investigation Work Plan, South Shore and Production and Manufacturing Area (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update September 2005
- Lennar Mare Island Mare Island RAB Update September 2005
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 2005