

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2007**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, April 26, 2007, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Mare Island, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:10 p.m. and adjourned at 9:20 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski
- Gerald Karr
- Kenn Browne

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- David Godsey (Navy Lead RPM)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Carolyn D'Almeida (USEPA)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Brian Thompson (RWQCB)
- John Kaiser (RWQCB)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Tessa Bemis (Tetra Tech)
- Chris Jespersen (Weston)

RAB Support from CDM:

- David Lange (CDM)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Welcome everybody to the Mare Island RAB meeting for April. We'll go around with introductions to start. I'm Michael Bloom. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator with the Navy.

Attendees introduce themselves as requested.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Navy Waste Consolidation and Time Critical Removal Action at Four Sites (IR04, Horse Stables, Paint Waste, and DRMO) Update.* Presentation by Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston Solutions and Mr. David Godsey, Navy.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. We'll go ahead and get started with our first presentation. It's going to be given by Mr. David Godsey from the Navy and Mr. Dwight Gemar with Weston. We're going to talk about our waste consolidation and our time critical removal action.

MR. GEMAR: The topic for the first presentation for this evening is a proposed time critical removal action on Mare Island. And as you can see on this slide, the objectives are to excavate soil

contaminated above criteria at five different locations on Mare Island, and to transport the soil to investigation area H1 to consolidate that soil within the IA-H1 containment area, and use it for sub-grade fill underneath the engineered cap within the containment area. And then we'll also be performing confirmation sampling at those excavation sites, and doing site restoration. The time critical nature of this removal action is to coordinate with the completion of the containment area cap, which is already in progress.

This map shows the location of the proposed five sites for consolidation within the H1 area. The five sites include: IR-04 in the southeastern part of the island, IR-05 at the southern end of the island, the horse stable area located inside the Western Magazine area, the defense reutilization and marketing office site, and a smaller site called a paint waste area site. And again, all of these sites are proposed for excavation and consolidation within the containment area. And you might recall that the remedy for H1 was approved late last summer and included a remedial action plan which, upon concurrence with the regulatory agencies, does allow for consolidation of soil from sites outside of H1 to be placed within H1 as part of the final cap construction.

So I'm going to talk a little bit about each of the five sites. The first one is site IR-04, installation restoration site four. Again, the background on this one is that this site was used for disposal of abrasive blasting material or ABM, and it contains heavy metals and potentially other contaminants based on sandblasting of painted surfaces. This material was distributed throughout the site therefore it required a good bit of characterization which was done, as you can see here, over a number of years. Although there are chemical constituents in the soil that need to come out, so far there has been no discovery of munitions in this particular site, and the remedial investigation did indicate that the metals did exceed the acceptable criteria and resulted in unacceptable risk to the environment. So there's an estimated 20,000 cubic yards of soil that is proposed to be excavated from this location. And the next slide on the left it shows a historical photo of a crew sandblasting a submarine hull, and of course this was not done in IR-04, it was done in the dry docks. But you can see in this other photograph, there was a fenced area here where components were sandblasted, and you can see some evidence in this 1980 photograph of disposal of green sand throughout this area even into the strait a little bit. This area is what is proposed for excavation to try to maximize the removal of green sand and to consolidate that within H1. Most of the green sand, in fact, did end up in H1 in the landfill, but there was a lot of disposal also in IR-04.

The second site that I wanted to briefly describe is what's called the paint waste area. And this is located in the northern portion, as I mentioned, on the map. This is south of building 505. This area was identified by a survey that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did in 2002 when they were out just basically surveying the wetlands and noticed a small disposal area with some paint waste debris. So the Navy conducted a removal action in 2003 and removed, as indicated here, about 520 cubic yards of paint waste. And they also did some additional sampling of the area as part of a site investigation. It was determined that there were metals and organics, elevated metals and organics concentrations in this area. And we're currently estimating that there may be upwards of perhaps 8,500 cubic yards that would potentially need to come out of this area. Here are a couple of photos from the Navy's removal action in 2003. You can see on the right-hand side there are some salt marsh harvest mouse mitigation measures just involving some hand clearing of vegetation along the perimeter of the excavation. The reason for this is to basically remove cover for the mouse. The mouse doesn't want to be exposed to potential raptors because they might be eaten -- which would ruin your whole day. So by clearing a buffer area that would tend to minimize the potential to want to come into the work area. And you can see here they were excavating in this area.

You've got some pickleweed kind of in the peripheral here that would potentially be habitat for the mouse. So there were certain mitigation measures that were taken in this area during this removal action. And so we would be doing a similar type of mitigation for this follow on work.

The next site is the defense reutilization and marketing office, the DRMO. This is located in the central part of the island, at the corner of Azuar and A Street. This was used by the Navy as a scrapyard for many years. And there were a good number of surveys and remedial actions done on this site for radiological PCB's, and most recently for metals contaminants. And, in fact, Weston is currently completing that follow on work. However, that was within this four and a half acre fenced scrapyard portion of the site. There is contamination, based on side wall sampling, along the perimeter of the site that extends beyond the limits of the current scope, and it's anticipated that there might be another 20,000 cubic yards of soil that may be impacted on the perimeter of this site. And on this particular map, the darkened grids are grids that we anticipate would be excavated, and potentially others even further out if need be in order to achieve the cleanup criteria. The orange colored side walls here are still exceeding the cleanup criteria. So, therefore, it's proposed to step out and continue to excavate soil beyond the original perimeter of this triangular shaped area. So that is part of the time critical removal action.

Another site is a smaller site; it's called the horse stable area. And I'll let you guess as to what that use was. But this is a small site in the Western Magazine area, and it was used for horse activities. They used green sand, again, for basically grading material in the areas where the horses were stabled, so there was a removal action by the Navy, again, in 2003, which removed a small amount of this green sand, but there are additional areas that need to be removed -- chromium, arsenic, lead, and nickel are the usual bad actors. This is a smaller site, though, so it's estimated that perhaps only about 1,500 yards or less might have to be removed. Here's a picture of the horse stable. Across the street there's a little circular area where they exercised the horses. Some soil on either side of this barn and even perhaps on the interior of the barn needs to be removed, as well as some of that green sand under the corral. And that's about all I know about horses, which isn't much. So the last site is a site that was actually proposed by Weston to the Navy and to the regulators to incorporate into the time critical removal action. This work is also being done by Weston on behalf of the City of Vallejo under the existing Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement with the Navy.

And this is site IR-05 in the southern end of the island. This island -- or this area was used for burning and open detonation of munitions debris and munitions items for many years, and also for open storage of munitions items. And, of course, given the history, there was a series of removal actions done over the years, mostly for munitions removal. And, in fact, again Weston is just now completing a follow on munitions investigation of this area that is a follow on to a Navy removal action in the late nineties. And in this area there is quite a bit of soil that appears to exceed ecological risk factors. Because this is done at the south end of the island, there is some nearby wetland areas and tidal wetland areas, and, therefore, the eco risk or ecological risk is driving the cleanup. So there's potentially a fair amount of soil that would need to be removed from this area. On the next slide I've just got a photo of the area. On the left is a historical photo from the 1950's. You can see actually a little bit of burning activity going on in the foreground. In the north part of the site is where they did a lot of container storage. But in this area back here they did a lot of their burning and/or detonation activities for the munitions. And, of course, this is how the site looks today. So you can see there's a big area here, there's some tidal wetlands and some non-tidal wetlands up here, and then upland here.

There are going to be a number of target cleanup goals proposed for these sites; and it's dependent on several different factors. One is reuse. We have a couple of sites, such as the IR-04 and the DRMO, that are intended for more industrial reuse, whereas the paint waste area and the horse stable area and IR-05 are destined for open space type uses therefore, the risk drivers are different. The ecological risk is predominant for the open space areas, and it varies depending on whether you're talking upland habitat or wetland habitat. And the basis for selecting the cleanup criteria is very conservative, it has a quotient equal to one based on threshold reference values or TRV's. We think it should give a fairly robust cleanup for these sites. There will also be a hazard -- or a human health risk evaluation, which would be either less than ten to the minus five for cancer risk or a cancer quotient of one for non-cancer risk. But typically, the ecological risk drives the cleanup goals because it's lower than human health. So that will likely again be the driver. And there is also a consideration given toward the ambient or background values on Mare Island which, if they are higher than the calculated risk values, the ambient values would be the default cleanup level.

Here's an overview of the H1 containment area. And the predominant placement area is the eastern portion of the site. This entire colored area is going to be completed with an engineered cap. You already know that we've been in the progress of capping the western portion of the site. And for those of you that either live on Mare Island or drives by and sees that work in progress, the plan for later this year is to finish up capping the eastern half of the site. And that is where we want to place this soil before we do that. One of the beneficial reasons for using this soil for this purpose is you can see that kind of the original grade on the eastern part of the site is fairly low because there was a former wetland there. You might also recall that we've created new wetlands to replace the wetlands that were inside the containment area which were impacted by the prior waste disposal activities. So it's basically kind of a bathtub effect. This is kind of an exaggerated scale here. But, nevertheless, you have a big depression that needs to be filled, because as part of the engineered cover, rather than having a bathtub, you need to build kind of a roof over the waste so that any rainfall will drain off the site. And so, therefore, there's this big chunk in the middle that needs to be filled with dirt, either imported dirt from off-site, or in this case we're proposing to move contaminated soil and basically get a two-fer by moving that dirt to the site from these other locations. And here's a transportation route that we're anticipating for these sites. The soil from the five sites will follow the track colored in red around the southern part of the island through the middle levee to the H1 area. The DRMO area is fairly close by, and the paint waste area is fairly close by. Contaminated soil would be transported in off-road trucks like pictured in the upper right. And we may also need to import, from off-site, some import fill to backfill these locations. That would come in trucks like this. In that case, those trucks would follow predominantly Railroad Avenue; make a little jog to try to avoid as much of the inhabited part of the island, if you will, as possible, to try to minimize any impacts when we are accessing IR-04. And for the DRMO they would, of course, just bail off on Walnut and Azuar to get to the DRMO area. So we think that those routes will minimize the potential for any noise or impacts to the folks that are out on the island. So this particular proposed project is on a very fast track.

We're looking to submit draft work plans actually next week. And we're hoping that those can be reviewed, revised as necessary, and reissued and approved by June. And then we'd have a 30 day public review period in July. And that would allow, hopefully, the field work to commence then in the summer and early fall. And then we'd do the site restoration in the fall. So it's -- trying to coordinate with our landfill cap closure is the main reason for the accelerated nature of the project. Again, just to recap, the benefits for performing this work are that it does allow the Navy for an economical and timely disposal option for the soil that exceeds these cleanup criteria. It hopefully

will accelerate site closures by using more conservative cleanup criteria, and allow some of these other areas to get freed up and/or transferred sooner. It does provide the needed fill, as I mentioned, for building this enhanced grade for the landfill cap. It would also reduce the truck traffic on the public streets because all of the soil would be transported via non-public roads. And then finally, for a summary -- you sure you don't want to take this Dave?

MR. GODSEY: You're doing fine.

MR. GEMAR: We're proposing that contaminated soil from five different sites would be excavated, transported to the containment area for placement under the in-progress engineered cap. Of course, confirmation sampling is going to be performed on these excavation areas prior to being backfilled with acceptable clean soil. The accelerated nature of the timing is needed to support the current schedule for completion of the containment area cap this year. So that is what I had for this evening. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. QUIGLEY: Are these five spots here -- Wendell Quigley, RAB member. These five spots that you're taking this contaminated soil from the H1, is that the PWA, this spot that you're showing us here on this map?

MR. GEMAR: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Right?

MR. GEMAR: Right.

MR. QUIGLEY: And my house is right there on top of that.

MR. GEMAR: I think I'm going to start putting Wendell's house on these maps. There's Wendell's house right there. Landscaping looks very nice.

MR. QUIGLEY: Why are we doing this? Why is this contaminated soil -- is it just because they need more, and this would be an easier way for -- a cheaper way, I guess, for the department to get the soil to put on H1?

MR. GEMAR: Well it certainly does have that benefit, Wendell, in terms of the economics. The other thing, as I mentioned, is that we need the soil to build this roof, if you will, over the remaining part of the area that we're going to cap. So if we didn't bring in this contaminated soil, we'd have to bring in some other imported soil from somewhere, either the dredge ponds perhaps, or from off the island. And so it just seemed like it to all the various parties looking at it, that it seemed to be a better use of both money and resources to remove this contaminated soil so that we minimize the footprint of impacted areas on the island. H1 is definitely going to be a fenced area; that's part of the remedy. And so we want to try to limit the amount of areas on the island that would be essentially off limits.

MR. QUIGLEY: What is the timeframe of this when you're going to be starting? Do you know a date? Like on your proposal here you're going to be using Walnut Avenue, which Walnut Avenue is going to be closed for a period of time for inter-structure work?

MR. GEMAR: Actually, Wendell, we're not going to use Walnut. I mean Walnut would only be used coming off Highway 37 up to G Street, but beyond that we're not going to use Walnut. We're going to divert the trucks, if they're bringing fill from off-site, we're going to divert it through Railroad Avenue, through the industrial part of the island. And, of course, the other soil would be diverted to the west. So we're going to stay away from Walnut south of G Street.

MR. QUIGLEY: And my last question is, on these large trucks that they're going to be using, have they, I guess, calibrated what damage they are going to do to the already messed-up roads?

MR. GEMAR: Again, these are all going to be diverted onto all non-public roads, Wendell, so there's kind of a mix of asphalt or dirt roads that we'll be using. But none of these large trucks you see in the upper right will be on the public streets; they'll all be off of the public streets.

MR. KARR: Dwight, in your research for this project, does anyone know where the sandblast debris from the dry docks went to? Where was that disposed? We've got a lot of green sand from the sandblast area, but I know there was a lot when they cleaned the hull of a ship, not only of the green sand, but the anti-foul coatings on the vessel and so forth, where did that go?

MR. GODSEY: David Godsey with the Navy. All the sandblast material of the dry docks was taken to the landfill, the shipyard's landfill at the time. It was never taken to IR-04. All the sandblast material that was found at IR-04 was generated at IR-04. So there is a separation there. That doesn't mean that some of the material that was sandblasted at IR-04 did not have anti-fouling coating. A lot of times we'd bring the nose cone or sonar dome up to IR-04 and sandblast that separately. They did have anti-fouling coatings on it. And then sometimes they were brought up there, they were sandblasted there also. So there's no guarantee that the anti-foul all reached the landfill, it's quite likely that some of it's in IR-04.

MR. KARR: The proposed contaminated soil, how does that equate to the landfill, the soil that you're going to be covering? Is this contaminated soil of a better quality? Less? Are you putting worse material on top of what we already know is bad? How is that translated?

MR. GEMAR: The Navy actually did do a summary table and compared what the high, low, average concentrations are for these sites compared to what is known to be -- to have sampled in H1. The bottom line is it's comparable or actually a little better than what's already in the H1 containment area.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I had three questions, two of them for the Navy, one of them for Weston. Let's start with the first one. In 2002 the City of Vallejo entered into a contract -- well, maybe it will answer the question for me. How are you doing this? How are you contracting with Weston to do this?

MR. GODSEY: Well, our contracting process is that we have established contracts that have four or five firms that have already met all of our contract requirements, and then -- we call it an EMAC, it's an environmental material action contract. And so they've already been pre-approved. Then we actually send out solicitations for bids on a particular type of job. In this case here we described what we wanted to do, and we solicited four proposals. And then we take a look at the proposals when they come in. We generally choose on best value. Not necessarily lowest cost, but on best value to the Navy.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So in 2002 you entered into a contract with the City of Vallejo for \$55 million to basically contain and cap what was the dump. Okay. Now you are changing that contract by importing something into it that you did not enter into a contract with me to do. And your legal people don't have a problem with that?

MR. GODSEY: Well, I won't argue or get into the details of what that ESCA --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You'll be called as a witness, I assure you, in the resulting suit.

MR. GODSEY: I'm pretty certain the details of that ESCA did not specify the nature of the constituents of the fill material that would be used in the subgrade.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't agree with you on that but that's your position, and I have my position too. Second question, you're going to take contaminated soil across the property that belongs to the State of California and the people of California without any authority to do that? How are you going to do that legally?

MR. GEMAR: It sounds like we need a letter from the city.

MR. GODSEY: You're obviously hitting us up with some questions here that, Gil, we're not necessarily prepared to answer at this time.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, I think so. Well, let me go to the third one, and this is going to take Cris because I know Cris was in the meeting. When Weston approached the City of Vallejo about doing this, how did you approach the City of Vallejo about doing this?

MR. JESPERSEN: We actually broached this with you guys about four to six months ago.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And you wanted to do what?

MR. JESPERSEN: We looked at whether or not we needed to modify our insurance coverage that covers for pollution legal liability at that particular site. And after a number of meetings with our legal counsel and our insurance provider, we reached an understanding that importation of this material is covered under our existing insurance policy.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You know, when I went to law school they called that a "Your Honor" question. Well, that's not exactly what I meant. When you approached the City of Vallejo, what you said was you wanted to modify the ESCA. And I said fine, I have no problem with modifying the ESCA as long as I get my cut. I don't see my cut here. I have a lot of problems with this, Mr. Bloom. So make sure you tell your boss that if my boss will back me up -- which will be the first damn time lately -- we have a hard --

MR. JESPERSEN: Gil, it sounds like we need another discussion on this which we'd be happy to do, me and my boss.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't want a discussion; I want to see my cut.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Noted.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I'm going to go back to a more mundane question. I was wondering about your truck route. Here you're going through the PMA area where you supposedly have got that secured now?

MR. GEMAR: Yes.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: How are you going to maintain the security when you've got all these trucks coming through, are you just going to leave the gate open for them or are they going to have to get out and unlock the gate every single time or are you going to have security there?

MR. GEMAR: Actually, Carolyn, the fenced area runs around the road by the cemetery and up the hill by the Navy housing, so the tracks would be running inside the fenced area all the time.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Oh, I see. So then you've actually fenced off that side on the other side of the road so --

MR. GEMAR: Right. They would not have to be having to enter or exit any fences.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Oh, okay.

MR. GEMAR: They would be inside the fence at all times.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Back to Gil's question briefly on the people of California's land. Gil, which part are you talking about?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The dredge box.

MR. GEMAR: He's talking about, we would have to cross, or at least it's proposed to cross the levee here which does, in fact, cross the city of Vallejo's stewardship area for the --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We have more than stewardship, we have that leased. But, of course, we have that leased for development, so it probably isn't fair to say that.

MR. GEMAR: In general, Gil, I would say, at least one answer -- you may not accept it -- but the city does have responsibility to close the landfill. And, of course, Weston is implementing that responsibility for the city. This is a way that will augment the closure of the landfill by providing this fill material. And obviously it also benefits, not only the Navy, but hopefully it would accelerate early transfer eventually to other development entities on the island. So I think that would also benefit the city.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You see, I see it as a modification of a contract and I live by contracts. So I wonder why it wasn't handled the way it was proposed?

MR. GEMAR: Well, again, this is a proposal, Gil; it's not cast in stone yet. So we're happy to have whatever further discussions.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Oh, I thought you said you were in a race here to meet a next month commitment here. I saw it in here. I read it --

MR. GEMAR: And if it's the city's position --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You want to do this fast as you want to get started on the other one.

MR. GEMAR: If it's the city's position, Gil, that we need to look at this from a standpoint of whether it's a modification of the ESCA, we'll be happy to sit down, as Cris mentioned, and talk to you about that. Again our feeling is it's within the scope of the ESCA. But again, if the city has a different opinion, we'll be happy to talk to you about it.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, we'll find out tomorrow.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I also just want to note a reminder, I guess, to all of us present that the Restoration Advisory Board is set up for the Navy, and the other responsible parties have signed onto this format at Mare Island to engage the community in early and often communication about potential environmental cleanup operations at Mare Island. So I don't see this as exactly being too far out there or that you have got everything the way you want it and you're going to plow through it. So I'm interested in hearing this discussion and Gil's questions are good ones. So I am confident you will all work it out.

MR. COFFEY: And let us know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What about -- can you -- you didn't have a map for the IR-04 area where you are taking soils from. Could you go back to that slide?

MR. GEMAR: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I know that on a site visit once that Dave did with us he assured us that you weren't going to be touching the wetlands at this point, that you were leaving that for later. Is that still the case? Can you just point out with the highlighter there what area you are proposing to remove the 20,000 cubic yards from?

MR. GODSEY: Well first remember, this photo was 1980, so there have been some changes in the shoreline, essentially right here. Actually there's a greater amount of exposed shoreline. So the shoreline wetland area -- there is a very clear demarcation between the uplands and the wetlands, though, around this area. So we will come up to that border. The pickleweed, which is one of the issues that we're concerned with because that's habitat for the salt marsh harvest mouse is very sparse almost non-existent. So we intend, as you can see the boundaries of the green sand, our intent is to go and remove it all. In some places it does go down to 16 feet or deeper, and so the 20,000 cubic yards is almost one hundred percent green sand that we're going after. So we want to remove as much as possible. Now, a lot of this green sand goes out into the shallow mud flats, and potentially into some of the deeper portions of IR-04. That's going to be left for another time and that's another project.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Quickly, could you also talk about the paint waste area? You didn't have a map or an aerial photo of that area, and I am just curious to know how detailed you've gotten in terms of the -- I mean, is that behind building 505? Have you ever confirmed that there aren't other types of construction related materials that have contaminant levels in that whole built up area behind 505?

MR. GODSEY: Well, 505 is located approximately right over here, and we're off, say, about a couple hundred yards over in this area, this former dredge pond here. Now, we went behind 505 because there were some debris piles behind that, and we trenched into those and found they were strictly debris, no contamination associated with it. That was done a number of years ago, and we essentially got what we believe will be sufficient to get a NFA around 505, but we'll see when that comes up for the agency's review. At the paint waste site, we went in and we did an aerial photo in infrared to check out the nature of vegetation, and also look for any potential debris piles besides the ones that we had discovered. And then we marked those on the map. And then went out with the GPS and took a look at them on the ground to see what they were. Most of them were these big concrete blocks --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The towers?

MR. GODSEY: Yeah, the towers used to be. And then what we did also in the upland portion, because we were doing the removal action, we noticed also that there was -- the shipyard had disposed of materials in the upland portion joining to the paint site. That's where most of the 8,500 cubic yards is coming out of. There was contamination there of certain metals and pesticides, and we're going to take out as much as we can also at the time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: My next question regards the IR-05 site. Where are you going to be pulling that material from? Will you wait till the seasonal wetlands dry up? Do you have work to do there? What about the tidal area? Are there contaminants there? What's your plan there? You weren't very specific.

MR. GEMAR: I think, Myrna, this area typically will be drier in the summer, of course. There is a channel that basically allows this area to flood over here, and so as part of our work plan

discussions we do need to talk to the regulators about the soil in this area. There are samples that were taken in this area that indicate that the soil exceeds the ecological risk criteria. So in order to excavate this part of the site -- if, in fact, that's the appropriate approach -- we'd have to block off this tidal access and allow that area to dry out as well, and then excavate it, and then most likely would just leave it an elevation that would remain as it is now in terms of being tidal.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Moving onto your slide on the cross-section. How much more -- after you place all of this material, given what -- if Gil gives you the go ahead to pass over our property -- not his property, he tends to use the "I" and we use the "we" in the city here -- how much more will you need to import? Or will you just be pretty much at your roof line?

MR. GEMAR: Since the amount that we'll be bringing in here could vary, we can adjust this grade accordingly. I mean we can raise it or lower it. As long as we have the required slopes for the runoff, the elevation isn't particularly critical. I mean, this is still going to be probably a good fifteen feet, I would say, lower than the existing top of the RCRA landfill that has recently been capped. You're looking at an elevation of about 35 here, and the highest point of the RCRA landfill that was capped last year is about 50.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you'd pick up any additional material you need probably out of the dredge ponds like you have been for the other cap material?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah. And I think we'll have enough to get the grades that we need if this proposed action goes forward.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. My last question is one that's really difficult for me to bring up because I really -- I do support this proposal, I think it makes sense. But, I'm very uncomfortable that Weston and the Navy have brought back a proposal that looks an awful lot like one of our major concerns about these off-road trucks rumbling through this very, very tight area adjacent to the naval ammunition depot, National Register historic district. I don't see anything in your materials here -- maybe it's premature for me to ask for a -- for the public to ask for a work plan -- but in your zest in making sure none of these trucks go on public roads on Mare Island, it looks to me like the Navy -- and this is the Navy nominated National Register property, and it makes up the National Historic Landmark, a Navy nominated process of the National Park Service. It appears to me that the Navy intends to potentially jeopardize that historic site again. I mean this time not under a Weston commercial project that has mitigations built in, but under this project that doesn't appear to have any mitigations. I'm not at all big on bringing those trucks through -- past Touro and past through the neighborhood down Railroad. Railroad has its own historic buildings. However, I'm very uncomfortable with that routing. I'm hoping that you're going to sit down with somebody who has an interest in this property to see what you can do to mitigate the impacts to this area, or if you do intend to do some type of mitigation. Lennar, for example, after a whole bunch of windows that are in the St. Peters Chapel -- that happen to be Tiffany windows -- started cracking at a very accelerated rate, in some cases every two to ten days, Lennar did take some measures that included hiring a geotechnical firm that set up vibration monitors adjacent to the property. They posted large orange signs -- which I'm happy to say was my idea. They tell the operators that they're in a historic district, that they should take some particularly special precautions. And then the third thing that they did was to set up signage that posts that Ghilotti, their contractor, was to maintain a fifteen mile an hour rate through the historic areas. And I imagine that also might apply to the housing areas. I'm just disappointed that all this work has gone into this and, once again, it looks exactly the same as something that we had a problem with three --

what? -- two or three years ago. And I don't want to kill this project at all. I don't want us to have to say anything bad about it, because I, as much as anybody, want to see the landfill capped, and I want to see money spent in a practical way, but what are you planning here? What are you doing with these gigantic trucks? How many truckloads is that? What hours of the day are you going to be operating? What measures have you thought of to reduce the liability there?

MR. GRIBBLE: Dwight, I have another question to build on that. Which buildings are you talking about in the PMA, the really old buildings? Is that the set of buildings you're thinking of?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: (Witness nodded head.)

MR. GRIBBLE: It is.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I mean you're referring to the A1 through A8. And the routing wouldn't go past those buildings. That's good input to know, Myrna, because obviously one of the things we do want to get is input soon into the process. And actually we weren't awarded this work until Monday, so we're still pretty early into the process. But we did want to, you know -- Michael wanted to get this out to the RAB right away, so that's why we're having this meeting today. We've put together the conceptual stuff but obviously we need to work out some details. And what you mentioned is certainly an important one regarding those buildings. The speed is going to be pretty limited in that area anyway because, as you know, it's a pretty tight turn there. So certainly the speed of fifteen miles an hour, which we can certainly post, is going to be about as much as they can do in that area as well. Right now we're looking at having four trucks running back and forth. We think it will take about 40 minutes. So that's probably about six truck trips per hour. So a truck would be going by about every ten minutes. So it's not a very dense traffic, if you will. But certainly there are things that can be done in addition to the speed, and we can lay down some additional soil that would cushion the route. And keep in mind even though these trucks are large, they have very large wheels to lower the ground pressure so that they don't sink. Even though they look very imposing, the amount of vibration that you might get from a truck running by might be a lot smaller than you might expect from a truck. I would think that an over-the-road truck would actually cause more vibration. But nevertheless, that's something that we'll take a look at, Myrna, and make sure that we can mitigate that. I think taking it through the city streets would be problematic as well. I hear what you're saying, so we'll need to take that back and look at it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well I'd like -- I really do trust you and your team. I think you guys are a really professional engineering firm. I really would like to see a little bit more than, well, those big trucks probably don't vibrate as much as you really think they do. That's fill, and there's -- I don't imagine the buildings are going to fall down, but I think there are ways that you could mitigate, and it's my understanding from operators I know that you can do things to mitigate the vibration. And, of course, the very best way to mitigate would be to completely avoid that.

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then I'd also like to know what hours of operation that you were expecting to operate.

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And whether you'd be using nighttime lights and that sort of thing.

MR. GEMAR: No, this would strictly be a daytime operation. Typically, although we would work the crew a ten-hour shift, the earliest that they would typically start hauling would be about 8:00 o'clock in the morning, and they would be done at 5:00 o'clock in the evening.

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah, we will need an engineering analysis to demonstrate that your proposal won't have an impact on those buildings.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. That's understood.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You have on your chart that black line that says off-site transportation is in addition to off the base. You're also going to be taking some stuff off the base?

MR. GEMAR: No, that's actually for soil to backfill some of the holes, Gil, primarily in IR-04.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay.

MR. GEMAR: So it's to bring soil in onto the site.

MR. KARR: I just wanted to comment for the record that the existing condition of Railroad is pretty ugly right now. I went down it last night a couple times, and truck traffic of this kind is not going to help that road condition. Can you make that a part or -- somehow that road is only going to get worse. And somebody has to have ownership for that road, and it's a component of the economic development of that island as well.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, Lennar has ownership if that's your question.

MR. KARR: Well, that's the question. I don't know who has ownership, but the road condition now is brutal, and this truck traffic is going to make it worse.

MR. GEMAR: That's why we were planning to limit it to the IR-04 site in terms of how many trucks would be bringing fill there. So we're going to try to keep that to a bare minimum.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, to follow up on that, I can't imagine that big trucks like the XKT or some of those the manufacturers are pulling in are doing any good things for Railroad, so I'm not sure that we can lay a whole new tarmac on your backs. I agree with Jerry that the historic district at the south end isn't the only part of a historic resource or economic resource. What -- all we have is Railroad right now, and I don't see Lennar probably making that their next area to improve.

MR. GEMAR: And basically we thought Railroad would be the least of the various evils. We didn't want to go along the waterfront, and certainly didn't want to go down Walnut.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or Azuar.

MR. GEMAR: And the new and improved Azuar, so that kind of leaves Walnut or Railroad Avenue as the most viable option.

MR. JESPERSEN: You might also point out that one of the other options was to take all this material to an off-site landfill, which would require an even larger number of truck traffic over the city streets. So that's one additional benefit, we're staying off the roads and we're minimizing what has to come through, and not disturb the rest of the residents on the island.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, not to mention it's been a tradition with the Restoration Advisory Board to encourage you to, as much as possible, not be pulling this contaminated material off the island. I know there's a neighborhood on the island, there are actually a million neighborhoods between here and your hazardous waste disposal site. So to the extent that the material can be creatively used on Mare Island in a contained environment, it is a lot less risk for many, many

communities up and down those highways, not just -- not just the small community that is impacted now with it just sitting there.

MR. QUIGLEY: Will they put out any flyers letting this small group of people who do live on the island, myself concerned, about the dust and stuff that can come off of these when they're dumping them? We do appreciate the water trucks, but there's still a considerable amount of dust, I know, that blows over the island from these. And we have a lot of people on the island with asthma and stuff that this does affect a great deal. So when we have contaminants now airborne because you're moving them around -- and not everyone is in total agreement with her opinion about moving it off the island. I think we need to let everybody know -- but I need to know date and time, so when you start moving early in the morning these people who have severe asthma problems, such as my neighbor who's very elderly, will know not to go outside.

MR. GEMAR: There will be a public review period, Wendell, and some fly sheets will go out to all the residents, not only on the island but in surrounding areas, to indicate what is being proposed and what measures are being taken to avoid problems such as you've mentioned for dust. And there will certainly be dust reduction activities ongoing quite extensively so, yeah, you'll definitely have an opportunity. As the current schedule goes, if it is accepted within the timeframe that's currently proposed, we'd be looking at probably July to start.

MR. GRIBBLE: So this whole timeframe to the details worked out and the whole project approved is very, very limited. We may want to consider having a focus group with RAB members along the way, Dave, and try to solicit more input.

MR. GODSEY: Certainly we'll do that. Yeah, I mean I have no problem with that at all.

MR. GEMAR: And we can present more details at that point.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'd also point out to the Navy that in the past -- and I'm only saying in the past -- that the way that these things like this has been matured is that they -- people start attending the city council meetings and complaining about it and what have you. Since we had nothing to do with this agreement, and we were left out of it, then we probably don't have much to say about it. And as I just mentioned to Wendell, that if -- when the little old lady gets up and says -- or a little young lady gets up there and says, "You're poisoning my babies," the City Council is not going to be able to answer that question.

MR. GEMAR: And there will be continuous air monitoring analytical of any particulates in the air, which is part of our air monitoring plans. So to the extent that someone thought that they might be impacted, I mean we will have the data to support what were the actual conditions.

MR. GODSEY: And also, all this soil and everything that's coming off these sites were driven by ecological risk evaluations, meaning that the level of contaminants generally is not considered to be harmful to humans under normal circumstances such that you would pick up -- you might have a hazard just by breathing this dust. It's more the ecological receptors, the smaller invertebrates and mammals that inhabit this area that are at risk. So that usually means the contaminant levels are really low, but they still need to come off.

MR. GEMAR: Or be capped in place. I mean, that's obviously another alternative, but it's not the preferred alternative most likely. But as David indicated, the ecological risks in most of these cases are what drive the removal of this soil.

MR. QUIGLEY: I have a question for Dwight. I'm really -- I know it's backtracking, but it's bugging me. And this is on the IR-04 photo. This down by the water, exactly how they're going to clean this up, the strait?

MR. GEMAR: Wendell, we're just going to be excavating the upland portion, so we're going to go up to close to the high tide line but not beyond the high tide line into the water. We're not going to go into the water part. So we're just going to be doing the upland part, and then we'll start excavating back towards the roads.

MR. GRIBBLE: I think Wendell's question relates to the remainder of IR-04 which is the shoreline and the offshore part of it that's contaminated.

MR. QUIGLEY: It's all contaminated. I mean how are you going to physically go about cleaning this up?

MR. GEMAR: Well, that part of the work is not incorporated into the current scope; it would have to be addressed later. And that would be basically a dredging type operation where you would take either an onshore or an offshore barge with an excavator and literally dig up those contaminants or those sediments below the water surface, and put them in a scow and bring them to the shoreline.

MR. QUIGLEY: And when you're digging it up, moving it around, releasing it into the strait?

MR. GEMAR: Well, you certainly have to do things like silt barriers, basically floating baffles that hang down into the water. There are things that you can do to avoid spreading it around. But that is certainly a consideration. That is why dredging contaminated sediments is always something that has to be done with a lot of care so you don't spread it around.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's been an issue for many years at that site. The reason it hasn't really been aggressively addressed is maybe there were other things maybe a little more pressing like an oil sump or a landfill adjacent to your neighborhood. But the other problem is do you leave the -- do you contain the area because you've got a wetland growing on it, or do you disturb the wetland and try making matters worse by removing the material versus capping the material in place? So I don't think that issue has been resolved yet.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thanks, Dwight and David. Right now we're going to go into our first public comment period. So do we have any public comment? Okay. I'm going to give the microphone to Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well because I, at least, remembered that it was the 13th anniversary of the Restoration Advisory Board, and I want to note that Paula, Chip and I are the three remaining people who attended as RAB members for that first time on April 14th of 1994. And so I think we've made tremendous progress, and to celebrate I baked a cake. So cake and ice cream on me. (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

III. LENNAR PRESENTATION: *Additional Investigation at Underground Storage Tank Sites.*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right, everyone, let's get back. Thank you for the cake and ice cream. Next we'll have our next presentation, and it's Neal Siler for Lennar. And he's going to do a presentation on their additional investigation at their underground storage tank sites.

MR. SILER: Thank you very much, Michael. And before we start, I do have a disclaimer on my presentation. In no part of this presentation will I be saying anything about the IA-H1 landfill. We're not going to be taking any material from anywhere on the site, taking it out to the IA-H1 landfill, and all of these sites are as far from Wendell Quigley's house as they possibly can be. (LAUGHTER.)

MR. QUIGLEY: Put that in writing.

MR. SILER: That's right.

MR. FARLEY: It is in writing.

MR. SILER: Okay. So this is an update on field activities for some underground storage tank sites that we've been working on, and two of these sites in our investigation area C-2, and that are underground storage tanks 46 and 50, and underground storage tanks 8 and 10. And we're actually going to be doing some additional sampling and analysis in those areas to close some data gaps to see if we can go ahead and close those sites out. Now, the other tanks that I'm going to be talking about are underground storage tanks 231 and 243, and they're in investigation area H2. And I'll show you the map exactly where these sites are. But we're going to be talking about a path forward at those sites. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to talk about the brief history of each of these sites, talk about some of the investigations that we've done to date, talk about the proposed sampling and analysis at the two sites in investigation area C2 and then talk about the path forward for these sites in investigation area H2.

So to start off; let's talk about underground storage tanks 46 and 50. As you can see, they're in the northeastern corner of investigation area C-2. Now, the installation date of these sites -- of these underground storage tanks is unknown. If you look at them, they're actually relatively small underground storage tanks. Underground storage tank 46 is believed to have stored about 130 gallons of gasoline or diesel. Underground storage tank 50 is believed to have stored waste oil, and it's only about a hundred gallons. All of these tanks were removed in 1993. So the next few slides I'm going to show you are just some maps, views of these sites, where they are, and kind of give you an idea of the investigation that has been done around these sites, and I'll talk about the proposed plans. So right here, this is underground storage tanks 46 and 50. You can see where we have soil borings in the area. You can see the excavation area that was performed in 1993. I'll show you some other slides that show you better views of these sites and gives you an idea of the spatial distribution of the investigations that we've done. And what we're planning on doing is actually taking some more soil and groundwater samples in a downgradient direction -- and I'll explain that -- to close out a data gap to see if we can go ahead and close out these sites. So this gives you an idea, if you're on Nimitz Drive and you're looking back toward the west, you can see that these tanks are behind buildings 1346, which is the small building right here; and this is the southern half of building 46 right here. So the next slide will show you where these tanks were located in this little alcove. You can see the 1993 excavation right here. You can see where tank 46 was. Underground storage tank 50 was right there.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You're not going to have to do anything to that little shed building?

MR. SILER: Let's go back.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: On that last slide, that building right there, 1346?

MR. SILER: No, we don't have to do anything with that because we should be able to get in here to do that. I'll show you what we're going to do so you can see that right now. If you go back to the

other slide, you can see where this well right here, is underground storage tank 4650 MW-03. The groundwater flow direction in this area -- and I'll go back to the previous slide from this one -- is kind of variable. It generally trends toward the east, but in some cases it will come down from the northwest, travel to the southeast, go directly east or come up from the southwest and go to the northeast. So this tank -- this site right here is kind of northeast of the underground storage tanks, but it looks like the prevailing downgradient direction of groundwater flow is to the east, it's more over here. So let me show you that on the previous slide so you can see it. You can see how the tank is right here. That well is up to the northeast of it, and it looks like groundwater flow generally goes almost directly east this way. So what we want to do is we want to go back and do some additional sampling directly downgradient of this tank in this area right here. So let me show you that. And that's what we plan on doing right there. And we're actually going to be doing work inside of building 46. So we're going to be going right here to the east and a little bit to the southeast right here, take soil and groundwater samples to see what we have. If we're below the regulatory mandated levels, which would probably be tier one commercial industrial ESL's, or tier two commercial industrial ESL's, then we should be able, or at least we are going to request closure of these underground storage tanks. If not, we'll have to step out and see how far downgradient these impacts have migrated.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So you're just intending to take samples in there, that's all you're going to do?

MR. SILER: That's right. The data so far appears that the concentrations that we've gotten so far after the excavation and after the remedial activities were done are below the tier one ESL's. So what we want to do is we want to close this data gap to make sure that what is believed to be the downgradient direction, to make sure that rings true for that downgradient direction. So that's why we're going off to the east here. And as you can see, these samples, the soil and groundwater samples, they'll be analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons, the free fractions; groundwater, diesel, motor oil. We'll be looking at volatile organic compounds. Because waste oil could have almost anything in it, so we want to make sure that we're going to close that data gap off. Some things that you usually find are chlorinated solvents. And we do have some low hits of chlorinated solvents, but they're all below the tier one ESL's. But we want to make sure and take a look at that downgradient direction to make sure that what our evaluation so far has shown us is true in that downgradient direction. So we'll be looking at SVOC's, PAH's, and some other things too. So that's what we're going to be doing at underground storage tank 46 and 50. Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Those two proposed sampling areas, they look like they're under a building. How are you going to collect those two samples from under a building?

MR. SILER: Well, we have some really limited access equipment we can get inside the building. So we can do it as direct push equipment so it doesn't have a lot of vibration. And actually once we core through the concrete and the floor, it just takes a direct push sample and puts it down. So it's very, very limited access so we can get it inside the building. It doesn't really have much more than maybe an eight to ten foot vertical swing in it, and that building probably is about twenty, thirty feet high, so we should be able to get in there pretty easily. And the fact that it's not really like a drill where you're going to have a lot of intrusive vibration or drilling and stuff like that, it just takes it and pushes it down directly. So it works out pretty well.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Thank you.

MR. SILER: Sure.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you. And Dwight --

MR. SILER: Neal.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, you don't want to be in Dwight's shoes. I just point out that building 46 is the oldest existing building on Mare Island, and that's why all of the sudden everybody -- or at least people who know that -- get real interested real quick.

MR. SILER: Oh, yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The other point is that I, the City of Vallejo, have a lease with you for that building. And if you have to go a step further than those samplings, then I need to give notice. I have a legal requirement to give notice to the sub-lessee on that.

MR. SILER: Certainly.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And so we need to talk if you find anything.

MR. SILER: And what's most likely going to happen here is this would not take place probably earlier. At least if we get out and get this approved from the regulators, probably sometime in June, July we'd be going out in the field, so we do have time to do that.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: How long would you be in there taking samples?

MR. SILER: Oh, we would be -- it would just be a few hours.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Good. Made my day. Just don't find anything. Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: Brian Thompson with the Water Board. Neal, you may want to -- I just got a call today about the plan to try to do the sampling for those USTs soon, like early May.

MR. SILER: That's not my understanding. I think what they want you to do is look at the sampling and analysis plan, of which I think I just got the final copy. They're hoping you can look at it in May so they can get out in the field in June or July. That's my understanding right now. Is that correct, Steve?

MR. FARLEY: I'm not sure that the sampling is proposed for early May.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

MR. THOMPSON: I was told that the field work was scheduled so --

MR. SILER: If that's the case, I'll talk with those people tomorrow; I want to give you enough time to take a look at the stuff. That was the plan for underground storage tanks 46 and 50.

Now we're going to switch to underground storage tank 810. And you can see that is a little bit more to the southwest of underground storage tanks 46 and 50. And this is actually right to the west of building 208, right to the east of building 866. So see where those are? Now, these tanks were discovered during construction in 1992. It appeared that there was a former gas station at this site in the 1930s, but apparently the underground storage tank was not taken care of. You can see this is a much larger tank than the tanks at buildings 46 and 50. You had 130 gallons as the maximum size of the tanks at building 46 and 50, this one is about 10,300 gallons and was believed to contain gasoline; it was removed in 1993. And there are also some fuel oil pipelines -- and I'll show you these in the next slide -- that are located right to the south of it. But the contamination that is associated with these underground storage tanks is not believed to be co-mingled with what we're seeing in the fuel oil pipelines. So there's building 208 here. Here's the area that was

excavated in 1993. The brown points are places where there were soil borings. There were a number of investigations that were done, starting in 1993 with the excavation of the underground storage tanks, doing some additional soil and groundwater sampling, soil borings, downgradient, upgradient, and cross-gradient of the underground tanks. There were some additional borings -- about 28, I think -- that were done to look at the lateral extent of the contamination that was discovered. There's about 39 additional borings that were done along the fuel oil pipelines. And there were also, as you can see, some underground storage tanks that were -- not underground storage tanks, excuse me -- monitoring wells that were put in to monitor any impacts that could be migrating away from those tanks. So there it is in side view. You can see where the excavation was, where the two monitoring wells are located. Building 208 right over here. This is building 382, 386, 388, 390 where XKT is located. If you look back this way back toward the west, that's where 866 is located. So the UST MW-0100 -- which is right down here -- at one point that wasn't thought to be downgradient, but now it's considered to be downgradient directly of the underground storage tank.

We did our last investigation of this tank back around 2002 to 2004, and since that time some of the screening levels have changed. And so what we want to do now is go back, take a look at some additional samples, evaluate them in the context of its current screening levels, and go ahead and see after that point what we have, and see if we can go ahead and get closure at that point. And as you can see, the last time some of these soil and groundwater points were sampled was anywhere from 1993 to 2002. So we want to get a current picture, see what the current conditions are right now, go ahead and evaluate those in the context of the current screening levels, and see if closure -- request for closure is appropriate at this time. So that's what we're planning to do at this underground storage tank site.

The last one I'm going to talk about is underground storage tanks 231, 243. In November I talked about this because we had planned to close out this area probably around 2004 or 2005. We went back, looked at some soil gas information, and found that some of the levels that we were getting were high compared to some of the concentrations we were seeing in soil and groundwater, and that required an additional investigation to delineate that soil gas plume. And it's very important for this area because we plan on developing this area as residential property. So with putting in residences in there, and having volatilization and indoor breathing of the soil gas in the indoor air, it's definitely a health concern and we want to make sure and get this taken care of before we actually start developing this area of the island. So it's kind of weird, I'm talking about underground storage tanks 231 and 243, but when you talk about them in a chronological manner you have to go 243 and then 231, because 243 was the original tank that was put in, and it was put in back in the 1930s. Concerning the gasoline again you can see these were very large tanks, 6,300 gallons. It fed into a service station, an island that was at the south of building 231, in this area. This tank was actually removed in 1992. And when they removed it, it was heavily corroded, there were a lot of holes in the tank, but there weren't any holes that we could see in any of the pipelines that went from the tanks down to the pump station island. Now 231, they were actually installed in 1942 with the idea of increasing the capacity of that gas station there. It was thought to be gasoline again, possibly diesel, and these tanks were taken out of service in 1993 and removed in 1995. And what's interesting is that we didn't see any holes or any signs of corrosion or anything in these tanks.

But if you go back and take a look at some of the soil gas data that we've done, and we've actually done quite a few soil gas points. We've taken soil data and groundwater data. The area of highest

contamination, and as I mentioned back in November, these readings we're getting are just incredibly high. When we first did this probably in -- was it 2004 or 2005 I think we did something? We were getting total hydrocarbons of gasoline in the soil gas around 31 million micrograms per cubic meter of air. When we went back and did this investigation, which was late last year, we're getting even higher readings. We're getting like 54 million micrograms per cubic meter of air. So that concentration -- although, remember I said these tanks down 231, which are in this area right in here, this is the pump station right here, this is 243 up in this area -- these tanks were heavily corroded, but we're not seeing really a lot of appreciable contamination in that area. The tanks down in 231 that we didn't see a lot of corrosion or any holes in the tanks, that's where the major portion of the soil gas contamination that we're seeing is in this area down here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Neal, I have a comment for you.

MR. SILER: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You've got lots of information on your presentation here, and you just -- I actually was going to ask you what the soil gas levels were. It would be really helpful if -- and I know I've said this about probably 146 or 147 times -- but it would be really helpful if, when you're doing a presentation like this, if you can weave in, besides the history and when it got started and how many gallons it is, is if you could add on these soil gas levels onto your presentation.

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You know, just so that it's here next time I try to go through it.

MR. SILER: The reason I didn't do that this time is because you go back to that November 30th RAB meeting, it's all in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, sure --

MR. SILER: But I --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- but I doubt I'm going to be able to find that. So it would be helpful if you'd just add that slide back in --

MR. SILER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- in the future.

MR. SILER: Okay. Just moving back up again, you can see we collected soil gas, soil, and groundwater samples back in the fall of 2006. The results of that sampling indicated that we were able to bound the soil gas, and that's what this red line is right here, that's a non-detect line of the soil gas. So we were able to bound that area of soil gas to the east, to the south, and to the west. Now, the investigation that is being planned here is actually one that wants to look into what all the remedial activities that we're going to be looking at in the future. Now, one of the things we're going to have to do is start looking to the northeast -- I'm getting ahead of myself here. We're going to have to look to the north area here because we need to bound this to the north also. But we also want to look in this area where we're seeing these very, very high readings, and we want to go ahead and see using some UVOST -- and I talked about that, I think, in January or February, which is the ultraviolet optical screening tool. And that's the thing that we turned upside down because we could when you're looking at the data. But we're going to go back in there and take a look at that to see if we could see if this is one large area of contamination, whether it's small pockets that we have to deal with, whether those pockets are -- all the contamination is located in

one central area, if it's emanating through the cracks, emanating out in different directions. We want to get a real good idea of that so that we can design the appropriate remedial action for it. So this investigation is going to be focusing on the source of the soil gas and the source -- I mean just what media it's in, it's either in unsaturated soil, saturated soil, or the groundwater. We want to see if it's in all three or in just the saturated column, the unsaturated column, or just the groundwater. And again, like I said, we want to see if it's one large mass, if it's a number of small masses, if it's going out into cracks, and if there's tentacles going out. So we're hoping to have a sampling analysis plan that we would prepare in May. And then with that we probably want to be able to go ahead and go out in the field and look at this probably again in the late spring, early summer. So that's the extent of my presentation. Anybody have any questions?

MR. GRIBBLE: It looks like in the proposed sampling that you've got VOCs and SVOC's, and it looks like as far as that goes you're addressing the uncertainty of the tank history, tank usage history with that broader sampling suite. But I didn't see anything about metals in any of the analyses or in the sampling plans.

MR. SILER: Yeah. And the information that I saw I think we have to take a look at that. And I don't know if you have anything you want to add? I don't remember that metals were an issue, but I have to go back and take a look at the data. But it's definitely one thing I had a question on also.

MR. GRIBBLE: In my mind metals is an issue until it's shown otherwise, because of the question regarding sandblast grit being used as a backfill material. And in most of the tank pool cases, the boring logs in the tank pool files didn't make any mention or didn't note -- it was silent on the issue of sandblast grit as a backfill material. And so what we have maintained for some time is that we need metals data as well to some -- that to be addressed in your sampling and analysis.

MR. SILER: Okay. And actually this sampling scheme was presented to both DTSC, to our project managers for DTSC and the regional board on February 26th, and they seemed to have accepted this sampling scheme. But we'll go ahead and go back and take a look at metals.

MR. THOMPSON: So I have the sampling analysis plan in my queue to review, the presentation I was given is kind of an oral and focused more on the -- in terms of covering the extent. And so I'll definitely take a look and see if that's -- if we need to add those.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I have a couple of questions.

MR. SILER: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mentioned, Neal that you're going to be trying to determine the extent that the soil gases go into that area. Why would you be requesting a closure letter for 243 if you haven't gone over into B.2-2 on that north side -- it looks like the north side?

MR. SILER: I think the closure letter -- what we've seen so far is that we're not seeing appreciable amounts of contamination there, we're getting ahead of ourselves. If the data that we see as we go up into the north seemed to corroborate that, then we'll go ahead and send that letter in for the closure for the UST 243.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then I got a document -- and I don't remember what the name of the document was, but I was taking a look at it -- where you were carving out or proposing to carve out of H2 this area so that you could ready it for transfer.

MR. SILER: Closure?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For closure. And then I assumed that you would go forward with -- I believe you're planning, Lennar's planning a residential development?

MR. SILER: That's right. And let me tell you what the current thinking of that is right now. Okay? And although this could change in the future, right now we are not planning on carving anything in H2 out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that document I received is bogus?

MR. SILER: Not bogus, but it's one thing that we potentially may carve something out. It's going to depend on exactly what it takes to go ahead and clean this area up. If it's going to take a longer time to clean this area up, and we get to a point where we need to carve it out, then we might do that at that point. But at this time we are not planning to officially submit a document or anything to regulatory agencies -- although DTSC has got a copy of this document -- we are not planning on carving this document out for the remainder of H2.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll have to take a look.

MR. SILER: Although that may change in the future.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll have to take a look at that document I received.

MR. SILER: It does say that it requests that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh.

MR. SILER: But we've gone back and taken a look at that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You've changed your mind.

MR. SILER: And we have no plans at this time to go ahead and carve that out.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that partly just because of timing on -- I mean I imagine you're still just driving your environmental cleanup regardless of what the housing market is at. Does that have anything to do with the --

MR. SILER: That is part of it. That is part of it. That's definitely one consideration we have considering what the housing market is.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're not in quite such a rush to --

MR. SILER: That's exactly right. Plus the fact that if we were to carve this out, this area out, and we have this soil gas issue in there -- and let's say we start doing it and go ahead and developing outside that area, to be able to give an idea of how this soil gas plume is moving, we're going to have to monitor it to make sure that it's not moving and getting out into those areas. And if we were going to put properties in, it could well be that to be able to get properties up to the line -- and it's kind of interesting here because this yellow line is a buffer that -- this is what we're seeing right now, but if this starts moving out, then that's why you see the yellow line. That would be the carve out area if we're going to do that, because that gives us some buffer --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I understand.

MR. SILER: So we'd have to have monitoring in here to make sure that this plume is not moving out toward these areas. And then if it came down to the fact that, let's say, it was getting close, and let's say that we have to put in vapor barriers into the foundations of some of the residential areas right here, we don't want to do that, we want to clean it up first and, so we don't have to do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Especially when you don't have any clue what the source is on those numbers that are so high.

MR. SILER: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, that answers that. Because I've been interested in how you were going to go about that.

MR. SILER: Okay. Anybody else have any questions? Well, I appreciate Dwight and Dave Godsey going first and taking all the heat tonight and taking it off me. So thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you stick around; we could get a fire going again.

MR. SILER: I'm sure. I'm sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thanks.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll move onto our administrative business. And I would just say if anybody has any comments to the meeting minutes from March, please get them to myself or Myrna.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And with that we'll move into our focus group reports.

a) Community

The community is still vacant. Yes, Wendell.

MR. QUIGLEY: I was asking about that. Could I move into the position? What would that entail?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think we just add the nomination to the agenda or whatever, put your name in the hat. But just add it to the agenda and then put it up for a vote. We'll make sure there's not somebody else lurking out there who would like to compete with you on that one. But we'll just add the vote to the agenda.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that would be of the community members.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: So we'll put it on the agenda for next month. Thank you, Wendell. With that, Natural Resources, Jerry.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

MR. KARR: Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Paula, technical.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is this on? Nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Gil, city.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I have one question so that I understand this next month. My understanding of the final rules, the RAB final rules is that at least I -- and I only looked at me as a

non-voting member for such a thing -- and, therefore, I would not be voting on that; right? I just wanted to make sure that's also your understanding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's right.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay. And I have no objections to Wendell doing whatever he wants; I just wanted to understand what I was supposed to do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's why I said it was the community members only. And in our particular charter we didn't -- we chose at the time, and you could always bring this back to the group, but we chose to not have the city considered a member of the -- one of the community representatives.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I think that's a better idea.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. So our charter just gives you -- you're off the hook.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Good. And the city council has no environmental issues pending before it that I know of.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. And with that we'll go to Lennar's update. Steve.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

MR. FARLEY: Thank you. A couple of handouts as normal including an eleven by seventeen handout of the map, and the documents schedule. Get one over here before you leave if you haven't grabbed one already. Let's focus on the lower left-hand corner of the documents in review. There are a couple of notifications. These are documents that we submit to -- notifications technically go to the U.S. EPA for work that we're planning on doing on a couple of PCB sites, so those are listed there in the environmental site closure status. It appears the status of the closures that we've achieved so far for the PCB sites, UST sites and the FOPL segments, fuel oil pipeline segments. In the milestones category, we just completed the second round of our quarterly groundwater monitoring for 2007. The photographs on the left-hand side of the image show a couple of the PCB sites that we're working at. One shows the example of the wood block flooring which was pretty common in the buildings. I don't know how much folks have seen those, but wood block flooring is very common. It shows how we are removing some of that flooring. The bottom photo shows some work that we're doing inside building 637, which we've been working on for some time now. In the upper right-hand corner there's three photos, they're very different, but I wanted to put them together to emphasize something, and that is safety. You can see the piece of equipment working amongst some very, very tight quarters, some existing -- looks like milling machines or lathes. And the gentleman in the white suit with the tank on the back is in supplied air in one of the buildings. It's rather uncommon for us to have to go to supplied air. But what happened is we encountered some liquid mercury in one of the buildings underneath some wood block flooring, and that raises a whole different level of health and safety concern for our workers. The other one is the spider that's sitting there. Sometimes it's easy to forget how dark and dank some corner of these buildings that aren't occupied very much can be. And these are just some of the examples of some of the health and safety things that we have to deal with on a regular basis. And then if you look at the body of the map you'll see a number of light blue circles. Those represent a number of the PCB sites that we're currently working at, and we are pushing very hard on the PCB sites. So that's all I have for this month. Any questions? Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, on your document schedule, what's the -- I'm sorry I haven't reviewed this document, IA-B.2 regional land use covenant? Is that for PCB sites like the next one or is -- what is that?

MR. FARLEY: I'm sorry, where are you reading?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On your deliverables schedule.

MR. FARLEY: Oh, I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sorry. And I can't figure out from your map where B.2 is.

MR. FARLEY: You know, that's a good point, we should probably update that. B.2 -- well, let's look at it this way. B-1 is the crane test area, and B.2 is the rest of B. So I'll make that change.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the crane test area is that sort of tan area?

MR. FARLEY: It's the little finger.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's the little jog out?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. So B.2 you're looking at -- what's a regional land use covenant?

MR. FARLEY: When we finish the remediation at sites, if they don't achieve unrestricted use, for example, if they're based on a future land use of an industrial type use, then there are covenants that have to be written to go with that land so that anytime the land is transferred those covenants control what kinds of activities can and cannot occur on that property.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah, but I don't know what a regional land use covenant is. I mean it's for the entire area B?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. It would be -- it would be the covenants that would go with all of IA-B.2, for example, that would say, for example, no residential use within IA-B. And then a specific land use covenant might be necessary for a particular PCB site for a particular lead site. Neal might -- it looks like Neal wants to add a few things.

MR. SILER: Just the regional covenant, because we're cleaning up to commercial industrial standards in that area and not to residential standards, because the commercial industrial is the highest and best proposed use for that area, when we do that, that requires a land use covenant that restricts sensitive uses in that area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. SILER: And those sensitive uses are residences, hospitals, schools, and daycare centers, anything under eighteen. It would cover that entire area that's closed out that way, except for the areas that we're closing out as residential areas. There's a few of those in there now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In B.2.?

MR. SILER: In B.2. And the only other potential LUC that would be in that area is for one PCB site, building 455. But I'm looking right now into seeing if I can actually remediate that area so that we would not have a land use covenant on that PCB site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. But regional land use has a different connotation to some of us than it sounds like you're applying in this case. Regional to you is just B.2.?

MR. SILER: Yeah. I think what we're saying is just over that -- it's the commercial industrial region of investigation area B.2.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. SILER: And that's the region.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because we get into city planning when we're talking regional land use normally. So it's just an odd use of the word.

MR. GRIBBLE: Steve, I have a few questions. In the picture with the wood block flooring, the removal of the wood block flooring in several buildings, can you give me the numbers -- the building numbers that you're doing that in?

MR. FARLEY: I can't give it to you tonight, but I can -- because there's a whole bunch of them.

MR. GRIBBLE: Really?

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: Because I've been involved in it so long, and I wonder if, also as you take them up are you doing any photographic records of the floor -- of the subfloor condition? It was always a question as to whether those floors were continuous in all cases, of whether the concrete was intact or did it -- had it maintained its integrity or were there cracks and crevices where PCBs and stuff could have gone down into the subsurface.

MR. FARLEY: Well, we inspect the floor underneath, and usually we collect confirmation samples underneath. I'm not sure we do a specific photographic record. If you're taking pictures to show that the condition of the concrete subfloor or whatever kind of subfloor you have --

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: We routinely take photographs. I mean, just as an example, the photograph you see here in the handout. But if there's something specific you'd like to see us do, I'd be happy to talk with you about it and make sure we accommodate you.

MR. GRIBBLE: Just out of curiosity mostly. I mean that's probably not -- maybe I'll call you and set something up on the phone.

MR. FARLEY: Okay.

MR. GRIBBLE: And then just a few comments about your pictures. There's a number of health and safety kind of dangers in these, like you got a hole in the floor, you should fill that in; and you got the tape on the floor, somebody could trip over that; and all those wooden blocks on the floor, you should probably sweep those up too. And that's --

MR. FARLEY: Just for the record, since it's not going to come across as tongue in cheek, I'm assuming, we very rigorously comply with our health and safety documentation and plans.

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah, that's tongue in cheek.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Cris.

f) Weston Update (Chris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks. Everyone should have a copy of our handout. I'll begin with the status of a variety of documents we have at the regulatory agency. Why don't you read those at your

leisure? We're continuing to excavate hot spot soil and move it inside the containment area in area H1. Once we excavate the contaminated soil we are taking confirmation samples, and if contamination levels are still above action levels, we'll either go ahead and either dig down deeper or step out laterally until we reach the action levels. And right now we're looking at having to move about 50,000 cubic yards of soil outside of H1 inside the containment area. And once we confirm that's all the contamination in these hotspots, we will backfill them. We continue work in installation restoration area five down in the southern end of the island. We've looked at 2,500 anomalies that we selected from a prior geophysical survey, and we're investigating those by excavating them. You can see that we found 196 live munitions items, and about 1,900 inert munitions debris items in the areas excavated. No RAD buttons as we found sometimes in other areas. And just about all of the munitions items in 191 to 196 were found in two disposal pits near the northwest and northeast corners of IR-05. And there you can see a variety of items we've found. And right now we're currently planning to wrap up the anomaly excavation, if I can say that, at IR-05 in the early part of May. And in addition to the big anomalies out in the open areas, we continue to investigate certain areas below the magazine buildings out there. And right now we've looked under ten of the magazines, looked at over a thousand anomalies, and found no MEC or RAD items, and we still have three additional buildings to look under. And our UXO techs really love to do that type of work on their knees.

Finally, an update on the early transfer remaining EDC parcels. The city of Vallejo selected Weston early in the year to lead the early transfer process for the remaining parcels. We had a kick-off meeting in March, the 20th, with Lennar, representatives of Touro, Weston, and the city. Since then we've been having weekly technical discussions via phone. And actually last week we had a nice meeting with the State Lands Commission to discuss some additional issues with them. And we've got a follow on meeting with the regulatory agencies next Tuesday. So I think we're starting to make good progress and reengage the various parties, and we're looking forward to wrapping that transaction up, hopefully by the very early part of 2008.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Cris. Next is the regulatory update, Chip.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble/Carolyn D'Almeida/Brian Thompson)

MR. GRIBBLE: We've been working with the Navy and Weston to update our overall project schedules. We've spent time with Weston reviewing hot spot confirmation -- confirmation data, and for the excavation of hot spots in H1. We've been working on preparing for this early transfer, and also working to get this consolidation removal action going. And we're also -- after fifteen years, we finally are getting our files in order in a real way. And there's also an effort underway to upload a lot of these past documents to an electronic database which is supposed to be available to the public. If you went to that website now -- if you knew how to, I'm not sure I could tell you how to do that. But if you were savvy enough to know to do that, you wouldn't find very much for Mare Island. But some of the sites that the department works on have virtually the entire file on an electronic -- in an electronic database that's available to the public. For these big military sites where you have these huge files that extend back for fifteen years or more, it's a bigger challenge. We finally have some support to help me, in particular, to get the Mare Island file uploaded. At some point when I get far enough along it might be -- you might be interested and maybe we could do a demonstration on how people can work their way around and access that kind of database. You know, maybe that would be in a few years, a few months in the future it might be better than now when we'll have more stuff uploaded.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Is that GeoTracker or is that --

MR. GRIBBLE: It's Envirostar.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks. Brian, Water Board.

MR. THOMPSON: Let's see. In the last month we issued, for the Navy owned portions of Mare Island we issued a letter related to the expanded site investigation in the building 742, former degreasing building area of investigation area C-2. I'm currently reviewing a number of underground storage tank sites and kind of getting updated on the status of these sites; I think to move some of these sites forward towards closure. Linda Rao has been reviewing the post closure plan for the landfill. For Lennar Mare Island I've provided comments on the land use covenant and operation and maintenance plan for investigation area B on technical memos requesting subdivisions of investigation areas B.2 and H2. Additionally I've provided comments on -- a letter discussing a risk -- a tier two risk assessment screening levels for petroleum hydrocarbon sites. And I'm currently reviewing the sampling and analysis plans for USTs 8, 10, 46, and 50 which were discussed tonight. That's it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Brian. Carolyn was here, but she left.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: That brings us to our Co-Chairs report. For the Navy we've been continuing our backfilling at the DRMO site. And again, once that's completed we will issue a summary report. There are some pretty pictures on the handout. Brian mentioned the comments that he submitted to us on the building 742 site. And we issued two documents last month. One was the FOST for the northern sliver site, and then a PCB data gap sampling report for the F1 area. We are continuing on with the early transfer discussions, as Cris mentioned. And that's about it. And Myrna has nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: So we'll move on to our second public comment period. Is there any public comment? If not, we will adjourn. See everybody on the 31st of May.

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Mare Island Sites Time Critical Removal Action– Navy
- Presentation Handout – Update on Field Activities for USTs in the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel Lennar Mare Island – Lennar Mare Island
- CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island Deliverables Schedule April 2007
- Mare Island RAB Update April 2007 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard April 2007

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:20 p.m.)