



# **DRAFT MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes**

**HELD THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2009**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, March 26, 2009 at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:10 p.m. and adjourned at 9:16 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 R. Coffey
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Randa Chichakli (CDM)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Joshua Bernardo (Solano County)
- Paisha Jorgensen (Water Board)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

## **Community Guests in attendance:**

- Ally Farley
- James Pollock
- Jim Porterfield
- Lester Rich
- Bill Stephens

## **RAB Support from CDM:**

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

## **I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**CO-CHAIR BLOOM:** Welcome everybody to the March, 2009 Mare Island RAB meeting. We'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the Navy Co-Chair and the BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

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

MS. TYGIELSKI: My name is Paula Tygielski; I'm from Benicia, California.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth representing the City of Vallejo.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2MHill.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island.

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

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chip Gribble with California EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. JORGENSEN: Paisha Jorgensen with the Water Board.

MR. RICH: Les Rich with the Historic Ships Memorial in Pacific Square, Battleship Iowa Project.

MS. CHICHAKLI: I am Randa Chichakli with CDM.

MS. MOORE: Carolyn Moore with CDM.

MR. POLLOCK: I'm James Pollock with Historic Ships.

MR. BERNARDO: Josh Bernardo, Solano County Haz Mat.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston Mare Island.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island.

MS. FARLEY: Allison Farley with Steve Farley.

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

**II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Mare Island Community Involvement Plan Update*  
Presentation by Mr. Michael Bloom, Navy Co-Chair and  
Ms. Randa Chichakli, CDM**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll get started on the first presentation. It will be given by yours truly, and also Ms. Randa Chichakli with CDM will do a little portion. I'm going to talk about the Mare Island Community Involvement Plan, and talk about the update that we're going to be doing to it.

The Navy's awarded a contract a few months ago to update the Community Involvement Plan. Actually it has been called the community relations plan, some of you or most of you may know that document -- and actually I have a copy if anybody wanted to see it, but it's about this big, the current one. And the name change -- EPA came out with new terminology, and rather than calling it a community relations plan, it's now called a Community Involvement Plan or CIP.

So the purpose of the CIP is to ensure that the local community has input into decisions about cleanup actions conducted here on Mare Island under the Navy's Installation Restoration program, or IR program. The original community relations plan was prepared in 1994 and then the last update was done in August of 2001, the one I have here. So we are this year going to update it again, in 2009. It will now be called the Community Involvement Plan. So this slide shows the components of the Community Involvement Plan. Or really when it was done in 2001, the last update, what the main components of community relations or community

involvement came up and, during interviews and surveys, etcetera. And obviously the one on top was maintaining the Restoration Advisory Board or RAB. Posting public notices in local newspapers. Maintaining the community mailing list, which we do. In addition, maintaining the Information Repository at the library. Providing status updates on the IR program or environmental program through various fact sheets and press releases in the newspaper. And performing site tours, workshops, and different presentations.

So for this year, the goals really for the 2009 update are to enhance community involvement even more. Pulse the community, since it's been since 2001 officially since we did it last time, to hear what they have to say about what they think about the environmental program. Gather ideas and suggestions to improve the communications and outreach. Then obviously all that will go into the new plan and to help us implement whatever we hear. And solicit community input. The way to do that is through either questionnaires or interviews or other means. Those are two that we just put up there for now that we've been thinking about. So I wanted to come and present this to the RAB. Pretty much I mentioned it, I believe, one or two RAB's ago as we just started kicking off the contract. But I kind of wanted to bring it up so we can just get early communication so we can really get this thing, when it's finalized, how we want it. And one way to do that is to get a RAB focus group together where we can start discussing these items. And you'll see in a minute actually all three of these bullets, but the questionnaire -- which will be done by mail -- is one option to try to pulse the community. Another way is online. There are a lot of surveys out there now done with the technology that are just online -- almost everybody has a computer, not everybody, but almost everybody. And so that's another way to do it. And also conducting community interviews as well. So what I wanted to do is we've put together an example of a questionnaire just to have you guys look at it and see it. And I'm going to turn it over to Randa to walk through that.

MS. CHICHAKLI: Okay. So, as Michael said, we've come up with some ideas for your consideration. These are questionnaires, draft questionnaires, to get you all thinking about what kind of things you could put out to the community.

Again, we're looking at two -- Michael and I have talked about two different main kinds of ideas for you guys to start talking about. One is, of course, by mail. And this questionnaire example is one that we could, for example, send out to your mailing list and to get feedback. So what it shows is kind of an intro, "You can make a difference in the Mare Island Community Involvement Program." It gives you a little history about what goes on at Mare Island, what the RAB is. And then gets some general information about the person that's filling out the questionnaire. Are they residents? How long have they been in the area? Do they work there? Are you familiar with anything that's been going on so far under the program? And then tries to get some information about what they're concerned about, what are the main things that the community wants to hear about. And what level of involvement they've already been at. Have they been to RAB meetings? Have they attended public meetings? This gets a little bit of -- we're trying to gather information about the community, but also what has been effective in the past so that if some of the efforts that the RAB or the Navy has been spending time and money on are not working, then let's change.

This is the opportunity to change this and come up with a new way or a different way to gather their input. And obviously the RAB is a huge part of community involvement at Mare Island, so we ask a lot of questions about that. Have you attended meetings? Do you have any suggestions on ways to encourage people to participate in the RAB? How do you want to be communicated

with? Do you get enough information right now? Do you want more? Do you want less? What kind of details do you want? Do you want more? Do you want less? And then some of the other things, you know, how frequently do you want information? What newspapers are the best ways to get information to you? Currently right now all of your RAB announcements go out in these five newspapers, so are these the best ones? Does anybody read these? Are there other ones that people are reading that we should be doing instead? Can we cut down the amount of newspapers? You know, these are all the kinds of things that are up for discussion in the Community Involvement Plan update.

And then, of course, with a mail in questionnaire the object would be that we'd send them to people's homes, and they'd return them to the Navy, and that information would go then into the update. One of the things is there's a question on here also is, "Would you be interested in being interviewed for the Community Involvement Plan update?" So typically questionnaires and interviews are conducted for a Community Involvement Plan at the initial creation, the interviews were conducted for Mare Island, so the question would be whether you all would want to do interviews again for this update. Now, the other way to do this, which we have done, we, CDM, have done for different governing agencies is -- I need to zoom this one, can you show me how? Oh, here we go. This is an example of an online -- I didn't have wireless Internet here so I have to do screen shots for you. I don't know if you're familiar with Survey Monkey, but these are just online services you would use.

We set up a survey, send out the URL, people would type it in, and obviously you get a lot of information very quickly. And the object of doing it online is we get to get a greater audience and to get more participation because it is easier. This is one that we did in Nebraska. Same kind of questions: Who are you? First of all, do you live here? Do you work here? Why are you involved? How are you involved and how would you like to be involved? What's the best way to get in touch with you? We can ask these questions about just check the box. There's also -- we can set these up -- I know there's another screen shot on here somewhere -- there it is. This one, these kind of questions, you can do on the survey as well, rank what's your preferable way of having information sent to you? And then obviously we can get additional information. People can add in their comments so we can make sure to capture all of the opinions that people have about the update.

I think one of the biggest challenges about doing an online survey and getting information that way is getting the word out that there is an online survey. So the ideas to do that would be to issue a notice in the newspaper saying an online survey will be available this day to this day, here's the URL. Sending out in your RAB announcements a flyer, just a tear sheet in your envelopes saying go to this website. Sending out a post card mailing advertising it again. Putting up flyers at your Information Repository. Things like that. So those are options we've come up, and they are up for your discussion.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. So the schedule to do the update of the Community Involvement Plan, the first thing we'd like to do is develop a RAB focus group to kind of discuss all these items that we've brought forth today, and maybe others when we meet sometime next month in April, if possible. And then we gather community input, probably a month to two months, maybe even longer. And then once we do that we would put all the information together and issue the Draft Community Involvement Plan. Obviously put it out for comment, and then we would finalize it. In between this time we would most likely come back to the RAB once, it's a draft, and talk about it and walk through it, and either gather comments that way as well before

it's finalized. So that was the presentation. Any questions at all on what we'd like to do or on the Community Involvement Plan? Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: You're having a public meeting on April 16th for the IR 17 project, maybe that might be a good night to have the focus meeting on after the public meeting.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: You guys will be in town.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Right.

MR. GRIBBLE: It will probably be early enough.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Right. It's an option. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I gotta say that in eight years since you did the last one I have not seen a great deal of sophistication applied to this project, or I don't have any sense that it's anywhere in the spirit of the Restoration Advisory Board. So I don't know, maybe I'm just in a grumpy mood tonight or Venus is in retrograde or something. But I just -- I'm disappointed in this whole machination that you've just described. You've done a lot of advance work without reviewing it with us ahead of time at all. You must have put a ton of staff time in already.

And, I mean, the Navy's been attempting to clean this property up since '92, '93, sometime like that, and lots of things have been happening over the course of those many, many, many years. And I just am not clear -- I don't think I probably missed a whole lot coming slightly late, I apologize -- regarding what the purpose is of this Community Involvement Plan. I mean I just have no idea that the Secretary of Defense, you know, commissions you to go out and find out what we're all thinking about, you know, digging dirt. So who invents these things besides contractors looking for some extra dollars? And who does anything with the darn information that you supposedly gather? And from the most obscure sorts of places. I mean, the place that in our town information exchange takes place, silly as it might seem, is the darn city council meeting. I don't see anything on the list about do you go to the city council meetings to learn about the environmental cleanup? No, because it never gets talked about there because it's not fashionable to talk about environmental cleanup for our city's future.

I don't see anything about the farmers market, and that's been one of the most effective places that those of us who have, you know, sent Bechtel and Shell off to torment somebody else have used or, you know other good projects that are going on in the city, you know, the efforts of the Iowa people. They attend the farmers market every weekend. So -- and we do have a year-round Saturday farmers market. I don't think probably the Navy's ever gone to the farmers market or even knows where it is, or the Wednesday night things or something like that. So listing off the things that you've tried in the past, like the Flyway Festival, I'm happy that a bunch of us continue to put it together that gives the Navy the once a time a year venue to interact with the people, I'm glad about that. But I guess I'm just really questioning what on earth is really the purpose of this whole thing? And is it just like -- is there a much better use? I mean, you say that everybody in Vallejo has a computer. Well, Bechtel and Shell, and this was in 2003, not ninety years ago, their analysis was that there were only 20 percent of the people in this town have a computer.

So how do you -- what analysis did you use to do your front-end work that you've presented to us tonight, and who did you do pre-interviews with, you didn't with me, or Paula or maybe

Wendell, I don't know. Paula, did they call you? Michael, did they call you? To find out, to even put together these draft things. I mean I'm not just trying to bake you all, you know, on a barbecue, but I'm just -- I'm totally at a loss to find out what the purpose of this is and, you know, whether it's just going through some motions to get this off the list of things to do to send back to D.C. or Pentagon and get CDM some extra cash in their pocket.

Who cares in this town about digging dirt at Mare Island? I mean, do we have chemicals flowing in mothers' breast milk? Do we have it in our drinking water? Is it in our air, the effects of the Navy's clean, you know, contamination over the years? Has it stopped our economic progress? Is it the reason Touro pulled out? Is it the reason Lennar went bankrupt? Is it the reason the city went bankrupt? What is the compelling reason that you really want to know about what we think or what we know about dirt digging at Mare Island? You know. And help me, or else don't, it doesn't matter. I mean it just seems like we probably should have done a community focus group meeting, or maybe not, maybe it just doesn't matter --

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, it does matter.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- anymore.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It does matter; I mean that's the -- whole.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To who?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It does matter, that's the whole reason I am -- we are here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To who? That's what I'm curious about.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I think it would matter to everybody, at least that's my thought, I think it would matter to everybody. And --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I thought so too about fifteen years ago, but now I don't know. How do you know that?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I don't know that, I mean that's my opinion. So I mean, that's my opinion. But the reason we are doing this is to pulse the community, I guess maybe to find that out, but also to come up with ideas, if the community has it, where they feel like they could become more involved or stay involved or get involved with the environmental program here. I'm going to try to answer most of your questions or all of them. First of all, the front end putting the stuff together, etcetera, that was done by me and Randa and a few other people in our office trying to come up with something first that we could present so we could have a discussion.

So the ideas are the questionnaire, the longer questionnaire, whether we want it to go out by mail, an online questionnaire with computers, if people have them. Again, talking about the computers, it was my opinion that most people do have a computer, but I could be wrong, so that was me. And so it was just some ideas to get the discussion going. Obviously -- and we had talked before, Myrna, we do want to have a RAB focus group to talk about all those things. So it was just to have something put forth for people to look at and talk about. And maybe not everybody likes those. Maybe not everybody likes the ways in which we try to pulse the community. But we are open to hear anything and to try anything.

The farmers market, like you said, if that's a place that folks go and have discussions about what's going on on Mare Island and the city, maybe that's someplace we do need to focus on and go to. I didn't know about the farmers market; okay? So those are things that we can talk about.

But I felt it was important to put something together so that people could look at it and we could have a discussion. And I thought we would have some of it here, but a lot of it when we're developing this to then move forward to update the plan. I don't know if I've answered.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I guess I'm just not clear what the Navy does with the plan, you know. Plans, they sit on shelves, they get imploded and exploded, around here anyway. They mean nothing in most cases as far as I can tell. But it -- really truly in the Navy's -- what is your track record with using a Community Involvement Plan? What does your research data show you about online survey data? How many people respond? How many people give you information that drives your ship, that changes its course and sends it to Hawaii instead of Japan? What are you telling me? I guess I think that this seems like a little bit of an exercise in blowing smoke up our skirts because I don't hear anything about in the last eight years we've done this and this and this, and this is what's been most effective. We have a website but we never talk about it. And we don't know whether it's been effective and what kinds of responses you've gotten from it, partly because the website has to be promoted, promoted, promoted, and I don't get the sense that our website is promoted.

So, I mean -- I don't mean to just waste the whole evening ranting, but I'm at that point where I don't see any statistics for who you're going to send surveys to, whether it's going to be targeted neighborhoods, whether it's going to be the neighborhoods closest to the facility. And if so, whether -- you know, the closer to Mare Island you are in the city side, the more poor and elderly people you have in that area. Why do you want to hear from those people? I mean, these are the kinds of things that I would hope we would be thinking about before we're asking them how did you hear about Mare Island's environmental cleanup or along with that.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Exactly. That's something we can talk about during the focus group. I don't know, right now, the plan. Like I said, we sat down and put things together on the table to propose was our first shot that we were thinking of ways we have our current mailing list, okay. So right off the bat that's who we were thinking of if we were going to do mail surveys.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, what are you going to do with this information? That's what I don't get. What are these things for?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You mean once we get the stuff back?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If you do.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: If, yeah, okay. I would say if we got the mail surveys back and/or online surveys back -- and I don't know the percentages to answer your other question about, you know, the percentage of people who go online and would answer online within the Navy. I actually don't know if there's been another base in my office that has done this yet online. I thought there have been other facilities that have done it, and I initially thought, hey, let me throw it out there; it might be a good idea to try. Again, it's an idea. But what do we do with the information.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: When we get it back, we tally it; we look and see obviously the information is -- the kind of questions we ask is the information we're going to get back unless they write other things comments, written comments. But we would tally the information, you know, and say, okay, there's this many people that say this newspaper -- I'm just using an example, you know -- they look at these three newspapers, they don't look at these two newspapers. They've been to one RAB, maybe somebody says the RAB's on a night that's not

good for them. So we would just get this information and then discuss it. We tally it and then come back and discuss it. And then whatever the outcomes are of that, then we would put together the plan and implement it.

MS. CHICHAKLI: Can I offer one thing if you don't mind?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Sure.

MS. CHICHAKLI: I just wanted to move back one slide. In the 2001 update these were the points that were -- this is what the plan said. It said this is how Mare Island is going to bring the information to the community, through the RAB, through public notices, the mailing list, the IR, you know, the site tours, and all this kind of stuff. This is really, I see -- there's two parts to this involvement plan. One is to evaluate whether these things are still working. If these are the best ways to get information to the community, which is why those questions -- this is why we put them on the questionnaire. If no one is going to the Information Repository, then the Information Repository needs to be rethought about. Is it really effective? If the mailing list is not effective, then maybe -- I mean there's not even a website on here, they didn't talk about a website in 2001, so that's definitely got --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes, we did.

MS. CHICHAKLI: Well, it was not in the Community Involvement Plan which I see a great thing that can go into this update is getting information to people via the Web. Our e-mail, should we have snail mail mailing distribution and an e-mail? If not, if only 20 percent have e-mail addresses, then no, obviously not. But that's part of the purpose.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you're just basically statistics gathering as Michael said? I mean -- and I don't -- I've never received a press release in these eight years, so I've never heard of you putting a press release out. I've put them out for you at times. And how many presentations have you done at Rotary Club or have we done? I haven't done any since Michael's been here. Jerry and I did a couple in Napa at the college. But I guess I kind of think this is somewhat like a PR firm, I guess, you know, rather than -- well, what do you really want this information for anyway? What were you going to do with it? I don't get a sense of, you know, what the mission is here, I guess. Are you going to -- is it just getting more people to know about what you're doing or to get more people here on the last Thursday night of every month, or to fill up the bus? I don't know, I don't get it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It's all of that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why? Why?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Because we want to get the community involved and keep them involved.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You haven't convinced me.

MR. COFFEY: But that's their purpose, isn't it? Isn't that their purpose --?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. COFFEY: -- in addition to the cleanup part of it?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But I haven't seen any evidence of any science, I guess, behind this approach. I guess -- if we're going to do science on chemicals, I was hoping we were going to

apply some strategic science on getting in with people, in bed with the people of the community. And I'm just -- that's where I'm headed, I guess.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I think, Myrna, you're also maybe suggesting -- and I may, I don't know whether this is part of what you're getting at as well -- but I might agree with this, it wouldn't matter what the result ended up with, most people in this community aren't going to care.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's true.

MR. RASMUSSEN: They don't pay attention; they're not going to care. You're going to ask them for input as to what goes on here in the cleanup process, they're not going to have a clue, and they're not going to care. The only thing they want to know is if there's a potential for another Love Canal here or not.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Barely, yeah, it's true.

MR. RASMUSSEN: And then about the water in their own house. And I don't mean to be so cynical about it, but I think it's largely true.

MS. TYGIELSKI: One thing I'd like to say is that what Myrna said has expressed a great deal of frustration, and if you look at this room right now you can see why, look how few people are in here right now. And then, you know, is calling it community involvement plan really gonna make a big difference than calling it community relations?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: If you're asking me that exact question I would say no, it probably doesn't matter what you call it as long as you get the information. The reason the name changed is EPA changed the name of the format of the document that's put together. What's in it is what counts.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And for the EPA?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, I mean, it's for us. I mean it's just a format. Chip, did you --

MR. GRIBBLE: Well, I hate to disagree with so many people at once, but actually I don't think it's --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Got you covered that way.

MR. GRIBBLE: Yeah, I don't think it's so much what's in the document, I think it's what is done with respect to the public. I think that's what you meant.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah.

MR. GRIBBLE: Chris said people really don't care about it and I would disagree with that also. I think it's what they care about, and somebody already alluded to that. They're not going to show up at a meeting or make their sense of care very -- they may not be very vocal about it, but I believe there would be a lot of; a high percentage of people that would care about is there a Love Canal kind of a situation. How they express that is a different issue. So I think it is their care, their level of concern or what they're interested in is relative and how they express it is the real challenge for us to hear what it is.

Just a few other comments. I think the impetus for this should be stated up-front. That kind of fits into a purpose and a goal kind of structure. Why are you doing this? Is this because the agencies have requested it? The answer is no that I know of. Is this a Navy directive or a DOD directive to update these across the Board categorically? I don't know. Is this coming from the EPA suggesting or encouraging that these things be updated or reformatted? I think that's kind

of relevant because, what's the purpose here? What's the goal of this new document effort? And --

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Randa.

MR. GRIBBLE: Randa -- I think then this focus group, I think one of the first things that should be done is a candid evaluation of the existing plan, how effective has it been, how ineffective has it been, where has it succeeded, and where has it failed? What we have might not be a bad plan.

And then one more thing. If the Navy is going to do this, I think it would be necessary that Lennar update theirs as a follow-on because the current structure of three community relations plans, one from Lennar for the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, one from Weston for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, and one from the Navy for their property, they were all intended to fit together, to complement each other. The Weston component is effectively done in that arena; I think that would be an assessment of that. People may have a bit different view, disagree on that. But clearly Lennar is not -- and that Lennar would, I think, need to update, could issue a new updated plan that would complement this or supplement this as well, but it should be done subsequent to this one.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thank you for your comments. Anything else?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess what I'm trying to say is that some of the things that I have said in the past about engaging the community because you think you have a hunch that it would matter to them if they only knew, there's going to be, like Chris says, there's going to be -- communities are all different. They have different characters and different concerns that drive them. If you were to go and meet with people at the senior center on a series of presentations, or you were to go to the community college and, you know, on a couple of presentations, or to Touro University, or to churches, you're going to get some people whose family -- who actually worked at the island or whose families did, who are going to be curious, who are going to be interested, who may be able to give you information. I know Jim's here tonight, he's been able to give people working on various projects a lot of information on the ground.

But are you willing to do that? Are you interested in gearing this plan to give you the tools, the resources to go in and then do something with that information with those targeted groups? If you've just completed a sediment sampling for the river, are you then going to take that information and go target in your interviews or in your surveys, are you going to go down to Brinkman's Marina and to the yacht harbor and go to the yacht club and over to Crockett, places where you know fishermen are coming out with their boats and hanging out in that river; are you going to go talk with them, find out how often they fish, how often they eat that fish, and talk with them about the potential exposures base that they are going to be having by eating that fish out of that Strait based on the knowledge you have of the contaminants in the Strait. This is where I'm heading. I want to see some science, and I want to see some thought put into this particular community and its needs before I'll have any sense that this is anything but just kind of an exercise that earns a consultant some money and gets a checkmark off of a work plan. That's just my thought.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Point taken. Michael.

MR. COFFEY: Mike, I think there is validity for doing all of this, and I think a lot of what Myrna is talking about is something that should be in that focus group. All of the who, what, where, why, and when. I see basically this as just the Navy hitting the refresh button on the

whole purpose of this whole Restoration Advisory Board. I think for a lot of what was done in 2001 and -- between 2001 and 2009, way too long a period of time.

I know I've heard Myrna say for many years now that the amount of information out there in the public has been sorely lacking, and I think probably the only real source of information that I have ever come across in the years that I've been on the RAB has basically been this group of people, you know; people like Jim, people like myself who are all different parts of the community, talking about the fact that we're even involved in this, that there is even such a thing as the Restoration Advisory Board. Most of the people I've ever mentioned it to go, "What? What's that?" So I tell them all about it and then they're interested. So I think there is a certain amount of interest out there.

And I think that just a different way of finding, to get people -- you know, honestly, just like Chris was saying, I don't think there's going to be that many people who will come down here and who want to get terribly involved unless they live on the island or in the immediate surrounding community. But I think there are people who are interested in it. I think we have to definitely readdress how the information is getting out there, which way it should be done. All of that should be in that focus group. I have no problem with it. I'll be the first one on that focus group, no problem there, I mean I like the idea. Yeah, it's been a frustrating period of time, and I can understand that there is that level of frustration. But I think this is valid, I think this is something that needs to be done, and I'm ready and willing for it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Anything else? Okay. We'll go ahead and get into our second presentation. It's going to be given by Neal Siler. And it is on Installation Restoration Site 21 and Building 386, 388, and 390 Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Work Plan.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Installation Restoration (IR) Site 21 and Building 386/ 388/ 390 Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Work Plan***  
**Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island**

MR. SILER: Thank you, Michael. The first thing I want to say is you're a real tough act to follow, I'll tell you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but look at that book you have with you, that's intimidating.

MR. COFFEY: Don't read that, please.

MR. SILER: That's what I'm going to do; I'm going to read it from cover to cover.

MR. COFFEY: You'll read it alone.

MR. SILER: My plan worked. Okay. Well, thank you very much; it's a pleasure to be here. You know, like I said, that Michael Bloom, he's always a tough act to follow, but I appreciate the setup job that he does for me every time for me that I come down here.

But what I'm going to talk about tonight is I'm going to talk about the Draft Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan for one of the major industrial sites on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. And that's investigation -- I'm sorry -- Installation Restoration Program Site 21, and Building 386, 388, and 390. And what you should have in the packet that I had together up here -- if people didn't get them they should go ahead and take a look at that -- you should have the presentation, you should have two tables. Table 8-8, which discusses the constituents of concern, the concentrations of those constituents of concern, the number of samples that we took

to delineate the extent of that contamination, how many samples were above screening levels, what the cleanup goals are, and just some ideas about where we're going from here. There's another table that's 10-2. That takes a look at all of the evaluation of the remedial alternatives. And then there should be one figure, figure 10-4, and that's going to show you the areas where we're proposing to do remediation on the site.

And just so you know, this is the document I'm talking about. I personally have a Steve Farley autographed copy, and I can get you one too if you'd like one. What I'm going to talk about during the program, I'm going to give you a brief summary of the site, history, background. I'm going to talk about the cleanup goals that we're proposing. Go through the evaluation of the remedial alternatives. Give you an idea of the types of things that we looked at to clean up the site. Present the selected or proposed alternative. And give you an idea of the schedule we're going to put forth to go ahead and implement that plan.

But I know there's a question you've all been wondering, just where exactly is IR-21 Building 386, 388, and 390? And it's located in the east central portion of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. It's the old ship fitter's building. It has the dual dolphin logo on it, if you ever take a look at it, if you're ever on the island. It's right on this side of the building right here. This is Building 390 so you can see it right here. It covers -- the site covers an area of about six acres. It's dominated by Buildings 386, 388, and 390. And this building actually was constructed during the 1920's and it was used as a major metal working facility since that time.

Currently Building 386 is unoccupied, but Buildings 388, 390, and then there's a southern Building 382, they're occupied by XKT Engineering who has taken up that mantle of major metal working at the site. That next slide kind of talks about what I just talked about, I'm just going to go over it real quick.

And what I'm really going to go over is the major facilities where cleanup is required. This picture right here shows you the interior of Building 386, which is the western-most building right here. The building in the middle is 388, and there are some minor cleanup actions we're going to perform in that building. And then the eastern-most building is 390. And the major area of concern is this steel grate area down here. And you can see what the steel grate area looks like down here. And the issue we have with the steel grate area is that there are lead and PCBs that have infiltrated into these areas right here which are open down to the soil. There's concrete here. The current tenant, and they're going to be staying in there for a while we hope, is XKT Engineering. And they really like this surface because it's something they can clamp onto and really utilize in the work that they do. So we don't want to close it down too much, we want to do an environmentally sound remediation program and we want to make sure they can go ahead and use this in the future. So if you look at that Table 8-8 that tells you some of the constituents of concern. You can see it's mainly petroleum hydrocarbons, diesel and motor oil. You've got some polychlorinated biphenyls or PCBs. And the main metal of concern is lead.

Now, one thing that we did do in 2007 to take a look at the nature of the petroleum hydrocarbon was do a number of trenches in the Building 388, 386, and 382 area, and just outside of 388. And we found some free phase hydrocarbons, but the way it appeared, it appeared to be in the partings and in the fractures of the matrix. We didn't actually see it within the soil matrix, but there was definitely free product in there. And that's one of the things we're going to talk about, how we can deal with that. And then with groundwater we detected a number of constituents, PCBs, Aroclor 1254 is a PCB. Endrin is an organophosphate -- organochlorine pesticide, excuse

me. We found that in one Navy well, but since we found that in the Navy well we really haven't found any relevant detection since that time. The main things we have found in groundwater again are the petroleum hydrocarbon, the diesel and the motor oil. They're detected above screening levels in a few areas. But if you go downgradient, you'll find that the concentrations of the petroleum hydrocarbons falls off very fast, so it doesn't seem to be migrating appreciably from the site.

Now, we took all the data that we had and performed a human health risk assessment. And we look at both the cancer excess risk and the non-cancer excess risk. And the cancer excess risk was within the risk management range, one in 10,000 or one in a million. But we did have some concerns with the non-cancer hazardous indices. And as you can see for construction workers and utility workers, especially in the steel grate area where we have the polychlorinated biphenyls, that that is a concern that we have as far as protecting them as they work in the future. Again, the other main driver was lead. As you can see, we have some really high concentrations of lead, and that's above the proposed cleanup goal of 800 milligrams per kilogram. They also did an ecological risk assessment.

There does not appear to be any risk to terrestrial receptors in the building. And the potential impacts, because we're so far away from the Strait, tends to be negligible on aquatic organisms. And of course, anybody who's been in the building can testify to this, there are all sorts of raccoon tracks all over that building, they get in there all the time. And how we get them out I don't know except basically to go ahead and develop that area. But the next slide you can see the constituents requiring action.

Again, the polychlorinated biphenyls, the lead, and the petroleum hydrocarbons. There are a few constituents in groundwater that we have to look at. So if you look at the areas we're requiring remedial action, you'll see Table 8-8 will describe those. And if you look at figure 10-4, you can see where those areas are located. We're not talking about a lot of really very deep actions here. The deepest action is in some of the isolated areas down to eight feet. But everything seems to be within the top two or three feet, maybe down -- appreciably down to five feet. But the proposed cleanup goals, we have lead, as you can see here, PCBs, and then the petroleum hydrocarbons both as diesel and as motor oil.

So we looked at all these areas, tried to come up with potential alternatives that could address the constituents of concern. We came up with seven major categories ranging from no action to excavate everything in the areas of concern. So we have no action. We have implementation of an LUC. We have excavation of the steel grate area, encapsulation of some of the areas in Building 386. The next alternative was excavation and disposal of the steel grate area, the dirt floor areas, and the encapsulation areas. Long term groundwater monitoring and implementation of an LUC. And you'll see implementation of an LUC is one of constituents of any remedial program that we'd be putting together. And then the three that are kind of related are alternatives 5A, 5B, and 5C. And they are mainly kind of a hybrid of excavation of the areas in Building 386. Some encapsulation of the -- encapsulation of the steel grate area, and there are some minor areas in Building 388 and 386 that we would actually be encapsulating also. Then if you go to alternative six you have encapsulation of just the areas in the Building 390, the steel grate area, and also the other areas in Building 388. In alternative seven we would basically excavate and dispose of everything off-site.

So after going through this analysis, and there's a number of factors that we look at that range from the overall protectiveness of human health and the environment; compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements; short-term effectiveness; long-term effectiveness; community acceptance; state acceptance; if it's implementable or not; and then cost also. And if you take it and look at that one table, 10-2, it goes through a very detailed analysis of all of those alternatives.

And after we went through those alternatives we found that the winner was alternative 5B which was the excavation and off-site disposal of the soil that contains petroleum hydrocarbons and lead in Building 386. That includes the quench tank area -- these areas are outlined in blue on that figure -- the dirt floor area. And there are some other limited areas within that building and actually in other parts of Building 388. There's the encapsulation of the steel grate area. What we're trying to do is put some sort of a mixture in there that would flow down those open areas that would be strong enough to set, to get into all the areas where we wouldn't have any potential contact with people and the contaminated soils containing lead and PCBs underneath it. And then we would record an LUC which would prohibit sensitive land uses, and control any of the activities that would potentially disturb that cap. And we would have long term groundwater monitoring.

So these are the reasons why we protected that -- not protected -- but selected that alternative. You can go over those right here and take a look at them. And then the schedule and the path forward for this. We've submitted this draft document to the agencies in February. We actually hope to distribute the draft for public comment sometime in July. Run through the public comment period in July. Try to get a final document formulated in September. And implement this remedy in the winter of 2009.

So that is the end of my presentation. If anybody has any questions?

There's one thing I also want to say. If you take a look at the Table 10-2, and because of the cost of the selected remedy, which at one point is, you can see it's about \$1.6 million, at one point there was a cut-off between an administrative document called a Remedial Action Plan, which is what we submitted here, and at one time we submitted this plan the cutoff was one million dollars between the Remedial Action Plan and the Removal Action Work Plan. And DTSC has subsequently raised that to \$2 million, so now we have a RAP, it's actually going to end up being a RAW. We're going to be going through all of the public comment periods because we do want your comments back on this plan. But the only thing that would be potentially optional would be another public meeting where we would talk about this plan. So we really want to get some sort of feedback from you about this plan. So with that, if anybody has any questions I'd be glad to field those questions. Mike.

MR. COFFEY: Neal, would the selection of the plan 5B change at all if that building wasn't occupied by the engineering firm?

MR. SILER: You know, it might. One of the real considerations with the steel grate area is the fact that XKT really loves using that steel grate area; it's really an integral part of their operation there. So we don't want to disrupt as much of their operation. I guess ultimately if we were able to do that, we may go in and take a look, a much more concentrated look at excavating that material. But since it's really going to disrupt their operation if we go in there and dig that entire area up, that's why we're going to the encapsulation remedy. But again, we want to take a look at

that and make sure that whatever remedy that we put forth is protective of human health and the environment.

MR. COFFEY: I would have thought that the first and foremost concern is what is the best for that; and secondly, what is going to inconvenience the tenant.

MR. SILER: And that's exactly right, and that's exactly what we look at. Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is this on? You know that a pet peeve of mine over the years has been LUCs, Land Use Controls. That's been one of my pet peeves. What sorts of Land Use Controls are there? How many of them are there? Where are they? And how are you going to implement them?

MR. SILER: Well, there actually already is an implementation program for the Land Use Covenants that are currently been recorded for Investigation Area D1.2. We actually do an inspection every year to make sure that those controls are still protective of human health and the environment. We put a plan together, we submit that to DTSC. It's submitted to the John F. Kennedy Library over here.

And actually one of the things I'm going to do, at Myrna's request, next month, I'm going to talk about, you know, what we've been doing the last three years since we've actually recorded those eleven LUC's that are on Investigation Area, IA D1.2. But for this case, in this area, anyplace where there's going to be industrial or commercial reuse, we're cleaning up to commercial industrial levels which means that it's perfectly safe for somebody to come in there and work eight hours a day, 250 days a year for 25 years. So we're not taking it to the next level, which would be unrestricted or residential land use which means that you could be on that site 24 hours a day, 365 days a year for thirty years. So, you know, there's a little bit of a -- we're looking at that to the proposed land use and how it's going to be implemented in the future. In this case also, because we have that steel grate area, we're encapsulating that surface to make sure nobody comes in contact with that. We want to make sure that the integrity of that encapsulated material stays intact so that nobody can come in contact with that material. Those are the two major components of this LUC. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is this considered a public meeting for this project?

MR. SILER: Not necessarily. Like I said, it's not mandatory. If you request another public meeting we can go ahead and have another public meeting. It's just not mandatory as it is with the Remedial Action Plan.

MR. COFFEY: You're not on, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess I have just looked at your abbreviated descriptions here and I can't tell what the difference is between them by your descriptions. Like I compared 5A to 5B, and I think that the language is -- well, pretty much exactly the same. And I see the price ranges are all like alternative three, you know, at 1.7, 1.6 for 5A, 1.6 for 5B. How did you -- you said, "And the winner is," but how did you decide that? I don't see what the difference is.

MR. SILER: Well, there's a little bit of difference.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Tell us about those.

MR. SILER: Five is a little bit of a nuance difference between which areas get excavated and which areas get encapsulated. And it mainly has to do with the minor areas as far as the

encapsulation is concerned in Building 388, outside Building 388 and 382. They are very similar, but when we looked at all the factors and implementability, that's why 5B seemed to be the best one that we could implement at this time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where in this project do you think is the greatest, or is it just kind of all over the place, risk or -- I guess two questions maybe; the largest long term risk to people working there, regardless of whether it's inconvenient or not for the current tenant. I know you're concerned about that primarily because you're also the landlord.

MR. SILER: Well our primary concern is always going to be protection of human health and the environment, but there are other things that go into that. And it's obviously one thing we want to make sure we have something that is implementable, is protective, but also fits into the plan for what we have and what's going on in those areas. Now, if you're talking about the risk, if you look back where I talked about the -- an earlier slide where I talked about the utility worker and the construction worker, it's actually somebody coming into contact with the lead and PCB impacted soil that's underneath that steel grate area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you don't see that that steel grate area is falling apart or that it's going to need major repairs at some point?

MR. SILER: Doesn't appear to be.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And when you say you really want to get our feedback, what do you want to get our feedback about --

MR. SILER: That we want to have your input.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- based on what you got here? It seems like it's a little bit difficult to make much feedback. You mean like from the regulators? People who are actually going to read the document?

MR. SILER: No, we definitely want to get it from the community also. And if you think you have some concerns, we want you to voice those concerns.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't think that -- it's just impossible probably without a site visit or without, you know, a lot of more in-depth analysis to -- more than you have time to do tonight to really say, oh, wow, this sounds like a fantastic idea. But do you feel like here you are, because there are workers in that one building, that you are focusing -- I mean are you kind of like -- that you can guarantee us or assure us that those workers, even though you're having to work at a more complicated setting, are going to be as protected or more protected than the folks that might come along and rent the building that's empty now that's easier to work in? That's all been factored into the alternatives?

MR. SILER: That is factored into the alternative.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Those are all my questions.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Neal, does this suggest that -- are the workers at XKT now subject to some risks by being there --

MR. SILER: No.

MR. RASMUSSEN: -- the way it is now?

MR. SILER: As you saw that, it mainly had to do with utility workers or construction workers coming into actual contact with that soil. Nobody right now is coming into contact with that soil. We want to make sure that the remedy that we put forth makes sure in the future that if somebody had to go down there and do something, we want to actually prevent them from contacting with that soil. So we want to make sure that they can't come into contact with it, so people who work around there would be prevented from ever contacting that soil.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I see.

MR. SILER: But really if you don't go down there you couldn't come into contact with that soil and you wouldn't be exposed. Yes.

MR. RICH: With regard to encapsulation, can you tell me what CLSM means?

MR. SILER: It's the Controlled Low Strength Material. And what it really is is a cement slurry that, you know, will flow into all the low areas and fill up, but it will set pretty quickly so that we can make sure that we get every of the area that is exposed in there as far as bare soil is concerned, to go ahead and we get in areas, all those areas so that nobody can come in contact with it.

MR. RICH: Grout?

MR. SILER: Grout, yes.

MR. RICH: Thank you.

MR. SILER: Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: What investigation area is this set of buildings in?

MR. SILER: This is Investigation Area C-2.

MR. GRIBBLE: C-2. So you already have a RAP for all of C-2 but this is carved out; is that right?

MR. SILER: It's not carved out. Actually what we're doing is we're looking at all these larger sites. If you remember back from the presentation in January, this is one of the larger sites I talked about that we're trying to get through this year. But the RAP for C-2, it's probably going to be a draft coming out here within the next few months, and we're hopefully going to schedule the final RAP sometime in the late fall, early winter of 2009.

MR. GRIBBLE: So in that RAP then you'll address the graveyard, for example, which is also part of the XKT area?

MR. SILER: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Well, just a couple things. I think it's interesting that this was -- XKT was the, as best I recall, this was the first reuse business on Mare Island.

MR. SILER: That's correct.

MR. GRIBBLE: And this is the first time where we went through with the Navy an effort to approve a property for an end use lease. And in the course of that we had to make some assumptions. We didn't have a completed risk assessment obviously, so we had to make some assumptions and then some limitations in the lease, restrictions to address the uncertainties. And if -- from your presentation, from what I get out of the presentation, basically it also translates

into, well, our assumptions were good, the lease restrictions that we imposed were appropriate, and the workers there haven't really been exposed to an unacceptable risk all these years. That's kind of nice for me to hear personally. I wonder on a conceptual level how many times we haven't been as fortunate over the years. But certainly this one, it's nice to hear that that's held up for this particular area. And XKT is still in business. Good. Thank you.

MR. SILER: Anyone else have any questions? Well, thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Neal. Next is our first public comment period. Is there any public comment?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No, okay. Let's take a short break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: First on the agenda is administrative business and announcements. Just have to say if you have any comments on the March meeting minutes, please get them to myself or Myrna. With that, Myrna, any other announcements on that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We'll go into focus group reports. First is Wendell with community.

#### **V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS**

##### **a) Community (Wendell Quigley)**

MR. QUIGLEY: I have nothing to report.

##### **b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Second is natural resources, Jerry's not here.

MR. COFFEY: How is Jerry?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I don't know, I haven't heard.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just know he's on another round of chemo.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Paula, technical.

##### **c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)**

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay. There's not been a technical focus group meeting, but I will make a comment or two about your CI -- CIP.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: The one we just talked about?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yes. The newspapers listed, Contra Costa Times was not listed, and it's a paper that people in this area do subscribe to.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you.

MR. COFFEY: Focus group.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Exactly. Next is Gil, city report.

**d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)**

MR. COFFEY: Last one.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: If you are a resident around here and read the local paper, you will note -- you would have noted this week that our major developer for the north area, the 200 and plus acres up there, Touro University of California has made a decision to take a break on the plan for development. Their statement in the newspaper as far as the press release was very short and didn't fill in a lot of the blanks. And we are not absolutely sure of what their complete intentions were.

And why does that affect the RAB? Well, one of the major things that was part of the development of the north area was an accelerated schedule of IR-17, which between the Navy and the regulators, DTSC and all those others, we have been working on for some months at an accelerated schedule and pressing hard to make that thing or complete the cleanup up there in record time. So we're now at a position where we're really not sure what those people -- what Touro's intentions are. They make a statement that they are not going to proceed with 27 acres, but they've been negotiating on 200 acres. And so we are now faced with the position of trying to determine what's the next step, is the project dead or what? We don't know that.

And that's the reason for my statement is that we are working with our lawyers, their lawyers, They're now making all statements out of their New York headquarters, and basically not answering the phone, so we are only left with their legal representation, and we're putting together meetings next week to finalize it. And I think that you'll be seeing in the paper a lot more -- a lot more complete explanation of what their intentions were. As I said, that's a major project up there; it was a \$210 million project just in infrastructure, and over \$1.2 billion for the complete project. So, you know, we're not sure, what did they say? They talked about 27 acres. Well, that's fine, but what about the other 200? So we hope that in the next few weeks, or at least next week hopefully, that we're going to get -- finalize that and know exactly what they're planning.

And then the last thing is, this is my last RAB meeting as a city employee; on the 18th of next month I retire, and turn around the following Tuesday and come back to work as a consultant for environmental issues and development of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. I don't think that the RAB will see any difference, you'll still see me sitting here, I just won't be being paid out of the same pot of money. I'm going to be being paid the same amount of money, but I won't be paid out of the same pot.

MR. SILER: You get the same amount of money for working only three days?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, that's the other thing; I won't be working as many hours. I only gotta work --

MR. SILER: We feel bad for you.

MR. GEMAR: He must be getting some of the stimulus.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I meant the same amount of money per hour. But don't worry; I'm still not buying any Lennar stock. That's it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, Gil, to follow up, I just want to thank you and your team at city hall under some really dire conditions for whatever you did among your team to light a fire under the Navy. And to also thank the regulators for everybody really pitching in, and the Navy for coming through. I still am mystified about why IR-17, when I so clearly remember what the guy looked like from Tetra Tech and the photos of the trench and the free product, and it was so long ago, why it hasn't happened, you know, a long, long, long time ago, except for, as I might remind you, that I recall that environmental cleanup is primarily driven by land use and -- you know, who needed what property to be available first. And, quite frankly, Touro's some of a long line of developers who really did work hard at -- I mean, I think North Island could have been developed about ten times over for the amount of money that lots of good people have put into it. But for you to have finally gotten us this far, I do hope that the Navy and the regulators will on their own go ahead and finish up IR-17.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: That's the plan, we're moving forward.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool. Then I also just -- I guess I wanted to put on the table that, you know, at some point aren't you kind of beating a dead horse with the North Island? I mean this 1.2 billion kind of makes me think that when it sounds too good to be true, it just might be. And if those guys couldn't deliver -- and I know there's been a meltdown. I wouldn't imagine that the people in New York have any more money now than anybody else does, so I can kind of understand them pulling out. I mean it isn't a terrible shock and surprise. But at some point wouldn't you be immediately getting -- getting a good group of people together at city hall, and maybe even outside of city hall, and saying, gosh, that property doesn't look like it's going to go anywhere in the commercial market for the next fifty years, let's hop on some of that -- that money that's coming down from the Feds for wetland creation or for energy generation, and just flat out go out and cancel all deals with Touro, and just go after the solar panel programs, the wetland creation, wetland banking or wetland creation programs that are coming out of the Department of Water Resources for flood control, and just bail on commercial development up there. It just looks like it's just a rat's nest; and it probably is actually.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The answer to that is, of course, going all the way back to the final reuse plan of 1994 where we went to the government and we said to the government, here's our plan. And how did we come up with that plan? Well, we had 200 people in the City of Vallejo got together and came up with a plan. And the federal government after, you know, some hemming and hawing and back and forth, we said, okay, they accepted that. And then they said, now you owe me X amount of dollars. And we said, okay, well, that's all fine and good but, you know, we don't have that kind of money. And they said, well, if you will develop X number of jobs we're going to make a deal with you. And if you develop so many jobs you will get this land, we're going to say for free, that's not really fair to say free, but we'll go ahead and say free. We're going to give you an economic development conveyance. And, oh, by the way, that means you've got to develop 8,000 jobs.

And as hard as Touro worked -- excuse me -- as hard as Lennar works on their 653 acres, they cannot put out 8,000 jobs. So if you don't develop this up here, then you have not met the requirements. You could legally -- I'm just saying you could legally -- end up owing the federal government that original amount of money which was \$19.4 million, if you care to know. Now, that said, you know, I haven't seen any of them checks from the federal government yet so I don't, I don't start adding them to my bank account. So when we start seeing some of those

checks, I'll believe it. But right now I don't see any checks coming over the horizon from the federal government.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well maybe we haven't had our ducks in a row, we haven't been thinking about that, so sometimes I just throw stupid ideas out, and then, you know, forty, fifty years later they're still not done. But I mean we could have money flowing into Mare Island right now, because I look at those -- I go to workshops and I look at the funding that could be available, and I just have to always hang my head. Same thing with River Park and a dozen other properties in Vallejo. We could get \$14 million scraped together to wipe out a neighborhood on Wilson Avenue and make that road pretty, but we couldn't take the badge and pass office and River Park and a couple of other parcels, the parcel underneath the Highway 37 bridge, and renovate those or get a package that all hangs together with our new super road so that it has any attractive, you know, purpose or economic benefit to the community. So I'm just, you know, again saying now's the time when maybe Touro has -- has to rethink what they're going to do, that we rethink what we're really capable of doing up there, and go back to the Feds. And if they aren't sending us checks, maybe they could at least forgive or rewrite that plan that makes us have those jobs hanging over our head or that requirement.

But anyway, thank you again, Gil, for everything you actually have done on, you know, to get us where we are. People probably don't know it, I certainly don't know what all you do, but I know that you are the -- often the memory, the corporate memory that we've needed that has moved us as far as we have on the environmental cleanup of Mare Island.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And I do want to make sure that we leave this discussion with all of these things have massive legal requirements behind them and we can't just go off and make wetlands. To do that we would have to change a lot of things, and that's fifteen years worth of legal work. So it's not -- I'm not saying that you could not do that, I'm just saying it took us fifteen years to get to this point, and if you start changing things, you affect a lot of things, you know. We have a very extensive huge agreement with the State of California on public trust parcels, as an example. Well, that is all based on the final reuse plan. And if you don't -- if you can't -- if you don't meet your legal requirements on that -- you gotta really be careful on everything that you do because there's somebody around the corner that's not going to be happy with whatever decision you make.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's what's gotten this town in the position it's in, it was so -- you know. But it isn't unlike lots of other towns. I mean you could tell the rest of the people about how you couldn't just make a wetland tomorrow I know more probably about not making a wetland tomorrow than anybody in this room, but then Weston's right in behind me there. So -- but like I said, you might just think of a new idea for that property after a century or so.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Gil. Okay. Next is Steve Farley with the Lennar update.

**e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)**

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Michael. Okay. I have a handout to highlight some of the main things that are going on. We have a number of major documents that have been submitted recently. The IR-15 FS RAP Feasibility Study Remedial Action Plan that went in literally today, agencies can pick it up if they -- I'm sure they all checked their e-mail before they left tonight, but it will be, it's there now. So that's a major document, major decision document for the IR-15 area.

We also have had some discussions with the agencies recently on the scope of work, proposed remedy for the Crane Test Area. That's another document that's in review. That went in about the 16th, I believe. And in terms of the environmental site closure status on sort of the bottom center part of the handout, we achieved one additional closure of a PCB site, and actually six additional fuel oil pipeline segments or FOPL segments. So things keep -- things keep ticking along, which is all good news, and we're very grateful for everything the agencies do for us.

In terms of the major field activities, if you look in the main part of the figure, let's start in the upper right corner with the photograph of the tripod and the gentleman in the white suit. That's some work that we've done as part of a PCB site. This is a storm sewer manhole location. If you look in the background of the upper left corner of that photo, you can see the crane that's just a little south of here, and then you can see one of the bridge that -- the draw bridge towers. So that picture gives you a little idea we're pretty close to the Strait. That's some work that we've done in that storm drain as part of the Building 535 PCB site which is, I don't know, about 1,500 or 2,000 feet away. And what we're looking at were sediments that accumulated inside that storm drain and cleaned those out. In the upper left corner, that's an excavation, continued excavation for the UST 231, 243 area which is in IA-H2. It's sort of in the center of the figure, and moves a little to the north under what was Building 637.

Looking in the photograph, the Building 637 and 811 and 231 and 243, they're all gone. Those buildings have all been demolished. And this is an excavation that we're doing primarily for total petroleum hydrocarbons. In the lower left corner the figure, or that photograph, I included this just to show you some of the range of activities that we do. This is a gentleman who's actually cleaning the inside of a switch gear cabinet. A lot of times the horizontal surfaces tend to collect dust, and sometimes that dust has PCBs in it. And so we'll go in and clean that material off using a number of different techniques, including simple vacuum cleaning, and then we'll go back in and collect wipe samples from these non-porous surfaces. So just gives you a little idea of some of the complexities of the things. Even though it looks simple, you've got a lot of potential hazards here with switch gear cabinets and making sure that when we take them off-line that Island Energy is, you know, clearly involved and that sort of thing.

So -- And then in the main body of the figure there's a couple of other things highlighted. The Triangle Area between dry docks one and two, we've -- we're working on preparing a Draft final Feasibility Study RAW for BGM or black granular material. I think I've talked about that in a couple of other meetings. We submitted the draft document, we've recently got agency comments, and so we're now in the process of responding those comments and preparing that draft final document.

And then to the south of that you'll see a couple of labels UST 102 and 1310. Those two locations we're wrapping up some field work, mostly excavation activities. And for UST 142 we've just completed some work there and recently submitted a request for closure of that site. In the upper right-hand corner of the figure there's an Industrial Wastewater Pump Station 4 and T2 Oil Water Separator, and then those small red lines immediately below it, those are the areas we're really doing some soil and water investigations and/or planning on doing some soil removals because of petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. GRIBBLE: I have a question, Steve. On the Triangle Area in C-3, I was -- I had the understanding that that was going to be an FS/ RAP, but you're saying it's a RAW, so how did --

MR. FARLEY: Did I get that wrong and it's actually a RAP? I'm looking at Neal.

MR. SILER: It's actually going to be a RAP.

MR. GRIBBLE: Oh it is, okay. So that would be a final remedial decision?

MR. FARLEY: That's right.

MR. GRIBBLE: So it's not just for black granular material, it's for whatever is in the Triangular Area; is that right.

MR. SILER: No, it's for the black granular material. The remedial action for the other constituents and conditions in IA-C3 has been implemented already. This is just for something that we found as we were doing those remedial activities.

MR. GRIBBLE: So this is the last component?

MR. SILER: This is one of the last components, that's correct.

MR. GRIBBLE: So everything comes together at your -- what do you call it?

MR. SILER: Implementation report.

MR. GRIBBLE: Yes

MR. SILER: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: Okay. Good.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mentioned, Steve, that in the Crane Test Area you're getting something out to the regulators regarding your plans for that. I'd like to have you give a presentation about that, you know, in the spirit of the RAB meetings being early and often communication.

MR. FARLEY: Be happy to.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, that would be great. Because I understood that maybe a year or two ago you were talking something about capping, and like maybe that's a part of the old landfill or something like that. I don't know that, I mean we haven't had a lot of situations on the island where we've resorted to capping, so it seems like that would be something that should be coming up real soon now if you're already sending documents out.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Next is the Weston update. Cris.

**f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)**

MR. JESPERSEN: Thank you, Michael. We have a handout if you all have it. First up is just an update on document status of documents that we have submitted recently or have submitted prior to the past month for review by the regulatory agencies. I'll let us you just read through those at your leisure.

Next up would be an update on the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall. We held a meeting with the regulatory agencies on the 3rd of March to go through the analytical results and the past sampling events at the treatment plant outfall. The most recent sampling event was performed back in September of 2008. And in that event we took 127 samples at various depths up to seven and a half feet deep at 31 locations in the vicinity of the treatment plant outfall. Following the meeting the regulators requested that we present the full dataset in a format that would help them

perform their own internal ecological risk assessment calculations, and we did that shortly thereafter. And right now we've scheduled a follow up meeting to discuss those results, and a path forward hopefully to site closure on April 6th.

Next up is an update on IR-05 soil excavation. And essentially the update is nothing's changed since last month. Again, both the Navy and Weston are waiting on a biological opinion that's being developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service. And this biological opinion will allow us to excavate the remaining hot spot soils within the pickle weed habitat portions of IR-05. And once we excavate that soil it will be consolidated within the H1 Containment Area prior to completion of the engineered cap later this summer.

And then finally the bottom two pictures there, an update on Investigation Area H1 Containment. We began construction of the perimeter security fence on the western and northern sides of the completed engineered cap. And you can just see our crews there setting some fence posts and constructing a trench to bury the fence fabric. So that was it for this past month. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

MR. GRIBBLE: Public trail meeting.

MR. JESPERSEN: I'm deferring to Dwight because I'm not sure when that's been scheduled for -- or we had it actually, didn't we?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, there was a public meeting on the -- what day was that, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: March 18th.

MR. GEMAR: March 18th, there we go, last week, to discuss Weston's proposed trail for the Western Early Transfer Parcel which is actually a condition of the Remedial Action Plan for the Western Early Transfer Parcel that DTSC approved in June of 2002. And this trail would basically provide public access out along the levee tops to the western most levee along near the tidal marsh with the views of San Pablo Bay and surrounding environs. And we had a small group, but it was I think a good meeting, and had some homeowners here which was good, and everyone seemed to be enthusiastic about the concept of being able to get out there without trespassing. So we're hopefully going to get approval from the city. There is a public comment period that runs I think through the end of this month, so if you do have any feedback I believe it goes to Michelle Hightower in the city planning department. And then after that they would act on the development permit application to install the trail. And then the timing would be most likely constructing it sometime during the summer, and hopefully opening it in the fall when some of the other work around the landfill area winds down.

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

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

MR. GRIBBLE: I suggest that maybe in the CIP that the Navy includes contingencies in the event that the newspapers disappear, and another contingency in the case that the U.S. mail service goes away and then how would we communicate to the public?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: You're welcome, Michael.

MR. RICH: Graffiti.

MR. GRIBBLE: Graffiti, well, a brainstorming session would be --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Already paying off.

MR. GRIBBLE: The IR-17 schedule, Michael said the Touro project going away is not going to impact the Navy's schedule to complete the work for IR-17, and I'm happy to -- no?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yes.

MR. GRIBBLE: We're happy to hear that, that's exactly what we think should happen as well, so that's good. It's just really -- it just really -- I think it's just really interesting how, you know, we say we set these schedules to complete the cleanup, but when you step back and take a look at it, so many of these things are actually driven by reuse. And we just can't get away from that fact that it does provide an impetus for some of this cleanup at least. And I'm not sure if we talked about the SSTP outfall the last time, but just to make sure. So we have this RAP that we approved several years ago, as Cris said, for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, which included the outfall. And we had in there our cleanup goals that were established based on the fact that we didn't have an adequate characterization of the site, we had a limited understanding of the site, but that it was the eleventh hour, Weston had to complete this, there was a deadline to complete things to keep the early transfer going, and so to keep all that together we opted for very conservative cleanup values for that site. That's what's spelled out in the RAP. That's the current requirement upon Weston to clean up that site. However, with the data that now exists out there, which is, you know, a pretty good dataset, if we were to stick with those cleanup goals, that in effect it would require Weston to excavate a fairly large area with no end in sight. And that was not the intention, and something isn't making sense out there. And so we agree with Weston that it's appropriate to reevaluate or revisit the whole issue to see if, in fact, those cleanup goals make sense or that they need to be changed. And we haven't gotten to a point where we think that they need to be changed yet, but there's certainly a basis for considering that, and that's where we're at with the site. So we'll probably have more to say about that at the next RAB meeting.

MR. JORGENSEN: At the Water Board I've been -- my desk has been a piling location for all the closure requests for FOPLs and USTs. I've been trying to get through those for Lennar and CH2M Hill and a few for the Navy also. Something that most recently we're working on is just all the TPH issues that spread around the Crane Test Area and DRMO, working with both Lennar and the Navy on investigation and the extent and nature of the problems there. So it has a few good meetings, and we're looking forward to getting those areas taken care of.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thank you, Paisha. Next is the co-chairs report. Myrna, you want to go first?

## **VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS**

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He wants the last word. Well, April 15 -- no, I mean April 14, 1994 was our first Restoration Advisory Board meeting, as I recall, and Paula and Chip and I were there. And our April RAB meeting will therefore, if I do my math right, be our 15th anniversary as a Reservation Advisory Board for Mare Island. And as I'm recalling, on the 10th anniversary we had our photo taken and the Navy PR people were up, and Diana and I got medals, and we had food. So I would hope that we could get a little committee together to do something nice to celebrate this long time that we've been working and talking together. And if you don't communicate together, then I think -- and if you were to do this environmental cleanup in the

absence of the community, no matter what level of contribution we make, I think it would be a diminished process. And I hope that some of you do agree. Certainly I have been faithful about attending, and many, many, many of the people in this room, whether you serve on the RAB or are faithful members of the audience.

April 26th is our 9th Daffodil Tea. It was founded to fundraise for St. Peter's Chapel. Right now it primarily introduces the public to the chapel and its needs for restoration. The Tiffany windows, the last time they were checked by a professional conservator, had 387 cracks in them; up from the two years before of 167 cracks identified by a professional conservator. So I can only imagine what in the next two years has taken place with those windows. So there's still a great need to publicize the chapel, its contribution and service in the Navy, as well as its art collection of glass, and its memorial ability that it still has. So if you're interested in attending the Daffodil Tea, here's the flyer, the reservation forms.

And if you really feel like you'd prefer to be a volunteer, there's a million ways you can do that in two hour shifts on that day, Sunday. The second Saturday in April, April 11th is Easter weekend, but it also happens to be the one year anniversary of our second Saturday access day. It's posted by ArcEcology, and we team up with the Sierra Club. Kenn Browne gives hikes on the south shore, and our thanks to arrangements with the Navy for escort there. And that Saturday, that's April 11, and we have planned an Easter egg and a golf ball hunt being that the park is -- headquarters area is adjacent to or below the golf course, and we do have people who have been in foursomes where the other members of the foursomes have said, now, there's that building where we try to hit its roof. So we've benefited from hundreds, if not thousands, of golf balls ending up in the preserve, and we're going to give kids, and I guess anybody who wants to go on an Easter egg hunt, the chance to turn those golf balls in that they find in exchange for an egg. And then I guess we'll get up to the golf course and see if we can't get a donation for those balls for the use of the driving ranges or something. Maybe one day there will be signs along the fairways that suggest that there's a certain amount of liability that comes with trying to hit a building that's a public visitor's center for a park.

Finally, at that preserve we have been conducting -- a team of volunteers from throughout the region and beyond have actually been coming in and working with us to develop a native plant survey. The Navy certainly conducted them when they were owners of the property, but we're now, after fifteen years of no grazing, fourteen years of not having any grazing, we're excited to find, to date, around 150 native, different native plants that have been identified by our team in the last six weeks. And we're finding more every time the team goes out. So we're very excited to see what the Navy and mother nature teamed up together to do to preserve the Bay area's natural lands and natural flora. As well as what might be extremely rare badger. We found the remains including the actual foot of a very small badger that might be quite rare if not endemic. I have to ask you, oh, no, I better wait until your report. Well, I'll segue to your report. Is this ship, the U.S.S. Boxer, named after our senator?

MR. COFFEY: God help us all.

(Thereupon occurred simultaneous discussion.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I don't actually know. So the Navy's monthly progress report. Our Petroleum Corrective Action Plan at Investigation Area A-2 where we surveyed the areas, that is going to actually begin its field work the first week of April; actually I guess the first week of April, it's really March 30th. But around the week of March 30th which is next Monday. And in

addition to that we finished our sampling efforts for the outfall and supplemental sampling investigation in the Offshore Area, and that was in February. As well as our first phase, which was gathering data for the eco-risk assessment which we completed in September.

Our validated data from that second phase should be coming back and validated the week of April 20th. And as we said, Paula, last month, that as soon as that is available we will discuss it at a RAB meeting. So if it does come back as it's supposed to, on time, we should be able to do it for the April meeting. Which it appears we have a jam packed agenda in April. So that's good.

The Navy issued some documents this last month since the last RAB meeting. The biggest one was the Draft Final Tech Memo for the DRMO, really for the TPH or total petroleum hydrocarbons at the Defense Reutilization -- and it should say Marketing Office. That was issued on March 6th. And comments are due from the agencies on April 9th. We issued a draft tech memo assessing munitions and explosives of concern as a contaminant of concern in the Offshore Area. That was issued about four days ago or five days ago. And we issued two final polychlorinated biphenyls or PCB site closure reports; one for Building 641 and one for Building 591 with the EPA.

And the comments we received from all three agencies were on all of the same reports for the Building 742 Draft Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis that was presented last month at the RAB. And also we've been talking about the last ten, fifteen minutes, Site 17, we're moving ahead on that. Our next BCT meeting is April 16th. As well as what's not on here, if all goes as planned, and I think it will, we will be issuing the Draft final EE/CA for Site 17, I believe, on April 6th. And then our public meeting for that is currently planned for April 16th. So we will be up here for that as well. It will be a combined DTSC/Navy meeting.

MR. GRIBBLE: 6:00 p.m.; right?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Correct. Correct. And that is all on my report. I do have a bunch of agenda topics that I wrote down pending what month; but Lennar's discussion of the Land Use Controls, Crane Test Area, the Navy's Offshore Area, and Chip, you mentioned the SSTP as well. So a bunch of topics.

MR. GRIBBLE: Also the MEC tech memo.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: MEC tech memo. Any questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And a birthday party.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And a birthday party.

MR. COFFEY: On the top there put birthday party.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: With medals.

MR. COFFEY: Care for a crown too?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. With that, we will -- going to our second public comment period, is there any public comment?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No. But I just remembered something that I have a comment I want to make. The next RAB meeting actually I will be out of town, I'm not here the last week of April,

so my counterparts, Marie, Janet, Julian, and/or other folks will be here in April. So I'm out of town, I will not be able to be here in April. Okay.

Any other public comment from the second public comment period? Paula.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula does.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: This is a question. Chip suggested that April 16th there was a public meeting about something, but what time and where? And he suggested combining that with a RAB meeting for your CIP.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well that was -- yeah, he mentioned that during the presentation. That is a possibility; I was going to talk to Myrna about that as well. We're up here on April 16th. If all goes as planned for the -- yes, it would be the public meeting will be here at 6:00 p.m., the public meeting is for the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis for Site 17.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You weren't able to get the Joseph Room?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I'm sorry?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You weren't able to get the Joseph Room?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No. No, got this room. Is it open then?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't know. I have no idea. I don't use it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Would you prefer to have it there?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We can talk about it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: But that's what the public meeting's on. And so, yes, if we're up here, then I mean we could have a focus group meeting, but --

MS. TYGIELSKI: Would you want the focus group meeting to be prior to or after that public meeting?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: It would be -- I believe if we come up we have a meeting prior to that already from three to five, so it would probably be after that.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Or before the three to five meeting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Public meetings tend to be very short, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Though you should make every effort, in my opinion, to have it in the Joseph Room because that's more centrally located to the town of Vallejo, and where it's usually been held.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Can you check, Gil, for me see if that's available?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think Carolyn checks.

(Thereupon occurred simultaneous discussion.)

MS. MOORE: The library closes at 6:00 p.m. on Thursdays.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't know if the 16th is a Thursday.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, it is a Thursday. Okay. Anything else?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. We'll adjourn. Thank you, everybody.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:16 p.m.)

#### **LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Community Involvement Plan (CIP) Update – Navy
- Presentation Handout – Draft Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Plan for IR21 and the Buildings 386, 388 and 390 Area – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Figure 10-4 Remedial Action Areas for Alternative 5B – CH2MHill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Table 8-8 Cleanup Goals for Constituents of Concern in Soil at IR21/ Building 386/388/309 Area – CH2MHill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Table 10-2 Summary of Comparative Analysis – CH2MHill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Features within the EETP – CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update March 2009 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard March 2009