



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

**HELD THURSDAY, July 29, 2010**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 29th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:09 p.m. and adjourned at 9:19 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
- Chris Rasmussen
- Kenn Browne
- Paula Tygielski
- Wendell Quigley
- Jerry Karr

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

- Heather Wochnick (Acting Navy Co-Chair)
- Brooks Pauly (Navy)
- Carolyn D'Almeida (U.S. EPA)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Dick Crim (CH2MHill)
- Steve Watson (CH2MHill)
- Jessica Beck (Tetra Tech)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Emily Hoe (SAIC)
- Janet Naito (DTSC)
- Alec Naugle (Water Board)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

### **Community Guests in attendance:**

- Vilma Aquino
- Barbara Bennett
- Miguel Buchwald
- Stan Golovich
- Jim Porterfield
- Russ Farnell

### **RAB Support from CDM:**

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Doris Baily (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville

## **I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Welcome, everyone, we're ready to get started. Okay. Thanks for joining us tonight. We have two presentations, one is by Brooks Pauly, and one is going to be by Steve Farley. And then we will have a special little presentation by DTSC, a little quick presentation, and that's going to be a little bit later during the focus group reports. So I guess we will go around and introduce ourselves. I'm Heather Wochnick, I'm the acting BRAC Environmental Coordinator for the Navy.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the Community Co-Chair of the Restoration Advisory Board, from Vallejo.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Napa Solano Audubon, from Vallejo.

MR. BROWNE: Kenn Browne with the Solano group of the Sierra Club from Vallejo.

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

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, RAB member, Mare Island --

MR. COFFEY: Resident.

MR. QUIGLEY: -- resident.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, I'm a RAB member from the City of American Canyon.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston on Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells, Water Board project manager.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito, DTSC project manager.

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

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth, City of Vallejo representative.

MS. BECK: Jessica Beck, Tetra Tech.

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. HOE: Emily Hoe, SAIC.

MR. WATSON: Steve Watson, CH2M.

MR. NAUGLE: Alec Naugle, San Francisco Bay Water Board.

MR. GOLOVICH: Stan Golovich, Sierra group, Mare Island.

MR. BUCHWALD: Miguel Buchwald, Mare Island resident.

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

MR. FARNELL: Russ Farnell with HSMPS USS Iowa group here at Mare Island.

MS. BENNETT: Barbara Bennett, resident of Mare Island.

MR. PAULY: Brooks Pauly, Navy RPM.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Well, thank you, everyone, for joining us tonight. Our first presentation is going to be by Ms. Brooks Pauly from the Navy. We are going to be talking about the Finding of Suitability to Transfer Parcels II, X-B (1) and (2). I know on the

presentation it says also X-B (3), but that's been removed. And transferring the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant, SSTP Outfall.

There's also been a change of venue for the Lennar Mare Island presentation. It's actually going to be the original presentation that was in -- correct? -- that was in your original packet, not the modified packet, and not the meeting agenda that's in front of you. So with that, Brooks, take it away.

**II. PRESENTATION: *Finding of Suitability to Transfer Parcel II, XB-(1), (2) & Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall***  
**Presentation by Ms. Brooks Pauly (Navy)**

MS. PAULY: Thank you, Heather. Is this on? It doesn't seem to be on. I will hit the button, and how's that? Fantastic. Hey, hello everyone. I'm Brooks Pauly, as Heather mentioned, Navy RPM. And tonight we're going to be talking about the Finding of Suitability to Transfer, or FOST document. Actually I guess I will be advancing this, okay. So bear with me as I work on the presentation side as well.

MR. COFFEY: Multi-task.

MS. PAULY: Multi-tasking. So when a base is closed, the goal of the Navy BRAC PMO, as you know, is to remediate the property and transfer it to other entities, often this is the City or the state. So one of the final steps in the process is the creation of the FOST document, one which we'll discuss today.

To give you a quick overview of my talk; we'll talk about transferring parcels, what's involved with that a little bit, give you the framework for parcel transfer. We'll talk about what's actually in the FOST document itself. Give a brief discussion of the parcel descriptions, just -- especially for anyone who is possibly new to hearing about Mare Island. And we'll give some of the history and various environmental conditions that are going to be up there on the parcels. And lastly, we'll talk about the transfer process and the schedule moving forward. So it's actually the CERCLA regulation section 120 (h) (3) that allows us to transfer property once all the necessary remedial action has been taken.

So -- and transfers are done by parcels, so I did want to point out the four parcels that are going to be transferred. So we've got Parcel II, which is this area up here in the northern part of the island. And the SSTP Outfall which is part of Parcel I. And then X-B (1) and (2) sort of toward the southern part of the island. So you've got the figure up here, but you've also got larger versions of the figures on your slides at the back of the packet. So if you wanted to refer to those, you could do that as well, as I'm talking.

So the definition, if you will, of a Finding of Suitability to Transfer document is, the purpose is to summarize how the environmental condition requirements and notifications for hazardous substances, petroleum products, and other regulated materials on the property have been satisfied. So this is a Navy internal document, and it's not necessarily created for all transfers, but it's often very helpful for summarizing what has been done at the various parcels. As we mentioned, it summarizes the environmental notifications and requirements, notifications and restrictions for the property; including such things as CERCLA and RCRA requirements -- hey, very nice, very nice. Thank you.

CERCLA, RCRA, and PCBs are another environmental condition, petroleum products and derivatives, asbestos, etcetera, these are the things that are on our various sites. I should say, too,

that sometimes we refer to polychlorinated biphenyls as PCBs, and asbestos containing material as ACM, so I just want to be really good with the acronyms. If I miss one, please shout it out and I can give the explanation for what it is. All right. Very good. It looks like we've gone a little farther than I had anticipated, how did that happen?

MR. COFFEY: It's your trigger finger.

MS. PAULY: Yeah. Well, you guys have been a really nice group so far.

MR. COFFEY: Just you wait.

MS. PAULY: Other aspects of the FOST document include things like discussing adjacent properties, the CERCLA covenants, notifications and restrictions, and also the fact that the Navy signs the document. All right. And I wanted to kind of highlight, because often times when we're using a property and when a Navy base is in use, we have certain names for sites. When there's investigation after the closure there are other names for sites. And because when we actually do a transfer, legal transfer, it's by parcel, I kind of wanted to give a little bit of a connection to some of the other names associated with the parcels that are being transferred. So Parcel II, it's about 64 acres, sometimes overlaps with Investigation Area A-2, and the Former North Building Ways Area. So you guys may have heard those in previous presentations. Parcels X-B (1) and (2) are about 7.8 acres down near -- down here, as we said -- near the Western Magazine Area, which is to the west there of the two parcels. And there also is the Horse Stables Area previously, which is this little tiny area right there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Brooks, if I could just interrupt for a moment? Can you, while you're at Parcel I and II there, X-B (1) and (2), can you explain why you took off (3)? Cause it's on our agenda.

MS. PAULY: Understood, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And also, could you also explain what the Navy means by parcels? Because these are not, as far as I understand, these -- I don't know how these properties came to have the words parcel as a name because, as I understand it, they aren't necessarily -- that doesn't jive with -- or maybe I'm wrong -- with actual parcels at the County Recorder's Office.

MS. PAULY: Oh, it does, yeah. At least for your second question, and it's a good question, the parcels do -- and that's exactly why we're using the parcel names, because they are specific parcel descriptions at the County Recorder's, as I understand it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And is that something that was relatively new? Because at one time there weren't any parcel numbers for Mare Island; right?

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: That's not new.

MS. PAULY: I think Gil has --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Relatively new.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: If you go back to 1994, you know, we sat around, all of us, all 55 of us which grew into -- what was it? -- 205, and we assigned Reuse Areas. So we called 'em Reuse Area one through thirteen. Lo and behold, we got that going, and after a while we decided that Reuse Areas needed another numbering system, so we set up another numbering system for environmental issues. And then, lo and behold, one day I go out and we contract for -- under our EDC the City was required to do the legal descriptions for the parcels, so we go out and contract

with Tetra Tech to do all the surveying and everything, and we had to have a separate system set up to identify what we were talking about. So we started calling 'em Parcel I, II, III, IV, V. And a lot of times they corresponded with Reuse Area 1, 2, 3, 4, but not necessarily. And then we got all these little side issues, like X-B and all these others. They were originally in Parcel X, which was the golf course, which was 10. But we couldn't transfer 'em at the time, and I don't remember why, but we couldn't. So we surveyed 'em separately. Parcel -- once it's recorded, that parcel becomes a parcel number with the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's what it is?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, once it's recorded.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: But that was just a way we set up to identify what we're talking about. So we're all on the phone, we're talking, so we know that if we use Roman numerals we're talking about legal parcels. If we use the other, if we use alphanumerics, that was environmental parcels. And if we use reuse area numbers, well that was a reuse area. It was just --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. That's very good.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Everybody set up a numbering system, and we just tried to make it logical.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, because the only people who ever use this Parcel X-B (1) blah, blah, blah, are the -- is the Navy in FOST --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- and that's because it's the --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Because it's a legal document.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- it is the actual parcel name.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's a recorded legal document, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. But that will switch to a number --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- an assessment number or a parcel number at the transfer.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes. All of Mare Island is 66 something or the other with a bunch of numbers behind it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Okay. Because I thought it was yet another unique system that the Navy used, because that's what my former co-chair told me. So that's all right. A couple of co-chairs ago, of course, you don't know who he was.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, it's true that the Navy did use it, because we all came together with our contractor and came up with a numbering system.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but I see what you're saying. But it only is surfacing primarily in a Navy document because it comes up primarily around --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Transfers.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- transfers.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And deeds.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Transfers and deeds; right. Okay, very good. And then three, you can go ahead and tell us about that.

MS. PAULY: Thanks, Gil.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: So X-B (3), we realize that there's still one environmental issue that remains on X-B (3). We noted it last night late while we were reviewing the presentation, so the presentation materials have been modified because of that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, what is that?

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: We are still using one of the buildings to store radiological materials from our active removal actions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Couldn't you just move them to another building?

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: We still would need to certify the building as clean after the fact.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. (Mumbling.)

MS. PAULY: Hopefully that answered your question. Thanks. So again, I just wanted to point out that you do have in your figures the larger map, kind of get a relative sense, and then I'll go ahead and talk about the various parcels.

So Parcel II, our largest parcel for transfer, is located in the northern portion of the island. This is actually looking across the Former North Building Ways Area. And Building 589 is in the foreground, however -- right here, I should say. Right here. But Building 655 in the background is actually not part of the site. So you can kind of see, it's a large site.

All right. And it has a lot of history. IA-2 and the Former North Building Ways are part of the area, as we mentioned before. It was used to assemble destroyers and landing craft during World War II. One of the environmental concerns there is radiological. And those investigations and remediation were conducted back when the base was closed in 1996 under the G-RAM, which is General Radioactive Material Program, and the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, or the NNPP.

So there were three buildings on Parcel II that had radiologicals, 589, 593, and 643. And DTSC, the Water Board, and the Department of Health Services, and EPA have concurred with closure after the final radiological surveys, and that was back in March of 1996. So remedial investigation began in '98 for other potential issues at the site. We had a revised RI back in September of 2008. So a lot of investigation had gone on. Petroleum was the other issue discovered at the site. And that removal action was conducted in April of 2009. There were 16 hot spot areas of diesel and motor oil. In October, 2009, the Water Board concurred with closure after the removal action for those.

In addition, Parcel II also had some PCB sites, and they were also identified as part of the RI, the thirteen sites. We've closed ten of them with EPA as of June of this year. There are three sites still pending, and we're just waiting for a couple of letters and that will finish those up. So in

that way we'd included Parcel II within the FOST document, even though we haven't completely gotten all the closures, similarly to X-B (3), but that's another good example of that. So we certainly anticipate that everyone concurs, that there's No Further Action required for IA-2 and the Former North Building Ways, which are the areas that had the most activity, if you will, on Parcel II. So we're hoping to finalize the NFA, Record of Decision, Remedial Action Plan, or as we refer to it, as a ROD/ RAP in August.

And the next picture is just of the actual site so you can kind of see where the various features are, Buildings 589 and 643, etcetera, the various PCB sites, and you can see the TPH sites, the 16 TPH sites that were remediated. You can also notice that this was the Former North Building Ways. You can see the last features of the Building Ways.

All right. Parcels X-B (1) and (2) are located in the southwestern portion of the island near the WMA, so just adjacent to it. This is actually the front of Building A166A, as you can see. And so the building was originally used as a -- there were many buildings in Parcels X-B (1) and (2). I believe there were a total of around fourteen or so. A lot of them were magazines for munitions. This happens to have been a former horse stables.

To get into a little bit more of the history of the two parcels, naval explosives were one of the main things stored, ammunition between the thirties up to 1975. Then inert ordnance was stored and related items. And then the magazines were not used for a period of time. Parcels X-B (1) and (2) were formerly located within the Western Mag[azine] Area [WMA] which is a munitions area and so it had things like MEC in it, so Munitions and Explosives of Concern, potentially. But surveys completed to date for X-B (1) and (2) have not identified any MEC. So it's worth noting that Parcel X-B (1) overlapped with the Horse Stables Area, and that was an area of concern for another environmental condition, abrasive blast material or ABM, also sometimes known as green sand.

The actual environmental concern associated with ABM, if you hadn't heard before, are metals, things like zinc, lead, chromium, and nickel. And confirmation samples taken as part of the Horse Stables Area TCRA, concluded that there were no CERCLA contaminant issues for Parcel X-B (1). So that was removed from the Western Mag Area and given a no further action with relation to MEC, as well as hazardous substances. So for X-B (1) and (2), MEC was a concern, and that was deemed no further action required. And it was only for X-B (1) that potential CERCLA issues existed, and they were determined in May of 2010 not to be an issue. Myrna, I can see a question coming.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you show us -- would you show us this overlap you're talking about, and whether that means that you changed the parcel boundary? I'm not clear what you're talking about there.

MS. PAULY: Absolutely, a good question. I can't quite show you --

MS. BECK: Look to the next slide.

MS. PAULY: Okay. Sorry, there we go. So yeah, actually you will see the overlap for the Horse Stables Area, which is this blue area right here. And then you can see that Jessica has very nicely noted in stripes the area that's outside of Parcel X-B (1). So the parcels don't change, those are fixed based on the surveys that Gil described. So does that make it a little more clear? So this was the area that potentially had ABM in it but was determined to not be of any additional environmental concern.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you cleaned up --

MS. PAULY: Yes, as part of --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- green sand in other areas of the Horse Stables Area, but not inside this boundary magically? Or is there an area outside of this parcel boundary to the west that also has no green sand concern?

MS. PAULY: This was the boundaries of the TCRA that was conducted for --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You should not use acronyms if you don't mind. I'm not picking on you, just I'd like for people who are in the room who don't know what a TCRA is to --

MS. PAULY: Thank you. No, thanks for mentioning that. It's the time critical removal action.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And so, go on, I interrupted you on that.

MS. PAULY: That's okay. So that area was remediated during that removal action, and so it was the entire area that's in the blue boundary. And so it just happened that that was identified previously, and then this parcel later was identified as able to be clean and FOST'd, if you will, for transfer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MS. PAULY: Does that make more sense?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yes. I mean, I think what you're saying is that it -- what you mean by overlapped is that the Horse Stables Area was inside and outside of this parcel boundary --

MS. PAULY: Thank you, you said it --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- but you have remediated that whole area.

MS. PAULY: You're exactly right, that's a much better way to say it.

Okay. So moving along to the SSTP Outfall which is in Parcel I. It's located in the tidal marsh mudflat area in the -- sort of the northwestern side of the island. And this is the SSTP Outfall when the tide is up. And this is what it looks like when there's low tide.

MR. COFFEY: Mudflat.

MS. PAULY: What's that?

MR. COFFEY: Mudflat.

MS. PAULY: Mudflat, exactly. Exactly. A little bit of the history of the SSTP Outfall is from 1957 to '72, all the industrial storm -- I should say not all -- industrial stormwater and sanitary waste flowed into the SST -- the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant or SSTP. The SSTP discharged treated waste to the western or tidal mudflat basically, as you can see, through the concrete pipe until 1976 when the effluent was actually rerouted to the City of Vallejo sanitary system. The RI or Remedial Investigation in 2001 determined that the contaminants of concern were PCBs and mercury in sediment surrounding outfall, not a huge surprise. And delineation sampling was conducted over a number of years, from 2002 to 2009. Once that delineation sampling was completed, removal actions were conducted partially after some of the original delineation sampling in June of 2002. And then finally in December of 2009 Weston got in there and did one heck of a job. So once they had completed the removal action and had done the removal report, DTSC and the Water Board were able to concur that no further action was

required -- or I should say concur with the recommendation that Weston had provided that no further action should be taken at the area, and that was back in May that we got the concurrence on that. So just, once again, a little bit of a close-up. It's not very detailed, but there's not much to the site, so --

Lastly, I just wanted to mention, so with this process, once all the applicable regulations are satisfied and the FOST document is created, the next part of the process is for, typically, if need be, a public comment period. And we did conduct a joint Navy and DTSC public comment period for the Draft Final FOST, and that was between May 17th to July 1st. So the next step of the process would be to take into consideration the comments from the agencies and the public to create the final FOST document. And lastly, the deeds that would be -- that would actually have the descriptions, the legal descriptions of the parcels to be transferred -- those would be prepared. And they would create the legally binding document which is the quit claim deed. And then the parcels would be transferred to the new owner. In this case, Parcels II and X-B (1) and X-B (2) would be transferred to the City of Vallejo, so that's pursuant to the Economic Development Conveyance, Memorandum of Agreement, often called the EDC/ MOA. And the SSTP Outfall would be a reversionary property that would go by deed to the State of California. So lastly, the process going forward and the schedule going forward is that the final FOST document is anticipated for August of 2010. Deeds will be prepared for the FOST parcels between August and September. And finally the transfer of the four parcels is targeted for September 30th of 2010. So I thank you all very much. That concludes my talk. Does anyone have any questions? All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On parcel -- Investigation Area 2, the Former North Building Ways, I'm just trying to figure out something here. You show property that's already been transferred from the Navy to the City out to the north and to the west of this boundary, but then you have gray hash marks over that. Does that mean that Parcel XV-A (1) has been transferred already?

MS. PAULY: Let's see if I can get to the part that you're talking about.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: North of the -- yeah.

MS. PAULY: Right in here. So Parcel IX is actually this left leaning blue hatch, and that is actually reversionary to the state that is untransferred.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, well, I didn't ask about nine though --

MS. PAULY: Oh, I'm sorry --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- I asked about --

MS. PAULY: You're talking about this parcel down here?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's XV-A.

MS. PAULY: Okay. Yes, that is part of the property already transferred to the City of Vallejo.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And when you show non-Navy property to the north of IA-2.

MS. PAULY: Right here?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Isn't that called the northern sliver, and wasn't that also transferred from the Navy?

MS. PAULY: No, actually --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The Navy never owned it.

MS. PAULY: That was never owned by the Navy. The northern sliver is slightly to the west.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We had the deeds researched on it, and it was something or other Stagecoach Company, I forgot what the name of it is, but it was the landing for the stage at sometime.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For the toll road?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And of course the stagecoach company is no longer around, so it's just a piece of property. Caltrans has basically taken it over. It all falls under the right-of-way for the bridge anyway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I thought you had a little piece in between the two that wasn't --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No, we tried to sell that to the marine -- the school -- the maritime academy, and we found out we didn't own it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's good to know beforehand. Because I know there was a lot of work on the northern sliver there for a long time.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, this is not the northern sliver.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where is the northern sliver?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The northern sliver is -- well it's not pictured on here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's not on this.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The northern sliver is outside the gate.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Literally outside the gate and towards Alco.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But -- oh, so it's not adjacent to this northern boundary?

MS. PAULY: I believe it's --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't think it's shown here.

MS. PAULY: Gil, am I pointing to the right spot over here? I think it's that there.

MS. BECK: Yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, there is a little piece of it right there. On your gray -- here, I'll walk over.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right here, right here, this little thing right there?

MR. COFFEY: Is that the technical term, northern sliver?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, we use legal terms.

(Simultaneous discussion occurred.)

MS. PAULY: It's in documents.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Okay. So that's one question. Thank you very much everyone. You're earning your hours here tonight, Gil. On figure four, Parcel X-B (1), they used to have a -

- I thought it used to have a jog out of it up here on the northwestern central -- that little finger thing, that prong as it's been called. Right about halfway down I thought it had a little jog in it, a little tooth out of it. Why is it straight now?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I'll look at other maps. And then could you tell us why X-B (2) cuts through the buildings themselves? And also, of course, now X-B (3) does, which you show without any boundary markers, but -- so could you tell us why that has occurred?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm lost.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: I don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I can help you get found, if you'd like. I doubt you are interested.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: You know what, I'm on the wrong map.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Most of the western boundary of those Parcels for X-B (1) and (2) follows what we kind of refer to as the Western Early Transfer Parcel Joy Survey Line. And I don't think this is the Joy Survey Line.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right, but that's different than the Western Early Transfer Parcel.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: I'm saying it is in reference to the Western Early Transfer Parcel Joy Survey Line, which this is the Joy Survey Line. There are additional portions of the Western Early Transfer Parcel which include services agreements which are beyond the Joy Survey Line, but that's -- I'm just saying that this is the Joy Survey Line, I don't know why they picked a straight line through the buildings, so if you want us to look that up, we certainly can, but --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I'm just grabbing the microphone back because the Joy Survey Line wasn't necessarily a part of the Western Early Transfer Parcel, it is something that was defined in like 1927. So the Western Early Transfer Parcel, some portions of it do go, you know, up to the Joy Survey Line, but actually it's -- they're not necessarily related. Like here they're not because you have an ESCA here for the work done in the Western Mag, so -- but if you are saying that it is the Joy Survey Line that made that boundary, then that makes some sense since the buildings could have been put in after that survey.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, it was, it was -- I would almost bet -- and I don't have the documents here in front of me -- that if we went back and looked in the State Lands agreement --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- that that was the property they were going to claim.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And, you know, we just drew lines, we didn't care about buildings in those days.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. Right. That's what it looks like. Yeah.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, we just -- I don't remember any particular exact reason why we cut off the ends of those buildings, because it probably just didn't make a big difference to us. I just really don't remember.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, okay. That's believable. That's something that people have been asking me, and I've said it was probably the Joy Survey Line but, you know, I'm just asking here on the record.

MS. PAULY: Fantastic. Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

MS. PAULY: Well, thank you all so much.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Brooks. As for the next presentation, it's been a little confusing. The first RAB packet that you received in the mail from CDM states that you're going to be listening to the Implementation of Investigation Area C3, the Triangle, Black Granular Material, that is indeed what you are going to be seeing tonight. The agenda that you may have received in the mail yesterday and the agenda that's up there are actually incorrect. So the original RAB packet is correct, and Steve Farley will now be presenting the C3 Triangle Area Remedial Action Plan Implementation.

**III. PRESENTATION: *Implementation of Investigation Area (IA) C3 Black Granular Material (BGM) Triangle Remedial Action Plan***  
**Presentation by Steve Farley (CH2MHill)**

MR. COFFEY: Go, Steve. Go, Steve. Go, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. Good evening, everybody. Okay. So we'll get started here. This is a presentation on the implementation of the IA-C3, Investigation Area C3, BGM, or black granular material, Remedial Action Plan. So I'll be using IA for Investigation Area, and I'll be using BGM for black granular material. I'll define what BGM is. And in the back, as we go along, if you're interested there's some photos back there. I don't want to distract everybody, but if you find something that you might have an interest in seeing a photograph of to kind of put it in context, there are photographs in the back, and we will go through those towards the end.

So the presentation tonight will go through the remedial actions that recently have been completed, and we're going to demonstrate that the proposed remedy that was described in the public meeting on June 24th of '09 has been completed. Here's our agenda. We'll talk about the location, background, what the selected remedial actions were, what we've completed, the path forward and, of course, we'll entertain some questions. We generally use the 'Triangle' term to refer to an area that's part of IA-C3. It's bounded by Berth 12 on the strait, and Dry Docks 1 and 2. And I hope everybody has had a chance to see Dry Dock 1 because it's absolutely beautiful. We prepared an IA-C3 remedial investigation Feasibility Study or RIFS that addressed the three known sources within the Triangle Area. These were Building 108, the Building 108 area, and then IR09 and IR12.

So when we first started the program we did a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, or RI/FS, to address the contaminants primarily in soil associated with those three sites. And you can see that lead and petroleum hydrocarbons were the common contaminants, and then PCBs were also associated with one of the sites. Then we prepared a Remedial Action Plan, we performed a remedial action, and part of that remedial action was some limited investigations, and then implementing a land use covenant or an LUC. During those actions, we removed on the order of 2,000 cubic yards of soil from seventeen separate areas.

So the action for these three sites involved seventeen different locations where we did excavation. We also collected 202 verification samples, six, of those exceeded the DTSC standard for lead. During that exercise or during those actions, we discovered this material that has become to be known as BGM. I'll describe the details of that in a moment. So the BGM was identified in a number of areas within C3 during implementation of this action which, in turn, was based on these investigations. After we got done with the work, DTSC requested that we do additional characterization of the BGM. Following that, we prepared a Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan to address the BGM that was discovered during implementation of this remedy.

So here's a little background on the BGM. We weren't really sure what to call it when we first encountered it, so it's gotten the term BGM. Fundamentally it's smelter slag, furnace blast material, foundry slag. It's very coarse material, has all kinds of different grain sizes. It actually looks like rusted rocks. And if you really boil it down, that's what it looks like. Lead is one of the common constituents in it. Typically the lead exceeds the Region 9 Remedial Screening Level or RSL for industrial sites. It was widespread. We found it in a number of places just below the asphalt. It was underneath building foundations. It was used as structural fill. We found it on top of brick rubble that occurred in the Triangle Area. And we think it was commonly used as a leveling course to essentially level out some of the unevenness in the ground surface, in this case out in the Triangle. It occurs as a layer below concrete pads, underlying railroad grade, thin layers between dredge fill, and it has lenses of borrow material from the Panoche. The Panoche formation is a cretaceous sandstone. If you look down here at the far end of the island, if you go look from this side back over towards the Vallejo side, you see some of those beautifully dipping beds over there, that's the Panoche formation.

Now, the remedial action objectives for the implementation of the FS/RAP are listed here. Fundamentally protect human health and the environment. The way we achieve that is to address the lead in the BGM and the BGM impacted soils so they couldn't cause a significant health risk. And then the idea was we gotta put the site back together so it can be used as a viable commercial area. There were a number of alternatives that were evaluated in the FS/RAP. Alternative S2 was the selected remedy, and that included encapsulation of the BGM by repairing some existing pavement and then placing new pavement in some areas, leaving structures in place, and then implementing some institutional controls; essentially to avoid somebody unknowingly going out and digging up the pavement and coming in contact with the material.

The Remedial Design Work Plan, or the RDWP, is a document that we prepared, and it's a typical part of the entire process leading to cleanup. It's the document that takes the Remedial Action Plan, which lays out this general alternative, and it works out all the details so that the project can be bid and folks can go out and actually build this. The components of that were to encapsulate the BGM and BGM impacted soil, repair the existing pavement, and then placing at least four inches of new asphalt, and the structures to remain in place. Following the encapsulation steps, then record and implement institutional controls. And then as – for the long-term, making sure that there's the appropriate maintenance and inspections of the encapsulating surface. And then, lastly, performing groundwater monitoring.

Here's some more details on the construction elements. We removed the existing asphalt and the aggregate base. We excavated the existing fill subgrade, particularly where there's heavy traffic areas, because we wanted to -- when we put the materials back, put the capping system in, we

wanted to make sure that it was structurally sound. We disposed of 7,500 tons of primarily BGM and BGM-impacted soil. And I think that's something that the RAB has expressed interest in before is what's being left here and what has been hauled off. In this case almost 8,000 tons of this impacted soil was hauled off and disposed of in an appropriate landfill. And I think a lot of it went to Kettleman. We compacted the subgrade and installed geotextile. And if you want to just take a quick look, there's some photos in the back that shows what the geotextile looks like. We placed and compacted the ag base. Performed final grading. We also had to adjust some storm sewer and other utility manholes because of the change in grade. Installed new storm sewer pipes. And then placed the actual asphaltic concrete in a couple of lifts to get up to a minimum of four inches. Those actions were conducted between November '09 and June of this year. So we've just finished this up.

Here's a drawing that shows the layout of the encapsulating surface. So let's go through these here as you see them out here. So first of all, these are the existing buildings, they are to remain. The existing surface is here, and that's this material here shown in the green. Heavy traffic areas are shown here. And I think if you've had a chance to go out here, you can -- these traffic patterns, you can tell just by looking at the absence of buildings in certain areas. So this is the high traffic areas. Remove and replace the asphalt in the center areas. And then other new asphalt in these areas here. So fundamentally, repair the existing asphalt, place new asphalt, and do additional subgrade work to make sure that the heavy traffic areas accommodate future use. Okay.

So the -- most of the rest of these slides go through some of the photographs that show work during construction to give you a sense for the kinds of work that we had to do, and what the existing surfaces look like. So here's the cranes along Dry Dock 1. Dry Dock 1 is right here. This is looking roughly to the northwest. So we removed rails and some of the asphalt that was in poor condition and areas where we had to improve the subgrade for heavy traffic areas. So in addition to these broad areas where we're using an excavator, there's also some areas where we had to actually do some hand work. So it went from large scale, excavator type activities down to small scale and actually using shovels and picks.

Another example of the excavated -- we excavated the existing fill. You can see here that we've gone down all the way through the asphalt, all the way through the subgrade, and this area here is getting prepared to lay new subgrade and then new asphalt. Here's the geotextile being laid down. That was laid down on the compacted subgrade. Once the subgrade is compacted, then we laid that down. And the purpose for that is just another step in encapsulating the BGM. Once the BGM or once the geotextile was laid down -- could we hit one of those lights over there?

MR. NEVILLE: Off or on?

MR. FARLEY: Off. Maybe one more. Okay. So once the geotextile was laid down, then more subgrade material was placed over the top, was rolled out, compacted. Here's another example of where the geotextile was laid out, and then this shows the subgrade material coming in and being placed and then finally compacted. These photos basically take you through the sequence from removing the existing materials, the existing asphalt, all the way down through, and you'll see in the end laying down some of the new asphalt. So, again, here's the final grading to make sure that everything is plumb. Placement of the new asphaltic concrete. Here's one of the bollards out there. So a lot of hand work. Rollers to lay out and compact the asphalt. And then

density testing here. And you can see how nice and pretty that looks once the new asphalt is laid out. Laying a fog coat on top of the asphalt to protect it. So this is all basically finished work.

In many cases we had to leave -- not had to, we -- the crane rails, for example, remained in place because of the structure -- right, Myrna, you know how important those crane rails are. So those items were left in place and we worked around them to protect the integrity of the crane rails.

So here's a couple examples of the finished product. You can see how nice and smooth that is. It's not only functional for long-term commercial industrial uses, but it also serves as an effective barrier to contact with the BGM.

So our path forward. The work in the field is done. Once the work in the field is done, then we write a report called an implementation report. The implementation report will detail all of the things I've talked about tonight, it will detail all of the steps that we did, all of the density readings, all of those details will go into the implementation report. We expect that we will have that out in August to the agencies. Then we'll record a site specific LUC, or land use covenant, to protect that encapsulating surface, require inspections, those types of activities. We'll conduct groundwater monitoring. And then requiring the future inspections and maintenance activities for the encapsulating surface. So this is taking it all the way from the samples that were collected back in the -- actually by the Navy back in the nineties, all the way up through the formal remedial investigation, the Feasibility Study, the early work that was done, the discovery of the BGM, the subsequent evaluation of remedies, implementing the remedy, and now we're at the point of writing these reports and conducting the groundwater monitoring to close the site out. So that's our presentation for tonight on the implementation of the remedy for the triangle area. I'd be happy to entertain, of course, any questions.

MR. COFFEY: Hey, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

MR. COFFEY: The reason for encapsulation rather than removal, is that strictly economic?

MR. FARLEY: There's a number of -- economics fits into it. In the FS/RAP there are nine criteria against which these different remedies are compared, and cost is certainly one of them. In some places like -- well, in some of the areas, like I mentioned about the crane rails, there's a number of areas where you just can't get to it. Structural integrity issues -- and Myrna knows this as well as anybody probably -- but the crane rails.

MR. COFFEY: They must be sacrosanct.

MR. FARLEY: Right. But if you look at the numbers I put up there, there were 7,500 tons that were taken off site.

MR. COFFEY: And the constituent element of that is lead, and you can't get anything much worse environmentally than lead.

MR. FARLEY: And the nice thing about lead --

MR. COFFEY: The nice thing?

MR. FARLEY: Well, not the nice thing. The property about lead that makes the encapsulation appropriate -- that's a faux pas -- that's a faux pas, huh? The geochemical behavior of lead, it's not very soluble in groundwater, so encapsulating it, plus the fact that the groundwater is below the surface where this stuff was applied -- remember it's basically a leveling course, it's -- every

place that we've seen it it's been in a layer some number of feet thick, I don't remember the exact number; but it was used by the Navy most likely as a leveling course out there while they were finishing up development of the Triangle Area, and before they placed the buildings, they constructed the buildings on top of it. So fundamentally lead isn't very mobile in groundwater. This remedy was an appropriate remedy based on those nine criteria.

MR. COFFEY: And if I remember correctly, it's a very low level of groundwater right there too.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: You dig down two feet and there it is.

MR. FARLEY: Well, no, it's not that shallow.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: And, in fact, if you look at -- if you look at where the Triangle boundary is -- let's actually go back -- you're bounded on two sides by dry docks that go down to what, 40, 45 feet, fifty feet at least.

MR. COFFEY: But those are encapsulated.

MR. FARLEY: Right. But what I mean is the groundwater wouldn't have very far to go. Groundwater out here generally flows towards the strait. But this area right here is really isolated from the regional groundwater system. So we have groundwater monitoring wells, and the groundwater out there isn't on the order of two feet.

MR. COFFEY: That geosynthetic textile, is that permeable?

MR. FARLEY: Well, everything is permeable. It's -- relatively speaking it's very impermeable. It's not meant to be a permeable layer underneath the asphalt.

MR. COFFEY: I mean because when I saw you putting that material on top of the membrane, and it's basically rock.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

MR. COFFEY: Then you compact it, and a lot of times that means you perforate the material.

MR. FARLEY: This stuff is --

MR. COFFEY: How many mil?

MR. FARLEY: I don't remember the exact mil, but this geotextile material was selected with that issue in mind, yeah.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. Jerry.

MR. KARR: Just a couple of quick ones. I don't remember, and in your research, how is this Triangle constructed? Was it just covered and filled, or how much of it was existing Mare Island, or do we know?

MR. FARLEY: It's a good question, and ironically this slide has the answer.

MR. KARR: That's why I had you put it up.

MR. COFFEY: Dude.

MR. FARLEY: No, I'm sorry, let's turn 'em off. One more. Okay. This -- I think everybody in this room knows the island was at one time an island.

MR. COFFEY: Really an island.

MR. FARLEY: Really an island. This was in the --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Kind of.

MR. FARLEY: Well, it had wetlands to the north fundamentally, and it had the strait and the bay on either side.

MR. COFFEY: At high tide it was really an island.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. FARLEY: So this line right here marks the boundary between the original island, I use the term with a lower case "i" and the fill material. So this -- this area here, although it's not a sharp line, this area here basically represented the shoreline of the island before the Navy came in and developed it. And the actual bedrock high out here, or the rock out here is all almost exclusively is this Panoche Formation which is really hard, it's a hard sandstone, you can tell by the cliffs over here on either side of the strait that the -- that this is pretty hard rock. And so --

MR. COFFEY: My backyard is made out of it.

MR. FARLEY: And so this area right here -- and I'm sure that there are old photographs of this that show that this was -- actually had to be built into the rock of the old island. When you get out in here, this material out here was actually fill. So in the far western portion of the dry docks and the Triangle Area, that was all native material, it was primarily rock. And as you moved this way, it got down into more of the marshy kind of material that you see, generally that you see up towards the north. Although the difference there is the Panoche isn't exposed at the surface very much. In this direction, in particular when we go down to the very south end of the island, when we're up by the spirit ship, that's all the Panoche Formation down there. So this area down here, there was some bedrock in here, but this area in here was built up. And if you look at the way the dry docks were built, you have a wall here, you have a wall here, and then you have the quay wall here. And so, generally speaking, this is predominantly fill material in here.

MR. KARR: And I'm certain it was covered in previous presentations and in your project here that you did borings to a certain depth to make sure there was nothing hiding there?

MR. FARLEY: Right. And, in fact, Jerry, that's a good point. When we did the RI and the FS initially, we focused on these three buildings because those were the known sources identified by the Navy prior to the Eastern Early Transfer moving forward. And so when we did our initial work out there, we focused on these areas, and we didn't find the BGM in large quantities. When we started doing the work, that's when we found the BGM. And so we did additional investigation of that before writing the latest FS/RAP that addresses specifically the BGM. So there were other contaminants out there from other sources, those were taken care of when we removed the couple thousand cubic yards of dirt associated with these three areas. Once we found the -- sort of the magnitude of the BGM, that's when we had to do the additional FS/RAP.

MR. KARR: Thank you. And then the last question; I noticed that you removed the rails as you start a project. Do the covenants address that, that if a industrial client or property owner in the

future would want to establish a new rail spur or something, can they -- I mean, will the covenants address that, that they will be able --

MR. FARLEY: You know, Jerry, to be honest with you, I don't know. The rail -- the rail sort of issues and relationships out here, they're beyond me. I don't understand them. But I know that these things, the kinds of questions you're asking periodically come up. I'm sorry, I just don't know.

MR. KARR: Well, and my reason for it, you know, I have no interest particularly, but if the covenants and your remediation is encapsulation, if somebody wants to do work like that, they're going to have to break that encapsulation to a certain depth to put in air beds and whatever for the rail. So I don't know how that's covered in the future if a, if the client, or I'm not sure, a lessee or somebody, if they wanted to do major industrial work, is that a possibility or does this closure mechanism eliminate that?

MS. NAITO: I can take that one. When we enter into a land use covenant, we really don't want people breaking through the cap, because that's why we put it there.

MR. KARR: Right.

MS. NAITO: However, if they -- if a plan is developed that requires breaking through the cap, they have to come back to my department. We have to oversee what they're doing, we have to review the plan, and make sure that it's not going to change the condition, the finished product will still be safe.

MR. KARR: Right. Right. I mean, that's easy to do. I just wanted to make sure.

MS. NAITO: So it doesn't preclude doing that.

MR. KARR: Yeah, that's -- there will be that ability in the future.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And there are periodic reviews, the one in five strikes me, I don't remember that exact one, but one in five years in which there are people that go back and inspect to make sure that that party, that industrial party that you've been talking about didn't do it and never came back and asked for permission.

MR. KARR: Right. Like in some building a guy might want to install an interior crane and have to do a new base and stuff, and for it to be attractive to industrial clients, there has to be a mechanism.

MS. NAITO: There is.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sheila, did you want to talk about those more complex issues that Steve mentioned that he couldn't talk about? Do you have some knowledge of that?

MS. ROEBUCK: With respect to the rails, you know, the question --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you want to use the microphone?

MS. ROEBUCK: With the question that Jerry asked, I think that Janet gave a good explanation. If there is a tenant that wanted to have a rail spur or anything else that would potentially impact the cap, we will certainly talk to them about that. But the cost associated with breaching the cap and putting something back that's acceptable to DTSC is something that they would probably have to bear --

MR. KARR: Oh, certainly, yeah.

MS. ROEBUCK: -- as part of what they wanted to have done. And if they're willing to do that, and DTSC accepts it, we're not going to preclude that as a possibility.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was there -- there was rail there existing?

MR. FARLEY: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Then what part of the process chose to select a remedy that removed the rail? Who authorizes that when that rail is existing?

MR. FARLEY: It's in the RAP, and then it's detailed in the Remedial Design Work Plan. It was the document that went out and went through public review back in approximately June of 2009.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did you have any comments or concerns raised in that document in response to that document?

MS. NAITO: Not on the removal of the rail line that I can recall.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What I'd like to know, a couple of questions is why did you remove the amount of -- I don't remember, I probably missed the public meeting, probably one of the few that I did miss -- but why did you remove the amount of BGM that you did remove?

MR. FARLEY: Is this the slide you're referring to, Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, that would be very close to that slide.

MR. FARLEY: A couple of reasons. One is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, if you were going to cap, why did you take any of it away?

MR. FARLEY: And it's a fair question. If you boil it all down, it comes down to the structural integrity of the BGM; could it be compacted? Could it be compacted sufficiently to support, like Michael was saying, to support the pavement? Would it be so -- It's really rugged stuff. It's crusty stuff. And if you were to try and place a geotextile liner on top of it, you stand a large chance, I think, I mean at least speaking conceptually, of puncturing that. So the -- one of the main reasons was because of the nature of the material, it's hard to compact, it's hard to deal with, you really can't get a strong structural foundation on which to build the rest of the remedy. That was the primary thing. There are also places where we disturbed it when we were moving certain kinds of other features that had to be removed to put the cap in, and it was just easier rather than try to move that material around, to just take it off-site because of the high lead level.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Besides the land use covenants, which I assume the owner or the lessee of the property would honor, is there any signage that kind of would remind an employee or a utilities worker or somebody that there's a geo -- there's a subgrade, protective --

MR. COFFEY: Do not dig here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- you know, do not dig kind of signage?

MR. FARLEY: I don't know. There are some sites where that kind of signage is required, the ML mark, for example, at PCB sites, that sort of thing. I'm not aware of any -- and I could be mistaken -- I'm not aware of any specific signage that would say, "Don't dig here."

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Do you think that's a good idea? Or why is it not a good idea?

MS. NAITO: Myrna, I want you to hold that thought. We're going to try to address some of that during the presentation I'm hoping to give to show you about the land use covenant monitoring system. It's not going to address specifically, though, the marker issue, but it will give you a sense of what we look for and what notifications we get and how we get them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Doesn't show you even on the agenda so, it doesn't show a topic so how would I know to hold that thought?

MS. NAITO: I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How many wells and where are they?

MR. FARLEY: Can you hit the lights again? I meant turn 'em off, yeah. Sorry. I didn't bring a figure tonight showing the monitoring wells. There are on the order of about a half dozen or a dozen monitoring wells that are out here, and they've been monitored for a number of years, and there's additional monitoring that's going to be going on. Those monitoring wells are most likely going to be directly in locations where we had previous source areas, meaning the buildings, but also in other areas around to monitor the potential effects and impacts on the groundwater from the remaining BGM. So I'm sorry I don't have an actual figure of that, it would be in the RDWP, it would be in the implementation report that's coming out, and that's certainly something that -- it certainly goes in the library. I don't know if it's actually a -- is it a public document, Janet, that goes through a formal public review? Or is it distributed, for example, to Myrna and the rest of the folks on the CC list?

MS. NAITO: It would be -- it is distributed once we approve it.

MR. FARLEY: Yeah. So that information is available in those documents. If the RAB would like a figure showing those monitoring wells, I can certainly either bring one next time, or I could have it sent out to the RAB mailing list.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What does that last bullet mean, future inspections and maintenance activities for the encapsulating surface? Is that referring to something that's part of the ongoing land use control --

MR. FARLEY: That's right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- package that, monitoring package.

MR. FARLEY: It's really two things. One is it's part of the periodic reviews that have to be done to make sure that the remedy is in place effective, that the cap is being maintained, but there will also be specific requirements for how to maintain that cap. Now, it's not going to come down and say use this size broom, but it will provide some specifics about the kinds of inspections that need to be done and the kind of maintenance that needs to be performed. So, for example, if there's just normal routine activities, and that asphalt somehow gets breached, let's say it's an extremely warm day and somebody does something that maybe they shouldn't be doing and it punctures through, those kinds of things would be required to be addressed. Now, that may not be the best of examples, but inspections and maintenance of that surface will be required just as part of the LUC, and then there's the normal long-term requirements for inspections, and then periodic review of the remedy through DTSC. I think there was a question in the back, provided you get a microphone.

MR. FARNELL: Simply what I was going to ask is that back on your encapsulation paving plan -- I ran around that area a lot myself before it was given to California Dry Dock Solutions -- there's this large vacant area next to the crane, big large blue crane alongside Dry Dock 2, there's no structures there other than a few pits for the revolving bollards.

MR. FARLEY: You talking about this area here?

MR. FARNELL: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: I think it's a concrete slab that's in there that's associated with the areas around the cranes.

MR. FARNELL: Well, the cranes next, you know, is next to it going towards the right, and I was just curious, there's nothing out there other than the pits for the revolving bollards, and I was just curious why it's such an irregular shape.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: In that area, back in 1993, four, as we were closing up, there were buildings that disappeared overnight and on weekends that the Navy just picked up and left with. There was also equipment that sometime left too. They were all classified stuff.

MR. FARLEY: So, Gil, are they concrete foundations?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: That's what I thought.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I remember that building, I just don't remember what was in it. The -- I remember the building he's referring to, I just don't remember why.

MR. FARLEY: Are we talking about this one?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: And that one?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could have been one of those G-RAM disappearances.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Steve. At this point we'll go into our first public comment period. Does anyone have additional comments?

(NO RESPONSE.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: No. Okay, great. We are running a little bit long so we'll cut our ten minute break to five minutes, and we'll meet back here at 8:22.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Heather Wochnick)**

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: We're going to be moving on to the administrative business and announcements. Everyone received a RAB packet in the mail with the draft meeting minutes from the last RAB meeting. If you have any comments or questions, please feel free to e-mail myself or Myrna with your comments. I have no other announcements. I would like to say that our office has selected the new BRAC Environmental Coordinator; however

we're not actually announcing who the person is yet, so you should know by next month. Myrna, do you have any announcements?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

## **V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS**

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Okay. So we'll be moving on to the focus group report. First report being Wendell for community.

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

MR. COFFEY: Wendell has nothing to report, as usual.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Michael, for Wendell.

MR. QUIGLEY: I'll owe Paula.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Natural resources, Jerry.

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

MR. KARR: I second that. Nothing to report.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: All right. Technical, Paula.

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

MS. TYGIELSKI: Technical also has nothing to report.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Well, we're making up time left and right. City, Gil.

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

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The City has nothing to report either.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Well, all right, Steve, I know you'll have something.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, Steve.

MR. QUIGLEY: He just wants to talk.

MR. FARLEY: Wendell.

MR. COFFEY: He just wants to clarify plumb versus leveling, and how much he likes lead.

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

MR. FARLEY: We have an eleven by seventeen handout. In the upper right, the photos there are those that we covered in the IA-C3 BGM work. And, in fact, I think -- I think the photo on the lower right actually shows one of those concrete pad areas that you were talking about that's right here next to the blue crane. Yeah, interesting. I didn't pick that up until just now. On the upper left, those photos are showing some of the preparatory work that we're doing right now in advance of starting the implementation -- implementing the remedy for the Crane Test Area. That remedy will be capping of that area.

So these are basic things, if you live out here or drive around you may see some of these things, and so I thought I'd just show 'em real quick. The fencing going up along Azuar Drive shown in the upper photo, the green fencing. The truck going in has got the wattles and the other

mechanisms to control rain runoff. The next photo down they're clearing all of the -- and grubbing the vegetation and kind of moving around the various just pieces of debris out there. And then the bottom one is just showing some of the concrete and some of the old metal fencing and such that are within the boundary. And all this stuff has to be moved out of the way before the actual excavation work and the preparation for the cap placement is started.

In the map we have a number of sites that we're working on. Obviously the C3 Triangle Area. We've also got some work that we're still doing on the IR-14 pipeline installation/ restoration. Pump Station 6 is sort of down in the lower right, and Pump Station 4 -- actually DOM 5, which is part of the sanitary sewage system, we're doing some work there as well.

The other main two that I'll point out are IR-15, which is right along the strait about halfway down from the bridge to the piers. That's an area where we are working with the agencies on finishing up a Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan to finalize the remedy for that location. And the one next to it is called the Building 493/ 971 FOPL, and that's the fuel oil pipeline. We're doing some work there working with the agencies to finalize the work plan for taking care of some of the soil contamination out there. 99 percent of the contaminants related to these fuel oil pipelines or these FOPL lines are petroleum. Building 535 I talked about a little more detail last month. We've got some PCB sites that -- one PCB site in particular in the northwest corner of Building 535 that had appeared to have some runoff that went down into one of the storm drain lines, and so we've gone in and fixed that line.

Down below we've got some of the documents that are coming up. The main ones are the draft Remedial Design Work Plan for IR-15, and then the IA-C2 Remedial Action Plan. A couple of public comment periods coming up. The IR-14 public comment period is ongoing right now. So if you have an interest in that, the documents are over in the library. And then secondly, the other upcoming public comment period is going to be the IR-15 FS/RAP or Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Plan public comment period. And we're hoping that that will start sometime in August. That's the hope right now. So that's kind of the status of the main things going on. Myrna, any questions?

MS. ROEBUCK: I have something I wanted to add, if you wouldn't mind?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure. You want to use the microphone?

MS. ROEBUCK: I just wanted to apologize to the RAB and to the Navy for the confusion regarding the agenda. What had happened was that as part of the preparation for the Crane Test Area remedial action, we had -- CH2M Hill and Lennar had received a request to consider the use of rail for removing soil from that site, and we couldn't do that -- well, there were a number of reasons that -- a number of things we needed to investigate, but we couldn't do it at all if the public hadn't been consulted. And it had not been part of the original public presentation in the Feasibility Study/ Remedial Action Plan. And so we asked to take some of the RAB's time for that. In the interim, there were other things that came up that made it not possible for us to do that so we didn't want to take the RAB's time to talk about something that wasn't going to be possible, so we reverted back to the original presentation. So we apologize for the confusion.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What wasn't going to be possible, the use of rail or the public information?

MS. ROEBUCK: The use of the rail, for a number of other reasons, it just wasn't possible for this particular project.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I only have one question about your lower left photo. Is that a salt lick?

MR. FARLEY: Let me borrow the microphone, I have to respond formally to that question. No.  
(LAUGHTER.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Steve. We now move onto the Weston update with Dwight Gemar.

**f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)**

MR. GEMAR: All righty. I hope everyone had a chance to grab the Weston update. Under document status there is a couple of documents that went out this month, one is the Draft Final Conceptual Site Model for Munitions and Explosives of Concern prepared for Investigation Restoration Site 05 and the Western Magazine Area. That went out a couple of weeks ago. And then just the last day or so we also sent out a related document called the Draft Final Munitions Response Action Completion Report, which documents some of the munitions removal action activity that has been conducted at those two sites over the last few years. And we have another -- a number of other documents, a couple related to -- also related to IR-05 and the WMA that are in preparation, as well as some completion reports that are coming up for Investigation Area H1.

And an update on Investigation Area H1, particularly with regard to the containment area. The placement of the two foot cover soil, which is kind of the last component of the engineered cap, was completed on July 20th, and we just have some minor finish grading to do. But for all intents and purposes, the engineered cap is done, with the exception of hydroseeding, spraying seed on top of the dirt which will occur later this summer before the rainy season. And then the last activity that has to be done within Investigation Area H1 is also a soil cover that goes outside of the containment area, and this just goes in the upland areas surrounding or within the Investigation Area H1. And that is, has been, started also on July 20th and, however, we are going to need some more dirt. The import source that we've been using, which is dirt from the highway widening project east of Suisun City for Highway 12, some very nice kind of farmland dirt that they're removing, has been coming here, but there are -- they are done with that work. So we've sampled a source over in Hercules, and we're looking at using that as the remaining cover soil. And that will hopefully occur and hopefully be completed by the end of August.

MR. COFFEY: Promises. Promises.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, yeah, I know. If anybody has some extra dirt they want to get rid of, just let me know. But it has to be a lot.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: And clean.

MR. GEMAR: And we do have some other miscellaneous activities such as finishing a perimeter road that goes around the containment area and the security fence, and that work is actually ongoing right now. And that's the story on H1. And down at the south end of the island, you might recall a few months ago, well, actually last year we removed some soil from Investigation Restoration Site 05 at the south end of the island, and left some holes out there that, of course, ponded with water over the rainy season. And they were not evaporating too quickly, so we discussed this with the agencies and got approval to pump that water into an upland area or actually over to dredge pond seven. And it was sampled beforehand, and also sampled during the three day duration of the dewatering. And so we basically, as you can see in the photo,

removed most of the water in that excavation area. So we'll let it dry for another month or so, and then we'll be able to backfill that area. And then the final topic is in the lower right we are moving along with installation of a walking trail which has -- will be done in conjunction with the remaining work at IA H1. And you can see the rock that we're laying down along the western levee there. So that will be a nice amenity. And we will have it done basically in parallel with the work we're doing in Investigation Area H1, we just need to finish hauling in all of the remaining soil and get that done so that we don't have folks out there at the same time we're hauling in thousands of truckloads of dirt. So that's ongoing. We're doing both in parallel so that we can hopefully open that trail up very quickly after we get done with the final work.

MR. QUIGLEY: When?

MR. GEMAR: Shooting for the end of August, Wendell. It depends on the dirt.

MR. QUIGLEY: What year?

MR. GEMAR: No comment.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I really appreciate the work that you are doing on that project. Obviously it doesn't make any sense at all to have the public out there while you're trying to wrap up and put the landfill to bed, so I get that. What I don't get is why you had to dewater and then fill IR-05 with soil? Why? I thought it was kind of designed originally, way back when anyway, to just be kind of a muted or a seasonal wetland or something like that. So why would you be filling it now?

MR. GEMAR: Well, we do need to fill it up with a couple of feet, Myrna. That is the plan is to make it a kind of tidal, muted tidal -- but the plan is to make it into a pickleweed habitat, and right now this would be submerged and pickleweed wouldn't grow there.

MR. COFFEY: Too deep.

MR. GEMAR: The ducks would like it, but not the mice.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just asking.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Okay. Thank you, Dwight. So for the regulatory update, as I mentioned earlier, Janet Naito does have a little presentation. But we can go to Elizabeth and Carolyn first. So Elizabeth, Water Board update.

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

MS. WELLS: Okay. Thank you. I wanted to tell everybody that I called John Kaiser -- actually I didn't call him, I e-mailed John Kaiser, and for the previous RAB meetings before he retired he would drive up and we would have dinner together at the Front Room, and then we would come to the meeting. And so I sent him an e-mail and asked if he wanted to join me for dinner, and he told me he was busy and that he had no interest in coming to the RAB meeting either. So in the last month --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Did you offer him money?

MS. WELLS: Well, on that note, no. I was out all day actually at Moffett Field yesterday, my other site, and I came in this morning and found out that I've been furloughed for the month of August. So now I don't have any money to give. He's retired now and --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Wealthy.

MS. WELLS: Exactly. The first thing I can do is -- and Alec introduced himself -- but Alec Naugle is my supervisor, and he's going to be overseeing the work that I do on Mare Island, and he actually worked on Mare Island five years ago.

MR. NAUGLE: Yeah, about five years ago for two or three years, a short period.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Welcome back.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. Okay. So in the last month I went on vacation and -- and now I'm going on furlough. But before I left on vacation I did have an opportunity to comment on a couple of documents for the Draft Site Management Plan. And according to the Navy I also commented on the Revised Draft Final RI Report for IR-04.

MR. COFFEY: Has no recollection there.

MS. WELLS: Don't remember that. And currently I'm working on -- I'm reviewing the Draft Record of Decision Remedial Action Plan for the Marine Corps Firing Range, and the Draft Final Site Conceptual Model for MEC at IR-05, Western Magazine Area Dredge Ponds. Thank you very much.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Carolyn with the EPA update.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I guess, as I understand it, it's PCBs that's holding up the early transfer on parcel --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The FOST.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Well, I'm sorry, it's not an early transfer, it's the transfer, the final transfer. And as Brooks was mentioning, there was like three outstanding issues out there. One of 'em is for the building we've already signed off on it, but in the description of the building there was a transformer that the Navy couldn't locate. They said the records showed it was associated with that building, but out in the field and it leaked, and there was some ambiguity about whether that site was addressed or not. So the Navy's come back with some more information about that transfer, and I got that letter and I still have to take a look at it. And an issue with another site out on the pier when I went out to look at it, it looked like the PCBs were gone, but there was a big gaping hole left there that somebody could fall in, so that was --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Things happen.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: That was a concern, so --

MR. FARLEY: Pickleweed marsh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Duck habitat.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: So that's why that one is outstanding. And then with respect to the transfer, there's a building out on the pier that's kind of an interesting issue where there's friable asbestos noted in the FOST document inside that building. And the reason why it's friable is because there were vandals who had broken into the building who were stripping copper wire and they damaged it. And so the Navy had boarded it up and posted a sign saying that there was friable asbestos out there. And they were planning to transfer it to the City as is. And we had concern - identified concerns about that. But the same day that I was out there with Mel from the caretaker's site office and saw the gaping hole, we also noted that the -- that building had been broken into again, three windows were smashed, and somebody had been back in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They took the asbestos.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: We don't --

MR. COFFEY: They mitigated it.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: We don't know.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They mitigated it.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I didn't go look, okay. But that was another issue that was identified. And so one of the concerns right now is we're trying to figure out who is whose responsibility is it. In accordance with the agreements between the Navy and the City, did the City agree to take that and maintain all that? Or who, what -- our comment is that it needs to be, it needs to be cleaned up before the property is transferred. It needs to -- I mean somebody's gotta do it, I don't care who. So that's -- those are the remaining issues that needs to be resolved.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Carolyn. As far as the hole, we have reported that we've repaired the hole again in a more robust manner. The CSO office again went out to the building that had been vandalized and they relocked it and reboarded up the windows. And as for the asbestos, we will continue to talk with the City of Vallejo, however it is our policy that we will transfer the property as is.

MR. QUIGLEY: Oh, great.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: So, yes, I know. So --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the reason that you would transfer the property and the City of Vallejo, Gil, would accept the property as is is because the Navy has continued to say that asbestos is not a CERCLA issue and, therefore, you don't have to do anything about it; is that right?

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: That is part of the DOD policy of -- and for BRAC it also applies to lead-based paint. As long as it's not a residential property, and if any building is -- has a future demolition in its plan, we are not allowed to condemn or remove or abate the asbestos.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what makes you think that that building has a future demolition in its future? Is that the only reason why you wouldn't -- why the Navy wouldn't address the friability of the asbestos?

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Well, there's another document, but I'd like to talk to the City of Vallejo first about it. But in the City Memorandum of Agreement, it is noted in there that for any EDC parcel, the City of Vallejo has a lot of operation and maintenance responsibilities, and part of that includes asbestos containing material. Now, there may be a question with the City for the pier. So since we just found that out, we absolutely planned on transferring the pier with IA-2. We would like to discuss that with the City before coming up with the final solution for that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, not to just go back and forth here, cause then we'll just each get a mic and we'll talk about it here; but I guess, here we are in the Restoration Advisory Board, early and often communication about environmental cleanup issues, and the Finding of Suitability to Transfer was the topic tonight, and we're now just getting around to talking about this issue because Carolyn brought it up now in her report, you know, maybe than rather during the presentation. And I would just like to go on record as saying that our city is not -- I don't know

what Gil's attorneys or he is advising the attorneys or the city manager du jour or the council or whatever, but my thinking is, as the RAB co-chair, and I'll just go on the record, not that that makes any difference at all in the final decision, but that is that our city isn't really in the position to go around remediating like we have, you know, or holding onto property being -- having property received with contamination on it like we did with the PCB site down just inside the gate at the south end where we sat, we got a quit claim from the Navy with PCBs on the property.

So I think that we should set a course that makes a certain amount of logical sense. And if you were planning to transfer it and it wasn't friable at the time, then that would be one thing. But if you now know that it is, because of vandalism or, you know, opportunistic, you know, whatever, whatever the reason is, whether it was for maintenance, then I would think that the Navy would make it unfriable. You would fix it or you would remove it. And then that wouldn't necessarily, you know, change the DOD policy on asbestos, but that you could just -- because you want to get this property off your books, you would just go out there and do it. I'll go help you. And, you know, save this whole carrying on and wasting the City's time, EPA's time, your time, our time. And then we'd all be really, we could be comfortable with that one little building than to say, well, if it's considered for demolition, then we don't have to do something. This is what happened with the PCB site. Instead of just making a grown-up decision of, okay, let's just go fix it, and let's get it all done, and let's get that FOST moving, it seems like the Navy is just trying to make a mountain out of molehill. That's my opinion.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: I would certainly disagree with you. As for your PCB site, we do understand that that site was missed, and it has been added into the PCB program, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's true, eventually.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: No, it's in the PCB program.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was an eventual, it was years.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: I understand that, but it has been corrected.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's right, eventually.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Like I said, we will follow up with the City and we will report back. As for Janet's update --

MS. NAITO: I'm going to, instead of giving my update, give a little presentation hopefully. Except for I don't know how to work the computer equipment.

MR. COFFEY: Steve can do it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's that side of the room.

MS. NAITO: We have to separate these guys next time. We're going to change the seating arrangement.

MR. COFFEY: Three amigos.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You don't have the authority.

MS. NAITO: No, I'll just sit right there. Tonight I wanted to talk a little bit about land use covenant monitoring, because I know it's come up. As part -- as the sites -- as the sites move.

MR. COFFEY: Click the button.

MS. NAITO: Is it on? Oh, that would help. As our sites move toward operation and maintenance -- as the cleanups are completed and we move towards operations and maintenance, land use covenants are a part of a lot of our remedies at Mare Island. We also have as part of our operation -- ongoing operation and maintenance requirements, requirements for inspections. We tend to do those annually. Just to make sure, if you told us this was going to be the condition of the site, to make sure that that is still the condition of the site. We also do five year reviews as part of that to make sure that the remedy selected is still protective. But tonight I'm here to talk about the land use covenant monitoring. So in order to get information out about land use covenants, we post them on the DTSC website, we send copies to the local planning department, so hopefully when they're evaluating a different project that needs a permit, they'll make sure that the project is consistent with our land use covenant. And we also monitor our land use covenants using a system called Terradex.

So -- and I'm going to apologize, you have to remember, I am not computer literate. So when I put this together, you'll see on the next couple of slides, they're not going to be pretty. So for -- on the DTSC website where we talk about the different land use covenants that are present here on Mare Island, we have five listings. The first one is for the eastern -- the general overall Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. The second one is for IA-D1, Investigation Area D1.2, and that we have a covenant on that entire -- or on part of that investigation area, and also ten separate deed restrictions specifically for PCBs. And some of them require maintenance of an encapsulated surface, some of them just say don't build single family -- or don't build residences, schools, hospitals, or daycare centers. We also have, again on Investigation Area A-3, we have a land use covenant for the overall parcel, and also three specific for PCBs. For the Western Early Transfer Parcel there's another one. And the golf course, for portions of it also has a land use covenant.

Okay. This is where I told you it wasn't going to be pretty. When I tried to take a screen shot off of my computer, it turned out looking like this. The upper one shows the area that's on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. The white blob I'm going to apologize for, that was supposed to be just a little blue teardrop, but this is what happens when you try to copy something on my screen. So this -- the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel includes both the overall Eastern Early Transfer Parcel land use covenant area, and also the Investigation Areas A-3 and D1.2. On the bottom you see the Western Early Transfer Parcel. So the system monitors any activity or alerts that come to it within these areas. And it looks much better on the screen. You can zoom in and out, so you can see specifically what the boundaries are.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess I was just getting your paperwork here --

MS. NAITO: Oh, I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- and I didn't hear the system monitors, how does it do that, the alert? Where -- how does it get the alert?

MS. NAITO: Anytime anybody alerts the underground utility locator service --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay.

MS. NAITO: -- the system picks it up. Anytime property -- there are notices -- I've gotten notices of property sales within the area. I think they're -- but mostly, the majority of them are through underground services alert.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Janet, there are parts of that, the island that are not in either dark, darker red area, parts of the island that aren't --

MS. NAITO: That is correct. There are some areas that have been cleared that did not require land use covenants.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MS. NAITO: Like the majority of the golf course did not require one. There's also a part, I think there's -- there was a part of Investigation Area D1.2 that did not require a land use covenant, so that would not be included on there either.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MS. NAITO: And some areas that are still being worked on by the Navy we haven't determined whether a land use covenant is required, so you won't see one up there yet.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MS. NAITO: So this is pretty much giving you like a week or two snapshot of the investigation -- of the alerts that come in. Some weeks I get two, some weeks I get twenty. And they range from digging to upgrade a sewer line; digging or installing a vertical boring for concrete, I'm not exactly, I can't remember exactly what that was; and anytime somebody proposes to excavate contaminated soil, that comes up. And here's the information that the alerts provide. It gives us the name of the site, the activity, or under event details it tells you what kind of activity they're proposing. Tells you when they propose to start the work; who's going to do the work; and at the bottom it gives us the general location where the work is going to occur.

Neal's not here tonight or he could tell you that I've been getting a little better at locating where the work is going to occur, because when you Google a lot of site addresses on Mare Island, they are not actually where the work is going to occur. My favorite is on Walnut Avenue. If you -- the Google system seems to think that the VA hospital is somewhere to the north, so that's been a real challenge for me. So I am getting to know the island a little better. But they generally give you a description showing you -- it's at the intersection of these two roads, and since roads have been renamed here, that's also been quite a challenge for me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, why would you -- what is wrong with this picture? Why would you have to be depending on Google and its information? And why would you have -- and with these, you know, as you say, road changes and the Google doesn't know where the VA hospital is.

MS. NAITO: Oh, because -- I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why should it have to? Why doesn't your system or the land use covenant coventee provide you with that information?

MS. NAITO: Well, what I have to tell you is when you get a USA -- an alert through the underground services alert system, it gives you a general description. My Terradex system uses -- I swear to God it uses Google maps, or something very similar to it, to tell me where the activity is going to occur, if it -- when it shows it on a map.

MR. COFFEY: So it's only as good as the last update?

MS. NAITO: Exactly. Or sort of the last update, not really the last update. And sometimes people, when they describe it, will tell you a building number that's incorrect. So generally what happens is I get an alert. If I'm not aware of the work that's going on, if it's not for -- if it's not for remediation or cleanup, I contact the property owner, in this case it would be Lennar. So I send a notice to either Neal or Sheila to let them know that this activity is occurring, and to ask if I need a soil disturbance form, or to suggest that I need a soil disturbance form for the type of activity that's proposed. Sheila.

MS. ROEBUCK: Janet, I think with the -- this area that you're showing in the red, the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel, there's quite a bit of this that has no land use covenant associated with it, so I think we need to talk about how we correct that so that the areas that are being considered by Terradex are ones that actually have the LUC's. I think they just might be one step behind some of the closures that occurred in the residential area.

MS. NAITO: That's entirely possible.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You mentioned that you -- you used the word you hopefully would receive notice from the planning department if something, if -- you used the word hopefully or hopefully the planning department would be aware of --

MS. NAITO: We send them the copies of the land use covenant so they can put it in the property files, so that they hopefully wouldn't approve a project that would be inconsistent with our land use covenant.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, this word hopefully, and then the illustration you're using about the failure -- the weakness of the system, maybe we might call it, weakness. This is showing a fundamental flaw in this whole program which is what we tried to address at least like -- I don't know --

MR. COFFEY: Four years ago.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Four years ago, that's a good number there, Mike. And we -- it don't look to me like, I shouldn't say us, like you're any closer to anything more than hopeful on this system in terms of ensuring that these land use covenants are trackable and responsible and responsible.

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean if the planning department, you hope, looks in a file; our poor planning department is like pretty --

MR. COFFEY: Bare bones.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- pretty beleaguered. And what makes you hopeful that they will look in that file and alert a potential permittee?

MS. NAITO: Well, there are a couple of series of redundancies. Again when -- there is a land use covenant. It's there to notify the property owner knows what is acceptable and what is not, what they can't do. So they are ultimately responsible. We are also going out there annually to make sure that the uses of the property comply with the land use covenant requirements.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I can just tell you that I live in a historic district, and property owners do not know what the conditions are that they are -- through the planning department about what they're supposed to do with their property. It does not happen that way in historical preservation, so why you would think that it would happen in environmental cleanup and

environmental protection, I have no idea, but I'm just going on the record, this is still -- thank you for sharing.

MS. NAITO: Okay. This is the best we've come up with so far.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It is, but it isn't good enough --

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- to meet this community's concerns. And we expressed them, we met in dozens of meetings, we had a tremendous organization come forward and say they could do things a lot differently than this, give us a lot more faith and, you know, the tracking on this. And that got -- I don't know what happened to that, but I think that you have a lot of work to do yet before this passes the straight face test for me in this community.

MS. NAITO: Okay. Okey dokey. That was it.

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

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Janet. So for the Navy co-chair report, hopefully everyone picked up our monthly progress report. I just want to go over some of the work that we've been doing. Last week I reported -- or last month I reported that the polychlorinated biphenyl sites for Buildings 163 and 832, that the field work had been completed for the removal. We are still working on final restoration activities. I believe the restoration activities for Building 832 are actually complete, and we're still working on fencing for Building 163. Those site closure reports will be submitted to EPA hopefully by the end of August.

The Non-time Critical Removal Action for Installation Restoration Site 17, there's a couple of pictures at the bottom of the first page. One shows some transportation and disposal activities. And the second shows us restoring the railroad along Azuar Drive. The excavation for that site is complete, was completed on July 20th. The railroad tracks were replaced, and Azuar Drive was reopened as of, I believe, the end of last week. And we performed -- the loading and the transportation of the remaining stockpiles will be done by mid-August.

If you turn to the back there's another picture for loading more impacted soils from our excavation at Building 742. We did finish that excavation. We also applied an oxygen release compound to the groundwater in the area of our excavation. The area surface has been restored, that was deemed complete by July 16th. Last week we started conducting some groundwater and soil gas sampling in the area for volatile organic compounds. During our removal action we moved 1,700 tons of soil and sent that to an off-site disposal facility. And we were able to divert about 300 tons of concrete and asphalt for recycling, so that did not go into a landfill facility.

There's one other item. We have -- our caretaker site office has been doing some maintenance vegetation removal over at the Production Manufacturing Area and South Shore Area, so some of you might have noticed that if you were on a Sierra Club hike over in that area. Those activities were done around June and July. Our activities were to remove vegetation around the buildings for a fire break. There were also other activities over there that Island Energy was doing, they've been removing a bunch of vegetation, it is non-Navy related, and none of this is related to environmental restoration at this point.

We submitted two documents, moving towards Section 3.0. We submitted the Draft Non-time Critical Removal Action Memo for the Production Manufacturing Area and South Shore Area. And we also submitted the Draft Record of Decision Remedial Action Plan for the Marine Corps

Firing Range. We received comments from three documents from DTSC, and two documents from the Water Board, one document from EPA. And just to update you guys, our last BCT meeting was today, this afternoon. And our next RAB meeting will be August 26th. Hopefully by that time you will be able to meet the newest, latest, greatest BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

MR. COFFEY: Du jour.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, thank you, Heather. I appreciate your clarification or expansion on your earlier e-mail to me about the vegetation cleanup, because initially you had said it was just Island Energy. So the additional information I appreciate.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Heather, I have a question about one of the items here. There's a comment about work in Building 503, I see the term, "Remaining soil stockpiles being removed."

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Yes.

MR. RASMUSSEN: What are those, and are they of any interest to Dwight?

MR. COFFEY: He needs lots more.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Dwight's interested in it.

MR. GEMAR: I want to get rid of 'em.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Yeah, he wants to get rid of 'em, and we will by hopefully mid-August. The stockpiles are from the excavations performed within IR or Installation Restoration 17.

MR. RASMUSSEN: It's excavated soil.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: It's excavated soil and the soil was TPH impacted.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But there's lots of other piles around the island that have, polka dot piles as Pearl Jones says, any of those available? All right.

I want to just go -- just update you on four things. First of all, I apologize for not bringing a sympathy card for us to sign for Larry Maggini, Weston Solutions. Many of you know him, his very ancient and wonderful mother Josephine passed away a week ago tomorrow. And he had been her primary caregiver for forever, for a long time. And we'll miss her very much. And I'll try to figure out a way for us to go ahead and get something to Larry on the RAB's behalf, if you don't mind. George Miller, Congressman George Miller conducted, as you probably have read, a tour with the National Park Service of properties that the City of Vallejo requested that he request the National Park Service to consider for inclusion in or creation of possibly a new Mare Island national park. It's amazing that after a while, if you've lived around here long enough, you get complete reversals of policy. Because fifteen years ago when it was, like, a good idea then, the City fought it tooth and nail. And so now, like when everything is sort of falling apart and the agency is probably a little less flush with money, now we're asking them for that.

But I was aboard that tour that Gil conducted, and they did come out and visit different spots. And they are in the process of what's called a reconnaissance survey that will be completed -- has to be completed by the end of the fiscal year, so by September 30. And then they will go, depending on what decisions are made up the line, the service at the agency, they would then, you know, make a recommendation or not to Congress for -- to conduct a feasibility study. So

it's basically everything the City owns that it doesn't -- on Mare Island that it doesn't really want. So it sounds like a good deal. But National Park Service is definitely very, very interested in the notion of partnering. So don't think for a minute that we're all going to be, you know, like off the hook to do our part as the public.

And that brings me to the Port Chicago Naval Magazine Explosion National Memorial site, which is pretty much our nation's latest national park. The Friends of Port Chicago spent the last seven years lobbying the heck out of everybody they could think of to get that national park designation. It is not easy at all. It takes a tremendous amount of citizen energy and commitment on the part of non-profit organizations and, you know, others who are committed. And it did take three years once the -- for Congress to pass that, to create the national park after the national park recommended its inclusion. So I'm just giving you a heads-up about kind of the journey. And even now the Port Chicago, which is -- was our responsibility, Mare Island's responsibility at the time of the explosion, is not -- the site, the memorial site is not going to be available to the public very much because it's an Army shipment site, an active Army facility. So the national parks and East Bay Parks and the City of Concord will be looking for -- to create a facility on the -- on the land that is somehow or another slated to be transferred to Concord from -- or the East Bay Parks or whatever at Concord Naval Weapons Station, and an area that isn't an Army site. So even that is going to take a long time. But I think we would consider all of this progress for Mare Island, and using Port Chicago as an example.

And then the last thing I'll report is that on Saturday, the second Saturday of August, we'll be holding a Mare Faire again, just a one day event this year, and just on a regular second Saturday. But our theme this year is nature, the natural resources of the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve. The first year in 2007 we did the 150th of the naval ammunition depot, 2008 was the 150th of the naval cemetery, 2009 was the 65th anniversary of the Port Chicago mutiny, and so those are all history events. So we think it's about time that we showcase the natural resources on the island. And we're -- I mean on the island, but more specifically in the preserve. So that's the theme of that day. And if any of you want to lead guided hikes, you want to teach people about what you do as a scientist, maybe get them inspired to be a citizen scientist, how to gather data, how to take samples, water samples, how to count birdies and bees and all those things that you love or you do as a profession, please see me, because that schedule isn't complete yet. And then go to our website [www.mareislandpreserve.org](http://www.mareislandpreserve.org) for an updated schedule soon.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Thank you, Myrna. Okay. With that, we go into the second public comment period. Does anyone -- oh.

MR. FARNELL: It moved fast from Steve to Dwight there a minute ago. But simply put, Steve, IR-15, does that include Building one zero one?

MR. FARLEY: Yes.

MR. FARNELL: Good. You drilled a couple holes in it inside and outside a few months back, what happened?

MR. COFFEY: It leaked.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You filled 'em up.

MR. FARLEY: We installed about ten or eleven wells in the areas around -- inside and around Building 101, 225, 273. And inside Building 101 there's a single location where we found concentrations of hexavalent chromium on the order of a few thousand micrograms per liter, and

we found carbon tetrachloride on the order of a few thousand micrograms per liter, something of that order. And although we don't have -- we have some Navy drawings that show some aboveground tanks, some type of dipping tanks or something of that sort inside the building, it's the only location -- I think we put in something on the order of seven wells inside that building, and this -- the one well was the only one where we found anything on that order of magnitude.

MR. FARNELL: So will there be a report later on of about what we're going to do about it?

MR. FARLEY: Yes. There's an FS/RAP that's in progress right now, and I'm hoping sometime in August is what I would expect, and all the details of what I just described will be in that report.

MR. FARNELL: And that will be sent to everyone here or is that --

MS. NAITO: It's about this thick.

MR. FARLEY: There's a standard mailing list for that, but it will go to the library.

MR. FARNELL: Okay. All right. One other thing is that I had fun last December when Marie and Battelle came in and told us about all of the sediment testing there along the quay wall. And I was hoping did they come through with the PCB stuff that you were saying that they didn't have then? I've been trying to read, even though I've been gone for a while, and of course the important thing is what action the Navy plans to take, and I was told Heather should know. I was informed that Heather should know what the Navy is doing as far as the action recommended for this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The Navy did not provide me anything regarding PCBs.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Okay. Well, I want to answer the PCB portion first. We did actually have a focus group meeting specifically related to the PCBs at Outfall 22. I believe that's what your question was related to after the Battelle presentation. So we did present that at a RAB focus group. I believe that was February? February. So if you need that information, please feel free to contact us.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There wasn't anything -- positive outcome out of it, there was no resolution.

MR. FARNELL: That's what I'm after is when a resolution should come through.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: As for our feasibility study, which would be determining what sort of remedial actions we are going to be looking at in the strait, that is forthcoming. We are contracting that document as we speak. But as for its actual submittal, I'd have to look and get back to you. But if you want to e-mail me I can certainly get you that schedule.

MR. FARNELL: Thank you.

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: If no one has anything else? Public comments.

(NO RESPONSE.)

ACTING CO-CHAIR WOCHNICK: Okay. With that, we are adjourned.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 9:19 p.m.)

**LIST OF HANDOUTS:**

- Presentation Handout – Finding of Suitability to Transfer – Parcels II, X-B(1), X-B(2) and Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant (SSTP) Outfall of Parcel I
- Presentation Handout – Implementation of Investigation Area (IA) C3 Triangle Remedial Action Plan
- Presentation Handout – Land Use Covenant Monitoring
- Presentation Handout – Features within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Mare Island RAB Update July 29, 2010 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 29, 2010