



FINAL MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

HELD THURSDAY, July 28, 2011

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, July 28th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:01 p.m. and adjourned at 9:08 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Miguel Buchwald
- Chris Rasmussen
- Paula Tygielski
- Jerry Karr
- Maurice Campbell
- Wendell Quigley

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Heather Wochnick (Navy Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC])
- Herb Nelson (Navy Environmental Security Technology Certification Program [ESTCP])
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- Carolyn D'Almeida (United States Environmental Protection Agency [U.S. EPA])
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC])

Community Guests in attendance:

- Dan Glaze
- Rose Marie Glaze
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM Federal Programs Corporation [CDM])
- Doris Baily (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Good evening, everyone. Welcome, everybody. It's nice to see you all. I missed you last month. I'm really excited about tonight's presentation. I think you'll find we've got some special information in store for you. We have Environmental Security Technology Certification Program -- that's a mouthful. And that's the Navy branch that does a lot of the emerging and innovative environmental technology evaluations and demonstrations, and they're here to talk to us tonight. And also we have a special treat in that Sheila is going to give us a presentation on Building 84. We don't get to see Sheila very much.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, Neal is also coming.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we'll start with introductions. I'm Janet Lear, I'm the Navy Co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the Community Co-chair.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Napa-Solano Audubon.

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

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski from Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey from American Canyon.

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

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito with the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

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

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island.

MR. BUCHWALD: Miguel Buchwald, Mare Island.

MR. GLAZE: Dan and Rose Marie Glaze, Mare Island.

MS. WOCHNICK: Heather Wochnick, Navy BRAC.

MR. NELSON: Herb Nelson, ESTCP.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, resident.

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston.

II. PRESENTATION: *Environmental Security Technology Certification Program and Classification Demonstration at Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard*
Presentation by Mr. Herb Nelson (ESTCP)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So as I mentioned, our first presentation will be given by Mr. Herb Nelson. He's the Munitions Response Program Manager for the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) Classification Demonstration at former Mare Island Naval Shipyard. They are going to be doing a project here and he's going to tell us all about that. So hope you enjoy it.

MR. NELSON: Okay. I'm pleased to be here to be able to talk to you guys. Do I have to stand or can I pick it up? I'll pick it up, yeah. I'm not really good about standing still. So I'm really pleased to be able to talk to you guys about this. And I hope --

MR. COFFEY: Turning it on is good too.

MR. NELSON: Gosh, even I can hear now.

I hope that at the end of this you'll have a good understanding of what we're trying to do, and then a year from now when this is all over maybe we can come back and tell you what we did. We're just hanging on for a second so that Brooks can hear this -- she's following along at home.

Okay. So as Janet said, I work for the two organizations with the Department of Defense that have the two clunkiest acronyms of anyone in the department, but there's a long line to do that. One is called SERDP, that's the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. And that's sort of the research-y end of what we do. This is developing new environmental technologies. This is a program that started in the early nineties, and it's a joint product of Sam Nunn and Al Gore. And the idea was that they were going to take defense technologies and apply it to the country's environmental problems. So it turns out, as it happens, the Defense Department has got a lot more environmental problems or as many environmental problems as the country, that is, and actually it's turned around completely now and it's taken other technologies and applied them to the Department of Defense. So it's completely different than they thought it was going to be, but the same idea.

And then this one, which is an even worse acronym, Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, this is what the Department of Defense calls demonstration validation. So this is when you develop new technologies and try them out in your backyard. This is when you go to a real site and you see if you're half as smart as you thought you were. Because, you know, when you're in your lab in your backyard, everybody's a genius, but then you go to a real site and it turns out it's a lot harder than it is in your backyard. So that's where we are today with some of these technologies.

So, Janet was a little nervous that there's too many geophysics words in this presentation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Never.

MR. NELSON: There are some geophysics words on these slides, but I intend to use plain English words talking about them. So if I use a word that you don't know what it means or it's not clear what it means, somebody has got to raise their hand or give me a frown or do something so then I'll stop. Because the goal, of course, is for everybody to understand what we're talking about.

So let's start talking about the munitions problem. And this is really going to apply more to the FUDS program, the Formerly Used Defense Sites. It's a little bit of what happens here at these BRAC sites, but most of the problem in the United States is Formerly Used Defense Sites.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That doesn't have any money -- right? -- FUDS doesn't?

MR. NELSON: Well it has some money, but not near enough money.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah, not very much.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Camp Beale.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's right, Camp Beale.

MR. NELSON: We have a project going on at Camp Beale right now. I'll talk about it in a minute. So there's about 3,000 sites in the United States contaminated with munitions. That includes mostly FUD sites, as I said, and BRAC sites. But the bulk of those are FUD sites. Lots and lots of acres, so it's going to be very expensive to remediate this. Current estimates are about \$20 billion to remediate. The FUDS budget is a couple hundred million a year, so it's about one percent. So, yeah, I mean, this is a losing strategy. This is like paying the minimum payment on your credit card, you die owing the credit card bill. So that's where we are. But it's not as if the money is going to go up. You know, they're not going to get the bill and say we have twice as much money as we had the day before, so obviously it's going to get worse. So obviously we have to figure out a new way to do this. We're never going to get that \$20 billion, so we have to figure out a way to do it for less. So that's what this is all about.

So I just said that, we've got to have a better way. So the better way stares you in the face when you look at this plot. This is data from the Defense Science Board unexploded ordnance (UXO) task force. And it comes from the Army Corps of Engineers, but it applies to stuff the Navy does and the Air Force does too. It's how the money is spent on a typical munitions cleanup project. So what you want to be doing is that one. And you gotta do some of that stuff, you gotta go map it and, I mean you guys know about that because you've been hearing about what goes on here. You know you've got to do some of these things to do that. But look at where all the money gets spent. All of the money gets spent digging up this out at sites -- I'm not good at pointing out -- but at this site: rebar; and on a site that's had agricultural use: tractor parts, or those things they put in cows noses or something. Lots and lots of hunks of metal that aren't dangerous. But it costs the same hundred bucks to dig the piece of tractor part out because you got to have a team of five guys that are UXO specialists and a supervisor and a backhoe and all that stuff. So it's a hundred bucks to dig a hole no matter what's in it. And most of the time, like more than 99 percent of the time it's not hazardous, so that is pretty easy to figure out what that is. So the only way to make progress on this really is -- the only way is not the right word. The most promising way to make progress on this, is to beat that down and take that money and do more of removing the hazardous stuff. And the more of that we can knock down, the more of that we can do. That's the point.

So we've been developing technologies to allow us to do that. And we term it classification. Sometimes people call it discrimination. It depends whether you talk to signal processors. But I use the word classification. And that you divide buried metal parts into hazardous things and non-hazardous things. And you deal with the hazardous part, which is a very small fraction, in a way that's appropriate for the hazardous stuff. And you either leave the rest of it there, or you dig it up just like it's scrap metal. You don't spend all the money digging it up. And so we're

trying to develop all these fancy schmantzy words that mean something that stakeholders, regulators, project managers, neighbors can believe, understand what we did, and have confidence in. So that's all this principled, data-based stuff.

So, you know, how do we do this? Well, if they weren't buried it'd be pretty straightforward, huh? Everybody in this room could close one of their eyes and still get this right. That's the hazardous stuff, that's the non-hazardous stuff. So once you get it out of the ground it's a piece of cake. But the problem is, it's buried in the ground so it's not a piece of cake. So here's what you do. I presume you've seen some of these sorts of things. You guys here had magnetometry data taken at this site. These happen to be a different kind of a sensor, it's an electromagnetic induction sensor --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We've had this stuff, EMI.

MR. NELSON: You've had EMI stuff, too?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure, sure, sure.

MR. NELSON: Okay. So then you guys know what an EM-61 is?

MS. HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. Orange thing.

MR. NELSON: So you can see the EM-61 data. Wow, this is a very sophisticated room.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

MR. NELSON: Woo. Well, what is it that I can't use, geophysics words? They know 'em all.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I didn't say not use geophysics words, I said don't use acronyms and don't make it overly technical.

MR. NELSON: EM-61, we're already there. Anyway, these are EM-61 data. And you look at these things and that one and that one and that one, and they all sort of look the same. But when you dig 'em up you find out that one of 'em is a 60 millimeter mortar, and the rest of 'em is all just some kind of frag or fins or something like that. So the question is, can you out of the data -- which you actually have these little traces over each of these things -- can you make something out of that to tell that from that? And that's the goal of the technology we've been developing, sensors to do a better job than the EM-61, analysis methods to do a better job than people have done in the past to do what we say we want to do, hazardous vs. not hazardous.

MR. COFFEY: I've got a really good suggestion on how to cut down the cost of scrap metal removal, because we have great experience on Mare Island, it's just leak that little picture on the Internet --

MR. NELSON: Call it all copper.

MR. COFFEY: -- call it all copper, and the next night it will all be gone.

MR. NELSON: And I'm sure those DTSC guys would just love all those hands that get lost in the middle of all that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Doesn't matter.

MR. COFFEY: Acceptable losses.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Doesn't matter, there's more where they came from.

MR. COFFEY: It's acceptable losses.

MR. NELSON: Wow, you guys are a tough crowd, this is good. So in the world where you can't blow people's hands off, and we've gotta do this, I mean, it's fine that we can do that here.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we do.

MR. NELSON: Here's in general how you do this. You go out and take some data. And this is actually a cousin of the EM-61, this is something called an EM-63, it's a little fancier.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it a towed array?

MR. NELSON: Oh, no, it's just one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Still just one thing?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, just one. But people gang 'em up. Depending on if the field is big and flat, and it's easy, then you gang 'em up so you can get a lot per hour. If it's a hard field where you gotta dance around trees and everything, then you can only use one of 'em.

So you take these data and you try to make something out of them. I talked to you about that before when I showed the little curve, the little blippies, you gotta figure out somehow how to make those blips, and get something out of that so that you can call things that are munitions, munitions, and all the rest of the stuff that's not munitions, not munitions. So it's the same goal I've been talking about all the time, but that's really the process.

So there's two main ways to do this. And I thought I was going to have to tell you about them, but you guys know about these two main ways, but we're going to run over them a little bit. Okay.

MR. COFFEY: Make sure you get this accent on there.

MR. NELSON: You know what my accent is?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, what is it?

MR. NELSON: I grew up in Mobile, Alabama, but I went to grad school in Berkeley, and college in New Orleans, so it's some sort of all that jumbled up together.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Kind of like my accent, it's not a place accent, it's a mix of lots of 'em.

MR. NELSON: Well, I got a little bit of place in mine. On words that end in I-N-G, I don't say many G's, you know, so that's my style, sort of goin' and doin' and runnin'. And so you can catch that, but that's about all I've got. My mother thinks I sound like a Yankee. And I clearly don't, but to my mother I do. So I'm using all my time up telling jokes, and that's not the point.

So there are two kinds of sensors, both of which I guess have been used here; magnetometers, which are pretty easy, cheap, good for large and deep things -- you'll see why in a minute -- but they really don't give you much information to make this decision I want to make, hazardous or not. They mostly just tell you where stuff is. So they're good for detection, getting yourself a map with red dots all over it, and go dig all them red dots. The other kind is the electromagnetic induction sensors. This is what the EM-61 is. It's a more complicated sensor, it doesn't go as deep. So if you have a site that's got a lot of big air drop bombs or something, then you definitely would want to do this. It doesn't go as deep, you can get some sort of shape information out of it. And I went to Home Depot on the way and got my little practice UXO. This is really pretty close to the size of these pounders that are an issue here. They're 40

millimeters on average, this is about 36, but it's pretty darn close. If you go to the building over there and look into the case, this matches it pretty well. So we're going to do a lot of using this to show the kind of things we're doing. Okay. So here's the magnetometer. And these are the data that we're working from, the magnetometer survey that was taken out there. If you just go out in the middle of nowhere, there's some magnetic field to the earth, that's the thing that makes compasses point to the north. And if you just walk around the field, the compass always points the same way because the field lines are real constant. But if you stick the hunk of steel in the middle of it, it perturbs those field lines, and it bends them. And if you look on the surface, you get a signature that looks like that. So that's called a dipole signature, positive on one and negative on the other end. And it's just like when you were a kid, if you put a bar magnet, paper on the top and sprinkle it with those little iron filings, that's exactly what it is, that's the dipole.

So the data set that we're working from, the magnetometer data, is full of a bunch of red and blue pairs like that, dipoles. And so that means the target is right about there. So this is sometimes called a passive technique because you just rely on these field lines of the earth, that's what's new and exciting, you're only looking so that's why they call it passive.

The other method is this electromagnetic induction. And the reason it's harder is you don't rely on the field of the earth, you bring your own field. So you take a loop. People that have seen this EM-61 know that it's got two like that, coils. You pass current through one of 'em to make a magnetic field, and then that excites the stuff in the ground. If there's something out there, it interacts. And now we're back to the same magnetic thing, we've got a field that interacts with the target, perturbs the field, and we can measure something about it. But we control where the field is. If those were the field lines, and this thing is in the ground like this, it's interacting with the long way and you get a pretty big signal. If this thing is in the ground like that, it interacts only with the short waves and you get a lot smaller signal from the same item. Of course, you have no clue how it's measured, so you get a wide variation in the amount of signal you get from the same item depending on whether it's lined up or anti-lined up and, of course, 45 [degrees to lined up]. With all those things you get different signals. With this you can move this field -- you can move this transmitting antenna all around this thing, and then you can hit it, da-da-da, and I'll show you that on a slide coming up. So what you really do is you turn that field on you excite the target, you turn that field off, and you watch what you got left.

So here's the movement around stuff. You can see that we've drawn the field lines. And right underneath you the field lines are pretty straight down. But they sort of curve back, this is the same dipole sort of thing, they're sort of curving back like that so if you look straight under, and the bomb is buried like that, you're really just doing the short side, just like we talked about, you're just doing the short side. But if you moved it over, you see they're starting to curve, and now you're starting to get a pretty good piece of the long side there. So with that one instrument and three or four measurements, straight down, over there, over there, you can sort of get all pieces of it, and you can figure out that there's one here, one real long one, two exact same short ones. So you know it's symmetric, you know about what size it is, and you call it a pounder. That's the theory.

So that EM-61 that you guys have seen used -- and it is, by far, the most commonly used thing in munitions stuff -- was designed in 1970 to find underground storage tanks (USTs). And it has been adapted to the UXO industry. Obviously underground storage tanks are huge targets.

So we, over the past five or six years, have supported three groups -- this one at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBL); a group that I used to work at, the Naval Research Lab; and a company in San Jose called Geometrics -- to sort of start from scratch, blank piece of paper, and design something towards UXO targets, rather than huge underground storage tanks, things like the size of a UXO or even if it's a bomb, that big, or if it's a mortar, that big. Anyway, think about the sizes, think about the ratios of shapes. Most UXO are long and skinny and equal. So take all of that and design a sensor. So there are three that we have designed. So as I talked to you earlier in the first slide about ESTCP and SERDP, we've been through the whole "do it on the bench, you're the smartest person you've ever met, doing it in your backyard, it still works pretty good, you're pretty happy with yourself; do it on a prepared test field, you're still pretty happy with yourself." But it's flat, it's sort of golf courses and the stuff is placed there. So now we're at the stage of doing it in real sites. And doing it in real sites is to get these DTSC people to buy into this, to get Navy project managers (PM's) to buy into this, and to get groups like you guys to buy into this.

So we have done three already. We have got three going on right now. We're doing something up at Beale. We like to do a lot in California because there's a lot of sites in California, the regulators in California are very active, and lots of other states pay attention to what the California regulators do. So if we can do well in California and get the DTSC people to believe it, that's what gives us a leg up on some of these other states. There are a lot of states in which the regulators are woefully uninformed about munitions. There are traditional chemical people that know a lot of perchlorate or something that have just got pressed into duty, don't really understand the technologies, don't understand the techniques, and so they look at the bigger states. So we interact a lot with Alaska, who has a lot of sites, of course; Colorado has a lot of sites and has very well informed regulators; California; and even North Carolina. The regulators in North Carolina actually are quite good.

So we're doing three of 'em now. And what we're trying to do is a whole range of site conditions. And one of the things that caught us about this site is that we've never done an industrial site. These are all out in the middle of nowhere, so it is tractor parts or agricultural pieces or something like that. At this site it's hunks of rebar, pieces off a building, so it's a lot different stuff we have to figure out.

MR. COFFEY: File cabinets.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, exactly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Copper.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Bicycles.

MR. NELSON: I tell you, it's very different than San Luis Obispo. So here's what we normally do. We identify a site. This site came to us, we didn't have to identify it. We always put some seed items out there, because one way you're going to tell whether people know what they're doing is we put some seed items out, and then we know. And if they don't do well on the hundred or two hundred seeds we put out, then we're not likely to believe what they did on the rest. We do a survey to identify the anomalies. Here that was done for us, we just adopted the survey that Weston did. Then we go out and do cued surveys.

So one of the problems before with that EM-61 is that if you stand here and it's up there, you're seeing a side of it. And if you stand over here, you're seeing that side of it. You stand on top of

it, you're seeing on top of it, if you know where you are and if you've got a really good global positioning systems (GPS), and the GPS you sort of get an area about that, couple three, five centimeters, something like that, so a little narrower, but a small number. The problem, though, is if you've seen those things, the GPS antenna is up pretty high, the sensor is here, the antenna is up on this thing, and as you go bouncing, rocking this thing is doing that number, and it's doing that number, not this, but this, so you get that sort of uncertainty to where you are. And when you try to piece all of those things together, it makes a mess of it.

So what we've really figured out is you've got to sit on top of it and do the experiment there. And the way we've been able to do that is the EM-61 only has one transmitter, it's flat. So I showed you a zillion times what the field lines look like, it projects straight down on the ground. These new sensors all have one, two, three, so you project down, sideways, and sideways all at one time sitting still. So no matter what this thing's at, you get down, sideways, sideways, you get it all without moving. So that's why we go back, that's the word we use "cued", you go back and sit over the target, fire it off, get some data. And then we do all that stuff I told you, we try to figure something out about it, try to classify it. I'll show you some more details about this. And then, of course, since we're doing an experiment, the goal, of course, is not to dig things up, the goal is to only dig up the hundred hazardous things. But to do these experiments you gotta dig everything up to test how they did. So that's no problem here because you're digging everything up. So this is a great experiment, a great place for us because we don't have to use our money to dig. So it's almost a free experiment for us, so that's why we hopped onto it here.

Okay. So everybody in this room is probably much more familiar with this than I am.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, yes.

MR. NELSON: We're working in the so-called Category A sector. We had money to do about 2,500, to 2,500, and it turns out there's 2,412 or 2,300 something, there's some number that's near 2,500 in those Category A sectors, so we're only working on A.

So here are the cued sensor systems. This one hasn't come yet. This is the one made by the company in San Jose. These guys, this is them out there. They finished up last Thursday and flew home on Saturday. So there it is sitting on a target. That's the easy part, of course. Here it is up in the hard part, sort of get itself up in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We'll store that for you when you're not here.

MR. NELSON: It's already gone home. We showed this one because it's right next to the no parking sign that's sitting there. Of course, the thing is sticking out in the back doing something. So this one's finished and this one is going to start in a couple of weeks. So many of these things -- since it's so little research -- we do multiple different sensors to see how they did.

So here's how we make this decision, and I've already given it away, so none of this ought to be a surprise, we're going to do it one more time. You figure out the responses along the three possible axes. So here is a UXO, I think that's like a 105 millimeter projectile.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It is a UXO or a MEC?

MR. NELSON: Well, I am shockingly sloppy about that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: It's got the boom.

MR. COFFEY: UXO.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, well, it could be discarded military munition (DMM). I mean, this is a DMM problem. And I mostly talk to RAB's at FUD sites. So I'm mostly talking about UXO. Everybody here knows the difference, UXO were fired or delivered or something and it didn't work, a dud. DMM fell off the back of the truck or I don't feel like taking it home or whatever. And this is a DMM site. But our guys can't tell that. That's a fine, fine detail.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's right.

MR. NELSON: Does it or does it not have that fuse on the front? We are not that sophisticated.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Don't need to be.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, you don't need to be, that's right, but we are not. So I will not try to tell you that we can tell the difference.

So here's this thing. And he helpfully color coded the axes, just like we said. One big one, two equal smaller ones right on top of each other, so completely symmetric up. The whole amplitude of this thing gives you something about the size, that matches bang on to a 105. Here's a likely cutter piece that's about the size of a 105, a tractor muffler. And there's a lot of fine details in here. It's about the same size. See, you can't read that, but they are about the same number, because the whole thing is about the same size. But the two others are not equal because it's not symmetric. And there's another clue in there, the whole curves fall off faster than the others do. The fastness of the fall-off has something to do with the wall thickness. So, in general, munitions are sort of three-eighths, half-inch thick wall. Things off of tractors, I mean, that would be a waste of steel so they're a thin wall. So many times you can just tell things apart by how fast they fall off. So we just do this on every target and make a decision.

So there's classification. There's one. And this is from Aberdeen proving ground, it matches 105 pretty well. What he's got plotted on here is the signature they measured in the field and some kind of something they collected beforehand, they matched really great, 105. That matches not at all, a piece of bent up old clutter. So we just do that 2,500 times.

The guys that do this for a living say that when it works it's as easy as what we just did, with your eyeball you can make the decision. The hard part of this is to make sure you leave this site with good data over all 2,500. If you know you're getting pretty tired on Friday afternoon, you take crappy data over the top of 10 or 15 of them, then you don't really know about those 10 or 15, and that's where you can go bad. So our scientists are not really good at standard operating procedures, and they're not really good at QC plans, so we're trying to teach all of our scientists to be careful, and you can't just let your mind wander on Thursday or something. So that's been the challenge for me as the program manager.

Okay. So I've just got two more slides. And these are two results from Mare Island. I asked the guys that were out here last week to send me two examples of things that looked like DMM. Here's one. Those that have it in front of them can see, the red curves are from the library, the blue curves are what they measured out in the site. Here's one that matches a 105 millimeter projectile dead on. I don't think there's any 105's out there, I think that's something we seeded. We don't have any inert naval ordnance, so we just try to get big old projectiles to sort of be like big old naval gun things. So I'm pretty sure this is a seed, but they don't know that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's cause you scrapped 'em all.

MR. NELSON: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We had thousands of them and people tossed 'em in the trash.

MR. NELSON: It's hard to get inert. So this here I think is a seed. Here's one that I know is not a seed. It doesn't match this 105 HEAT. Do you know what that is? That HEAT stands for high energy anti-tank or something or other anti-tank. It's got a big, old, long nose on it, it hits the tank, and then you get sort of a shaped charge that's supposed to penetrate into the tank. So it's a funny looking thing. This doesn't quite match it. The two small ones aren't equal, so that means it's not completely symmetric like this. But they're going to have to call this a munition because it looks pretty darn close to a 105. So this is presumably some Navy thing that sort of looks like a 105 HEAT, we'll find out when we pick it up. But they're definitely going to call that a hazardous item.

MR. COFFEY: It's a file cabinet.

MR. NELSON: So somebody should write that number down. Did they tell you what the number? Well, I'll figure out what the number is and we'll write it down on the back of a piece of paper, and when we dig it up we can find out whether it's a smoking gun or not. Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But Mike gets the first call on what it really was, and it's a file cabinet.

MR. COFFEY: File cabinet.

MR. NELSON: Oh, okay. So you just gonna lay your ten bucks on the table right now and I'll lay my ten next to it?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah.

MR. NELSON: I'm going hard that that ain't a filing cabinet. It's just like taking money from a baby.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. TYGIELSKI: It might be a vending machine, they did find one of those out there.

MR. COFFEY: Remember, you don't know Mare Island, we know Mare Island.

MR. NELSON: No, no, no, yeah. But you don't know how to read them graphs as good as I do, and I know how big it is and, I mean we just should not do that bet. I mean, you can just buy me a beer at the end of this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Fair enough.

MR. NELSON: So, finishing up. Here's how we get them to tell us how it is. They rank these things from: they're highly confident it's not a munition" through "they're confident it is". And the reason we make them rank this is, if you can't say you're highly confident it's not hazardous, then we gotta take it out of the ground. So we take all that out of the ground. This, of course -- there's hundreds of these, and just a few of these, so it's not to scale, but that's how we make 'em do it. And I told you I had two and I actually have four slides, so I apologize.

Here's how we grade these things. It's something called a receiver operating characteristic curve which comes from radar in World War II. None of that is important. Here's what you do. You dig 'em up starting at the bottom, because you want to dig up all the hazardous stuff. You dig from the bottom, dig up. If it's DMM, you go up. If it's scrap, you go to the right. So this is perfect. Everything at the bottom that they called red, I color coded 'em red, so bang, they're

dead on. You know, everything UXO, UXO, UXO, and then all the stuff they called non-hazardous is not hazardous, then that would be a perfect result. Here would be your clueless result. The things you called red that you were sure was UXO, has some chance of being UXO and some chance of not, it's just going up. But all the things you were absolutely sure were not hazardous had the exact same chance of being UXO and the exact same chance of not being UXO, so this is coin flipping. So, clearly here we don't want you.

And we used to think this would be a great result, but we don't want this, we're much better than this now. So they sort of generally knew what UXO were -- at the beginning, sort of going up. Remember, you go up if you dig up a UXO, you go that way if you dig up a non-UXO. So they sort of knew what they were doing. But in here they sort of lost focus and it isn't so good, you know. So the positive part is the last half of it they called non-hazardous and they were right. They identified all the UXO up to there. But it took them a long time to get there. So this isn't real good.

So here's something we got at Camp Butner. Nearly perfect. So there's a lot of promise to these technologies. What we have to do is make sure they work, not only at this Camp Butner -- the hard part about this was it was a very, very dense site, but it works at a site that has got rebar and vending machines and --

MR. COFFEY: File cabinets.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, it's working on file cabinets. And so, over the next three years, we're going to try this out at a whole bunch of sites, and then we're going to start doing it.

So here's where we're going. Just like everybody else in Northern California, we got so screwed up by the rain this spring, summer, we were supposed to be long in and gone, so we're late at Camp Beale or we're late here, but it happens.

So I showed you one of 'em is already out of here. The Metal Mapper shows up on the 7th, I think, of August, or the 8th, something like that. They are right now at Pole Mountain in Wyoming. We sort of had to jumble the schedule all around. Our analysts will tell us in September, their guesses. And then we're sort of hostage to the digging. So next summer the digging schedule, as soon as we get those dig results, we'll put together those scores, and then I would love to come back if I could.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah.

MR. NELSON: I mean, if we sucked, then I'm going to have to come back and tell you we sucked. But if we did really well, then, you know, you'll be seeing me with the chest puffed out and everything telling you we did really well. So I appreciate you guys letting us work here.

MR. COFFEY: We want to see physical evidence too, we never get to see physical evidence.

MR. NELSON: Well, we keep all the scrap in a barrel, because we want to take it home and measure it separately and see what we got. But of course they won't, things that they decide they can't let us have, then, you know, you can want 'em all you want, but you don't get 'em. Yes, sir.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It would appear to me by just looking at your pictures, that this would work very well at an Army site or something where they were using a gunnery range and they had an opened area --

MR. NELSON: Yep.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- and what have you. Of course, we don't have that, we have a -- I don't know how many buildings out there, I've never counted 'em -- it's a very populated area, so you don't have these long stretches of open fields.

MR. NELSON: That's right. I actually call this an open site though. Up at Camp Beale, we're doing it in the woods up at Camp Beale. So what you're seeing in these pictures, the ones I showed you here, are the large vehicular pull version of these. Large because the bigger the coil is, the deeper you can see. So you definitely give up something if you go smaller. So all of these guys have a -- these are sort of meter scale, all these things you're seeing. Everybody has a one foot scale version, and that's where they use them up around the trees. And so those things can either be on the little baby cart or even at the end of a boom. You give away some depth doing that. So then they can only really make a decision down to about two feet, maybe two and a half feet. So, some places they don't care about anything deeper than that. But if you care about something deeper than that, you just gotta dig it up if it's that deep. But most stuff is not that deep.

At Camp Beale we were so late, and it's so hot up there, and that ground gets so hard up there, I thought, I'm dying on the budget, those guys are going to get no results -- first off, they can only do this 40 minutes on and 20 minutes off, so I'm already, you know, paying these guys to sit in the car, and the ground is going to be so hard that we're not going to get much digging done. But everything is really shallow up there, so we're making our targets on everything, 'cause we're lucky, not 'cause we're good. So I think these little small things are doing fine. We've not used those as much, and that's the big thing we're trying to get out of that Camp Beale survey is how well you can do with this size versus this.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. COFFEY: Cool.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So when we get your scores and all, will you tell us then for which areas you used the smaller equipment that would be --

MR. NELSON: Well, out here we use nothing but the big equipment.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay.

MR. NELSON: Comparatively -- the reason I call this big is it -- you're right, there's a lot of buildings and everything, but you can drive stuff almost everywhere. I mean those guys, had to see saw and parallel park to get some of those things right upside the building, versus when you go up in the woods up in the foothills, you know, the trees are this far apart, so these things wouldn't even get out of the gate much less. So you're right, the world's best site is these bombing targets in Southern California in the desert. You know, where you can see to Japan and you just drive miles at a time.

MR. COFFEY: Or at least Bakersfield.

MR. NELSON: Yeah. The problem with most of those things though is nobody cares about it. You go to 29 Palms and then go another hour east, you're almost in Arizona, nobody cares what goes on out there, so there's really not that much push to clean those places up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Would you hope that what you'd be able to achieve with this technology, if it looks like it's going to work like it looks like it's working, that you could get a confidence level that would be close enough -- oh, I guess what we've dealt with here forever is, you know,

what was good enough for public access, what was good enough for this and that, and also recognizing that we still have to have a robust education program -- which I don't know why we don't have one right now exactly, but that's a sore subject around here, this little part of our island. But you would still have a chance that something was left behind, but you would have a much higher level of confidence and you would get in and be able to do a lot more with your dollar so that theoretically you could get a site done faster?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, absolutely. So I think on all those things, yes. There's always going to be residual risk.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MR. NELSON: So my buddy that used to work at DTSC and now he's with the Corps of Engineers, Jim Austreng, taught me a long time ago that you always have to manage every former munitions site for some residual risk. So if you add a small quantum of extra residual risk, it doesn't change how you manage the site at all. So Jim is a very risk adverse fellow, in my opinion; but he's much calmer about this than many, because I think he thinks about it correctly. Now I think you really hit on the right answer here. Here's the right answer: if you can do this with a lot less resources, that means you can do it a lot earlier. And actually risk is a time interval thing. It's far better to get 99.5% done today, than a 100% done 20 years from now, because there's 20 years of stuff laying around in the field. So I think you should look at it like that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's just a no brainer here, I mean, because --

MR. NELSON: Well, that ain't a no brainer in a lot of places, so you should maybe come visit me for a while.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we're here though. I mean, we have all that land sitting there, and we have every bad person on the planet has magnetized themselves and probably EMI, LI -- well every device they can think of.

MR. KARR: No acronyms, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They're getting in that property. And so the only people that can't get on it now are the good people. And so the longer you sit here with the bad people going there --

MR. NELSON: Yeah, that's right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- the higher your risk, and the more of a chance of an incident that will then just blow us out of the water forever.

MR. NELSON: You're singing off of our hymn sheet or something, this is good, we like that word.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So thank you for being here. Now, there's only one other thing that I -- and you'll get support from me, that's for sure, for whatever you're doing.

But the early August thing. You have an opportunity -- and I'm just going to throw it out there -- we have something that I call the Mare Faire, and people go along with me now for a few years on it. We just celebrate that south end of the island in a little weekend thing. And the Navy will be there, I think, with some educational information. And if there was a way for you to swing by our visitors center, or that we could look through the gate or the fence right there at our area, and you could be demonstrating your equipment on this Friday or the Saturday or the Sunday.

MR. NELSON: So the average member can't go inside that fence?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

MR. NELSON: It's restricted access. So it's easy for us to put our equipment just outside the fence. So you just want a tire kicking afternoon?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, right.

MR. NELSON: I like doing those.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And actually see you driving along past our --

MR. NELSON: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where you could even do a pass by and we could see what you're doing.

MR. NELSON: Throw this on the ground, see what it looks like, pull this out of there, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You have that opportunity, I'm offering that.

MR. NELSON: I love to do those kind of things.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool. All right.

MR. NELSON: I think that's the way you convince people it's not black helicopters and weird stuff, you show 'em what you're doing and you show 'em why you're doing it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We like that part actually.

MR. COFFEY: We like black helicopters.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We like black helicopters and orange ones too.

MR. NELSON: So we'll interact about this, is that how it's going to go?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, we'll be happy to get these guys. Well, thank you all again. You know, I did a silly thing, I brought a bunch of cards, I did not put our website, on -- look at this, I also brought ten bucks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, that's for that bet.

MR. COFFEY: Beer for all.

MR. NELSON: I did not put our website on this. Lots of more details are up on our website. It is www.SERDP-ESTCP.org. But it's on my card.

MR. COFFEY: Geez, acronym city.

MR. NELSON: But this is the Department of Defense.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I will email the website address.

MR. NELSON: Yes.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What is it, the Web site?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I got the dot org part, did anybody get any of the other part?

MR. NELSON: It's our silly acronym, so I apologize for not putting that up on the slide. But there's more details about this whole program, and we do a lot of stuff with traditional chemical cleanup also, and so it's all on the website. So thank you again for your patience.

MR. COFFEY: Very nice, thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

(Thereupon there was discussion off the record.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks again. Okay. So --

MS. MOORE: Brooks was pleased, she said she learned a lot.

III. PRESENTATION: *Building 84 Update*
Presentation by Ms. Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So now we have the Building 84 update presented by Sheila Roebuck.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah, I'm back.

MR. COFFEY: You're going to have to do a dance to fill those shoes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 84 pages, is that what this is?

MS. ROEBUCK: 36, but a lot of them are pictures, so --

I'm just going to give you a short background because in 2008 you had your last RAB update, and so I'm not going to go back to the things you've already talked about, hopefully, at least mostly not. And then talk a little bit about the history of the site, because we have some work that was done by our historical architect. And then we're going to talk about the status of the environmental work that's happened since the last RAB update.

This is just to show you where Building 84 is, it's in Investigation Area D1.3. And it's just south of the Marine Corps firing range.

MR. COFFEY: We've been there; haven't we?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah, we did a site visit a year ago.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah.

MS. ROEBUCK: Most of you know the Building 84 was the naval prison, the brig. It was first built in 1885. And then the last addition to Building 84 is at the turn of the century. After that, Building 84A was built starting in 1909. And then with some additions that were after 1939, the dates aren't clear. But the way that you can tell the difference between the two is Building 84 is brick, Building 84A is poured concrete. They are both historic resources. They are to be retained, and they are in a residential area.

The initial plan for the building was to renovate it for use as 22 condominiums. That was our initial expectation. We've done a lot of work here. And as of now -- so we're cutting to the chase -- we have solid media that all meet the residential standards, but PCB's in indoor air are the challenge that we still have.

So as I said, the last RAB update was in 2008. In 2009 there was a presentation that was given to the Architectural Heritage and Landmarks Commission to talk about potential demolition of

the building. And the reason that came up is because we thought there may be no way that we can clean up this building for its intended use. After we talked to them, we talked to the City of Vallejo, and they have a process that they go through to consider demolition. And following through that process, we got a historic architect to look at the building and see what potential options we would have for either demolition or partial demolition of the building. And after we went through that with the City, we went to the State Historic Preservation Office and talked to DTSC about it, and they, the City, DTSC, LMI, and the SHPO (the State Historic Preservation Office) had a conference call, and we talked about it. And the end result was that the SHPO said the building is too important to demolish without you trying everything you can to remediate everything that's there. And if you then have to consider demolition, you have to go through a full environmental review, an EIR, environmental impact report, for that. So what we did is in the next two years we've done the additional remediation that we can do.

So now I'm going to talk about just the history and just show you some information that we got through the historical architectural review. As I said, it was a prison. It was originally only a basic prison, but then it was added onto with the mess hall and galleys and activity rooms. It has not been occupied since the base was decommissioned in 1996.

This shows the site plan. The blue areas were Building 84 that was built first. You can see there's an inconsistent date, Building 84 was built in either 1885 or 1895. It says both here, but it's not really clear, it's somewhere around there though. The areas in green were the additions to the building that were the poured concrete for Building 84A. And then the last additions were the Building 84, later, that was in this yellow color.

These are some photographs that we got from the Library of Congress from the Historic American Building Survey, and they're just kind of interesting to look at. And when it says northeast here, the person is looking from the northeast, so that's what the perspective is. And this just shows Building 84, and you can see the concrete versus the brick. And you can see these are pretty old photos because the bars are still on the windows.

MR. COFFEY: So are the gutters.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Good point, Mike.

MS. ROEBUCK: And this is Building 84A which, you know, to my eye is not as pretty, but I guess it's in the eye of the beholder.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It didn't have to be pretty.

MR. COFFEY: I still think they're pretty.

MS. ROEBUCK: So again, this is Building 84. And this is how it looks today. And this is actually some remediation that was going on at the time that the photograph was taken for BGM, black granular material, outside the building.

So we'll talk about the environmental status. The building has three PCB sites: Building 84A UL-01, Building 84A AL-01, and then the PCB site in the mezzanine. There are three underground storage tanks. All the tanks have been removed. And I'll talk a little bit more about each of these things. One fuel oil pipeline (FOPL) segment has been closed by the regulatory agencies. All the black granular material and associated contamination has been removed. Chlorinated pesticides were a potential concern that has been resolved. And then lead based

paint in soil was removed in 2004. And the request for no further action has been submitted to the agencies for review.

This just gives you general locations of the sites, the FOPLs. This UST was removed in 2004. This is the courtyard area. The two USTs in the courtyard area, one was removed in 2008, and the second one was just removed this year. The PCBs in the mezzanine site were remediated in 2010. And the other sites: the flooring was remediated earlier than that, but we still have, as I said, the PCBs and the indoor air issue that we're dealing with; for AL-01, the concrete floor inside the building was removed, and all the solid material meets residential standards. EPA has approved the closure request and DTSC has not. They have agreed that the solid media meet the standards but, again, they have a concern regarding indoor air. 84A UL-01, again, was a floor issue. The EPA granted closure of that site in 2004. And DTSC, again, has agreed that the solid media meet residential standards, but they had asked for indoor air sampling. The PCBs in the mezzanine site was found during the remediation of the site AL-01. Remedy Engineering remediated that for LMI in 2010. We had thought that that could potentially help us to reduce the indoor air concentrations, and it helped some, but it didn't get us to exactly where we want to be. And we'll talk about those results. And again, we've got closure from EPA, and DTSC has granted closure with respect to the solid media but not the indoor air.

And this just shows you indoor air results over time or the sampling events and results. And just to point out in your handouts, I hadn't put these Building 84 versus 84A designations, so that's not in your handout, but it's here just for your information. Because what this shows is that the indoor air samples as we have been doing the work have come down. This was the most recent result for Building 84. Building 84A was recently sampled and it's higher. Just to give you a sense, the cleanup goal for indoor air for residential occupancy is 4.3 nanograms per cubic meter (ng/m^3), and the commercial industrial standard is 21.5 ng/m^3 .

So what we did is we looked at a risk assessment for indoor air. And the risk guidance had changed in 2009, and so DTSC directed us to take another look. And so CH2M Hill did that for us. And what they found is that the risk for the residential scenario ranges from 1 to 4×10^{-5} , and for the commercial scenario ranges from 2 to 7×10^{-6} . And we have talked to DTSC about that. And both of those results are within the risk management range, but what DTSC has said to us, and we haven't gotten this formally -- this has been informal discussions -- they want to be at the point of departure, so 1×10^{-6} for a residential reuse. But for commercial industrial, these kinds of results would be something that they'd be willing at least to talk to us about. The problem with that is that that's not what it's entitled for, it's entitled for residential use. And so we'll talk a little bit about what that means to us.

So the rest of this is actions that we have taken that all meet residential criteria. So the fuel oil pipeline segment has been closed by the regulators as has the UST 84 north site. The UST courtyard sites were -- we'll show you a picture of that -- it was really right in the building, and really challenging to remediate given concerns about the structural integrity of the building. But that has been done. The regulatory review of that should start soon. We have the document ready for submission in about a week, so Elizabeth, you're going to be getting a little gift from us.

Again, this just shows you these are the UST's that we've just been working on, and I'll show you a couple pictures. And you've probably seen some of these before, so as you can see, it's right

against the wall, and so we had to have a shoring system to get the tank out. And that was successfully done, and this is how it looks now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Did you learn what the tank had in it?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, all the tanks had in them were petroleum.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Fuel oil?

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah. And these are the results that we had. We looked at the TPH and at benzo(a)pyrene. And you can see these are the screening levels and the maximum remaining concentrations that it meets all the residential cleanup goals. So that report, as I said, is going to be submitted to the agencies in about the next week. The black granular material, I mentioned earlier during the remediation of the PCB site AL-01, when that floor of the building was removed, underneath it in soil there was black granular material that was discovered that had -- the contaminants associated with that were primarily lead, but the lab also reported some results that they thought could be interference from organochlorine pesticides. And so when the BGM was fully removed from the interior, we still needed to look outside the building, which we did, and BGM was found. No pesticides were found outside. So we then looked at remediating the BGM and primarily lead. We also did look at polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). And that work was just completed in the early part of this year. And what we found is that the lead in soil meets the cleanup goals. The highest concentration that's remaining is 260 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). The cleanup goal is an average concentration less than 210 mg/kg lead. And no single sample above 400 mg/kg. And both of those we have met.

PAHs represented by benzo(a)pyrene had an average remaining concentration of .15 mg/kg, which is the 1×10^{-6} risk that we like to see. The report documenting that result is in agency review.

This just shows when we remediated the BGM outside, this is Building 84A looking north, as soon as we took the hardscape out there was BGM, there was quite a bit of it. It was very shallow. And what we found was that when we did the work, we could pretty much remove the BGM visually. And so we talked to DTSC, and that's what guided the rest of the work that we did. And then we took confirmation samples based on getting all the side walls and the floor of the excavations represented correctly or adequately.

This is looking east toward Flagship Drive.

So where are we? I think we're finished with the physical remediation of that building. Everything that we knew was there has been addressed and meets residential criteria except, as I've said ten times, the indoor air. We honestly, at this point, don't know what more to do to remediate PCBs, we don't have any additional PCB sites. And the indoor air is within the risk management range for both residential and commercial, but indications are that the commercial use would potentially be accepted, but not the residential use for which the building is entitled.

So what are we going to do next? We're going to finalize the reports that we have. And then we're going to have to decide how the building is going to be used in the future. And, you know, at this point we haven't decided how to deal with that. We would like to use the area for residential use, I mean one of the things that we had considered when we were looking at partial demolition was to demolish a part of the building and leave a part of it there for a museum or a park or a commercial use. At the time we didn't even know we could meet the commercial standards, so we thought we would have to leave the building open in order that there wasn't an

indoor air risk. And SHPO said that's not okay because that could hurt the interior of the building. And so we would consider potentially a commercial use, but it's not entitled for that, and there are costs associated with changing that. And so we haven't really decided how we're going to deal with that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, there would be costs with demolition too --

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, yeah, there were.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- so that wouldn't be gigantic when you did the cost analysis; what was it?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, when we were looking at it, honestly we didn't get to the point of looking at precise or even ballpark costs for demolition. But one of the things that we were considering at that time was retaining 84 and demolishing 84A. And so we would have to do sort of a surgical demolition so it wouldn't be like the other demolition that we've done on the island where we didn't have to try to maintain the integrity of a portion of it. And at this point we don't even know if that's going to come back up to be considered.

If we did that, we would have to go through an EIR, and that process takes a couple of years. And we're interested in getting the site closed. But the other option that we had considered was maybe we put a fence around it and figure out later. I mean, we just didn't know how to get it to where it needed to be. And so now I think it's a positive that we're close enough to a commercial reuse, and we're within the point of departure or within the risk management range even for residential. But we haven't had the discussions with the DTSC that we need, to really consider what our options are. And then from a re-entitlement standpoint, we have not talked to the City about that. And we haven't looked at it from a financial standpoint about how we get that done, because now we have an insurance company that has a responsibility to help us to achieve the reuse that was in the reuse plan. And so there are just a lot of variables that we haven't resolved.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What is the possibility of installing some sort of air circulation that continuously ventilates that building?

MS. ROEBUCK: We thought about that, but the problem with that is what if it fails to operate at some point? And it's closed up and there's potential risk because all the electricity goes out or something. So we've thought about that, but that would be something again we would have to talk to DTSC about. And Janet can speak to it better because she would be the one that gets to decide with her agency. But our expectation is that something like that in a residential setting would be hard to get approved. And would you want to move into a building like that? I mean, we want to have buildings where DTSC and the Water Board say, yeah, this is a great use and it's safe. Not, oh, well, maybe. Especially on a residential reuse.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Maybe it could be a passively operating system rather than relying on electrical power.

MR. COFFEY: There's always solar.

MS. ROEBUCK: And, you know, we're willing to consider all potential options. Because we think from a remediation standpoint we've gone as far as we can go. Yes.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I have a couple of questions about this. Is there any record or indication that the people who worked in this building over the years have suffered any ill effects from whatever material has been found in this building, including PCBs?

MS. ROEBUCK: Not to my knowledge. But let me just tell you also, when we do these indoor samples, what we do is we close the building up as tight as we can for 72 hours, no air exchange. And when somebody's using the building, if the windows are open, the doors are open and closed and I think that when it was being used there was probably more air exchange so that what we're seeing today, it may not be representative of what was there then. I just don't know. And I don't imagine that the Navy would have collected that kind of information. I mean, for example, EPA doesn't regulate PCB's in indoor air. I said a bunch of times the EPA has closed sites and that at the time that it was federal property DTSC wouldn't have been involved. It would have been the EPA, if anyone, and they don't regulate it. So there would have been no reason that I know of that the Navy would have taken samples.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Another question. Is there any estimate of how much money has been expended on all the work that's been done in this building to date?

MS. ROEBUCK: We have not counted it up, but it is more than just a few hundred thousand dollars, I mean we're talking well over a million dollars to do all this work. Neal, do you have an assessment of that?

MR. SILER: I think it's multi-million dollars, I would say it's above two and below five.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, let's not forget, that's not coming out of LMI's pocket; is it? It's coming out of the Navy's pocket and out of your policies.

MR. SILER: Well, some of that's correct, the majority of it does come out of there, but we do expend money in doing these types of environmental cleanup.

MS. ROEBUCK: And from LMI's perspective, we haven't ever said, "Let's not do this because of the cost," we have always said, "What needs to be done, we'll do."

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I'm just responding to Chris -- I wasn't quite sure what your question, the intent of your question was, Chris?

MR. RASMUSSEN: My question was exactly what it was, how much money has been spent on this single building?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, but --

MR. RASMUSSEN: Is it a million, two, five, ten? I think it's an important question to consider.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I guess maybe I'm asking for clarification from you. Why is it of concern to you? It's part of the environmental cleanup of the island and the Navy's commitment is that it -- it made the contamination, it's on the hook in perpetuity for the cleanup, so I'm just curious.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Well, we're seeing these days that commitments for expenditures by the Government are not boundless.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, in this case I think we've done all the remediation we can, and from a cost standpoint, you know, it's kind of interesting to ask the question, but it certainly didn't control our approach to the question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah, and I think we have a pretty established process that in the environmental cleanup world where you make those decisions and decide, and I'm sure you didn't deviate from that, it wouldn't necessarily make sense.

There's two questions I have from your presentation. And thank you for doing the presentation, very well done as I would expect. But that it's finally done is great. The existing site plan on page eight, you show "to be demolished" on like three quarters of the building.

MS. ROEBUCK: That, as I mentioned, when we looked at this with the SHPO and the Historic Landmarks Commission, we had done that with various scenarios. And our initial thought was that if we demolish Building 84A but retain Building 84, that was one of the things that we would consider. And this site plan just comes from that time period when we were considering it. So I didn't even notice that, Myrna, but that's not our current plan, it was just what we had looked at, at the time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well, you can count on me to notice something like that.

MS. ROEBUCK: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sorry. Okay. That's a good answer. Just two more things. When you talk about your entitlements, you could either explain that a little more, or maybe just answer my question which would be: why wouldn't you just be requesting a variance for a commercial use of the building instead of residential?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, I think that --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, it sounds like -- you sounded like -- you said it many, many times like it was incredibly onerous to do that, and I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that's really the case or not, if I'm understanding that correctly.

MS. ROEBUCK: And I'm not, you know, that's not my area of expertise; but my understanding is that the difficulty isn't necessarily just the building itself, it is that there were a certain number of homes that were entitled for Mare Island. And if not here, where would they be? And if there were other areas where they would have to go, that would have to be considered, the Specific Plan, you know, kind of where the land use plan shows where residential is going to occur and it's not going to be there if we use commercial. So my understanding from others whose area it is, is that it is a big deal and it's expensive and time consuming to get that done.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As compared to just demolishing it and making a big hole there in the ground?

MS. ROEBUCK: That's also very time consuming.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MS. ROEBUCK: So right now I think what we're trying to do is leave all the options on the table, get to the point where we can talk to DTSC and the City about it, and come up with some ideas that we think are viable.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe what you said earlier which was just to put the fence around it was what you're going to do -- we're going to do anyway as a business model. So it sounds like there's just a lot of uncertainties. But if you could at least get to environmental closure, then you could settle the rest of it down the road when your market comes back anyway, so.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah. And I don't disagree with what you're saying, Myrna, and I don't think any of us at LMI would, we just don't know what the best approach is. We know that there are a number of potential approaches, and we want to consider all of them. And, in fact, at this point

we just want to get all the rest of these reports done, and then at that point, except for this one issue, it's ready to go. And so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, just air the place out and hope for the best by the time the market comes back.

MR. COFFEY: Large bottles of Renuzit.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Febreze.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah, Febreze.

MR. KARR: If -- I'm certain that everyone involved in this situation has asked this question dozens of time, but if all the known PCB sources have been remediated and signed off, what's the source of the airborne?

MS. ROEBUCK: I don't know.

MR. COFFEY: There's no way to detect that?

MR. KARR: How is that being pursued?

MS. ROEBUCK: We have remediated all the PCB sites that we could find. And we've, you know, the floor is gone, you know, we've scabbled the mezzanine, I mean everything that remains meets residential criteria. So I don't know the answer to your question.

MR. KARR: Have you examined the bricks? I mean, bricks are nothing but big sponges and, you know, if it was enough of it in known sources and sitting there and, you know, especially stagnant for years, that might be a place to look.

MS. ROEBUCK: And that's true, but I also just want to bring you back to remember that the risk profile now for that building is that it can be used safely for commercial use and within the risk management range for residential use. So it's not like we think this building creates a big health hazard for any kind of reuse. I mean, there was a time where we thought that the remediation we were going to have to do was so complicated that we weren't going to be able to achieve it. In the mezzanine we were concerned about the structural integrity of the building, same thing with the UST. We've met and successfully dealt with all of those challenges, and the building is not so bad right now. It's not zero, it's not like background outside, but it's not what it used to be.

MR. KARR: I guess my point is that if, for whatever reason or use it is -- end result would be, that would have to be something that would be disclosed to tenants or commercial tenants. And, you know, telling 'em it's a known unknown isn't going to work, you know.

MS. ROEBUCK: And we wouldn't say that.

MR. KARR: There's a situation where we have airborne PCBs that are in a manageable reasonable limit and we don't know where they're coming from, that's going to be a tough sell.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah. I mean all that honestly, Jerry, would argue for some sort of demolition if you're going to reuse the building. And I think that it's historically significant enough that that has to be one of our last choices. So we want to try to reuse it if we can, but if there is a sense from the regulators and the community that there would be a real lack of comfort with that, then that's important.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I am thinking that once you do interior design and remodeling, putting inner walls up, that encapsulate so that whatever might be coming out of the bricks doesn't get inside, and putting down floors that whatever might be coming up out of the ground can't get in the --

MR. COFFEY: It's an expensive remedy.

MS. ROEBUCK: And I think you're right, Paula, that that would probably be helpful.

MR. COFFEY: It's an expensive gamble.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's a gamble, yeah.

MS. ROEBUCK: But we have to assume none of that and safe. And if we can get to none of that and safe then add that, that is better. But we can't assume any of that is necessary in order for it to be safe.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To follow up on what Jerry said, and not to keep you here all night, but have you scabbled or sampled brick? What are PCBs usually in, an oil?

MR. KARR: Typically.

MS. ROEBUCK: We have not, to my knowledge, sampled the brick. And normally it is in oil.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because you might be able to seal, seal something if you knew where it was coming from, of course.

MS. ROEBUCK: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cause there's a lot of bricks in those buildings.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah.

MR. QUIGLEY: In our report to you on the AHLC, they had scrubbed the bricks. But my question to you, on the DTSC: What's wrong? Why are they scrapping the plan for the open air that they talked about?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, that was SHPO. They were concerned that if it was open air and the building was open to the elements, it could degrade the building over time.

MR. COFFEY: Even further because it is a marine environment.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure it would.

MR. COFFEY: What a bummer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Let's give it to the national parks.

MR. COFFEY: Well, I've seen where they take the buildings and move them, and in the process of moving them they can save the building, but that would be expensive.

MR. KARR: Leave the air there.

MR. COFFEY: When you move the building usually, you know, you're moving sections of the building, you may find whatever it is that does that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The secret. Well, just put it on a mystery show, a detective show.

MS. ROEBUCK: Right. All right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Sheila.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you, Sheila.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And that brings us to our first public comment period. Any comments?

MR. COFFEY: Publicly, no.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. So we have a ten minute break, and there are some treats over behind the --

MR. QUIGLEY: Yay, Janet.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And we'll reconvene in ten minutes. Thank you.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So Gil tells me ten minutes are officially over. Now we are at administrative business. Please get your comments on the meeting minutes to Myrna or myself so we can finalize those. And I will turn it over to Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well, because we only meet every two months now more than two months ago we received an application from an individual who would like to become a member, one of the community members of the Restoration Advisory Board. And the nominating committee did meet today, and we would like to make a recommendation to the Restoration Advisory Board to accept Maurice Campbell as a new member representing the community for the Restoration Advisory Board. And I think what I'm supposed to do --

MR. COFFEY: Nomination, second.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You are going to nominate or I'm going to --

MR. COFFEY: You nominate, I second.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And then the community members only --

MR. COFFEY: Have to vote.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- of the Restoration Advisory Board have to vote on --

MR. COFFEY: Accepting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- accepting our recommendation. So I will nominate Maurice Campbell to become a new community member of the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

MR. COFFEY: And I will second it. And --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. And then you have something that you usually say before we do a vote?

MR. COFFEY: Specifically to the new member, and it's basically the spiel about who we are and how we conduct ourselves. As you can tell since you've been here several meetings already, that we're not a very acrimonious group, we tend to keep things a little bit lighthearted. And we do have a serious intent about why we're here, and our focus is definitely the environmental cleanup and the reuse of the island and its maintenance and upkeep. We all take our position seriously, not only the federal members and the state members and the community members, but

we do try and keep it on a non-political, lighthearted, non-acrimonious level, and whatever happens at the RAB stays at the RAB.

(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. On that lighthearted note, I'd like to have the community members of the Restoration Advisory Board vote whether to accept Maurice Campbell --

MR. COFFEY: All those in favor?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All those in favor say -- or raise your hand, how about that? Anyone not raising their hand who is a community member?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No. Well, Maurice, welcome aboard.

MR. COFFEY: Come on over.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Would you like to take a couple of minutes to introduce yourself to the rest of the Restoration Advisory Board and the public here today?

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure, I guess I could. I am somewhat familiar with RAB boards. I was a Community Co-chair in Hunter's Point; as a matter of fact, we got a lot done during that point. I understand it has dissolved since then because of some of the politics that has gone on. I also worked on the conveyance agreement for San Francisco to convey the property. Michael Cullin, who was the City's major architect for mayor's office, worked very closely with me. I worked on a lot of the things having to do with community benefits and the right of the artist to return to Hunter's Point Shipyard. Yes, I was involved with a lot of the technical stuff. I have been listening to your group and your meetings, and I'm pleasantly surprised with the technical details that have been discussed. I was just speaking with Herb about one of the people that I knew, and I knew he was involved in one of the particular areas, and just tracking some of the people. My goal isn't political. My goal is to try to help the organization and community as much as possible. I believe that there's a tremendous potential in Vallejo, it has a rail service, it has a deep water port, it has a lot of residential availability. And when I see what has happened in some of the cases being written up by Newsweek and things like that, I think I'd like to see some of those things changed to the positive.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool. Have a seat.

MR. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. KARR: Welcome.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Might as well get your feet wet now.

MR. COFFEY: Claim your territory.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So welcome aboard Maurice.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And we are now at focus group reports. Community report.

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: Yeah, I've got a couple of little things that have been going on in our fine community here that I'd like to relay. One, I would really, and a lot of the locals here would like to thank Myrna Hayes for opening the south end of the island for the Fourth of July. There probably were 75 of us up there enjoying the fireworks. And it was absolutely beautiful, and the mosquitoes were large.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you were sumptuous.

MR. QUIGLEY: And another thing, Lennar has been forced to, for those who aren't on the island a lot, put up a fence all the way down Azuar. We have a lot of offroaders, and due to that they've had to put up a chain link fence. And there's been a lot of concern about that, thinking it was going to be a big massive fence, but it's not, it's just a small one to keep the offroaders off. Some of our local people have interacted with some of these people offroading, but that didn't work too well.

MR. COFFEY: I'll bet.

MR. QUIGLEY: Another thing, our neighborhood watch, I am so proud to say, is very, very effective. We had three squatters in empty homes, and I happen to know two of the people who moved out. I called them. They gave me the bank. The bank gave me the realtor. So with the realtor and the police we went and evicted 'em.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, yeah, that was really cool. And the last thing was Chris Rasmussen here put together a group, and we've been meeting, and we met with the City council to discuss the CTF -- CFD, I'm sorry, CFD.

MS. NAITO: What's that acronym?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Community Facilities District, Mello Roos.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, higher taxes.

MR. COFFEY: Janet, we should congratulate Wendell on his first ever community report.

(APPLAUSE.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That's not true.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It is so.

MS. NAITO: That's his longest.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's the longest.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Natural resources, Jerry, did --

MR. KARR: Well, I can -- I can't turn this on. I could never top Wendell, that was a pretty amazing report. But I really have nothing to report but to tell or kind of inform the folks that live on the yard and that take walks out on the new paths and stuff to keep your eyes on all the mudflats cause even though we're still waiting for summer to begin, all the shore birds are in migration, they're done raising their kids up in Alaska, and they're all heading back to South

America. So daily, daily, daily the numbers are increasing. And a lot of 'em still have some of their breeding colors. And I lost mine years ago, but -- so it's a good time if you pay attention to nature. It's not fall yet, but it's damn near winter for those little birds, they got along ways to go yet, so --

MR. FARLEY: Jerry, I have a question for you. Last year sometime I went up to the National Wildlife Refuge up in Sacramento Valley up by Willetts, yeah, Willetts.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Williams.

MR. FARLEY: Williams, that's what it was. That was quite an experience. How was that involved in the migration? Are these birds now flying down south through that area?

MR. KARR: Yeah, they are. I could talk for hours on that, how all the birds, not only shore birds are starting now, they're the earliest to go, and the ducks and geese and all those millions of snow geese you saw up there in the wintertime, they won't be coming down until September and October and on in through there. But we're right on the Pacific flyway, and all birds that migrate come right through here. We don't see 'em all cause many of 'em go at night. The majority of 'em travel at night. And these mudflats are the best McDonalds in the world. There's more little critters and bugs and worms and stuff, you know, and that's why they're all here. So it's a really great place to be, and it's a nice adjunct to the folks that are able to live out here. Just kind of keep your eyes open, it's a very interesting place.

c) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Technical report.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Well, I technically don't have anything to report, but I want to give Michael a rough time. But thank you, Jerry, for filling us in on the birds. And now I know why I hear so many geese calling. They have taken over the school yard in the school they closed next door to me.

MR. COFFEY: Really? That's a good thing.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Not if you walk across that school ground and get goose shit on your feet. And if you have a dog that chases them away and eats the stuff.

MR. COFFEY: Is that a technical term?

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. KARR: Biological, we use it in the field a lot.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay. Goose fecal material. And anyway, okay. And the other thing is I plan to leave this and go to see a movie. I'm going to go see Larry Crown with Tom Hanks in it, it starts at 9:15, so that's where I'm going next.

MR. COFFEY: Gil will be happy to hear that.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Gil, you're up.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. FARLEY: We have our meeting handout, I was going to say monthly, but I guess it is monthly because we sent it out. Okay. We have our monthly handout. The main parts are the map in the center, the two photographs, and then in the lower left are the submitted documents. A lot of documents either submitted or upcoming. I'll talk about those a little bit when I get to the main map.

In the upper left corner is a photograph looking, I think, to the northeast, north or northeast of the Building 637 Area. Building 637 was a repair shop, and it was Building 811 on the south side which is an old locomotive dyno building. Those buildings are now gone and there's some additional work being done there for soil gas and some soil contamination. In the upper right is an interior photograph of Building 121 which is the old power plant. And there's some abatement of some building materials ongoing inside that building.

If we move down to the main map, I think the highlight here is in the area in the upper left corner, the part of IA-B which is B.2-1. Actually got the land use covenant signed and recorded, the release of the pre-decision land use covenant signed and recorded, and I think that's a major triumph. And everybody here should be very happy at the progress of being able to close out that part of the island. That's a terrific milestone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I can see where it is, but what's it bounded by? Walnut?

MR. FARLEY: Oh, it's the causeway on the north. Azuar Drive on the west. And what is that, Railroad? Railroad on the east. And down to, I think it's Kansas Street on the south.

MR. SILER: Connelly.

MR. FARLEY: What was that? Connelly, yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. FARLEY: So this is the area basically to the west of us over here. So again, I think that's -- everybody on the RAB should be very proud of themselves for participating in getting that area closed and --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is this where you had those really complicated soil gases and all that?

MR. SILER: Not in this area.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. So moving on then. In the upper right where it says oil/water separator (OWS) T2 and IWPS 4, that's the industrial wastewater pipeline system, IWPS. There's a groundwater monitoring plan that was submitted for those two areas. Groundwater monitoring will continue on under that plan. Building 271, there was an elemental mercury removal that was performed there. An implementation report has been submitted for that site. There's a cleanup plan that's being prepared and will be submitted soon for the Building 69 UL-02 and -03 which is unknown location (UL) two and three.

Moving down towards the Ways, Building 854 UL-01, and 1304 UL-01, there have been site cleanup plans submitted to the agencies for those two sites. At the Independence Wharf Area, which is down between Dry Docks 3 and 4, there was a Final Petroleum Corrective Action Plan that's being prepared and will be submitted soon to the agencies.

And there is some groundwater monitoring that's been performed, and those results will be made available soon as well. And then 1342 UL-01 over by the Berth 18, a request for no further action has been submitted to the agencies for that PCB site.

MR. FARLEY: I guess I'm all done. Any questions? Any questions from anybody?

MS. WELLS: What about IWPS Number 6?

MR. FARLEY: Neal, do you have an update on that one? I don't remember what the status --

MR. SILER: That is the Building 206/208 Area.

MR. FARLEY: Oh, yeah, that's the soil removal going on. Yeah, there's some soil removal ongoing over there for lead and soil, shallow soil. And then up at Building 531 there was an abrasive blast material (ABM) removal around a vault. I think we talked about that at the last RAB meeting.

f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update.

MR. GEMAR: All right. Weston update. Under document status, Janet Naito has been busy reviewing some of our documents, so she's only down to two, one of which just showed up at her desk, so she's doing some major catch up there. And the other three documents, the Remedial Investigation Report for IR05 and the Western Magazine Area, we're doing some revisions to that document to respond to the comments from DTSC. And also the same with IR05, the Time Critical Removal Action and Completion Report. And we just got comments, literally I think today, on the CERCLA Remedial Action Completion Report for H1, so we'll be taking a look at those comments as well. I notice that the Navy also had this update in their section, so I'll let Janet --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: No, you go.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. Well, of course, you got the date right, so maybe you should go. We took samples on July 6th, which was correctly reported on the Navy update, incorrectly reported on mine, in five locations at IR05. And this was to address one of the comments on the Remedial Investigation Report regarding some data gaps. And so we took some additional samples there, and those results will now be incorporated into the final version of the Remedial Investigation Report.

And also down at IR05 we have a Wetlands Restoration Progress Report. We had excavated and backfilled about five acres of previously contaminated areas down at the south end of the island, and the goal is to have that be restored to a pickleweed dominated wetland area. And you can see a couple of photos on the right-hand side. This is the first season since we backfilled the site last fall. So the pickleweed is coming in pretty well. And you see a picture of the hat for scale there. It's not exactly knee high by the fourth, unless you're a mouse, of course - then it's pretty high. But it's definitely coming in pretty well. And you can see some tidal channels that we had graded to help distribute the water through this five acre area. So it looks like it's off to a good start. We will monitor it for the next potentially five years, or until the criteria have been achieved, whichever comes first. But so far, so good. So we're literally watching the pickleweed grow. That's pretty much our story.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If you need any help, we'll do it from the hillside.

MR. COFFEY: I just want to know, was any pickleweed harmed in the placing of that hat?

MR. GEMAR: Absolutely not. I gingerly walked around all of the pickleweed.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Regulatory agency update.

MS. NAITO: I was going to try nothing to report, but Myrna got mad at me for saying that last time, so --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, dear. Sorry.

MS. NAITO: It was June and July. We've gotten a lot done. It doesn't necessarily show up as finished documents, but we've gotten a lot of comments out, we've got a lot of documents reviewed. And it seems like the stack is still managing to grow somehow. So the good news is things are moving.

MS. WELLS: All right. I wanted to say that I'm almost at my one year anniversary.

MR. COFFEY: Woo hoo.

MS. WELLS: Yeah, I guess maybe we should have a party.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or maybe you should move onto another project.

MS. WELLS: I don't know, I've been on Moffett for four years. But anyway, I'm not planning on going anywhere right away, but I've actually really enjoyed working on Mare Island. And so what did I do over the last two months? Well, I think I reviewed some reports and wrote some letters and made some comments. But I did go on vacation, which was fabulous, to Germany to watch the Women's World Cup. And the highlight was we got to meet Hope Solo, the goalie for the U.S. team. We met her on a street corner in Frankfurt, just walked up to her. And then the other thing I wanted to tell you is, well, first, thank you to the Navy for the snacks. And I appreciate everybody who has contributed to the snacks because I think it adds a lot to our break. So thank you -- if I miss anybody, I apologize -- but to Jim, Janet, Steve, Dwight, Gil, Janet, and Wendell. And so we need someone to step up for our next meeting. And you can step up now.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. D'ALMEIDA: I guess she's suggesting it's my turn.

MS. WELLS: No, I didn't mean that, but you can.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Oh, okay. Well, yes, September I think I can make that meeting, I don't think I have any other conflicts. My kids are in college and all driving now, so I'm a lot freer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No more excuses.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yeah, no more excuses. So yeah, okay. Remind me. Janet, remind me.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Put that as an action item for me.

MS. NAITO: That's going to be weird at the BCT meeting.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yeah, but my memory has come to this. For the past couple of months since the last meeting, and I think I missed the last meeting, but the last couple of months I've closed

out four PCB sites for the Navy, and approved two cleanup plans for PCB sites for Lennar. And I've also got a consultant reviewing the Revised Remedial Investigation Report for Area F1, the Ordnance Manufacturing Area. So that's what we've got working.

MS. WELLS: So Myrna, to follow up on the comment that the Water Board changes project managers, we actually have two new project managers that came into our division, so if you'd like, we can shift.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I wasn't advising that, I was commenting on the past.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Didn't I already say no to you? No, you can't leave. No. No.

MS. TYGIELSKI: We like you, Elizabeth.

MS. NAITO: I can't wait to read that in the meeting minutes, the no, no, no, no.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So Co-chair's report. Do you want me to go ahead?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sure.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So in the past month the Navy has done some field work, and I will skip IR-05 because Dwight already covered that. We've done some field work at Building 505A, PCB removal, that consisted of removing contaminated concrete and soil. The impacts were due to electrical equipment formerly at the site. A catch basin and section of associated discharge line were removed. And we have a picture of the catch basin removal on the front page there. Following that removal, confirmation samples were collected, and then we'll put all of that information together and submit closure documentation to the agencies for concurrence.

We have submitted three documents in the last month. And we've received comments from the Water Board on, and actually concurrence on the J-line closure certification report, and then comments on the Production Manufacturing Area/ South Shore Area (PMA/SSA) storm water. And we also, as Carolyn mentioned, we received comments and concurrence from EPA on four PCB Site Closure Reports.

We had our Base Closure Team (BCT) meeting today and, as always, it was very productive and a lot of fun. And then our next RAB meeting and BCT meeting will be September 29th. And I will turn it over to the Community Co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This Production Manufacturing Area/ South Shore Area Draft Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, is that still open for comment or review? Because this last winter it seemed to me that we didn't have a very effective storm water pollution prevention plan in some areas of the PMA. Maybe we could just talk off-line about that.

MR. COFFEY: I remember that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Well, we can certainly do that. This particular plan has to do with what we will be doing to prevent any additional discharge from the actual work that will be conducted.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And there was inadequate, either on your previous project that was there this winter, there was either inadequate planning or inadequate execution. And when I called the

various agencies they kind of like over the phone, I guess, rolled their eyes or something. And so I was just figuring it was a good time to talk about it before the storm systems, you known started coming back through, before the rains.

Because I'm not clear, like people say things like, oh, the Navy, the Navy self-regulates or the Navy we don't regulate them, or they don't need a permit. Those are the kinds of things that have been said by other agencies, which you might appreciate.

But anyway this jumped out at me when you said that you actually work with the Water Board on a permit. So just would like to know what it -- what all it involves.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah, you're certainly welcome to comment on the document. Whenever we do excavation work on one of our projects we develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. And it's usually an attachment or an appendix to the main Work Plan. The way this particular project was set up they were all issued separately, in separate binders -- which is very confusing and we will never do that again. But all of our earth moving type projects have that component in the Work Plan. But I know you had brought up this kind of issue before, and we did, I believe, double check on the things that were done around our excavation. Now, to prevent run-off from those excavations, now I think maybe what you're referring to is maybe just a site wide issue and not related to individual excavations.

MR. COFFEY: Weren't you talking about a whole lot of flooding that went on last year?

MR. QUIGLEY: On Azuar.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No. No. No. Well Azuar --

MR. QUIGLEY: Azuar completely floods.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But that's not their issue.

MR. QUIGLEY: Whose is that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It was -- at the time I think it was Lennar's on the Crane Test Area. But I was actually referring to the actual site where the demolition took place and where there was backfill into a known, documented wetland, and then I got kind of like a lot of flak for saying that it was backfilled into wetlands. It was like, oh, no, it was just making roads and stuff. So I have some photos that I didn't know who to show the photos to. So if it's you and you or together you's, then I just would like to see those kinds of things not take place without knowing that they were approved beforehand.

MS. WELLS: So if it's backfilling of materials into a wetland, that's one thing, and I think if you see that or you have photos... I think the important thing is let's start here and move forward because we're going to make sure that the work --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think it was like a wetland that had formed due to storm drain system failure or removal or something. So, anyway.

MS. WELLS: Okay. So starting here moving forward, if there's something that you observe that's a problem, I think talk to both of us, and you can send us photos and we can see what we can do about it. And the permit -- or the plan that the Navy put together follows a permit, a general permit for construction projects.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, so there is a general permit?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: For construction.

MS. WELLS: Yes, for construction projects over a certain size.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, this was a construction project or a deconstruction project, so I guess that counts as a construction project.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. So this particular plan follows the requirements of the permit in terms of what they need to do and how they have to mitigate and manage storm water and all of that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, this was all news to me because I actually did call the Army Corps, I called the Navy itself, and I called the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District, those three parties, and I didn't get any response from any one of them except for the Corps said send us photos and we can send someone out. So I'm happy to know that you actually do have a plan and a process that you normally follow. Okay.

Very quickly, I'm at the end of the meeting this evening so I will just tell you a couple of things. One, that I did attend Commander Robert McFarland's 85th birthday this Saturday. And he was a former commander of the Naval Ammunition Depot. And he is still very interested in Mare Island and wants to continue to be actively involved. And I think he's a very valuable resource.

For those of you who are working in the Production Manufacturing Area and historic South Shore, he can regale you with some pretty amazing stories of where they off-loaded munitions in his truck when he was working here in the late sixties, early seventies. And the methods through which they cleared out buildings and disposed of materials. So he might be a valuable interviewee, and he is here in Suisun for another month or two before he goes back to Japan where he spends part of his year.

And then the other thing to put on your calendars, please, is August 12th through 14th, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, is the fourth annual Mare Faire. And if you would like to participate as an exhibitor or presenter, a guide, it's not too late to get that scheduled into the programming. And it's not too late to offer to sponsor or to bring some cookies or pie for a bake sale fundraiser during that weekend. And certainly do plan to attend, open ten to eight all three days.

And that's it, thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, everybody. See you next time.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:08 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Environmental Security Technology Certification Program and Classification Demonstration at Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard
- Presentation Handout – Building 84 Update, Investigation Area D1.3 – CH2M Hill/Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Mare Island RAB Update July 28, 2011 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard July 28, 2011