



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

HELD THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 2012

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, January 26th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:11 p.m. and adjourned at 8:46 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
- Paula Tygielski
- Maurice Campbell
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Steve Farley (Lennar Mare Island, CH2M Hill)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC])
- Carolyn d’Almeida (United States Environmental Protection Agency [U.S. EPA])
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Joshua Bernardo (Solano County Hazardous Material/Site Remediation)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Fred Ousey (Envirotech)
- Elizabeth Mosts
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM Smith)
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Welcome, everybody. Welcome to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board. We'll start the meeting with introductions. I'm Janet Lear, I'm the Navy co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the community co-chair from Vallejo.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm Maurice Campbell, a community member from Vallejo.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I am Paula Tygielski. I'm a community member from Benicia.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill representing Lennar.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey representing the delightful City of American Canyon.

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

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells, Water Board.

MS. NAITO: Janet Naito, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

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

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen with Weston Solutions.

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

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey, Envirotech Services.

MR. BERNARDO: Josh Bernardo, Solano County, Hazardous Materials/Site Remediation.

II. PRESENTATION: *Wetlands Mitigation Status Report Investigation Area (IA) H1 and Installation Restoration (IR) Site 05*

Presentation by Mr. Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Tonight we have two presentations. We have a presentation given by Dwight Gemar of Weston Solutions on the wetlands mitigation status for two of our sites: Investigation Area (IA) H1 and Installation Restoration (IR) Site 05. So Dwight, we'll get started with you. Thanks.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. And this actually is a photograph of our open water habitat with some local inhabitants enjoying the area and some of the newly created wetlands in the background.

MR. COFFEY: It could be a baseball diamond too.

MR. GEMAR: That's right, who's on first? And the reason why we needed to do wetlands compensatory mitigation is that we had some non-tidal wetlands adjacent to the old facility landfill within Investigation Area H1, and those wetlands happened to be co-located with some oil and debris disposal, and they were impacted by a variety of contaminants. And as part of our final remedy for IA-H1 it was determined that it would be best to encapsulate or encircle that area with a soil bentonite slurry wall to cut off groundwater, and then to cover the area with an engineered cap which included the areas occupied by those wetlands.

However, the Clean Water Act prohibits discharge of fill into waters of the U.S. unless it's authorized. But in cases of unavoidable impacts, what they call compensatory mitigation is

required to replace the loss of wetlands. So essentially there's a requirement that the government wants no net loss of wetlands if you have to impact or fill a wetland area. And in most cases they want a little extra replacement.

And just for a spatial orientation here, the green areas where these wetlands are adjacent -- this is the old facility landfill here.

So these areas are what are inside the area that we wanted to contain. And, therefore, they were backfilled as part of our cap of the H1 containment area. And these areas in blue are the areas that we selected to create new wetlands to compensate for the loss of wetlands. The reason we selected this area is that it was a fairly low lying area to begin with, so we didn't have to excavate too much of the upland area in order to depress the elevation enough to make it into a seasonal wetland area. And also -- it's hard to see in this photograph -- but this area is an existing non-tidal wetland area, as is this area. So these were upland areas. And by lowering these areas and creating new wetlands, it basically tied these areas together and provided a more contiguous wetland area which helps with providing a better quality of habitat, especially for our local endangered species which is the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse.

A couple other complications, or challenges, in this particular project were that there was pickleweed in about two acres of the roughly seven acres that were impacted, that were destined to be part of the containment area. And that's important because wherever there's pickleweed there's the presence, or the potential for the presence of the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, which everyone here, for the most part, knows is a federal and state endangered species. And under both federal and state laws you basically want to avoid any impacts or no "take" is allowed. In California, the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse is a fully protected species and, therefore, even the loss of one animal is considered unacceptable.

So the Navy worked with the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a biological opinion to help comply with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. In this case it was somewhat interesting because we were allowed to do some trapping, which is normally not even allowed for an endangered species. But in this case, because of the remote location of what we lovingly referred to as Wetland X, there wasn't a whole lot of suitable habitat in the immediate vicinity, and so rather than just try to shoo the mice out of the way, we trapped this area over here because this is close to some pickleweed. In Former Dredge Pond 1, we used what's called passive vegetation removal -- to encourage the mice to move out of the area. And basically we do that by cutting the vegetation and just kind of herding the mice, if they're present, over to a more suitable habitat. In the area of Wetland X, which was more remote, we hired a specialty contractor to set 200 traps which were set over a period of eight nights, four consecutive nights, then a two night break, and then another four consecutive nights. And the requirement was that if we trapped any Salt Marsh Harvest Mice, we would have to trap for an additional two nights. Well, we did actually trap one Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, I think it was on maybe night five, so the eight nights were sufficient. We did get a lot of field mice, etcetera, but only one Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse in the area.

In the location where we did the passive vegetation removal, which was over here where we cut the vegetation to kind of herd the mice over this way, we did observe a couple of Salt Marsh Harvest Mice. So really, for all that work, there were approximately three mice that we protected.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Were they blind?

MR. GEMAR: I don't know, but the one in Wetland X was definitely lost, I think.

In addition to protecting the Salt Marsh Harvest Mice from any impacts, we were also required, as I mentioned earlier, to do compensatory mitigation, which means we had to replace the wetlands that we backfilled. In the case of H1, roughly eight and a quarter acres was required. And in order to do that, we first did some collection of seedlings way back in the late 2004 time period. And then as part of the remedy for H1, we excavated about 58,000 cubic yards of soil to lower the elevation of the upland areas in order to facilitate the creation of the new wetlands. And then we took those seedlings, after being actually in a nursery for a couple of years, which was longer than we thought we'd need, but we did some planting in early 2007. Based on the grading that we did, we actually created about 8.6 acres which, of course, is greater than what was required. Roughly 7.1 acres of area that we graded to create pickleweed dominated wetland. And then about one and a half acres of an area a little bit lower, we created a seasonal ponded area for open water habitat. And the reason we did both varieties of habitat is because in the area that we backfilled in H1, there was some open water which was habitat for migratory waterfowl in addition to the pickleweed. So essentially, the Fish and Wildlife Service wanted to create some new wetlands that were of equivalent or better habitat for the new wetlands. So that's why we did both.

And then, in order to help sustain the new non-tidal wetlands, we made sure that we allowed the storm water run-off from the landfill cap, once that was finished, to drain into the wetlands. This is clean storm water that comes off the top of the soil cover, and goes into the wetland area to provide some additional hydrology, or improve our hydrology.

Here you can see just what these little seedlings look like in the containers. They don't look like much, because these are dormant plants, but we had, I think, somewhere on the order of 14,000 pickleweed plants that were planted. And here you can see an area that was graded to create the new wetland area. You can see some existing pickleweed areas out here. Again, this was taken in the fall or winter time frame, when the areas are dormant, so this pickleweed looks a little tannish and then greens up in the spring. But you can see a lot of little flags of different color, and each different color represents different plant species. We planted pickleweed, salt grass, Alkali Heath, and fat hen. And basically they just used a tarp as kind of a grid, and they had holes in the tarp, and they would just plant the plants in a certain sequence, and then they'd just flip it over and start over on the next section of ground. So that way they were able to plant a consistent sequence of these target wetland species that we were looking to create.

And you can see in the background where we're still excavating some areas. There's an excavator and large haul truck. Here's another haul truck.

And this is what it looks like now. So you go from this to that in four years. So it's doing quite well. In fact, every year we have a consultant do a quantitative vegetation survey, and the salt marsh plant cover at Year 4 is 82.5 percent. Our goal for four years from the biological opinion is 65 percent, so we're doing well there. And also the pickleweed cover at Year 4 is roughly 45 percent. We have a goal of 60 percent, so we're closing in on that as well. So we're pretty happy with the progress. And as we indicate here in the last bullet, we think we're doing well in terms of meeting our obligations for the quantitative plant species propagation there at the wetland area on H1.

And this is just another shot of an open water area where the ducks and the geese can hang out as part of the wetland creation within H1.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's my understanding that some of these ponds that have pickleweed in them have -- I can see in the front of this photo you have some plants that don't look like they're salt marsh type plants, they're more nasty weeds. And I understand that all of those ponds out there could eventually -- with enough water washing through 'em, and they aren't being replenished with dredge material anymore, so they aren't getting that refreshing of the salt in the soil, and so on. Do you just have to do five years, and then after that you really don't have to monitor, you just let nature take its course? And if it converts to a ruderal landscape, well, then that's just the way life goes. Are you on the hook for just these five years?

MR. GEMAR: Well, under the requirements of the [biological opinion] BO we do have just a five year monitoring requirement if we achieve the final goals. We also do have a post closure care plan for H1 and the agencies are reviewing that. So, it's possible that they might want to continue to see some kind of annual review of how we're doing, just to make sure that it doesn't revert back to a more upland type vegetation. One of the things we did in this new area was we graded the elevation fairly low. And based on our experience out at Mare Island, at this elevation it would be very difficult for the ruderal community to establish itself, because it is very close to the groundwater table which is brackish out here at Mare Island. So in some areas pickleweed can grow at a very at certain elevations, but it tends to thrive in an area where you're within a foot or so of the groundwater, at least the seasonal high groundwater, which is what we have out here at H1. There are some adjacent non-tidal wetland areas that are probably two feet higher where there is some pickleweed growing, but there's also a lot of other things. But in this case, because we purposely graded it a little bit lower, I think we're going to be okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. It seems like you would have done your job here, and it didn't seem realistic to expect you to maintain it into perpetuity since Mother Nature's pretty much going to be the master of that.

MR. GEMAR: We hope what we've set up is going to be self-sustaining.

In addition to the H1 created wetlands, we also created some new wetlands out at Installation Restoration Site 05, which is at the very south end of Mare Island. This is the Carquinez Strait here. And over here we had a small area, kind of shown in pink or lavender here, that was a pickleweed dominated wetland area. And unfortunately there were some pretty high levels of mercury and some other contaminants in that area, so a decision was made as part of a Time Critical Removal Action to remove that soil and backfill with clean fill. And so, because it contained pickleweed, we had the same issue as we had at IR-05. We had to hand cut the pickleweed to encourage any Salt Marsh Harvest Mice that were in the area, to leave the area. And then we did harvest some new pickleweed over here in the area with a lot of dense pickleweed in order to replant that area.

So in this case, as I indicated here, we also, through the Navy, had another Biological Opinion issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Our requirement was to replace the two acres that we were planning to remove based on the contaminated soil excavation. And in that case, as I mentioned, we minimized any impacts to the Salt Marsh Harvest Mice by doing a hand removal of the vegetation in order to, again, encourage any mice to leave the area, because Salt Marsh Harvest Mice are very cover dependent, they're nocturnal typically, and they like to be in dense cover for obvious reasons, because if they get spotted by a raptor they are no more, and it ruins your whole day, so they tend to hide. And when the area is bare they tend to get out of there. So in this case we excavated to -- well, we in some cases overexcavated in order to remove any

contamination, but then backfilled to an elevation of about five and a half to six feet above mean sea level. And that was to establish a muted tidal environment that was similar to what was there before. And as I mentioned, we also did some harvesting and planted some cuttings in that area. And because there is an adjacent area that was kind of a salt pan area, we adjusted the grading a little bit, to make it more amenable to growing pickleweed. So we actually generated about 4.7 acres of new wetlands that should be good habitat for the pickleweed.

These are some photographs of some of the site activities. Here we're removing some of the contaminated soil with heavy equipment. And here we're doing some harvesting. In this case, rather than pull up plants by the roots, we just did clippings of the upper part of the plant, which is where the seeds are. And that also helps to maintain the canopy so that we don't impact an area that we're collecting these cuttings from. Here we have the classic head down, butt up photograph where the guys are planting the cuttings in the graded area that we established.

And then here we have a biologist measuring the first year progress of wetland plants in the IR-05 area. And they do that by setting transects. You can see a little green post over here, and they have another one over here. And they run a tape between the two. And then they have a little one meter square jig that they move along the transect, and they, literally just estimate the percent cover. You can see here this is pickleweed coming in. And so they estimate the percentage of pickleweed and/or any other plant species in that grid. And they sum up or average those over the transects in order to get an overall quantitative vegetation number. Which, for IR 05 at the end of Year 1 had 19 percent coverage of native salt marsh plant cover, which is very good for the first year. Typically you're looking for about ten percent, so we're off to a good start. And the pickleweed is over half of the cover, so about 11 percent overall, so that's also a good indicator. The area where we collected the cuttings in Dredge Pond 7-South (7S) basically, based on the pre and post estimation of the pickleweed, there's really no difference so we had essentially no impacts there. And then these are our five year goals, which are the same for IA H1: a minimum of 90 percent cover of native wetland species after five years; and then 60 percent coverage of pickleweed; and then less than five percent cover of non-natives, which is pretty aggressive criteria. I mean, for people that have been out to Mare Island and walked around, you can tell that getting five percent or less of non-native is not typical out there. So it's going to be very high quality habitat in order to meet those criteria. And with that, I'd be happy to entertain any other questions on the status.

MR. COFFEY: That jig you got there, is that a high impact schedule 40 PVC purchased locally?

MR. GEMAR: It's probably purchased locally, but it looks more like a half inch schedule 160 or something PVC, pretty --

MR. COFFEY: Real high tech stuff.

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, it's high tech out there. Yep. All right. Thank you very much.

III. PRESENTATION: *Upcoming Investigations at Building 207 and Building 85/87/89/91/271 Areas*

Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, Dwight. Okay. Our second presentation tonight is going to be given by Neal Siler of Lennar. And he'll be giving us an update on some investigations soon to be performed at Building 206 (-- and why do you always put a whole bunch of buildings in the titles?) Building 85/87/89/91/271 in Investigation Area C1.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And 207.

MR. FARLEY: Because it's one building.

MR. COFFEY: I'm so confused.

MS. NAITO: Isn't that usually Wendell's line?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, he's not here tonight. We know where he is.

MR. SILER: Okay. What I'm going to talk about are some upcoming investigations we're going to perform in Building 207, and then the aforementioned horribly titled 85/87/89/91/271 area complex. What I'm going to do is start off by talking about just the areas, give you a general description. I'm going to review the current status of environmental issues that we're going to be looking at in those areas. I'm going to identify some data gaps that we need to close. Discuss the proposed upcoming investigations. And then I'll entertain any questions that you have after that. So the Building 207 and Building 85/87/89/91/271, I'm going to continue to say that just to drive everybody crazy.

MR. COFFEY: No acronyms. No acronyms.

MR. FARLEY: That's right.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What's wrong here with multi-buildings?

MR. SILER: It covers an area of about five and a half acres in a commercial industrial zoned area.

Historical use; these are some of the oldest buildings on the island. Buildings 85/87/89/91 were constructed in 1858. They were used as foundry, boiler shop, machine shop, and for storage. Building 207 was constructed in 1911, and was used as a warehouse. Building 271, which sits in between the Building 85/87/89/91 horseshoe was used for general storage. It also was constructed in 1918.

The future use of this area is going to be industrial commercial. And the constituents of concern that we're looking at generally are associated with [fuel oil pipelines] FOPLs. There are a few exceptions that we'll talk about as I move along during the presentation, but mainly it's petroleum hydrocarbons, and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). We do have some mineral spirits and chlorinated volatile organic compounds in soil vapor. And then as we dig in this area, we come across the ubiquitous black granular material that we find in a lot of the industrial commercial areas on the island.

So the main issue in the Building 207 area is fuel oil pipelines (FOPLs). And there are ten fuel oil pipelines that are associated with the Building 207 area. Five of those segments, as you can see up here, have been closed. And right now it's kind of a good idea to backtrack a little bit so everybody understands the pipeline terminology. The G1 just refers to a grid section. There's a map that goes over the entire island, and it has rows and columns, and so it's basically a row and a column, G-1. The next number, 2, that refers to the diameter of the fuel oil pipeline. And then the last number is just a building or some landmark that it's associated with. Every once in a while you'll see an X or you'll see a VAR in that second number, X means the diameter is unknown, VAR means it's variable. You usually see step ups or steps down as you go through the pipeline.

So these five segments that you see here, those were all closed between 2004 and 2009. There are five other open FOPL segments. And those are the ones that we looked at in evaluating these investigations in this area. Now, the five closed segments that we looked at, we're obviously not going to do any additional work at unless we see something as we're doing the investigations that we're conducting at now. But we're also not going to be doing any work at this time at these four other segments. And the reason is because it looks like the soil impacts have been defined or that the groundwater impacts, that there have been no exceedances above the Tier II Screening Levels. It doesn't mean we're not going to be doing any remediation in those areas, it's just for purposes of this investigation we're not going to do anything additional at this time.

So the only one that we're going to look at now in the Building 207 area is H1/X/B207S. What we want to do is define the soil impacts and define them as we go along the pipeline alignment, and confirm that there are no groundwater impacts. So this map right here kind of shows you the general layout. Building 207 is this building right here. Pipeline H1/X/B207S is this one right here. It's about 451 feet long. And it is one that has been removed. So the entire segment has been removed. We've collected soil and groundwater samples previously along the alignment. We do have TPH that's above our cleanup levels. In groundwater, though, we're not seeing any petroleum hydrocarbon compounds above our Tier II Screening Levels. In the 2007-2008 time frame, three exploratory trenches were excavated along the pipeline. We did see sheens standing, and we saw evidence of petroleum hydrocarbon impacts along the pipeline. We also collected some groundwater samples downgradient of the FOPL alignment. We took both reconnaissance samples and grab samples. We also installed three monitoring wells. And we sampled those three monitoring wells over four consecutive events over a year long period. The last time they were sampled was in April of 2009. But we did not see any exceedances of Tier II Screening Levels in those monitoring wells.

So what would do we want to do with this pipeline? If you go to the next slide, there's a map, and it shows you what we're going to do basically. And there was no sample that was taken at the northern end of this pipeline, so we have pretty good control to the south, the east, and the west, but we need some additional control to make sure we can find the lateral extent to the north. So we are going to put in at least one boring here, and we may step out to put another boring here, so we need to define this to the north. If we do see evidence of staining in the boring -- the pipeline itself sits about between two and a half and three feet below ground surface, so we're going to take a sample right below what we think the base of the pipeline was -- if we see any evidence of staining, we'll actually go deeper, take a sample at seven and ten feet. And if we see anything that looks like there is some contamination here, we're going to step out to the north again.

Then along the pipeline itself, there are a few areas where there have been some exceedances. And we want to see what's in between those areas, so we're going to do six additional borings, take samples right below the base of the reported depth of the fuel oil pipeline. And if we see any staining or any evidence of contamination, we'll take deeper samples also.

And there's one other thing that we want to do here, or two other things actually. This kind of brownish gray area that comes out here, there was actually a passive soil gas sampling program that was done back in 2008/2009. And we found some chlorinated solvents in there. So we want to take a look there and actually get some real data, some concentration data. So we're going to do some soil gas sampling right in this area.

The last thing that we're going to do, because we haven't found any exceedances or any impacts to groundwater above our screening levels or cleanup levels, these three wells still exist, MW0200, MW0201, MW0202, and MW0203, we're going to go and sample these wells one more time to see if that still holds true. Like I said, the last time we sampled them was back in April of 2009. We want to confirm that there are no impacts to groundwater at this time. If there are some impacts, then we'll go back and we'll probably do some additional sampling from that point on. So that's the program at H1/X B207S. And that's the easy one.

Now, we're going to go ahead and go on to the Building 85/87/89/271 -- I dare said it again -- site. And at this site we have seven fuel oil pipeline segments associated with the building. One of those segments is closed, it's this segment right here. There are six other open segments that we have right here. In addition, there are some other issues that we have inside this building, and that is soil gas. We found chlorinated volatile organic compounds and mineral spirits that showed up as petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil gas, and we want to make sure that there is not any kind of an impact to the environment or to human health as people are going to occupy those buildings at some time. And then, of course, we always have this ubiquitous black granular material that we see as we come across the island.

So the segments where we're proposing to do additional work are these four segments right here, and the two suspected Navy FOPL segments that we have not been able to confirm yet. The reason we want to do additional investigations here, we want to verify the soil impacts, we want to characterize groundwater conditions, and we want to characterize the soil vapor conditions.

The soil vapor samples that were collected before were done with a passive technique called the Gore-Sorber. If you've ever seen it, it's like a petri dish or a ball, and it has a little filament or a little detector inside of it. And they weigh it before they put it in the ground. Then they just take it in the ground, they bury it, leave it there for a time, and come back, pick it up, and weigh it again. They can also do some speciation with it. That's why they can see things like the trichlorethene (TCE) that we're seeing, tetrachloroethene (PCE), trichloroethane-111 (TCA-111) and the mineral spirits that we're seeing. But the problem with it, is that you don't know anything about the air flow that's coming through there. So you can't really do any kind of risk calculation to see if it really is something that we need to look at. And so what we're going to do here is go back and do modified soil gas sampling. So that's what we want to do to characterize these soil vapor conditions. And, of course, we're not going to do any additional investigations at that one closed FOPL segment.

So this is the area inside the multi-building complex. There is a lot going on in here. A lot of samples have been collected over the years. The first one we're going to look at is H1/6/B85. And that is a segment that has a number of different things going on about it. At about 209 feet, there is a southern and an east-west section that have been removed. There was about 30 feet that went under railroad tracks and the roadway that we couldn't remove, so we abandoned that in place. And there was also a section that supposedly went to the north and continued into Building 87/89, and into 271. But we could not find that section as it went through there. And it appeared that it took, as we actually traced it, we did some trenching, looked at some different things; it made a ninety degree turn to the east. And actually we call that new pipeline that went off to the east that we found H1/6/B85 North. And I'll talk about that one a little bit later.

So some remediation was conducted to date on this pipeline. There were three excavations. We did some trenching to see if we had found the lateral and vertical extent of the contamination.

Removed about 500 cubic yards of soil. And the only soil sample that we had left was where it made this ninety degree angle, it went from Building 85 into Building 87, and then down toward the pathway between Buildings 85 and 271 where we have some TPH and some polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons that are greater than our cleanup levels. So what are we going to do here? We really don't have much groundwater data, so we really need to take a look at some of the groundwater data. We do have some reconnaissance data near the FOPL, it was less than our cleanup levels. We have one downgradient well in there that's outside the building, but the Tier II Screening Level was actually above what we were looking for. And at this location we're within 300 feet of Mare Island Strait, so we want to be very careful about how that is characterized and what remediation technique we look at. So what we're going to do is install a new well [FOPLB85MW0201] that's inside the building that's nearest to the FOPL so we can characterize groundwater in that area. We're going to sample it quarterly for one year. We're also going to sample that one well [FOPLB85MW0200] that we have in place concurrently, and we're going to record any incidents of black granular material encounters.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sound Halloween-ish.

MR. SILER: I know. So if you look at this map, this tells you what we're going to do. Here is this proposed well, FOPLB85MW0201. It's going to be installed inside the building. This is the FOPL segment that we're looking at right here. As it makes a turn right here, this is this new FOPL segment, H1/6/B85N. This is H1/6/B85 if we go through here. And then this other well, FOPLB85MW0200, is totally downgradient, it's a little bit down here off the map, a little bit down here.

So now, H1/6 B85N. That section was abandoned, the oil was drained out of it, it was cut, cleaned, and capped. After we did that, we did a vacuum test on it, and it failed the vacuum test indicating that there were places where oil potentially could have escaped into the environment. So we collected samples along the segment. TPH was less than our Tier II Screening Levels. We had one sample, which is right where it made that bend right there into the building, where we found benzo(a)pyrene greater than our Tier II Screening Level. So what we're going to do here is define benzo(a)pyrene at that western end segment, and that is right there where it makes the turn right there. We're going to be putting in two soil borings at that location, collect samples, and analyze for PAHs.

Now, the next pipeline, H1/2 B271. This is a pipeline again that everybody has been trying to locate but nobody can locate. And the reason it's hard to see things in Building 271, especially in the western section of the building if you've ever been in there, is because it's built up, and there's probably between seven and twelve feet of concrete. It's mainly concrete. You'll find two feet of concrete, you may hit a foot of soil, then you'll hit six inches of wood planks, and then you'll hit another three feet of concrete. And you have this down to seven to ten feet. So it's very hard to actually do anything inside this building. And in a lot of ways it's analogous to Building 680. At one point we tried to excavate the concrete out of Building 680, and we decided that wasn't practical unless we were going to corner the hydromam market in North America, because we busted a number of hydromams. We just couldn't do it.

So the soil and groundwater investigations conducted to date, those were done in 2008/2009, were hampered by subsurface obstructions. We did collect soil and reconnaissance groundwater samples adjacent to the FOPL segment that exceeded our Tier II Screening Levels. We also had

reconnaissance groundwater samples further downgradient of the FOPL that did not exceed our Tier II Screening Levels.

So what are we going to do? We're going to look at groundwater at this section. There are no existing monitoring wells in here. We just have those reconnaissance samples that were a snapshot in time back in 2008/2009. So we're going to install a new well in here [FOPLB271MW0200], sample quarterly for one year, and that's the well that sits right in the middle of the building right there.

So the last FOPL segment before we get to the suspected Navy FOPL segments H1/2/B89. This, again, is another FOPL segment that we tried to find through geophysical investigations. We used ground penetrating radar, metal detection, we couldn't find it. We did some investigations along its purported alignment. In 2003 we found that there were TPH impacts greater than our screening levels along the midsection of its mapped alignment. Two monitoring wells were installed -- these two right here -- FOPLB89MW0200 and FOPLB89MW0201, we sampled those for four quarters. This FOPL segment, which is the upgradient one, it exceeded Tier II Screening Levels for diesel for two quarters. We didn't detect anything above our screening levels in the further downgradient well FOPLB89MW0201. And then, if you remember this segment about in that time period, this is the one where we did the excavation and we came across the brick manway. It's right alongside of the building right there. So excavation was limited due to structural integrity issues. We definitely want to make sure that these structures stay up, so we want to be very careful working around them.

So here is the additional sampling that we're proposing. We're going to go back, look at these wells, we're going to take samples, and if we find anything we may actually do some additional sampling in these wells. Again, this is the one where we didn't find any exceedances of our cleanup criteria or screening criteria, this is the one right here, further upgradient where we found petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel above our screening levels in two events.

Now, there's a 1911 map, a Navy map, that shows that there are two FOPL segments that we just have not been able to find, and I'll show you where those align in just a minute. There's a southern FOPL segment, it's called Navy 1, limited soil sampling has been conducted to date. There's the eastern terminus of where it shows in the map. We have groundwater where it exceeds our screening levels. And in the northern segment, which kind of goes off to the north and then comes into Building 271, again we have very limited soil data there -- soil samples that we found along that northern portion, we did find TPH greater than our Tier II Screening Levels. So what are we going to do? We're going to look at that southern section. We're going to take samples at two locations along that eastern section of that southern section of Navy 1. Navy 2 we're going to take two sample locations midway at the southern junction of Navy 2 and Navy 1. We're going to again look at this one well that we're going to install in Building 271, FOPLB271MW0200, we're going to use it to look at groundwater in that area. We're going to record incidents of black granular material encounters.

So, this is Navy 1 right here. These are the two segments where we're going to do the additional sampling on right here, the two areas. And then this is Navy 2. So it comes like this, and then goes in the building here supposedly. Going to take a sample in here, and then right at the junction between where the map shows where Navy 1 and Navy 2 intersect each other.

Now, the last thing that we found in this building when we did that Gore-Sorber information, we found chlorinated volatile organic compound (CVOC) hot spots and mineral spirit hot spots

within the building. These maps show you those areas. There is the mineral spirits on this map right here. This is the trichloroethene. This is the trichloroethane (TCA). And then this is the tetrachloroethene right here. So the results from all the soil sampling and groundwater sampling that we've done to date, does not correlate with any of this passive soil vapor data. It kind of is by itself in some areas. The one that kind of lines up right here, this is the TCE lines up along here, along this one FOPL segment that's been removed. But some of these just appear in different areas when they did this that really don't look like they correlate with any of these FOPL segments. We're going to go back in there, do soil vapor sampling where we can get concentrations, and then we're going to evaluate whether this is an issue or not. We're going to obviously collect soil and vapor samples for tetrachloroethene, trichloroethane, and then also the mineral spirits, and then we'll evaluate once we get that concentration data whether we do have a soil vapor issue or not, and whether we need to go on from there.

And so here are the different colors for the different hot spots we're looking at. This grayish brown, these areas, that's the TCE. The TCA is this blue area. The tetrachloroethene or PCE is this purple area right here. And the mineral spirits are these three areas right in here.

So the path forward is to install those additional groundwater wells. Collect the additional soil groundwater and soil vapor samples. We'll summarize and evaluate that additional data. We'll go to the regulators, talk to them about it, see if we need to do additional investigations or whether we can go to remediation at that point. So with that, that's the end of my presentation, so if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them at this time.

MR. OUSEY: When do you begin to proceed with all this work?

MR. SILER: We're going to try to get this done sometime this spring.

MR. OUSEY: Have you selected a consultant?

MR. SILER: We do have a consultant that we're working with on this. Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I had a question. You said you weren't getting alignment with some of the lines. Are you getting a methane hit at all?

MR. SILER: We haven't done any work for methane at all, that's probably one of the things we'll do in the future is take a look at that. Again, this is just our phase one investigation. This doesn't mean this is all we're going to do. This is what we're proposing to do right now to see if we do have any issues at these sites and find out if we need to expand or not. That's one of the things we've talked about with the regulators, and that's probably something down the line we'll go ahead and evaluate, most likely methane.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you. This reminds me, whatever became of those soil gas issues over on that other property, bounded by Azuar and Walnut and Kansas to the north of Kansas?

MR. SILER: That's still being evaluated. Are you talking about the [underground storage tank] UST 231, UST 243, and there was also some CVOC's right in that area?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, the gas station and --

MR. SILER: And that's all being worked on right now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, well, you don't know anything about it?

MR. SILER: All I know is that they're evaluating it. I know that's one of the jobs that Sheila's working on. And I know that's something that's in the regulator's review at this time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what about Building 84, speaking of air gases?

MR. SILER: Building 84 still has an indoor air [polychlorinated biphenyl] PCB issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Neal, what do you think the source is of this? I mean it's TCE and PCE and TCA. I mean, they're solvents here, and this is the fuel oil pipeline, so what do you think the source is for these?

MR. SILER: It was a machine shop at one time, so you could have some use of chlorinated solvents in the building. We don't have any recorded use of chlorinated solvents in the building but that's why we want to take a look and see if we can see real concentration data as we go forward with the soil vapor. So it's possible that they did use something in there. One of the weird things that we found on one of the PCB sites on one of the second floors, as we were actually cleaning up the PCB site, this is Building 271 AL03, we started lifting up the wood blocks and there was elemental mercury underneath it. And we had to stop the work, clean everything up, come back, and deal with the elemental mercury. So we always find strange things like that whenever you look in these buildings. And no one has any idea how it got there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, no one who's talking.

MR. SILER: Yeah. No documented use, you know. No, it's just real hard to say where it came from. Yeah, Jim.

MR. PORTERFIELD: What was it again that you found under the wood block?

MR. SILER: Elemental mercury.

MR. PORTERFIELD: And that was on level three?

MR. SILER: That was on the second level.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Along the north side of Building 271?

MR. SILER: Along the north side of Building 271.

MS. NAITO: Uh-oh. He's going to figure out what it was.

MR. PORTERFIELD: All of the machine shop work had been stopped in that building when I first started working in there. But we did have a great big clean facility between 85 and 271 in that long narrow alleyway.

MR. SILER: But you're on the other side of that alleyway, and you're on the second floor. And supposedly that was used for storage in this area. But they could have stored something in there that it could have gotten broken, could have gotten out. Who knows? We just know it was there, we dealt with it.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Yeah.

MR. SILER: That's really all we can say.

MR. PORTERFIELD: As far as the mercury thing, we used, for many long years, liquid mercury thermometers. And there may have been a storage area, a tool room or something like that, somebody dropped a box of 'em or something and --

MS. D'ALMEIDA: That's a lot though.

MR. COFFEY: Was it a lot?

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yeah.

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I always say, "Mare Island, the gift that keeps on giving."

MR. SILER: That's right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So that brings us to our first public comment period. Do we have any public comments?

(NO RESPONSE.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Ten minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. We're at administrative business. So, as always, if you have any comments on the meeting minutes, please get those to Myrna or myself. Myrna, did you have any administrative business?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So we're onto focus group reports.

MR. COFFEY: None of 'em are here.

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Wendell is missing, does anybody else have any community comments?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I have a comment on Wendell. He notified me that he would not be attending this meeting because he has been called/anointed, I think, to the Greater Vallejo Recreation District Board by our mayor and city council, so his first meeting was with them tonight. So I don't know if that means it will always conflict with our Restoration Advisory Board meeting but we might have to change our schedule to accommodate the great one.

MR. COFFEY: The anointed one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The anointed one. If I recall, they also get paid for that duty, so I wouldn't want it myself, even for the money. It's a pathetic little organization but -- uh-oh, that's in the record. He'll turn it around. He'll turn it around, I'm sure.

MR. COFFEY: Oops.

b) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Technical report, Paula?

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have nothing to report.

c) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: City report?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

MR. COFFEY: I knew that.

d) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. COFFEY: Nothing to report.

MR. FARLEY: There's a handout over on the table. There's our normal layout of the island with the different color coded stages of cleanup. In the upper right are some photographs of some work being done at Building 637. If you look at the upper photo, that's looking about east, and it's Building 535 in the background, so this is the Building 637 area. And the investigation that's going on there is primarily for petroleum. The photo on the bottom there is -- and folks, if they haven't had a chance to see how soil samples are actually collected, this is a good shot of the drill rig, little track mounted drill rig usually used for very tight access areas, you can see how small it is. And down below there's a tube that's right in the middle of the photo, sort of a clear or gray colored tube, that's an acetate tube. And the tube is pushed down into the ground, and the sample is retrieved inside that acetate tube. And you see the core samples, the actual soil that comes out of that acetate tube just below it in the photo. So that's kind of it in a nutshell for how samples are sometimes collected.

On the left-hand side is a photograph of the Building 1304 UL-01 area. This is in between Ways 1 and 2. So you're looking at Ways 1 in the background there. And the rectangular area up against that curb where the two orange pylons are, that area has been scabbled. And scabbling -- it's a PCB site -- scabbling is they take a small jackhammer piece of equipment, and they pound on it, and they break off a quarter inch or something like that --

MR. COFFEY: That's why the plastic is there?

MR. FARLEY: And, yes, that's why the plastic is there. Good call. So this is a common way that PCBs or concrete are remediated.

There's some labels to some of the buildings, and I'll just go through them real quickly. Up at Building 461 in the upper right-hand corner, we're preparing some documents for that, moving towards closure, working with the agencies closely on that one. Of course, Neal talked about the group of buildings, names will go without mentioning, the group of buildings.

And I think that the one that I'd really like to focus on here for a second is the IR-15, Installation Restoration Site 15. And for those who have been around, you know that was primarily a chlorinated ethenes problem, although some hexavalent chromium as well. And the work has been done, and we're working on finalizing the implementation report, which is the report that's prepared after all the field work has been done. And so we're at that stage now. And again, a lot of help from the agencies getting through that process. It's a fairly complicated site, and it's nice to see it moving forward. The treatment technology is an in situ bioremediation. They squirt cheese whey down into the subsurface and get the bacteria to grow --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah, we had the presentation.

MR. FARLEY: Okay. All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We had samples of the cheese whey.

MR. FARLEY: Of the cheese whey -- camembert.

And down in the lower right-hand corner are some fuel oil pipeline, or FOPL, segments. And there's an interim removal action work plan that's being prepared for that. And I believe -- Neal -
- that work is going to proceed?

MR. SILER: Next month.

MR. FARLEY: In the next month, okay. And then over on the left-hand side there's a whole list of documents that have either been submitted or are upcoming. And, in fact, Neal pointed out just a short while ago, that some of the documents that are listed as upcoming have already been moved up and they're actually documents that have been submitted. So you get an idea of how many documents are being prepared and how busy everybody is.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I was wondering if this list is so much bigger because we're meeting every other month instead of every month, or it's just that you're working hard?

MR. COFFEY: Yes.

MR. FARLEY: I don't know how to answer that.

MR. COFFEY: On the record.

MR. FARLEY: I would say that maybe that's a good idea. I want that in the record.

e) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update.

MR. JESPERSEN: You can see from our handout that we've also been very busy generating documents for agencies to review. That takes up about three quarters of our monthly update, going through the status of documents that we have either prepared and submitted or have been responding to comments, and trying to finalize those documents.

So I'll skip over all that and move to the status of the Investigation Area H1 groundwater extraction trench. And we continue to operate this trench. And to date we've extracted over 29 million gallons of groundwater. And the water that we extract is discharged into the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District storm sewer. And before we do that we have to analyze the liquid to make sure it meets the discharge criteria. The system has been operating continuously since the last oil removal event which occurred on December 5th. And as you may also recall, there's been an oil water separator in line with the material, so we do catch any oil that's pumped out of the interceptor trench so it's not discharged into the storm sewer.

And then finally Dwight's got another picture there of the Installation Restoration Site 05 wetland creation area. And the comment as part of his presentation on the year one annual wetland mitigation monitoring. And we also submitted the results of that monitoring to the agencies for their review. And as he indicated during his presentation, the growth of that engineered wetlands seems to be moving on a little bit ahead of our plan, so that's good to see. And the establishment of the pickleweed is well underway. So I will take any questions if anybody has any. Myrna?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 29 million, almost 30 million gallons of water is a lot of water. What is it down to in terms of the volume? I mean, is it slowing down or do you almost have the bathtub drained, or will you always be pumping water out of this spot?

MR. JESPERSEN: Wanna field that one, Dwight?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, it's definitely slowing down. It's down to about two gallons a minute, which is not a lot of water when you consider that the trench extends for about 7,300 feet, so about a mile and a half, and we only collect about two gallons a minute, so it's pretty slow. And we do measure the groundwater mound that existed under the landfill cap, and the mound just means that there was kind of a hump in the groundwater level where the groundwater tended to accumulate because of the trash and the voids and whatnot, and that continually has gone down. I think we've probably dropped it three feet or more in the last few years. So yeah, definitely it's petering out. That's a technical term.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I have a question about the landfill. And I've walked around it, the trail. And there are spaces along inside the fence, some concrete, it's like concrete pads, it's actually a grill over them, and they sort of sound like a slow breathing lung. What is that? What is going on with that?

MR. GEMAR: Those are our air operated pumps. And so they have a cavity, and when they fill up with water it senses when it's full, and then it discharges compressed air to push out the water. So when you hear it, it pushes it out and then it has a vent so you hear the shhhh, that's the air venting after it's pushed out of a pipe full of groundwater. So if there's a fair amount of groundwater there, you'll hear it every few seconds huffing and puffing, otherwise it will be quite slow. Or if there's no groundwater at all there then you won't hear anything. So that's what it is. It's the pressure. It's the air being vented after it does a cycle with the compressor.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The things you didn't know. We'll add that to our trail guides' training.

I do have another question. When you were saying that the groundwater was dropping below the, I guess the facility landfill portion then, does that cause subsidence, or do you just -- it's basically just drained, drained through the garbage, and now it will just suspend there or -- you know, and the garbage was pretty well decomposed already or --

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, I mean it's an old landfill. A lot of the garbage was placed in the sixties, so it's fifty years old now, and so a lot of that, a lot of decomposition has occurred. But eventually you get to a point where there's still water in the void space of the soil, but there's no really free water, it's held by hydroscopic pressure, or whatever, and it just sticks there. So you'll never totally drain it.

As far as subsidence goes, we do measure that annually, and we have actually seen very little subsidence, which is good. I think maybe at most six inches in one part of the landfill, and typically about two to four inches. And that's over a couple years now. So, so far so good, it doesn't look like any major issues.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: One more trivia question. What is the height of that landfill now?

MR. GEMAR: I think at the highest point it's 56 feet above mean sea level.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I've been saying 60, I was pretty close. Okay.

MR. COFFEY: Didn't even need an English man to measure it.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Regulatory update.

MS. NAITO: Carolyn is going to go first.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: Yes, let's see. In the last month I responded on four Weston PCB closure reports. I responded on them, and I guess Neal has only gotten two of them, so I have an action item for me. And then the other thing that I got out this week was our comments on the Navy's responses to comments on the Offshore Investigation Area K Remedial Investigation. So those are the two things that I've been working on.

MS. NAITO: Hi. This is Janet, DTSC, Department of Toxic Substances Control. Over the past two months I haven't gotten as much done as I would have liked. My boyfriend had some major surgery in December, so I wholly underestimated how much work it was going to be, but I have gained new appreciation for how much he really does around the house. And it's going to continue for about another month, but after that I should be back full-time. But during the past months -- I am trying to do my best to get stuff turned around, but I need to apologize to Dwight, he did not get a Christmas present. But it should be done, most of his stuff should be done by the end of the month, which is only three days away. And so I am going to beg everybody to have a bit of patience, I will get to it.

MS. WELLS: This is Elizabeth, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region.

MS. WELLS: I have no idea what I did the last two months. I did ten petroleum closures for Moffett Field.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We don't want to know what you did for them.

MS. WELLS: I've been working on, I think, some Lennar sites. I know I met with Lennar, with Neal and the consultant about the site that Neal did the presentation on. And I worked with Sheila right before Christmas on getting some stuff done, actually for doing some review for the investigation that Steve was talking about at Building 637. So other than that I think maybe I should start writing it down.

MR. COFFEY: I can't believe they took down the original hangar, I cannot believe it.

MS. WELLS: They didn't take it down. They're just taking the siding off. They're leaving up the frame. PCBs.

MR. COFFEY: Really? Wow.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So enough about the Moffett.

MS. WELLS: I love Moffett.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You love us more, you do.

MS. NAITO: Yeah.

MS. WELLS: I care deeply.

MS. NAITO: I care deeply.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So during December and January the Navy did some field work. We did a survey offshore at IA K to look at the amount of sedimentation and access around some of the piers to determine if we could access those areas to do additional surveys for munitions, if that would be required in the upcoming investigations. We don't have the results of those back, but when we do, we will have a presentation and discuss the path forward on that project. We also did some additional investigation at IR 17 in the wetlands portion. We did some soil sampling and soil gas sampling for pesticides and VOCs and also measured water levels at 29 wells in that area.

We submitted seven documents during December and January. And we received concurrence from DTSC on two documents. And comments or concurrence from the Water Board on three documents.

MS. WELLS: That's what I did.

MS. NAITO: Oh, I did do something at Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: I love Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So on our little table on the back page, because this last period covered the end of 2011, and a few documents also in January. So there's our total for 2011, 44 documents submitted by the Navy. And off to a good start in January 2012 with two.

So that's all we have. Our next RAB meeting is March 29th. And I'll turn it over to my co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You didn't even comment on our really fine photo of the family.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You're right, I'm sorry.

MS. NAITO: I look really short. Hold it, I am really short.

MR. COFFEY: I was going to comment on the political statement that your dog was making.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Your dog is showing us his better side.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I took more than one photo, pick from the best. Maybe they did. Yeah. That is a very common side to see on that dog, he's very showy. Little children are always sketching her with that view.

MS. WELLS: Moving right along.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Yeah. Moving right along to area IA K -- your sonar survey activities. I have no clue what that guy is doing in that photo, but it looks industrious.

I want to tell you folks this. That whether it's true or not, I had six young men visit the preserve on Saturday last. They told me that they fished -- I actually met the guy who supposedly fished a 40 millimeter with barnacles on it from their fishing rod off of the riverfront.

MR. COFFEY: Cool.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: On a hook?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, on like a big double hook.

MR. COFFEY: Did he drag it across the bottom?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They said they're going to bring it here and they're going to give it to me. And I'm like, "Oh, please, never mind." But --

MS. NAITO: Give it to Dwight.

MR. COFFEY: Call some technicians.

MR. GEMAR: Lay it on the shoreline and we'll go look at it.

MS. WELLS: They took it home?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah, they're very proud of it. One kid told me he comes from three generations of risk takers, and whatever I say about what they're doing out there is not going to faze him, it's just going to egg him on. So I thought I'd report that just to get that off my chest.

I guess that's really it, except to remind you, invite you, thank you for helping us put together, once again, what is the 16th Annual San Francisco Bay Flyway Festival, premiere wildlife viewing festival in San Francisco Bay. And it's actually the 17th event that will be February 10 through 12, 2012, 10 through 12, 2012, easy to remember.

I say 17th event because the U.S. Navy, even though it was an active base, held the first event on January 20-something of 1996. And we had over a thousand people who weathered the military police at the gate to come out to Mare Island where Assistant Commander John Becker was the host for the four hours that we spent in Building 505 together. And that was really the gauge of the public interest for a permanent environmental education facility. The Navy's thinking was they would test the waters and see if there was something worthwhile about planning for a permanent facility. And over the years, that's gotten all watered down and washed away with the tides, but it still faintly reminds us of the interest of the public and the value of the environmental resources that we have on this island and surrounding it, each year during this time at the Flyway Festival.

So I want to thank Weston Solutions for coming in again as a host sponsor, and lots of other organizations who have joined in as sponsors. There's still an opportunity to fill out a sponsor response form. Get with me and I'll help you with it, and give you our bank account number, whatever it is you need. And then just want to thank all the folks who are helping to make it actually functional, like Lennar giving us a building, and the Navy providing a permit for escorted travels on some of their property, as was done at the very, very, very first event seventeen events ago. And the Audubon Society, Wally will be giving walks.

It's just a testament to the commitment this regional community has to not only are we trying to clean the property up for reuse, we're also trying to hold it in our arms, cherish the natural resources and historic treasures that are here on the island and in the region as well. So --

MR. COFFEY: As a note to that, my wife told me that she was at a community function in American Canyon and she said she was a little bit surprised because it was at a Fairfield Inn, and they were basically saying that the Flyway Festival was an American Canyon community event. And my wife was like, uh, no.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, Napa Solano Audubon Society is part of that conspiracy. It's fun, but it is neat that they're doing a lot of work with American Canyon and --

MR. COFFEY: They're promoting it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- with the city and community to promote the festival. I have to give credit to our city as well that they have been and will be doing a lot more to promote the festival. It is a regional event, and that's fun to think that American Canyon is taking some ownership.

MR. COFFEY: Well, the Fairfield Inn was actually putting it on a flyer as part of local events to go and see from the hotel, so very good, great.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Do you have an e-mail address to give us so that we can look on site?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes, www.SFBayFlywayfestival.com. And maybe by tomorrow or Monday the schedule will be up, if I get it together.

But anyway, thank you. Thank you very much. And it's a really fun event. Last year the weather cooperated and it was awesome. And I believe that we're going to make every effort to do a little grand opening on the western trail around landfill hill.

And by the way, American Canyon is a sister city. They just opened their landfill trail that encircles their landfill. So you heard it here first, it's trademarked by me.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah, but our landfill is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The dump to dump run.

MR. COFFEY: But ours is oozing. Yours is losing water, but ours is oozing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oozing. Oozing. Woo woo. But you heard it, the dump to dump run, it's a fundraiser.

MR. COFFEY: That would really improve the image; American Canyon is going to be jealous.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The two cities at the mouth of the river are going for it now. Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, everybody.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 8:46 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Navy Presentation Handout – Wetlands Mitigation Status Report – Investigation Area H1 and Installation Restoration Site 05
- Presentation Handout – Upcoming Investigations at Building 207 and Building 85/87/89/91/271 Areas – Investigation Area C1
- Presentation Handout – Features within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Mare Island RAB Update January 26, 2012 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard January 26, 2012