



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

HELD THURSDAY, March 29, 2012

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, March 29th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:11 p.m. and adjourned at 8:38 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
- Maurice Campbell
- Chris Rasmussen

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy)
- Heather Wochnick (Navy)
- David Geist (Lennar Mare Island)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Michael Chamberlain (Trihydro)
- David Kleesottel (Trihydro)
- Allison Riffel (Trihydro)
- Kevin Hoch (Trevet)
- Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board])
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC])
- Carolyn d'Almeida (United States Environmental Protection Agency [U.S. EPA])
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Fred Ousey (Envirotech)
- Jim Porterfield

RAB Support from CDM Smith:

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

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Welcome, everyone, to the Mare Island RAB meeting. Let's start with introductions. I'm Janet Lear, the Navy Co-Chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, the Community Co-Chair, that's what they call us.

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

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

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

MR. SILER: Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

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

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

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

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar, Weston.

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

MR. GEIST: Dave Geist, LMI [Lennar Mare Island].

MR. OUSEY: Fred Ousey, Envirotech Services.

MR. KLEESOTTEL: Dave Kleesottel, Trihydro.

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. RIFFEL: Allison Riffel, Trihydro.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain, Trihydro.

MS. WOCHNICK: Heather Wochnick, Navy.

MS. DREYER: Marie Dreyer, Navy.

MR. HOCH: Kevin Hoch with Trevet.

MS. MOORE: And Carolyn Moore with CDM Smith.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We have two presentations this evening. The first one will be presented by Marie Dreyer of the Navy. It will be about the Preliminary Assessment/ Site Inspection (PA/SI) Work Plan for Crane Test Area (CTA) North, and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) South.

II. PRESENTATION: *CTA-North and DRMO-South, Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection Fieldwork Plan*

Presentation by Ms. Marie Dreyer (Navy)

MS. DREYER: Tonight the Navy's presentation will be on the Crane Test Area North and the Defense Reutilization Marketing Office South, Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection field effort. It's a lot to take in, but Kevin and I will be going over the field work we plan to do at these two sites. So I'll be co-presenting tonight with Kevin Hoch from Trevet.

Before we get started, I wanted to go over the packet. Each packet is paper-clipped together. And what you'll find in it is the presentation stapled together, and then 11x17 printouts of the figures you'll see within the presentation. So please refer to the bigger printouts as those will be easier on the eyes.

To overview tonight's presentation, we'll go over the site locations of the two sites, I'll go over the purpose of the preliminary assessment/site inspection, and then I'll turn it over to Kevin who will go over the work plan, what we plan to do, where, how many samples, what are we sampling for. And then we'll go over the schedule and answer any questions you might have.

Here's a depiction of where the site is. Essentially the two areas I spoke about, are shown in the overall figure of Mare Island here; the two areas are within the middle of the northern part of the peninsula. What you're probably most familiar with hearing us talk about is the DRMO, that's outlined here in green. So that's the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office, no "-South" attached to this little triangular area here. We've decided to extend further south to investigate what else might be going on south of DRMO, and so we're now calling this new investigation area here in the pink DRMO-South. And then above that, above dump road, is Crane Test Area North, CTA-North. And that's outlined here in blue, and that's the other site we'll be investigating.

So what's the purpose of a preliminary assessment/site inspection? It's the first step of the CERCLA process and CERCLA stands for Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act. In this step of the process we don't really know much about these two sites, so in this step we're just getting our first look at the site essentially, we wanted to see what's out there and what type of concentrations and what chemicals. What do we know so far about these sites? Unfortunately, very little, and hence why we're starting at the beginning of the CERCLA process. For Crane Test Area North, in 2010 Weston helped us complete a big petroleum corrective action that removed 136,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. When we were excavating the northern-most portion of that area, we had some residual hot spots of TPH [total petroleum hydrocarbon] contamination. At that time the agencies allowed us to walk away from the excavation with those hot spots in place with our promise to go back and look at them. And so this is us going back and looking at those hot spots and CTA-North as a whole.

Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South -- let me bring it back here -- that's the one in pink [DRMO-South], I just spoke about the one in blue [CTA-North]. Now, the one in pink, limited data is known about this area also. What we do know is there's some metals contamination here in the southern tip of it, but we wanted to see how widespread it is and where else there might be contamination. We know this was a scrap yard area, so we want to see how the rest of the area has been affected.

And then the last bullet we have is for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office site proper, and that's the green outlined area. Now, a lot of work has already been done here. You've probably heard me talk about it several times in a bunch of different presentations. You might recall in 2008 we finished a NTCRA or a non-time critical removal action. The NTCRA removed, among other things, MEC, munitions and explosives of concern, and certain chemicals. And we excavated to depths up to 8.5 feet. And then in 2010, as I mentioned before, we completed a petroleum corrective action which removed 136,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. So a lot of work has been done here in the green already, but one thing we

didn't go back and follow up on was how all of the work that had been done there helped to improve groundwater. So that's one part of the RI/FS [remedial investigation/feasibility study] that we've done for DRMO and it's not quite complete. So we plan on going back in the field this summer to see what the state of groundwater is at the site now that this cleanup has taken place.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You guys always mention in all of your presentations about that property modern, or during your time, environmental cleanup that's been done there, but you never talk -- and so I always put on the record, and I will tonight again -- that prior to the base closure there was radiological contamination there which was also removed prior to the base closure.

MS. DREYER: Thanks for that, absolutely right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: A pretty groundbreaking project, and one that the Restoration Advisory Board, as I've said before in past years, should be very proud of because the city, the Restoration Advisory Board, and the agencies really worked hard to impress upon the Navy the commitment we had, and we inspired you to have, which was to not leave that radiological contamination in place, but to find the technology to remove it. And I think we tested new technology there which is now commonly used. So it would be nice if you would start to incorporate that into your future presentations -- cause I won't forget -- but it would be just nice to acknowledge the whole picture in your presentation. So if you could make a note about that?

MS. DREYER: Sure, I will. Thanks, Myrna. Now I'll turn it over to Kevin.

MR. HOCH: Marie talked about the initial investigation we're doing in the Crane Test Area North and the DRMO-South. As we went through this process, we started looking at previous reports and aerial photographs to try to target some other possible areas we may want to investigate. We also include a large suite of analyses. Because of where we are in the process, we didn't just hone in on metals and say, "All right, in this area we have metals and that's all we're going to look for," so we have a pretty good analytical suite, and I'll get to that a little bit later.

I'll talk about the three sites we're looking at, some of the specifics that happened and what we found through either review of photographs or through historical documents. Then I'll go through and show the sample locations we've chosen and why we picked the specific areas we have picked.

I'll start with the Crane Test Area North. There were really no known historic buildings or use of the site, but because the site was adjacent to the Crane Test Area, there's the possibility that there may have been contamination from the Crane Test Area into this northern area. We're looking at sources -- vehicle maintenance, storage, lumber salvage, materials sorting areas, and general crane test operations. So there may have been some hydraulic fluids and such that may have leaked. Along with that, we're looking at base materials in the utility corridors, so we've located some samples in that general vicinity. And then there's an area of the site that was filled between 1925 and 1942. Previous analytical results showed contamination with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and metals that may be related to debris that was put in place at the time the fill was laid down. The debris on top of the fill seemed to be the source, so we will be looking for those specific types of chemicals.

As you go through the legend on Figure 4 in your packet, it's an 11 x 17, you'll see we're doing both soil and groundwater samples at the Crane Test Area North and the DRMO-South. Once

we get into the DRMO proper, we're looking at groundwater specifically. So in the first two figures we have these orange circles, those locations will be soil only. And then you have these other circles, kind of the dual layer circle there, it's kind of yellow and then it's green in the middle, kind of scattered about. In this figure Marie had talked about the petroleum that was left in place in the sidewall samples and the concentrations that were higher than the screening levels at that time. These are the four red triangles here. So you can see we've located some samples close to these and somewhat away from them to see if there's still contamination in place, and how far it goes. And then this is just the initial phase as well. So if we find something, then the likelihood would be there's some sort of step-outs to define what's going on there.

We have some other samples we talked about, the 1925 to 1942 fill area. That's this green polygon area here. So within the Crane Test Area North as Marie described, it's blue, we have a few locations that we've placed to target that specific material. And those samples will be put at a depth specifically targeting the areas where contamination was found in the past, specifically in the Crane Test Area. We have a few samples along some utility lines or nearby utility lines. We have some that are scattered along the borders of the site where we're looking at general site conditions. For the Crane Test Area, we didn't find any specific aerial photograph anomalies, that looked to be developed during a specific period of time and now is no longer developed. This slide summarizes some of the things I just talked about.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How did you come up with this boundary on the western side? It kind of squiggles.

MS. DREYER: Do you mean the northern side, Myrna, the one up above here?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, north and west, yeah, the whole thing. How did you come up with that boundary?

MS. DREYER: We had to be able to bid this project out somehow, so we gave this as the boundary for Kevin's company, ultimately who won the contract, to look at. If our sampling effort, shows contamination at levels higher than they should be, then we'll chase them out. So this boundary may change over time. I don't want to say the boundary is arbitrary, but basically it's the boundary we chose at the moment so that the contractors could have something to bid on.

MR. COFFEY: Best guess area?

MS. DREYER: Best guess area.

MR. GEMAR: I was going to say it also kind of approximates the wetland-upland interface, I think. And so it's the upland areas that were most probably likely to have disposal. And so I think that historical information was also taken into consideration. I believe it was just the point of the boundary in the wetland.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay. That's helpful. However, I was just curious about in this one area where the PCAP excavation footprint goes outside of this boundary quite a bit, so why you didn't go there? But I haven't been on the land so I don't really know, so I'll take your word for it.

MS. DREYER: That has already been excavated to pretty deep at that point.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, I know.

MS. DREYER: So we hope not to find further contamination there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It just kind of jumps out that -- how you made that line go across the little arrow there, why you did.

MS. DREYER: Just follows the wetland boundary still for the most part.

MR. HOCH: For groundwater we've located eight sample locations across the site which you can see in that figure. Those samples will be analyzed for a full suite analyses, and you'll see the same suite of analyses throughout the presentation,. We have volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in the gasoline range and the diesel range, which would include motor oil and bunker fuels. And we have metals. And for the groundwater we'll have total dissolved solids.

For soil we have 26 samples taken at 13 different locations, so each location will have two samples. One of those samples will be taken at the surface (0 to 1 foot) and the second sample will be collected somewhere between 1 and 10 feet. The approach is to pull a core and to examine the core and decide if there are visual signs of staining, or odor. We'll have field instruments on site; if we get instrument readings we may target a specific area. We'll have a geologist on site who will make those calls. If there's no sign of obvious contamination, then we'll target the area just above the water table. And again, for the soils, they're analyzed for the same suite of analyses as the groundwater, with the exception of the total dissolved solids.

The next area is the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South. Again, there's limited information about this site. There are a few buildings. Building 275, in particular, was a crane maintenance building. It didn't include a paint shop. They did some work there in conjunction with the Crane Test Area. There were some support buildings, Buildings 961 and 965. There was an above-ground storage tank adjacent to Building 965 that has been subsequently removed. Building 831 is the large open air parking structure along Azuar next to Building 275. And then there were some equipment storage and parking areas west of Building 275. So this obviously is a somewhat noisy figure, it's probably easier to see on Figure 3 in your packets; it has the same symbols for groundwater and soil. So you either have a soil sample in orange, and then a boring where we would collect groundwater and soil with the combined yellow and green. This was in the 2000 aerial photograph -- we tended to target areas where there was historic activity, along with areas where there was metals contamination. There's equipment storage, buildings, utility lines in and out of Building 275, and some other [sample locations] that target open space.

We've tried to blanket the site as much as possible, targeting more samples in the areas that were actively in use as opposed to being out in the outlying areas. We have twelve groundwater samples that will be analyzed for a full suite of analyses as we're doing within the Crane Test Area. And we have 52 soil samples at 26 borings. The approach there is the same, we would sample zero to one foot at every location for a surface sample, and then we'll collect a second sample between one and ten feet targeting contamination if we see it, or the area just above the groundwater. And those soil samples would also be analyzed for a full suite of chemicals.

The source of contamination in the DRMO proper area has been removed. Before that was done, the groundwater samples had very few detections above any screening criteria, and the detections were mostly volatile organic compounds. The plan now is to go back and try to get a better picture of what the groundwater actually looks like today, post removal of the contaminated soil. The groundwater samples are shown here in blue, and they're scattered across the site to try and get pretty good coverage of the site. We did target these areas, these red squares, where there

were elevated volatile organics detections in the past. And the sample locations covered some upgradient, downgradient, and source areas. Those samples will be collected through the use of these temporary monitoring wells. We have the twelve wells, and we'll do a full suite of these analytes just to have full coverage and to give us a better picture of what's actually going on today. We'll have volatiles, semi-volatiles, polychlorinated biphenyls, polycyclic aromatics, TPH or total petroleum hydrocarbons, gasoline, diesel, metals, and total dissolved solids. Even though we've only had detections in the past of VOCs, we wanted to give a full picture of what's going on there currently. As far as a schedule, the work plan is out for review now with comments due back pretty soon. We hope to have the final out by May 11th, and then start field work pretty much immediately after we get approval or concurrence on the work plan from agencies. We'll be out there for about a month. Should be finished up by early June. So that's the last slide. If there's any questions?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: This is all sampling, you're not going to dig up the road for the fiftieth time?

MR. HOCH: Not at this time, we're geoprobing or hand augering depending who I'm talking to, if it's my guys we're geoprobing, but if it's Marie we might be hand auguring.

MR. HOCH: If it's August it's probably geoprobe.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe you could just go ahead, since there's lots of conversation about that, what's the thing with that? Why one over the other or da da da da da?

MR. HOCH: Yeah, geoprobing you take a truck out there and you push down and you take a full core mechanically. If you're going to hand auger then you have two guys out there with an auger, and they're digging it in, digging it down ten feet with a hand auger.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But here's my point of my question, I guess I wasn't specific enough. I get the picture of the two different types of action, but why one or the other? Why a little snickering about da da da da da, which gets done? Who's going to make you do what?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What's the advantage of one over the other?

MR. HOCH: No, there's no advantage of one over the other. You'll get the same core with either, you'll get the same sample. What I was joking about is if I'm going to have my guys out there in August, and it's 105 degrees with a hand auger, they would prefer to do it with a geoprobe, but I'll get the same sample.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What I'm saying is who's telling you you have to do it by hand? What's -- what? Why?

MR. HOCH: The only reason to do that, and we will in some cases we do it by hand, like if we would be getting into an area near wetlands or something like that. Or sometimes it's just easier to get access using a hand auger.

MR. COFFEY: Aren't they really kind of different results though? I mean, I thought hand auguring you usually dig down and it pulls up dirt?

MR. HOCH: You can do it two ways. There's ways to do it where you actually pull a core.

MR. COFFEY: Oh.

MR. HOCH: But, yeah, it's one of those that's less intrusive in a lot of ways, so if you have trouble maneuvering a truck in, that would be the way to go.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Thanks, Kevin; thanks, Marie. So we'll move right into our next presentation which will be given by Sheila Roebuck of Lennar Mare Island. This is on Building 637, Investigation Area B.2-2, Contamination Identified During Building Demolition: Site Characterization and Upcoming Remediation.

III. PRESENTATION: *Building 637, Investigation Area B.2-2, Contamination Identified During Building Demolition: Site Characterization and Upcoming Remediation*
Presentation by Ms. Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)

MS. ROEBUCK: The first thing that I wanted to do was a couple of introductions. I'm going to give the presentation, but we do have our contractors from Trihydro here, and I wanted you to know who they are. Allison Riffel is back there, she's our project manager. And Michael Chamberlain is back there also, and he's in charge of the field program. So if you have questions, they can probably help to answer some of them.

We're going to go through some background of the site. There's been quite a bit of work done at the site, and we'll talk a little bit about that. And then we're going to talk about the demolition activities which Neal was responsible for overseeing. And what we want to talk about mainly is what we found during the demolition process that we have discovered needs some additional work. And so we've done some site characterization, and we plan to do some additional remediation.

This slide just shows you the location of Building 637. It's pretty close to the area that the Navy was just talking about, the DRMO. And this is a historical figure, and I don't know if you've seen this before, but this is the area where Building 637 was located, but prior to Building 637 being built there, which was in about 1943, in 1921 there was another building, Building 241 with a locomotive roundhouse that was located on the site. Building 637, as I said, was built in 1943. It was a very large building, the biggest building in the investigation area. It was a transportation repair shop, mainly for railroad vehicles although there were equipment storage and offices there as well.

The environmental sites that were known prior to demolition of the building, some of them we will look into a little further in the current work, but many of them have been closed. There were three underground storage tank sites. UST 241 is believed to have been removed. We have never found it in spite of all the work that's been done. Since it was called UST 241, maybe it was associated with that really old building. It was supposed to have been located on the southeast corner of Building 637, but it's never been found. The Water Board granted no further action on that UST in 2006, and the DTSC closure request is still pending. There are two USTs to the east of Building 637, both have been removed with a large excavation that was done by Weston. Both of those sites, those USTs, have been closed by the Water Board and by DTSC. And I will show you a graphic that gives you the location of all these sites. There were three polychlorinated biphenyl sites inside the building, but they've all received regulatory closure as well. There were seven hydraulic hoists that were along the southern interior of the building. And there was a former service island that was southwest of the building. There were four fuel oil pipeline segments that were located south and east of the building, all those have been removed and all have no further action status as well. There was a 900 gallon aboveground storage tank that was reportedly on the south side of Building 637. That entire area has been

excavated, and the location of the AST was investigated and no contamination was found there. There was a pretty large infrastructure project that was done along the south side of Building 637, and that removed some of these features including the FOPLs, the fuel oil pipelines. This is the Connolly Street excavation. The FOPLs that are shown here in red were removed. These are the hydraulic hoists. The PCB sites are shown. The UST 637 one and two, the location where they were is shown. The east of the building, and the former service island is here.

This is what the area looked like prior to demolition. This is looking approximately west, northwest. It was demolished in the first quarter of 2009. There were hazardous building materials like lead based paint and asbestos that were abated prior to demolition. An aboveground superstructure was removed, as well as the concrete foundation. During the demolition the locomotive roundhouse was discovered, the concrete foundation of that. There were a couple of three inch oil pipelines that were associated with that concrete foundation. Again, I'll show you a graphic that gives you the location of these. There was petroleum contaminated soil in the northwest corner of the building. And that northwest corner is sometimes referred to as the northern two-thirds area. There were creosote treated railroad ties that were found at the time of demolition. Those actually have already been removed from the site. There was also a small amount of abrasive blast material that was in one location along the northern perimeter of the building. This is how the site looked after demolition. And looking at about the same north, northwest vantage point. And, you know, obviously it's not as nice of a day.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It sure opened up the views.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah. And you can see that there's soil that was stockpiled, and once they found there was contamination, there was no point in restoring the site just to dig it up again.

MR. COFFEY: Is the turntable still there?

MS. ROEBUCK: No, the concrete that was associated with that has been excavated and has already been removed and taken off-site. Now that the demolition is done, the regulatory framework within which we are working is that the future land use will be residential in this area. We're more than 300 feet from a sensitive receptor, which is the wetlands. The RAP, the Remedial Action Plan for Investigation Area B.2, contemplated excavation for this area, and that's the remedy that we're going to implement. There was a work plan that was approved to guide the work for site characterization and following excavation. And the site characterization, which I'll talk about in a minute, was done in January and February of this year. The contaminants that we're dealing with now are primarily petroleum hydrocarbons. And the Water Board is the lead agency, and DTSC has deferred to the Water Board.

This just shows the site features again. This is the Connolly Street corridor. This is where the locomotive turntable was. This is the outline of that former Building 241. This is the northern two-thirds area which you'll see when we did the site characterization the contamination goes farther than this. But the former service island is here. And a couple things I want to point out. The remediation that is necessary in this area is limited to the south and to the east by excavations that have already occurred. In the south it's the Connolly Street corridor, and in the east it's the excavation that was done for the UST 637, one and two in 1999. As I said, Weston did that work.

This is a small drill rig that was used to do the site characterization sampling. As I said, the site wasn't restored, so it's hummock-y, and we actually have a figure up here that shows the current configuration of the site. But this allowed Trihydro to get all over the site, even if it wasn't all flat, and take cores to get the samples that we needed. They did 29 soil borings. The total petroleum hydrocarbons exceeded the Tier II Residential Screening Levels in many locations, and you'll see that both from the figure that's on the wall and also later in the presentation. We do have TPH as gasoline, as diesel, and as motor oil that have exceeded the Tier II Screening Levels. Benzo(a)pyrene was the only polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon that exceeded screening levels. No volatile organic compounds exceeded screening levels. And we had metals that exceeded screening levels in the abrasive blast material, which is common. And then in one location where there was a stockpile we had lead that exceeded the screening levels.

So we're going to plan to do remediation in the areas that I've mentioned before, the locomotive turntable, the hydraulic hoists, the former service island, the northwest portion of the building, and then in the abrasive blast material area. We're going to clean up to Tier II Residential Screening Levels. As I said, excavation is the approach. Our target contaminants include TPH as gasoline, diesel, and as motor oil; Benzo(a)pyrene; and in the abrasive blast material area and the one area where we had the stockpile, we'll also be looking at metals. And I mentioned before, the footprints can be found to the south and the east by previous excavations. And all I wanted to show here -- I know you can't really read it -- is where you see the red dots is where the exceedances of the screening levels were. And this aqua dashed line is our planned remediation footprint. Most of these excavations are going to be around seven to eight feet deep, that's our expectation. This is an exception. That's just going to be about four feet deep, it's really a hot spot cleanup for one of these pipelines that was found. The abrasive blast material was found just up around the northern perimeter. The former service island was down here, and when we did this excavation of the Connolly Street corridor, we found quite a bit of contamination. And so we thought that this was going to be a big problem for us. That's not what we've found so far, it doesn't seem to be as contaminated as we thought it would be, so hopefully that's what we find when we actually open up the site.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Does it seem possible to get this property from such an industrial use area to residential with no land use controls?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, we sure hope so.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, you haul enough of it away, sure it would.

MS. ROEBUCK: The screening levels that we're going to clean it up to are the residential screening levels.

MR. COFFEY: Would you remind us what those levels were, Tier II?

MS. ROEBUCK: For the TPH in soil, the screening levels for gasoline and diesel are 100 milligrams per kilogram. For the motor oil it's 370. In groundwater, which I'll mention later, those TPH compounds are 5,000 micrograms per liter.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what are you at now? What is the range here --

MS. ROEBUCK: Allison, do you remember what the highest has been? I mean we've been in the thousands definitely.

MS. RIFFEL: Yeah, below 10,000.

MS. ROEBUCK: But we're going to dig that out and, you know, honestly we're going to go to groundwater. And then our next task is going to be to see if groundwater is contaminated. We are going to be sampling and monitoring groundwater for a year.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you're confident that you have the footprint -- I mean, that you've done enough sampling that you know where the other soil is pristine or at least below --

MS. ROEBUCK: These green dots are clean samples, and what we've done in trying to come up with the footprint is go pretty much equidistant between one that was hot and one that was not. And we'll be sampling the sidewalls to confirm that we have clean soil. So, we're not a hundred percent confident that it's not going to get bigger, but our task is to continue to excavate until we have it cleaned up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Now, at what point does it economically not make sense to try to clean up to residential? I mean you must make those decisions.

MS. ROEBUCK: I hope that's a rhetorical question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I mean, you must make those decisions sometimes and ask for a variance or something to -- to place something else less rigorous there?

MS. ROEBUCK: It's certainly possible, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is it possible?

MS. ROEBUCK: If we got to the point that we didn't feel we could meet the residential standards then, you know, it wouldn't be something that would make sense for us to want to have homes in a place that wasn't appropriate.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, right, no. I wouldn't see that you would do that, no, given what I've seen you do with the areas where you do have homes, I can't imagine that you would or that the agencies would let you do that. But I'm just curious, at some point you must do some cost benefit analysis on that and start thinking about what else you might want to place there. I mean this seems like a really aggressive program, but it's been going on for a heck of a long time there just to put some Section 8 housing there or something.

MR. COFFEY: How do you know it's going to be Section 8?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's what we need here on the island. That's what Lennar committed to. I mean, look at all the burnouts we have all over the rest for our low income housing. Now, I'm not making fun -- but, you know, legitimately at some point, you know, I don't know if that's, what level of density you're planning, I thought that was townhouses or apartments or something. What would you do to make something like that pencil out if you just had to dig to China, as they say?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, I guess at this point we're not there. We still think that we can achieve the cleanup levels that we have, and we have support internally and from the agencies to do that. If we find that we just can't achieve it, then we're going to have to take another look at it, but we're not there yet. Gil.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Maybe the answer is Sheila, or maybe Neal, I know Neal gets into this more than you do, what's the source of funding for this work?

MS. ROEBUCK: This is being paid for by our insurance carrier.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: All this is under the known or unknown?

MS. ROEBUCK: Unknown.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay. So there's the answer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, okay. That's very good.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: They're not spending their money.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right, so let's go for it. I'm all for this. Isn't your money running out of the -- isn't your money policy --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Not under this policy.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not under this policy?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Oh, no, they've got lots of money under that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool. All right. Well, you dig, baby.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So we can put Section 8 housing.

MR. COFFEY: Drill, baby, drill.

MS. ROEBUCK: So, our schedule. We still hope to start in April, but the weather is not being cooperative, and so right now we a lot of water that we don't really want to have to deal with. But if we got lucky and it stopped raining, we would hope to start toward the end of April.

MR. COFFEY: I wouldn't guess we're that lucky.

MS. ROEBUCK: And be out in the field for about six weeks, which would allow us to have a report to the agencies later on in June. So that's the current schedule but it's weather dependent. What we're going to do is we'll have a public notification on the website a couple of weeks before we start the work. And that, in addition to this presentation, and the work that we always do for traffic safety, whether there's going to be trucks on the road or road closures -- and I don't think we're going to have any road closures, but we may have traffic controls. And then we'll also, of course, have best management practices for the soil that we excavate so that it doesn't cause problems with --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You'll be able to excavate pretty quickly because you've already disposed -- demolished all those structures?

MS. ROEBUCK: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How many truckloads or whatever are you -- tons are you, you know, what -- how long is this going to take? I don't recall.

MS. ROEBUCK: Six weeks is our expectation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Six weeks. And those trucks would be going northbound to Highway 37, they wouldn't be traveling on any of the city streets?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, normally they go over to Railroad and they go up, they don't go over the causeway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Question on UST 241. Did I understand you correctly in what you said, it was never found?

MS. ROEBUCK: Yes, you did.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would you explain that to me, please?

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, UST 241, I'm assuming by its name was associated with the older Building 241 that was on the site --

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MS. ROEBUCK: -- before Building 647 was built. And based on the location that was reported, there have been several excavations in that area as well as remote sensing to try to find that.

MR. CAMPBELL: To find it, sure.

MS. ROEBUCK: And it's never been found. And so the hypothesis is that it was removed at some time when Building 241 was demolished, and maybe there just were no good records of it. So given the amount of work that's been done in the area and where it was supposed to have been located, we just think it's not there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right. What was the target goal of UST 241? What was it used for?

MS. ROEBUCK: I assume it was used for heating oil because there was no service tank, filling station or anything. Neal, is that --

MR. SILER: That's correct.

MS. ROEBUCK: Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. All right.

MS. ROEBUCK: Allison?

MS. RIFFEL: And it looks like the maximum concentration that we found was 2,000 milligrams per kilogram of diesel, to answer your question.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Sheila. Okay. So we are now at our first public comment period. If there's any public comments?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Time for our ten minute break, folks. There are snacks from Janet on the front table. Thanks, Janet.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are at administrative business. As always, if you have any comments on the minutes, get those to Myrna or myself. Do you have any administrative business?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, I don't.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we're ready for the focus group reports.

MR. COFFEY: Jerry's not here, Paula's not here. We're done, let's go home.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Gil has nothing to report.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Anything to report?

a) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

b) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. SILER: What you should have is the 11x17 figure that is usually handed out with the Lennar update. So if you look at the figure, you can see some of the documents we have submitted recently, especially with the PCB sites, land use covenants (LUCs), and requests for no further action at certain sites. The 2012 annual inspection reports for the Investigation Area D1.2 and B.2-1 area-wide LUCs, those are going to the agency tomorrow along with the IA-C3 PCB specific LUC annual inspection report.

As far as upcoming documents that we are planning on submitting, there are a number of documents that are associated with Installation Restoration Program Site 15 (IR15). There's Groundwater Monitoring Fourth Quarter Annual Report, a land use covenant, the operation and maintenance plan, and the final groundwater monitoring plan. In addition we're hoping to submit some revised reports for the Crane Test Area, Investigation Area B.1, and also some additional land use covenant documents that you'll be seeing there.

Now, as far as the field work that we have been implementing recently. We did a PCB cleanup action at Building 854, Unknown Location 1 (UL01), and also Building 1304 Unknown Location 1 (UL01). And those are right on the central spine of the former building ways. At Building 854 we removed some PCB contamination in a wood decking that we have there. And in Building 1304 we actually scabbled concrete at that site. In addition, at Building 69, PCB site UL02 and UL03, we did scabbling there. They were doing that work, and they finished it today, and they took their verification samples, so hopefully -- knock on plastic -- they'll be done and the verification samples will come back saying we don't to have do any additional work there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Neal, what's UL stand for?

MR. SILER: Unknown location.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh.

MR. COFFEY: Underwriter's Laboratory.

MR. SILER: That's right. And then as far as upcoming field work, you saw Sheila's presentation about the upcoming work at Building 637. We also have some additional investigation work that I discussed during the last RAB meeting at the Building 207, Building 85/87/89/271 complex for the FOPL work. I just wanted to remind you of that title because you hadn't heard it tonight.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you so much.

MR. SILER: And then also we're going to be doing some petroleum hydrocarbon investigation at Building 121. So that's the work that we're going to be doing, we've done, and we're going to be doing in the near future. Yeah, Jim.

MR. PORTERFIELD: Neal, this photograph in the upper right-hand corner, where is that?

MR. SILER: That's actually -- if you look down here on the figure, there's actually a line that goes to it, it's right at the corner of Nereus and Railroad, right down here.

MR. COFFEY: Why are we looking at it?

MR. SILER: Because that's where we also did some additional field work, and we have some more field work to do there. If we look at the field work under implementation, those are fuel oil pipeline segments, D2/4 Building 382, D2/4 Building 290 West, and D2/3 Building 388. So the central pink line, that is actually the FOPL line. The concrete where you can see striping and the pink paint, that's actually an old electrical conduit for the CIA's former lighting system on the property. And then there's a storm drain that's underneath that that was unmapped.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: C-I-A being central industrial area?

MR. SILER: No, Central Intelligence Agency.

MR. COFFEY: So that's secret lighting right there.

MR. SILER: That's secret lighting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's why it's pink.

MR. COFFEY: That's why it's striped.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's the J. Edgar Hoover effect.

MR. COFFEY: Now we know where Jimmy Hoffa is.

c) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update.

MR. GEMAR: Well, try as I might, I could not fill up a full page. So --

MR. COFFEY: No jokes?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Bigger font.

MR. GEMAR: Bigger font, there you go. So we did submit three recent reports that are being reviewed, those are all compliance type monitoring reports. And in addition, there's three H1 related reports and the one IR 05 report that are all pretty close to completion hopefully, and we'll be hopefully wrapping those up soon.

And then in the lower left there are some new reports that are coming up. And if you can believe it, the second five-year review report is coming up for the Western Early Transfer Parcel -- it's been ten years, hard to believe, time flies when you're having fun. And also it's been five years since the remedy was approved for Investigation Area H1, so that five year report is also coming up. Also the Draft Feasibility Study will be coming out for IR 05, Dredge Pond 7-South and the Western Magazine Area. And hopefully that will be arriving at a doorstep in the next couple of months as soon as we get the remedial investigation report wrapped up, which hopefully will be soon.

And nothing too exciting out in the field. The groundwater extraction system continues, and we're up to almost 30 million gallons since we started in 2005. And we're also doing our semiannual groundwater sampling event in between the rain events. So that's about it for what's happening on the Weston side.

MS. NAITO: You only extracted 30 gallons?

MR. GEMAR: Oh, sorry, I forgot my "M". 29.9 million gallons. Sorry about that.

MS. NAITO: Thank you.

MR. GEMAR: Makes a difference.

MR. COFFEY: Geez, could have gotten a whole 'nother column out of that.

MR. GEMAR: Kind of like the government, a million here, a million there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I wanted to mention that when I was out at the trail on Friday, and in just absolutely dreadful rain conditions, that we have these wonderful waterfalls coming off of the -- as designed -- off of the landfill. And I thought, you know, it might be something to write home about, something to attract people out for. It's not Bridal Veil Falls, it's not Yosemite, but, no, really, I mean big gushing --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I don't remember reading about the waterfall in the design documents.

MR. GEMAR: It's where we have the bears and they try to catch the fish.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Are you sure that was designed?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah, it's working perfectly. No it's -- when you say waterfalls -- you know.

MR. GEMAR: The riprap area coming into the wetlands -- look how nervous these regulators got.

MS. NAITO: Erosion.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, no, no. There was no erosion going on, but it was working absolutely perfectly. It was just this rippling little river going into the wetlands.

MR. COFFEY: The salt marsh harvest mice were doing back flips all night.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Regulatory update. Don't all fight for the microphone.

MS. NAITO: I brought snacks today, so I expect to get credit for that. I'm also behind in my reviews, and I apologize for that. But I am getting help on my other project, so I should be hopefully caught up by the next time we chat.

MS. WELLS: I helped her pick out the cookies so I hope I get credit for that. I wanted to say that the San Francisco Estuary Institute has just put out the "2011 Pulse of the Estuary," I brought some last year, this year they're evaluating "Pollutant Effects on Aquatic Life," so at the next RAB meeting I will bring hopefully enough copies for everybody and we can all leaf through them together. And I also am behind in all of my work, and so I'm hoping to defer everything to Janet.

MS. D'ALMEIDA: And I, too, am behind in all of my work. This last month we did close out one PCB site for the Navy, it was a site down -- way down in one of the old, old magazines, I think it was A-5 or something like that. We closed that out for PCBs. And then there's another site that I've been talking with the Navy about in the area of Building 900, in that green sand area where we've got some overlap between a transformer site and actually the green sand that was out there, and there is ongoing discussion regarding whether the remaining PCBs are from the former transformer or from the green sand. So anyway, we've been discussing how best to resolve that particular site. But those are the main things that I've been working on lately.

MS. WELLS: I would say one other thing is I did go out in the field with Neal to look at that piping, but it wasn't pink. So between when I was out there and this presentation, he must have -

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He colored it by hand, he said so.

MS. WELLS: And stayed within the lines.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, yeah.

MR. COFFEY: He got his Hello Kitty chalk out there.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So before I go through the Navy monthly progress report, I wanted to let the RAB know about a Navy-retained condition that we have identified. We were looking through some various documents regarding some of the removal actions that were conducted at the Marine Corps Firing Range, and it appears that at some point during the munitions removal action, that a 55-gallon drum containing a few low level radiological deck markers, was stored in Building M162, which is not on Navy property. So we notified Lennar that we were aware of this situation and that we were going to be doing a survey to make sure that there wasn't any impact to that building from this drum that had been stored there temporarily in 2004. That building is not used for anything, no occupancy, no other uses, and it's in a fairly secure area, and Lennar has agreed to do some additional security measures to make sure that the area isn't accessed or used until we get that work done. But we did want to let the RAB know about that situation. We've been in contact and are coordinating with Lennar about additional work in that building.

So for the Navy monthly progress report. In the last month we've done a groundwater monitoring event near the former UST 993-4. We collected samples from six wells. And the samples were analyzed for polyaromatic hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, gasoline, diesel, volatile organic compounds, and metals. During this reporting period we submitted nine documents. And we received comments or concurrence from DTSC on two documents, from the Water Board on one document, and also comments from EPA on one document, and that was the PCB closure report that Carolyn mentioned for Building A5.

Of special note, Mare Island received the Fiscal Year 2011 Secretary of the Navy Environmental Award, as well as the Chief of Naval Operations Environmental Award for Investigation Area H1 Restoration Team accomplishments. And that is for all of the folks that worked on that project as you know, as the Restoration Team; that includes the RAB and the regulatory agencies and, of course, our contractor, Weston, who did a great job out there. So we're all very excited about that and we know that you're all proud about that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Does it come with a cash award?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I wish. I wish.

MR. COFFEY: Don't we get to meet SEC NAV (Secretary of the Navy)?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I hope that we'll get a plaque. We did the last time we got that award.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Well, I hope we get a plaque. I don't know, but at this point --

MR. COFFEY: There's no funding for that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Right now we're just celebrating our e-mail that notified us.

MR. COFFEY: Celebrating our e-mail. Woo. Look, everybody.

MS. WOCHNICK: And actually the riprap that you were noting, that was one of the special noted pictures, because we were noting the green and sustainable remediation and design that Weston provided, and that riprap picture was in the award.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Did it have a waterfall at the time?

MS. WOCHNICK: No, it was dry.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's very beautiful when it's operating. It's very beautiful.

MS. NAITO: So she can go out there when it's pouring rain to take a picture.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You can hire me to do that.

MR. COFFEY: We can have pseudo Steve Farley do that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It could be short time period.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Anyway, so congratulations, everybody.

MR. COFFEY: Yeah, thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thanks for the notice of the e-mail. If it's not got money with it --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I know. I know. What can you do?

MR. COFFEY: At least a handshake from SEC NAV, I mean, come on.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All joking and everything aside, that is a tremendous accomplishment. It's a very competitive process. I happen to have been lucky to have been a judge in that process a few years ago, and actually -- as you might recall, Jerry Dunaway, my former co-chair, gave me a Southwest ticket on miles, and I flew to the Pentagon for those awards because I was a judge. And it's a very high honor for you to have gotten this award. This is really a great accomplishment.

MR. SILER: Sweet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's competitive across all of the services as well, you know, so you did good. You did good.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We did good.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I mean, there are, this is a Navy environmental award, but the Pentagon also has the overall awards, which you probably were a part of as well with this. So it's cool.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah, when you win one level, they automatically bump you up to the next competition. So I think we are in the third competition, that's very, very difficult to win. But we haven't heard anything yet, so --

MR. COFFEY: No new e-mails?

MS. WOCHNICK: In SEC NAV, this is only the fourth one in our office, so that's pretty cool. And we haven't won one since 2005. The CNO awards we've won one every other year or something, and somebody in our office has won one, but the SEC NAV one is pretty cool.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's good for a difficult site.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yep.

MR. COFFEY: Okay. Roll report.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Were you done?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, pretty much done. Mine will be brief. Janet, I wanted to follow up with you regarding that really cool little field note or field projects guide that I got a copy of from the Treasure Island Restoration Advisory Board, just to learn whether you'd been able to locate a copy of it and talked amongst your staff and the other responsible parties about that document format. It seemed really useful. I don't have a copy for everybody, but it outlines every project site and field manager, like Sheila just introduced your contractors and, you know, a point of contact, a phone number, and it's just a really nice little chart. And it was neat because it was handed out at the Restoration Advisory Board meeting and, you know, you would be able to pick up the phone and call the field project manager directly or whatever. And I just was wondering if you've been able to follow up anymore with that from the Treasure Island RAB?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yes, I did get a copy of it, and this is just a first draft of it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: For us?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cool.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We've got the upcoming projects for us, the projected field start dates, the Navy RPM. We've got my phone number as well as the caretaker's site office, Patricia McFadden's phone number. And then the Navy resident officer in charge of construction phone number, which is Izzat Amadea. We do have the names of the contractors, just the company names on here. I don't have phone numbers or names for each of those yet. I will need to, of course, talk with them about that. And because these are, many of these are out a little bit, I don't have the field team leader information. But as you get closer to the projected field dates, the Navy RPM would be able to give you better information if this isn't updated before then. Anyway, I didn't know whether we wanted to hand these out at this point -- I have a couple copies if anybody's interested. Otherwise I'll just update and send it out when I send the e-mails.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And maybe you could at least share this with Lennar and a copy with Weston just because it would be helpful. I think it was very instructive and handy for people to be able to just, you know, pick up the phone.

MR. COFFEY: Reach out and touch someone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes. Yes. Absolutely. At least a piece of paper with someone out there. Okay. Very good. Thank you, Janet. I don't have too much else to report except for the preserve is open every day through Easter for the last couple of weeks for spring break. And we have our own special note of accomplishment, Tom Stienstra, the outdoor editor for the Chronicle, featured the preserve and the walking trail around our highly decorated landfill and waterfall as the recommended Sunday drive, for this last Sunday's paper. And it makes all the difference in the world to have Tom Stienstra put a plug in for you. We had a tremendous turnout on Sunday from people from all over the Bay area as far away as Stockton, Alameda, San Francisco, the peninsula. So I want to thank him. It was very kind of him to do that. Okay. That's it. Oh, and do I get credit for taking the cookies off your hands?

MS. NAITO: Of course, you guys all get credit.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, everybody.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 8:38 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Crane Test Area North and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South – Preliminary Assessment/ Site Inspection Field Work Plan
- Presentation Handout – Crane Test Area North and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office South – Figure 2 – Site Location Map
- Presentation Handout – Figure 3 – DRMO- South Proposed Soil and Groundwater Sampling Locations
- Presentation Handout – Figure 4 – CTA-North Proposed Soil and Groundwater Sampling Locations
- Presentation Handout – Figure 5 – DRMO Proposed Groundwater Sampling Locations
- Presentation Handout – Building 637, Investigation Area B.2-2, Contamination Identified During Building Demolition: Site Characterization and Upcoming Remediation
- Presentation Handout – Features within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Mare Island RAB Update March 29, 2012 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard March 29, 2012