



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

HELD THURSDAY, March 27, 2014

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, March 27th, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:07 p.m. and adjourned at 8:33 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 (Community Member)
- Paula Tygielski (Community Member)

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Chris Dirscherl (Navy)
- Brooks Pauly (Navy)
- Heather Wochnick (Navy)
- Steve Farley (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Mark O'Brien (City of Vallejo)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

Community Guests in Attendance:

- Mike Chamberlain (Tihydro)
- Jim Durkin (Community Member)
- Matthew Jones (Tihydro)
- JoEllen Myslik (Leadership Vallejo)
- Jim Porterfield (Community Member)

RAB Support from Sullivan-Weston Services JVA, LLC in Attendance:

- Jessica W. Cooper (Sullivan International Group, Inc.)
- Wally Neville (Audio/Visual Support)
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay, everybody, let's get started.

Welcome, everyone, to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board meeting. We start our meetings with a round of introductions.

My name is Janet Lear. I'm the Navy co-chair.

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

MS. TYGIELSKI: My name is Paula Tygielski. I am a community member from Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: And my name is Mike Coffey. I'm a community member from American Canyon.

MR. SILER: I'm Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with Weston.

MS. NAITO: I'm Janet Naito, and I'm with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mark O'Brien, City of Vallejo.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Well, actually you're not speaking to just us, so you guys can get in the habit of using a microphone. This room kind of goes that way behind you. Not to pick on you, Mark.

MS. WOCHNICK: I'm Heather Wochnick. I'm the lead remedial project manager for the Navy.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Chris Dirscherl. I'm a remedial project manager with the Navy.

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

MS. MYSLIK: I'm JoEllen Myslik with the California Maritime Academy, but I'm here representing Leadership Vallejo.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mike Chamberlain, Tihydro.

MR. JONES: Matthew Jones, Tihydro.

MR. DURKIN: Jim Durkin, a community member from El Cerritos.

II. PRESENTATION (Chris Dirscherl [Navy]): *Paint Waste Area and Vicinity Remedial Investigation Fieldwork Overview*

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Our first presentation this evening will be given by Chris Dirscherl, the Navy RPM. And he'll be talking about the Paint Waste Area and remedial investigation vicinity fieldwork overview.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Good evening, everyone. As Janet said, my name is Chris Dirscherl. I'm an RPM with the Navy. And I'll be talking about the Paint Waste Area and vicinity remedial investigation fieldwork overview.

On the first slide here -- a bit difficult to see in the light -- but this is the Paint Waste Area looking south-southwest -- H-1 is off to your left here, and in the distance you can see probably the Western Magazine Area there off in the distance.

So we'll first go over a brief introduction of the project objectives followed by a brief history of the Paint Waste Area as well as a summary of previous actions that took place and finally an overview of the upcoming fieldwork.

So everybody should have a packet. On the last page there is an acronym and abbreviation list. I'll try to avoid using them, but if I happen to -- there's certain ones you might see in the presentation, like PWA is Paint Waste Area.

SU is survey unit, you'll see that on a couple of figures.

MEC is munitions and explosives of concern.

RAD is just an abbreviation for radiological items.

And then RI is remedial investigation.

Okay. So our primary remedial investigation project objectives are to verify that the Paint Waste Area time critical removal action, also called a TCRA, excavation footprint reached the north, northwest and northeast extent of debris.

Our second objective is to determine whether munitions and explosives of concern, MEC, radiological items and/or radiological or chemical contamination are present in the Paint Waste Area vicinity.

And finally, to determine the nature and extent of the contamination if it is present.

All righty. So we'll go a little bit into our site history here. So the Paint Waste Area is that red blotch on top of the dredge pond there.

As you can see, we're looking from the top, this is a historical picture, it's a bit hard to see again. So the red outline, and then Azuar Drive along there. So north is generally kind of diagonal in this picture here. So, located in a pre-World War II dredge-fill area.

Surface debris led to the initial classification as a suspected paint waste disposal site.

In 2007, some low-level radiological items and munitions and explosives of concern were also encountered.

And in 2009 through 2012, a TCRA excavation was completed. During that excavation, 52 MEC items, 1,201 RAD items were recovered; and approximately 31,650 cubic yards of soil was removed from the site. So, quite a big effort there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Can I just note -- maybe you'll be getting into that and I'll be getting ahead of you, but I don't think, it doesn't look like it.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just want to note for the record and maybe a reminder for some Restoration Advisory Board members and others that might be new, that this location was -- the finding of it was by staff from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who were mowing out here. And as part of their -- the planned transfer of this property to federal -- transfer by the Navy to the Department of Interior for use adjacent to Building 505 and for their management.

And this is a really important illustration of how the environmental cleanup work is not necessarily ever done. And that as much as we try to have -- do a good and thorough historical review, there are always surprises. So this has turned out to be a pretty big project.

And, you know, it wasn't on the radar screen, so to speak, of the basic IR investigation restoration site program.

So I just want to remind us of that, that this is a treasure hunt, and it's not necessarily anybody's fault that it didn't get picked up, but it's an example of how, like the Audubon Society, some of the most important bird nest areas are found by citizen scientists, not by the Department of Fish and Wildlife or you -- it's just regular people stumbling across things.

So, you know, I just wanted to point that out about this particular site history because I don't, it's not quite clear that that's how this came to be a project.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Thank you, Myrna, you're absolutely right. So okay, we'll move onto the next slide here.

So this is a summary of our previous actions at the Paint Waste Area. So in 2009 through 2010 -- our contrast is a bit difficult to tell here -- but survey units one through eight, SU one through eight on the figure, the yellow; so this is one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, and then eight down here were the initial investigation areas.

The main 1,187 --

MR. DIRSCHERL: Okay. So, yeah, so 1,800 -- I'm sorry -- 1,187 RAD items, and 17 MEC items were recovered there. And approximately 29,450 cubic yards removed there.

The second phase in 2011 and 2012 was SU 9A which is the orange, which should be orange, it's just this area right here outlined there with the arrow. So there we discovered an additional 14 RAD items and 35 MEC items. And another 2,200 cubic yards of soil were removed from that area. So that was the old actions.

And now the blue area around the northwest, north, and northeast sides is the Paint Waste Area vicinity. That is the area that we'll be investigating in this upcoming fieldwork season.

Does anybody have any questions on the limits there?

Okay.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Kinda.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Okay.

MS. TYGIELSKI: You've got north, northwest, northeast, are you confident you've got --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula, you have to use the microphone.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Are you confident that you've got everything from the south?

MR. DIRSCHERL: So there were some items found in the yellow area; however, there was enough of a buffer that we were confident that we had reached the southern extent of debris. So if we found an item the excavation would continue approximately 25 to 50 feet past that item, and if we didn't find anything, then we decided we found the extent.

MR. COFFEY: And one quick question for clarification. Most of this stuff that you're finding, was this outfall or being dumped there by people?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Not outfall. There's no specific outfalls in that Paint Waste Area.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

MR. DIRSCHERL: It's probably dumping.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you should probably clarify that it's not dumping like we have dumping now from imported from off the island that's such a problem --

MR. DIRSCHERL: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- this is discreet dumping by, theoretically, under authorization from the Navy at the time of the operation of the facility.

MR. DIRSCHERL: And as you mentioned, a lot of it was off the books almost, so it's difficult to find documentation that says that's exactly what had happened.

Okay. So here we have an example of some of the previous activities that took place during the 2011 through 2012 removal event.

In the top-left corner there is a gentleman surveying soil that was staged outside of the hole.

On the top-right-hand corner is item removal: could be MEC, could be a RAD item, it's difficult to tell from those pictures exactly what it would be.

In the lower-right-hand corner is an interesting picture there. That's scrap metal. So when they go to investigate it with a metal detector or a mapping device, there's a lot of miscellaneous debris that is not necessarily of concern like a MEC item or a RAD item, but it still has to be removed in case it may be.

And then on the left-hand side and on the bottom-left-hand side are examples of MEC which are very small. So for scale, most of those items are probably less than six inches, and you can see in comparison to the amount of scrap metal you may receive there's quite a difference there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, MEC isn't categorized by its length as much as it is by how much explosive material would be in it, correct? So even though those might look small to -- and we don't know what the scale is of this image -- it's what the item, what risk the item poses, correct?

MR. DIRSCHERL: The net explosive weight I think would be the technical. So when these are small there's certainly a limit of how much they could hold --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't really like -- I'm going to argue a little bit here.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't like -- and this isn't new to Janet or Heather or any of you in the room probably -- but I'll go on the record, I don't like it when the presenters try to diminish the significance of the munition and explosive of concern items that are found.

The fact is, if it's considered MEC, it's on your radar screen as an explosive item. Otherwise, it's considered MDAS or something, scrap that isn't related to -- I mean it could have been a munition component, but it's not, it doesn't have any munitions explosive material in it.

So let's not talk about small and little and tiny, you know. I'd like for you to talk about it as the way -- the way it is presented in official documentation.

MR. DIRSCHERL: To expand on the MEC a little bit, to expand on Myrna's point. So MEC, there's three different types; there's unexploded ordnance, there's discarded military munitions, and then there's munitions constituents.

So unexploded ordnance is usually found on ranges and things like that, where they shoot them off, they're fuzed.

Discarded military munitions are most of what we find on Mare Island that were dumped, that weren't primed, weren't fuzed. So they're not going to explode if you step on them necessarily. So they're certainly dangerous, not taking away from that, but in comparison to a range, a UXO site, it's not quite as much of a concern, but it's certainly not to diminish the danger of running into a MEC item.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. And again, just because you don't step on and it doesn't blow you up or you do step on it and it doesn't blow you up doesn't mean that it doesn't hold risk, especially considering that the gene for picking things up that's presented by Doug Murray from the -- if you've been to his presentations, and I won't talk about that again here. But any of this is considered, you know -- otherwise we'd have the preserve open on the shoreline right now if this wasn't the problem.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I'd continue to kind of argue that point right now. Sorry.

MR. COFFEY: And also a quick question. You see the wonderful picture of all the scrap metal.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

MR. COFFEY: Is there any kind of breakdown of what that consisted of, or is it just everything?

MR. DIRSCHERL: In the back of the truck there, the scrap metal picture?

MR. COFFEY: Yeah.

MR. DIRSCHERL: I don't have that information. I can get a little breakdown on exactly what that scrap metal was: rebar, any kind of stuff that's been put in concrete.

It's difficult to tell from the small picture I have, but I can dig up that information and distribute it.

Okay. We'll move onto the next slide here. Okay. So here we have an overview of our remedial investigation fieldwork activities. I understand this slide's a little bit text heavy, so I'll try and go through each of the bullet points. But if you guys have questions, please feel free to interrupt there.

So the first is our site preparation requirements. So we'll go in and cut the vegetation manually and install an exclusionary fence with biological oversight for protection of the salt marsh harvest mouse in the pickleweed areas in the Paint Waste Area.

After we install the fence and clear the vegetation, we'll go in and perform the actual surveys for RAD and MEC using a digital geophysical mapper for the MEC items and RAD scanners, detectors to go over to try and find those.

Our third fieldwork process will be the soil sampling. So we'll collect and analyze for RAD at zero to 0.5 feet below ground surface. And we'll also collect and analyze soil samples for chemicals of concern at zero to 0.5 feet, and also at two to four feet below ground surface.

Our fourth activity will be to install eight trenches approximately three feet wide by four feet deep. And we will also perform surveys for RAD and MEC in each one foot interval in those trenches.

Our fifth activity will be to install monitoring wells around the Paint Waste Area, both in the vicinity and just outside -- excuse me -- inside of the Paint Waste Area itself.

And lastly, on the documents side is the Risk Assessment. So take that data that we find in the field, and also the data that we previously collected from the TCRA itself, and perform human health and ecological risk assessments.

So on our next slide here is a picture of a GPS radiation survey cart. So the four important parts: up on the top are our GPS antennas, and then the Trimble GPS instruments, and they are all connected to the scalers and ratemeters, which are then connected to the detectors. So if the detectors go over an item, the scaler or the ratemeter will detect it and the GPS will basically log where that item is so we can go back and find it again very easily.

So again, this is for radiation items and the detectors would detect items about a foot below ground surface depending on our conditions.

On our next picture --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that where they were found in the last excavations?

MR. DIRSCHERL: That deep?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Uh-huh.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yeah, most of them were on the surface.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. DIRSCHERL: And our next picture here, DGM stands for digital geophysical mapper, and in parentheses this is MEC, and so we use this to find MEC items.

So there we have the detectors on the bottom, then the geophysical mapping unit, and then the GPS antenna.

So just as with the RAD items, it will go over, it's more in depth than a metal detector -- but it will map the results of a ground, and then a geophysicist can go in and analyze which items might be of concern and which might be just a piece of scrap metal.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And this is going to be done before you do those trenches?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yes, that's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So will you do -- I assume you'll do confirmation sampling with this data after the geophysicist has reviewed?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh. So if the geophysicist will look at the data that the geophysical mapper puts together.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. DIRSCHERL: And he'll decide --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He or she.

MR. DIRSCHERL: He or she, correct -- will decide which items might be of concern based upon the response of the item, and they'll do digs of certain items which might be of concern from the map.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And those are the ones that are going two to four feet?

MR. DIRSCHERL: So I'll go into the -- so this item -- or excuse me -- this cart can also detect items approximately one foot down, it depends on the size of the items, so it's magnetic response.

If you have a big item it's going to have a stronger response than a smaller item.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well your number two, you're at surveys, right? Excavate all confirmed anomalies?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So why are they going to be looking at it to see whether it may or may not present as a munition anomaly?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Well they'll go in and --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Didn't you just say that?

MR. DIRSCHERL: I believe so. So they'll go in and analyze what they think is an anomaly, and they'll go in and excavate that to makes [sic] sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But your paperwork here says you're going to dig all anomalies in the survey, excavate all confirmed anomalies?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The data is looked at and the anomalies are picked.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So until they have a map of all the readings and evaluate it against background, after that is done then the locations of the anomalies are identified and the crew goes back in to dig.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you're doing a hundred percent dig of all anomalies?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Of confirmed anomalies, yes.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yes.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's a surface clearance. So if there's an item that the geophysicist or the RAD crew identifies as an anomalous location, then we go and excavate at that location.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And surface is going to be just the zero to five -- to point five feet?

MR. DIRSCHERL: The survey, the GPS -- excuse me -- the RAD detector. The RAD detector can detect approximately one foot below ground surface. And as well as the DGM, can detect approximately one foot below, depending on the size of the item.

MR. COFFEY: So that's considered sufficient, one foot?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: This is an RI investigation --

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- so it's not intended to be at the same level as a removal action.

MR. COFFEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So we're doing surface clearance and getting all the data from the surface and identifying any of those anomalies that we found, excavate those anomalies.

Then we're going to do the trenching to try to get a feel of how deep, if there's any debris in that area.

And then when we have all that data we'll evaluate it and present it and determine the next step.

MR. COFFEY: And your trenching will go four feet?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yes.

MR. COFFEY: But if it looks like it will require further --

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Then it's just like any other RI, we come back to the table, bring the information, and evaluate what it tells us, and then we determine the next step.

MR. COFFEY: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So your survey is just to clear the surface for safety or --

MR. DIRSCHERL: Because we discovered most of the items on the surface in the previous area --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, okay.

MR. DIRSCHERL: -- that's why we believe that the surface, if you will, will give us the most information.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We're just asking because it's not -- it isn't clear here. But if that's so, then that makes total sense, yeah.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have a question about point three.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

MS. TYGIELSKI: It says you are analyzing soil samples for chemicals of concern from zero to point five and from two to four.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

MS. TYGIELSKI: What about between point five and two?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Well, that's a good point.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yeah. Yeah. Why skip all that?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Well, they can be taken in that general area. So if we take a soil sample and we note when they take the boring log, so we might have a foot and a half, and there's an area that looks like there might be a contamination problem, they can take one from that specific area.

So if we just say we're taking it from point five, you know, and then we dig a little bit deeper and we run into something that might be a concern, then we'll take a sample from a little bit deeper. So then another two feet below that one, and another two foot area, again, to see if there's perhaps something in that two foot area that would be of concern, that we should target to take the sample.

So it gives us a little bit of room to take it in a specific location, but also enough we're not taking the sample every --

MS. TYGIELSKI: So you're actually doing borings?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yes. Uh-huh.

MS. TYGIELSKI: And so the depth from point five to two --

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh.

MS. TYGIELSKI: -- is actually part of a boring?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yes. Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It doesn't say that. Sorry to be asking.

MR. DIRSCHERL: No, that's okay. We go into it a little bit more on the soil sampling and the well installing in another couple of slides. So I'll explain it a little bit more there, hopefully that will clear it up a little bit.

So on slide eight we have an overview of our trenching. So the green items emanating out from the yellow are the approximate trenching locations. So again, those will be three feet wide by four feet deep, and we'll excavate in one foot layers. So we'll do each of the RAD and MEC surveys over the top. And then we'll dig up one layer -- excuse me -- one foot layer, and then we'll do the surveys again, because we only get that one foot response from the cart for the RAD and the MEC.

So we'll have the eight trenches. And this is approximately 500 feet total length. And the excavated soil will also be staged outside of the trenches. And we'll survey them again outside of the trench to make sure there's nothing we might have missed when we dug up the soil.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Do you feel confident -- do you feel confident enough of SU one through nine that you don't feel you need to trench that, just --

MR. DIRSCHERL: SU one through eight were already dug, there was a whole lot of soil excavation there. So, almost that whole area has already been dug up through the previous TCRA action.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay. So this blue area needs some more, so you're trenching the blue area?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Uh-huh. That's correct.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MR. DIRSCHERL: So most of the things were found on the surface, but we're going to do the trenches to try to give us an idea if maybe there was anything below the surface in a representative way.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, most of the things, you've dug up 30,000 cubic yards of soil, so it must not have all been on the surface.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Certainly not. There were things below the surface, but there was also chemical contamination that we had to remove.

So back to the original -- when the Fish and Wildlife personnel discovered the paint cans -- some of that soil removal was to dig up the paint waste, the actual chemical paint waste contamination, so that wasn't directly related to RAD or MEC items that we had found, that was chemical contamination from the paint items.

On our next slide here we go into a little bit more about that chemical sampling, the soil sampling. So we'll collect ten soil samples from the zero to 0.5 below ground surface, and also ten samples from two to four feet below ground surface.

And again, we can pick certain areas within those -- within that boring that if it's of concern, we'll take the sample in that location.

So it will be twenty total samples, one at that first layer, and then one sample at that deeper layer. And then each of the samples will be analyzed for metals, semi-volatile organic compounds, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls PCBs, explosives, and TPH, total petroleum hydrocarbons.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was any green sand ever found in that area?

MR. DIRSCHERL: Not to my knowledge, no.

Okay. On our next slide we detail a bit more about radiological sampling. So for radiological soil samples we'll collect 30 soil samples from the zero to zero point five layer scattered throughout the Paint Waste Area vicinity.

So each of those black dots will be a soil sample which we analyze for radiological -- excuse me -- send for radiological sampling.

And then on our next slide here we will show the location of the four monitoring wells that we'll install. So I'll point them out here.

We have one up in the north side. One down here and then one way south of the Paint Waste Area. And one over here: MW/91A on the eastern side there.

So we'll also analyze each of these groundwater samples for metals; volatile organic compounds; semi-volatile organic compounds; pesticides; total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH); TDS, which is total dissolved solids; and then finally Radium-226, which is the RAD contamination similar to the soil samples.

Okay. So this next slide details more of the documentation process. So this will be after we collect all of our data, get it back to the office, analyze it: we'll perform a human health risk assessment.

So there's three parts to the human health risk assessment. So, first we'll analyze the effect [on] the exposed population or receptors. So a possible future commercial or industrial worker, a future recreational user that might be out there, a future construction worker, a future -- or a hypothetical future resident.

The second part will be the MEC hazard assessment. So that will be based on the items that we have found in the TCRA, the original excavation as well as anything in the outer vicinity area as well.

And then the final part would be the maximum RAD dose rate risk which will be based on the investigation results -- it will be based on the soil results from the vicinity as well. So that's more for our RAD risk than the chemical risk.

And then finally is the ecological risk assessment. So we'll evaluate if the site poses an unacceptable risk to potential ecological receptors including the salt marsh harvest mouse.

And both of those risk assessments will be included in the overall remedial investigation report that will detail all of the activities that were performed on site, such as the trenching and the soil sampling, and they will all be included in the RI report.

Okay. Our next slide here is just our planned work schedule.

So we will send the final RI Work Plan out on Monday. Now, our schedule is highly dependent on the rains at Mare Island. The Paint Waste Area gets very muddy and access is extremely difficult.

So right here we have April 2014, so that would probably be more of late April 2014. If it's dry we can get our trucks out there to clear -- sorry -- get our personnel out there to clear the area.

And then hopefully in May, if it's dry enough, we can get out there to do the surveying and the trenching.

So we'll get our samples back in June, evaluate the sample results, and backfill our trenches.

And then we'll install our monitoring wells a little bit later after our soil sampling.

A few months later after we have a chance to analyze the data, we'll submit the draft RI report in September.

And a few months later we'll get the final RI report in December.

Okay. That's all the information I had. So do we have any questions?

MR. O'BRIEN: The strontium-90 --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you use the microphone, please?

MR. O'BRIEN: The strontium-90.

MR. DIRSCHERL: The ten percent analyzation for strontium?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah. Why are you analyzing for that?

MR. DIRSCHERL: We haven't found strontium at the Paint Waste Area, the ten percent strontium is kind of a safety -- not a safety, but I guess a --

MR. COFFEY: Cautionary.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yeah, cautionary, thank you. Even though we don't think we're going to find it, it's kind of a cautionary to make sure we don't have any strontium.

MR. O'BRIEN: The half-life is very small.

MR. DIRSCHERL: What's that?

MR. O'BRIEN: The half-life is very small.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yeah, it would be 33 years.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Strontium has been found in drains up there.

MR. O'BRIEN: So what's the source of that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Nobody knows. Nobody has identified that.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: There are strontium deck markers.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Yeah. We believe most of the activity at the Paint Waste Area was, I believe, in the late forties, and they didn't start to use strontium in the buttons until the late fifties. And we believe the activities at the Paint Waste Area had ceased by then, so that's why we don't believe strontium would be an issue at the Paint Waste Area.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.

MR. DIRSCHERL: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, Chris.

III. PRESENTATION (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island]: *Industrial Pump Station No. 4/T-2 Oil Water Separator, Investigation Area 1, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP)*

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Our next presentation by our regular, Neal Siler, from Lennar Mare Island. He's going to talk about the industrial wastewater pump station number 4 and the T-2 oil water separator pilot test at Investigation Area C1.

MR. SILER: Okay. So, as Janet had mentioned, I'm going to talk about a pilot test that we recently implemented at industrial wastewater pump station number 4 and the T-2 oil water separator that are located in Investigation Area C-1. How I'm going to do that is go through my normal process. I'm going to, you know, recollect my memory and yours about the description of the site; talk about some historic investigations and remedial activities; and monitoring activities that we've done in this area; talk about the planned pilot test activities; talk about how things actually worked out when we implemented the pilot test, things that we've completed; things that we have yet to complete in the future; and then take any questions from you if you have any at the end of the program.

So, description of the site, and there's a slide right behind this one that tells you about what I'm going to talk about.

Industrial Pump Station No. 4, which is this facility right here, and the T-2 oil water separator, which are right here, are located in the northern portion of Investigation Area C-1. These facilities are all part of what's called Installation Restoration Program Site No. 14, which was the industrial wastewater treatment system on the island.

There is about 8,600 linear feet of pipeline in Investigation Area C-1. There were three oil water separators and three pump stations in the area. Tonight I'm just going to talk about these specific ones right here.

In conjunction with that, this entire area that it sits in is an area called Installation Restoration program site 03 which was one of the major fueling facilities on the island. So that's the slide right there that has everything in it.

This system operated from 1972 to 1996; and in 1996, the Navy decommissioned both facilities. They cleaned out the sludge, flushed the pipeline, and plugged the pipelines at that point. But they left them in place and didn't remove them.

So, when the property was transferred to the City of Vallejo and then to Lennar Mare Island, this is what these two areas looked like. This is Industrial Pump Station No. 4. You can see the facility right there. You had a wet well and a dry well with a pump in it that kicked on when the water level got too high.

And then this was the T-2 oil water separator which was just a gravity flow oil separation tank that was located in that area.

So there were a number of investigations that had gone on in this area. It started back in 1983 with the initial assessment of the island; went on to additional investigations in the early 1990s, the mid-1990s.

In addition to that, because you had so many things going on in this area with Installation Restoration Program Site No. 3, Installation Restoration program site 14, there were a number of investigations that kind of overlapped these areas with the Industrial Pump Station No. 4 and T-2 oil water separator.

The only real remedial action that took place prior to 2005 was the removal of a small segment of FOPL, which is a fuel oil pipeline, part of the fuel oil pipeline system, which was in the area of the T-2 oil water separator. And that FOPL was I-14 in Building 477.

But after 2005, things kind of took a little bit of a different turn, kind of went from the investigative stage to the remedial action stage.

At Industrial Pump Station No. 4, about 1,300 tons of soil that had been impacted with petroleum hydrocarbons and volatile organic compounds was removed. The investigation itself was a stepped investigation: it was about 55 feet wide, 60 feet long, and it went from zero to 20 feet because it stepped down as it went down into the excavation.

They removed the actual pump station itself, but left the concrete footing that was on it in place because they couldn't get to it when they had the excavation at that point.

They were confident what the confirmation samples showed them was that the area had been remediated to the cleanup criteria at that time.

As they started doing monitoring in the area, though, they realized something else was going on. They started doing some additional investigations to see if they could confirm that they got all of the contamination.

So they did a number of soil borings, took soil and groundwater samples, did a soil gas sampling program, and installed some additional wells to see what the extent of the contamination they were seeing in groundwater at that time.

And then also in this area -- and I'll show you a picture of this -- we can go back or forward and I'll show it to you -- right here.

Again, because everything was overlapping right here, this green outline right here that kind of reminds me of a scorpion, this was the Installation Restoration program 3 soil excavation, the source area. So this little tail right here went right between the T-2 oil water separator and installation -- I mean Industrial Pump Station No. 4. So that was the other remedial action that went on in this area as we were moving forward after 2005.

So what this slide shows you is what the excavation looked like. You can't really see it over here but you can look on your handouts. They found significant oil in that area and they are remediating it.

And this on the right-hand side shows you what it looked like at the extent of the excavation. They took out this wet well, the dry well, but they left the concrete pad in place down here.

Then that was backfilled and they started doing groundwater monitoring. Now, between 1991 and 2014, groundwater monitoring was very intermittent in this area.

In 2012, we started monitoring the 22 wells that covered Installation Restoration Program Site No. 03, and also Industrial Pump Station No. 4, and the T-2 oil water separator. So that well network is 22 wells.

Now, what caught our attention was the fact that we kept seeing either stable or increasing concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and volatile organic compounds in those wells that lead us to believe that there was something else going on that we weren't able to get when we did the excavation back in 2005.

So what the next two slides show you is -- you can't really see it, you can take a look on your handouts -- but the green shows you concentration; and this is vinyl chloride, which is one of the volatile organic compounds that we were looking at, in the 2010 to 2012/13 timeframe. And they were stable and going up. But what troubled us was that they weren't going down.

Now, the good part was that this wasn't getting to the strait down here above a concentration we were concerned about, but we were still concerned that we weren't getting this to actually decrease in concentration. So that's the volatile organic compound concentration.

This next slide shows you petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel in groundwater. And this is a little more of a larger area. And one of the problems here is that, again, you have these overlapping facilities on the island.

This structure right here, which was right at the head of the scorpion here of the Installation Restoration Program Site No. 03 excavation, is a wood deck that we found about ten feet below ground surface. And we couldn't take that out because you'd undermine the entire wharf in that area if you try to take it out, so we had to leave it in place.

But there were some areas underneath it where we found some pockets of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination. So we wanted to see if we could get some of this remediated without being able to dig it out at this time. And also we wanted to get this area and around the T-2 oil water separator remediated also.

So we've planned this --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: How many acres are we talking about? Your laser was going all over.

MR. SILER: No, you're not talking about a very large area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: A hundred acres?

MR. SILER: No, you're only talking about one or two acres.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. SILER: It's not very big.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right.

MR. SILER: So the planned pilot test activities was [sic] to advance soil borings that would be used as injection points; install some additional groundwater monitoring wells; prior to doing any of the injections, perform a baseline groundwater monitoring event; and then inject two types of materials. One was in the Industrial Pump Station No. 4 area, activated sodium persulfate which goes by the trade name of Persulfox. It's an oxidizer. It wants to burn or destroy

the material. That was going to be done in two rounds, two injection events at fifteen locations, 6,000 gallons were going to be injected.

Further downgradient along the IR-03 and the T-2 oil water separator where we saw petroleum hydrocarbons of concern, we were going to inject oxygen-releasing compound. That would be one injection event at 140 locations: injecting about 1,400 gallons of the oxygen-releasing compound.

While we were doing that we did some injection monitoring; and if we had any problems, we'd do some mitigation measures, and I'll talk about that. We had a couple of events that we had to look at.

We're going to be doing performance monitoring after we do the second injection in the Industrial Pump Station No. 4 area.

And then post-remediation activities, which is the paperwork, tying it up, seeing how it worked, and see if there's any next steps that we would have to go to.

So this was the planned injection areas. We had one in the Industrial Pump Station No. 4 area, and we had a number of areas downgradient along the wharf, the submerged wooden deck wharf, and around the area of the T-2 oil water separator.

And then these, kind of goldenrod, with the orange circles, those were the areas that we were kind of monitoring to see if anything got into the storm drain system and could get out into the Mare Island Strait, so that's what we were monitoring is those locations right there.

Now, the focus areas, again this is the Industrial Pump Station No. 4 area. This is where we were injecting the Persulfox, so that shows up as pink.

And these blue areas downgradient, that shows you the areas that we were going to inject the ORC compound.

So this work was initiated in January, started off by advancing all of the bore holes, doing them with an air knife to make sure we weren't finding anything underneath or disturbing anything.

In February we actually started the injection. We started at Industrial Pump Station No. 4, had fifteen injection points. We were able to inject about 2,900 gallons of the oxidizer.

At the T-2 oil water separator area in the IR-03 area we had about 98 injection points, and we injected about 1,360 gallons of material.

Now, Mare Island is one of those great places where the best laid plans of mice and men always go astray, and anytime you try to stick something in the ground you meet resistance somehow. So, as I had mentioned, we had planned to put 140 borings in the focused areas downgradient, but we were only able to get 98 in. That's because we had -- so many times -- we had refusal, or you'd get so low and then you'd get refusal somewhere else as you got deeper. So we were only able to get 98 borings in, and we injected almost the target amount of oxygen releasing compound.

And those areas are the ones shown here. If you look on your figure they're in blue. These are all the areas that we were able to inject, had it mapped out on a grid here, did all that.

And then up here at Industrial Pump Station No. 4 we were able to inject fifteen locations. They show up as green on your slide. And that was the first round of injections.

The ones that are in goldenrod, those are the ones that we're going to do for the second injection event. And that area is pretty well open because, again, that was an excavation that was backfilled with material that is kind of porous, so we found that the Persulfox was getting all the way in the area that we were injecting into.

So the next few slides, they show what we were doing. You can see the grid of the area at Industrial Pump Station No. 4 where they took out the concrete corings, that's where we were planning on doing the injections. This is the same type of thing where we had the cores at the T-2 oil water separator.

Now this is the pilot test, the injection location at Industrial Pump Station No. 4. You're looking northeast toward Building 477 and Mare Island Strait. They were mixing the material here. There's the oxidizer and bags there. Mixed it with water, then so you're seeing they were taking that and that gets injected into the ground in those boring locations.

Now, this is a little bit downgradient at the T-2 oil water separator. This right here is the air knife with the vacuum truck that they're using to clear the borings.

Here's the direct push drill rig that they're using to actually inject the materials in.

And then they're doing storm sewer protection and monitoring right in here.

And if you look at the next slide, that's looking down one of those monitoring locations as we were doing the injections. And this is one that's right outside of the Industrial Pump Station No. 4.

So what we did was we put plugs -- inflatable plugs -- anywhere where this could get out. And then they actually monitored the concentration of persulfate in the water that was here.

Now, luckily enough, while we were injecting this, it wasn't raining, but we did get some persulfate that seemed to be leaking out into the storm drain here. So we kept monitoring it making sure that the concentration went down as we removed all the water. So as we removed all the water, we kept monitoring, looking at the concentrations, making sure it didn't get out into the strait as we were going forward.

And then when we were done we went and backfilled all of the injection locations to make sure they were sealed up again.

So what we have to do is, again, we need to go back to Industrial Pump Station No. 4, complete that second round of injections. That's going to be done on April 8th, 9th, and 10th. That's the schedule right now.

After that they're going to be doing performance monitoring in the wells around there. That will be done at one, two, and four weeks after they do that second injection round.

In addition, we're still doing quarterly monitoring in this area, so we'll be able to see things as they progress forward in the future. And so it looks like we will be done with that performance monitoring sometime in late April, late May.

And at that point we'll be preparing documentation that will describe all the actions that took place, and if and what any next steps that we have to do.

So with that, if anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to respond to them or that completes my presentation.

(No response.)

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Neal.

Well, we are at our first public comment period. Do we have any public comments?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And items not on the agenda that you can talk about.

So before the break we should talk about the fact that April 14th would have been our 20th year anniversary of the Restoration Advisory Board at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Since we're not going to be meeting in April, I ran over and got us an anniversary cake and plates and napkins, and I cannot find any forks, so it is a food fight thing, like with your hands. In your mouth, all over your face, then go over and kiss the guy next to you.

MR. SILER: That ain't happening.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So congratulations to Paula and me for being here for twenty years.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Twenty years, ever since my youngest was a baby.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But then the rest of you have been here a long time, and we sure enjoy your company.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Ten minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So we are at administrative business.

Meeting minutes, comments on those, please give those to Myrna or myself.

Did you have anything else?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So, focus group reports. Technical, Paula?

MR. COFFEY: Technically she has.

MS. TYGIELSKI: The only thing I have to report is that somehow or another during one of the mailings I got a computer disk.

MR. COFFEY: Yes.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Is there a reason? Should we have some sort of meeting about this or anything?

MR. COFFEY: That was a report.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: That was a report, and it's actually discussed a little bit on the Navy progress report so we'll talk about it a little bit later on.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. City report. Mark, do you have anything you want to talk about?

MR. O'BRIEN: No, we have no report tonight.

a) Lennar Update (Neal Siler [Lennar Mare Island])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update. Neal always has something to say.

MR. COFFEY: He's always updating.

MR. SILER: There hasn't been a lot of fieldwork going on in the last month. But as I mentioned during my presentation, we have been doing some of this pilot test injection at Industrial Pump Station No. 4 and oil water separator T-2.

And the picture in the upper left-hand corner, that's another picture of the injection event at Industrial Pump Station No. 4 with Building 477 in the background.

In the upper-right-hand corner, we did the first quarter 2014 groundwater monitoring event at Installation Restoration Program Site 03, industrial pump station four, and the T-2 oil water separator. And that was just completed earlier this month.

But as far as some of the big items that are kind of significant this month, we got a number of concurrences from the regulatory agencies. I want to thank them for looking at a number of different items.

But we were able to get concurrence on an exception to sources of drinking water policy for shallow groundwater in Investigation Area B.

We were able to get no further action for petroleum hydrocarbons at the Building 811 area.

Also in Investigation Area B (B.2-2), we also received no further action concurrence for fuel oil pipeline -- two fuel oil pipeline segments -- G1/6/7E and G1/10/7W.

We got concurrence on a cleanup at a PCB site, Building 69, unknown locations number two and number three.

We also got conditional concurrence on a remedial action work plan for storm sewer sites in Installation Restoration Program Site 21 and the Buildings 386, 388, and 390. I wanted to do a bunch more buildings because I know Janet Lear loves it when I do that, but I only have three in that time.

And then today we actually got another one that came in after our update had been prepared: we got a no further action concurrence on another fuel oil pipeline segment in Investigation Area C-1, and that was G1/4/BE3BE8.

So a lot of concurrences coming in this month, and a lot of comments on a number of different other reports that we had submitted.

Now, as far as things that are upcoming and are kind of exciting. We have submitted the Investigation Area C-1 draft RAP. And Janet, the initial study will be on your desk tomorrow, so that's coming through. I know you won't be there, but it will be waiting for you when you get back on Tuesday.

And then also we're getting ready to get the Remedial Action Plan for Investigation Area C-2. I'm reviewing that right now, and hopefully we will have that out by the end of the month.

So those will be very good milestones through the year. If we can get those completed this year, we will be very, very happy.

MS. NAITO: The month ends on Monday.

MR. SILER: Well, I mean next month. Not this month, but next month.

So that's the report. If anybody has any questions to ask me about anything, I'd be glad to answer them.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have a quick question.

MR. SILER: Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Why are some of these things -- PCB sites, I think -- still called unknown location? I mean, don't you know about them?

MR. SILER: You know the history, Paula, there were known unknowns and unknown unknowns. And the reason they're just called -- they have different designations like AL is an assessment location site, and UL is an unknown site -- its because of the ESCA. And so if it wasn't included in the ESCA and it was found out later, it's called an unknown site. Just kind of a way of categorizing them.

MS. TYGIELSKI: So you know about them now?

MR. SILER: We know now.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Right.

MS. WOCHNICK: So there are known unknowns.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There are unknown unknowns too.

MR. SILER: Oh, yes.

MS. NAITO: They've never been able to explain that one to me really well.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I know how, I'll tell you later.

b) Weston Update (Steve Farley [Weston Solutions, Inc.]

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Weston update. Steve, should I change this officially to you every time?

MR. FARLEY: I do this when Dwight's out of town.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So leave it as Dwight?

MR. FARLEY: So leave this as Dwight is probably the best way to do it. I'm an alternate, I guess.

MS. NAITO: The permanent alternate.

MR. FARLEY: Permanent alternate.

MR. COFFEY: Where is Dwight?

MR. FARLEY: I don't know where he's at, traveling somewhere.

So we have our Weston update. There's not much to report this time.

MR. COFFEY: It's half blank, what's the deal?

MR. FARLEY: The reports that are listed here are pretty much the ones from last month.

MR. COFFEY: We're rehashing.

MR. FARLEY: What's that?

MR. COFFEY: We're rehashing?

MR. FARLEY: No, I'm not rehashing at all because I'm moving on.

MR. SILER: We're regifting.

MR. FARLEY: Also in terms of fieldwork, we're continuing with the operations and maintenance of the H-1 containment system. Again, there's not a lot to report there. It's working just fine. The number of gallons that were removed, guess what? They haven't changed much either.

Well, we did complete the 2014 semiannual groundwater monitoring event. And that was done, I think, a couple of weeks ago.

So that's all I have to report. I'm sure there aren't any questions.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Navy report. How about a little Navy monthly progress report. I also have the field schedule --

MR. SILER: Why aren't we getting any agency update report?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Oh, am I forgetting people again?

Sorry.

c) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito [Department of Toxic Substances Control])

MS. NAITO: I don't really have one. I would just like to point out that for the first time ever there's more -- I gave more comments than documents I received on the Navy site.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS (Myrna Hayes [Community Co-Chair] and Janet Lear [Navy Co-Chair])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So on the table you will find our Navy field schedule. So you can look at that at your leisure.

And then our Navy monthly progress report. We had no fieldwork this month, so not a lot of pretty pictures.

But I did want to talk a little bit about the document that Paula mentioned: the Community Involvement Plan (draft version) went out.

MS. NAITO: It looks like this.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It looks like that.

MR. COFFEY: Mine was flatter.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It was e-mailed to all the RAB members and participants, and most of you I believe also got a CD.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Is that correct?

MR. COFFEY: Yes.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. This document is basically a plan that the Navy uses to determine how they get information out to the community. A big part of the development of that plan is interviews.

In the fall, the Navy and its contractors reached out to 80 residents, businesses, community organizations, to invite them to participate in the interview process. We conducted interviews with those that were interested.

And Myrna, thank you again for participating in that process. And of course, as I --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Not a problem. Not a problem.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And, of course, as I'm sure you're all aware, the main community concern was the reuse and redevelopment to produce more economic stability.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I might note that something we always say here about that topic, and I think it's so, is that environmental cleanup makes reuse possible. So we're right here on the front end of just exactly what the biggest concern is.

MR. COFFEY: Twenty years later, we're still on the front end.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We're still here. We're still doing our job.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And one of the things that came out of the process is that the preferred way to receive information is through brief messages by e-mail, and putting information on established community distribution lists and websites.

And once again, the Restoration Advisory Board is an effective tool to keep the community informed and interested in the Navy's environmental cleanup.

The document was sent out to you to get any additional comments, feedback, ideas that you would like to provide. We'd like to get those comments by May 14th, if at all possible. You can call me, e-mail me. And I'm sure you could also talk to Myrna and she could pass on any input that you have as well.

So as far as document submittals, the Navy submitted two documents this month, one of them being the Community Involvement Plan, and then we also submitted the Land Use Control remedial design for Marine Corps Firing Range.

We received comments and concurrence on four documents from DTSC, and five from the Water Board. So they've been very productive this month apparently: not only for us but also for the agencies, as Neal said, so that's great.

We are -- our next meeting is May 29th.

And we'll just keep moving with the program. And Myrna, I'm sure you have some things you want to say?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Okay. Well, yeah. Because I guess we're at the Co-Chairs report?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: We are.

MR. COFFEY: Yep.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I want to thank the Navy and contractor staff for sending a note to us as members of the RAB. We send you our heartfelt condolences with the loss of Gerald Karr, a valued RAB member. And signed by a lot of wonderful folks who have supported us -- state and federal regulators, Navy staff, contractor staff - so thank you very much.

I got the cake, I got the plates, I did not get the card that I intended to go to our preserve headquarters and get for you to sign.

So if you don't mind, if you would, I mean I will happily send a card on our behalf to Teresa Karr, Jerry's wife, and his sons, Cliff and Kevin. And I would like to also, with your permission or with your blessing, send an e-mail to you telling you the address for Jerry's wife and family, where you can send a card if you'd like as well, or make a phone call.

If you don't know, Jerry had a very long battle with cancer from the seventies, early seventies through very, very recently. But he also then from that cancer had complications that created a COPD, you know, issue with his breathing. So he was living with 300 feet of oxygen lines that went around the house so he could plug in wherever he was. So it was not a very good way to live.

But he was -- Wally visited him recently. And he tried to get off the RAB at the last minute because, I don't know, he thought he wasn't serving us, but I told Wally he couldn't, so he continued to serve on our RAB through his death a couple of weeks ago.

So there was a nice memorial service for him that Saturday. Wally attended, and you can talk with him a bit about it.

But certainly Jerry made a tremendous difference, not only on our Restoration Advisory Board regarding Mare Island, but he took that extra step beyond the environmental cleanup.

He and I and Kenn Browne and a number of others -- Robin Leong, Wally DeVille -- lots of us came to the Restoration Advisory Board from either the Audubon Society, where Jerry was a president at one point, he was the past conservation chair there for the Napa-Solano Audubon Society.

He got involved in our efforts to protect the region between Vallejo and Marin County and including the five counties that surround the San Pablo Bay and the Save San Pablo Bay Lands.

He was a founding member, Board member and also served as the president for the Friends of San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

He was the chair of the Mare Island Regional Park Task Force that prepared and gave a final report to the City Council in December of 2007 regarding the reuse of -- or the plan to reuse the Naval Ammunition Depot as a regional preserve.

So he was very engaged and involved in our community in -- on this island and in the wetlands and wildlands adjacent to it, and certainly involved in the Flyway Festival.

And I wish that he had willed, and I hope he has, his meticulous notes that he took at every meeting that he ever attended, because I always wanted to get a sneak review of those, that we wouldn't have needed a minute taker if we'd gotten access to them, but they appeared very private.

So let me just tell you a couple of other things. Again, let's celebrate twenty years of our Restoration Advisory Board. You can say a prayer or a blessing or big sigh on April 14th (that is the actual 20th anniversary).

And I recently saw a long-time member of our Restoration Advisory Board this week, Diana Krevsky. And speaking of anniversaries, April 12, coming up in a couple of weeks, is the sixth anniversary of the founding -- the opening on a regular basis -- of the Mare Island Shoreline Heritage Preserve. And we've planned some type of festivities. We'll probably serve the rest of that cake, and maybe some of those cookies will be left.

And thanks to the Navy and their tremendous efforts to work with us, we are now able to get back out on guided and escorted hikes on either the south shore or the Western Magazine depending on, you know, how we flip the coin. Really in consultation with Wally and Robin regarding who is nesting where and who might be impacted by hikers. We are going on every second Saturday now, which will be our sixth anniversary, April 12, ten to twelve.

So just show up or, I don't know, somehow or another find out whether we're going to the Western Magazine or whether we're going to the historic south shore, but thanks to the Navy and their local staff -- for making that possible again.

And then the last thing to put on your calendars: June 27 to 29, the second annual San Francisco Bay Osprey Days at the preserve. And you can get involved in that in a lot of different ways.

So thank you again for your involvement in the Restoration Advisory Board here at Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, everyone. Drive safely. We'll see you next time.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 8:33 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout -- Paint Waste Area and Vicinity, Remedial Investigation Fieldwork Overview
- Presentation Handout -- Industrial Wastewater Pump Station No. 4 and T-2 Oil Water Separator Pilot Test, Investigation Area C1, Eastern Early Transfer Parcel
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, March 27, 2014