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

HELD THURSDAY, May 28, 2015

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, May 28, 2015, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:05 p.m. and adjourned at 9:25 p.m. These minutes contain a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting.

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)
- Jesus Cruz (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston Solutions, Inc.)
- Erin Hanford (City of Vallejo)
- Patrick Hsieh (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Shara Churchwell-Fetters (Helios)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- Sheila Roebuck (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (Regional Water Quality Control Board)
- Steve Farley (Helios)
- Reginald Paulding (Navy)

Community Guests in Attendance:

- Patricia Figueroa
- George Higgins
- Jim Porterfield
- Heather Wollenburg

RAB Support from Construction Engineering Services, LLC, in Attendance:

- Lucas Verret
- Virginia Demetrios
- Doris Bailey (Stenographer)
- John Neville (Audio/Visual Support)

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So welcome, everyone, to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board. We usually start the meeting with introductions. My name is Janet Lear, I'm the Navy co-chair.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And without a microphone --

MR. COFFEY: I was going to say, no microphone, microphone. Busted.

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

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MR. PAULDING: Reggie Paulding with the Navy.

MS. ROEBUCK: Sheila Roebuck, LMI.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley, Helios.

MS. FETTERS: Shara Fetters, Helios.

MR. HIGGINS: George Higgins, guest, city of Vallejo.

MS. FIGUEROA: Patricia Figueroa, guest, city of Vallejo.

MS. WOLLENBURG: Heather Wollenburg, ERRG, guest.

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

MS. HANFORD: Erin Hanford with the City of Vallejo.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells with the Water Board.

MR. HSIEH: Patrick Hsieh with the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. CRUZ: Jesus Cruz with the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control. And I'm the new public participation specialist, for a while at least, taking the place of Richard Perry, formerly with my department. And I am out of Sacramento.

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

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski, RAB community member from Benicia.

MS. DEMETRIOS: Virginia Demetrios with CES. We're taking over coordination for the meetings now. Lucas is who you're going to see in the future.

MR. VERRET: Lucas Verret with CES.

MR. NEVILLE: John Neville helping with Wally.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So once again, welcome everyone.

II. PRESENTATION (Reginald Paulding [Navy]): *Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan, Installation Restoration Site 17 (IR17) and Building 503 Area*

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Tonight our meeting also serves as our proposed plan public meeting for the Installation Restoration Site 17 and Building 503. To start the proposed plan public meeting portion of tonight, Jesus Cruz with DTSC was going to say few words about the process.

MR. CRUZ: I have a very strong voice unless you're recording it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, no, no, you have to use it, I say so.

MR. CRUZ: All right. All right. I've been -- I have the privilege of opening up the public comment session and asking for your comments here tonight on the draft plan, the proposed plan. And tonight we will be accepting your comments, you know, orally here in writing or verbally.

You can step up to the microphone. Hopefully you'll have signed in. You will introduce yourself. I ask that you introduce yourselves, speak slowly and clearly if you're going to comment.

We also have a comment form that we'd like you to fill out so that we know how to introduce you and what organization you may represent, or if you are a interested resident, citizen, community member.

And the public comment period is from May 26th through June 25th. Comments are accepted during the whole comment period in writing during the 30 day public comment period May 26th through June 25th. And tonight, of course, you can submit your comments, you know, orally or in writing.

And that's about it.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And to follow up on that, there are extra copies of the proposed plan on the table. Most of you should have gotten a copy of that in the mail. If you're not on our mailing list and you would like to be, there's a sign-up sheet on the table as well.

And Reggie Paulding with the Navy is going to present the proposed plan, and then we will take your questions at the end of the presentation, your questions and comments. So if you'd hold those till the end, that would be great. So Reggie, you're up.

MR. PAULDING: All right. Good evening. Does everyone have a copy of the presentation?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're going to get tired of bending down, you better lift that up.

MR. PAULDING: I will.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or lift it up a little bit maybe.

MR. PAULDING: Does everybody have a copy that wants one? And as Janet said, we do have copies of the proposed plan here also.

One second here. All right. There we go.

So welcome everyone. As has been introduced, we're here tonight for the IR-17 Proposed Plan Public Meeting. I'm going to introduce or will talk about the proposed plan, summarize it, and then we'll take questions at the end.

So the agenda for tonight, as we said we'll go over the Proposed Plan Draft RAP -- or I'm sorry -- Remedial Action Plan.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

MR. PAULDING: Yeah, I'll try not to use acronyms. We'll also discuss the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act process which is the law, the basis for doing the environmental cleanup.

We'll talk about site location and history. Our conceptual site model for the site. Previous investigations and removal actions. Nature and extent of contamination at the site. We'll review site risks. Future site use. Remedial Action Objectives. The summary of remedial alternatives that we've identified for the site. Remedial alternatives are the plans to clean up the property.

Then we'll go over the -- how the alternatives were evaluated. We'll present our preferred alternative. Talk about next steps, timing. And then we'll take questions.

So to go over the legal process. What you're looking at is the proposed plan is the part in the stage in the process where we present the Navy's preferred alternative to the public, which is happening tonight, and also through the proposed plan which you should have received in the mail, and we do have copies here again.

We're open for public comment, as was previously stated. And we'll respond to comments in what's called a responsiveness summary which will be published in the Record of Decision which is a follow-up document.

The Draft Remedial Action Plan portion of the proposed plan is required by the State of California and it identifies specifically what it is and [sic] potentially [sic] responsible parties.

Okay. So here's a graphic that shows the process, I think it might be a little bit clearer on your handout there.

But you can see there's the preliminary assessment site inspection where you initially identify a site based on, you know, previous history, activities that happened at a site. You would -- environmentally there would be some questions, concerns about if there were some contamination at that site. You go out and collect, you might do a historical research, some historical research on the site. Then you would go out and collect some initial samples as part of a site inspection.

Then you would go out and do a more in-depth sampling as part of a remedial investigation. And then as part of a feasibility study you would identify legal requirements at a site as well as remedial alternatives.

Here in the proposed plan stage is where we are today, this blue on the handout. You identify the remedial alternatives, you go over the history of the site, and receive public comments.

Then you move next again to the Record of Decision and the Final Remedial Action Plan.

Then we go into remedial design where we'll talk about some actual physical remedial activities that we're going to do at the site. So in that document you would design those and then you would implement the remedial action.

In this case we envision having some extended monitoring at the site following the remedial action. Then at some point, hopefully once the sampling shows that the remedial action was successful, we would then go into response complete phase. And then ultimately receive site closure.

Okay. So here we have the site location. You're all familiar with Mare Island. This is where we are today in San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, I guess more specifically.

And IR-17 is here in the north end of the island off of Azuar Drive, and Railroad Avenue here is off to the east.

Here we have a photo of Building 503, and I think this is 610, I think, six something, one of the 600 buildings off in the distance. I think this is J Street running across here.

Okay. Some of the history on IR-17. It was originally part of the tidal marshlands near the shoreline of Mare Island Strait and Northwest of Mare Island upland area.

It was filled in over time between 1911 and 1938 with dredge material from Mare Island Strait.

And it remained undeveloped until, you know, pre-World War II era, 1938 to 1944.

And at that point several buildings were, as well as tanks and other infrastructure were built to support paint manufacturing that was ultimately used in painting the ships and vessels that were manufactured here at Mare Island.

And that facility closed down in the mid 1950's.

So here we have a couple historic pictures from the records. This one here was taken in September of 1940 and it shows Building 503. A couple of classic cars out there.

Then this one, June 1941, it shows some of the tank farm, obviously the railroad and a lot of activity happening ramping up for World War II.

Okay. Here is our site conceptual model or a picture of it. So what you'll see, you see the tanks. You see we had two tank farms, we had a southern tank farm, a northern tank farm.

Here's Building 503 which was the main shop.

We had a couple storage areas here. Building 499 is a storage area.

We had a plant here. I can't see the numbers there, I think it's 579.

MR. COFFEY: 519.

MR. PAULDING: 519, thank you. So you have a lot of activity in the forties and fifties here. You can see we also identify some leaks, so here there's a pipeline that ran from the southern tank farm up to the various plants and manufacturing facilities, so we can –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Reggie, I know we're not supposed to ask questions right now, but how many acres is this? It looks like a big facility. Do you have any clue?

MR. PAULDING: I do not have the actual number offhand. I can definitely look it up after I finish this presentation. I have a couple reference materials. And I can give that to you.

But here you see a leak here. Down here in this southern area which we're, we identified a chlorinated solvents leak, we had some -- we envisioned drum storage down in this area.

We had some more different sewer lines running in here.

We also had some oil water separators up in this area.

So all -- and then obviously the train track lines which were bringing raw materials in and the finished product out.

So here this, we have two pages that list out previous investigations. If you remember from the earlier slides where we talked about things like preliminary assessments, we had several stages of early investigations here at IR-17 beginning back in 1985, what they called a verification study, which obviously someone expected, you know, thought there might be an issue and went out and collected some samples and found something, contamination.

Then we had a follow-up study in 1986. What they called a phase one remedial investigation in 1992.

Base-wide groundwater monitoring began in 1994.

Did a phase two remedial investigation in 1996.

Baseline human health risk assessment in 1996.

Now, see here where they call, group two and three accelerated study. So this was right around the time that the base closed and the Navy identified numerous -- well, sites, IR's, so how we got IR-17 there was IR one through.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why don't you say what IR stands for?

MR. PAULDING: I'm sorry, yes. IR is an investigation -- I'm sorry, I'm drawing a blank here. Actually, luckily, we have a page at the end.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Installation restoration.

MR. PAULDING: Installation restoration, thank you.

On the back page of the presentation there's an acronym page. Installation restoration sites. And in those sites, once those sites were identified going through historical records, they identified them in groups one, two, and three. And IR-17 fell into group two and three. And that study was done in 1997.

We also had a base-wide polychlorinated biphenyl confirmation sampling, also known as PCBs. And those samples were collected everywhere that there were electrical equipment that may have PCBs or polychlorinated biphenyls.

And then continuing on into 1999, did a confirmation and characterization sampling at IR 17, and then a removal action for those pipelines that I showed you in that site conceptual model. So there was a lot of excavation work done, which we're going to -- we'll get into on the next slide.

Then there was a chemical oxidation injection treatability study also in 1999 following that excavation work.

Did groundwater data gaps investigation in 2002.

Onshore ecological risk assessment in 2002, looking at risks to different eco-receptors.

And then in 2006 did a remedial investigation.

That was followed up with a document, a feasibility study was performed in 2006. And at that point there was some input from the regulatory agencies, DTSC and Water Board along with EPA, that identified some data gaps in the assessment work.

We went back, the Navy, in 2009 and collected additional soil groundwater and soil gas samples.

Which then took us to a non-time critical removal action in 2010 and additional sampling.

Then we did a post removal groundwater monitoring event in 2012.

We did a non-tidal wetland investigation in 2012.

We did a -- completed a chlorinated solvents investigation in 2013.

And then collected, I believe it was two additional polychlorinated biphenyls or PCB samples outside of Building 499 in 2013.

So quite an extensive list of different sampling projects.

So in late 1988 and through mid -- through June of 1999 there was this time critical removal action. So time critical means that the Navy and the regulators have identified that this is something that should happen in a pretty timely period.

So then at that point we write a work plan and so forth.

And then we conducted excavations to reduce the threat to human health from the polychlorinated biphenyls or PCBs that were identified at the site, along with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons or PAHs, metals in the surface soil. So there were -- the soils were excavated and removed from the following areas.

So there's these buildings here beneath the entire footprint of former Building 519. And there's a photo on the next slide of that excavation.

Along the eastern and southern sides of the former electrical substation, that's Building 567 which is adjacent to Building 503.

At the other isolated -- so there were other excavations that were done, smaller excavations at Building 503 and 519.

Product distribution pipelines that ran along Azuar Drive were removed and there was excavations done there.

Oil water separator just north of Building 519 was removed and -- along with contaminated soil. And that excavation removed approximately 8,900 cubic yards of soil.

We collected confirmation samples and verified that the time critical removal action goals were met.

So here on, I think we're on slide 16, this shows the footprint of the excavation from Building 519.

Then in 2010 we did a follow-up non-time critical removal action in response to the results of the 2009 additional soil groundwater and soil gas sampling. This covered three areas known as excavations A, B, and C..

And you have a -- those are on the next slide, they're shown there, but then they're also shown here on this poster board we have up here, which you can all come up and take a look at, which shows the three -- well, actually it's this large area here just adjacent to Azuar Drive, this box, square area here off of Azuar Drive, and then these two smaller areas, this is excavation C.

And those were done to remove coal tar distillates which were one of the key ingredients in the paint manufacturing process. As well as at excavation C, that was done to remove chlorinated solvents which were identified as -- during the soil gas investigation in 2009.

And then here on this slide we have some photos of the work in action. And you'll see where it shows excavation C, A, and B. B is the larger of the three excavations, or largest.

So then here, this slide, slide 19 shows, well, the nature and extent. What we're trying to show here is all of the samples that were collected as part of those various investigation activities that were done starting in 1985 going through 2013.

So -- and then the thing that you'll see here, these subareas that were broken out, this was something that we did to identify, evaluate risk in the feasibility study.

So subarea one includes the northern tank farm, Building 503, most of the manufacturing activities that happened.

You have subarea two includes the southern tank farm, and Building 499, and the storage facilities.

Subarea four here is the wetland that's adjacent to IR-17.

And subarea three here is a parking lot, it's west of Azuar Drive, and the parking lot is for Building 759.

So then the chemicals that have been identified at IR-17, the chemicals of potential concern in soil, soil gas, and groundwater include heavy metals, specifically lead for the most part; polychlorinated biphenyls, PCBs; semi-volatile organic compounds; total petroleum hydrocarbons, and those are mostly represented by the coal tar distillates in benzene and xylenes. Volatile organic compounds again which would be the benzene and the xylenes. And polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons or PAHs.

All right. So site risks. So then if you remember, we broke the site up into four areas based on site use mostly. So -- and those are also again shown on this poster board here, and you have that figure in your -- I think there's also, there should be like an eleven by seventeen in the back of your packet.

So subarea one again includes the paint manufacturing areas and the northern tank farm.

Subarea two was the southern tank farm, the chlorinated solvents area, and the storage areas.

Subarea three includes again that parking lot adjacent to Building 759.

Subarea four is the adjacent non-tidal wetland area. And subarea four was sampled and investigated and was found to not be impacted by activities and IR-17, and is not a part of the feasibility study or the proposed plan.

So human health risks in subareas one and two were, unacceptable risks were identified for future commercial and industrial workers and a hypothetical future resident.

So we evaluated a hypothetical future resident just to see if it was possible to get unrestricted use for the property, although that is not the current proposed future use for the site. But it's something that the Navy does as part of policy when evaluating risk at a site.

So then subarea three, no unacceptable risks were identified for hypothetical future users.

So ecological -- no ecological risk was identified at any of the subareas across IR 17.

And there's an exception to -- excuse me, Elizabeth, cause I'm sure I'll get this wrong -- but to domestic and municipal beneficial use for groundwater, we have an exception to that, drinking water policy from the Water Board due to -- I guess to complete that thought, due to high dissolved solvents, high dissolved solids –

MR. COFFEY: Say that three times fast.

MR. PAULDING: -- in the water. Okay.

So here we have another photo. This is the back side of the Building 503. The anticipated future land use in this area, IR-17 and Building 503 is commercial industrial.

Okay. To go into the details of the risk assessment and Remedial Action Objectives on this slide, it's a dense slide so I'll take my time and go through this. You guys can follows along.

So our goals here, this pretty much lays out our goals for subarea one; right? What we want to do is we want to prevent direct contact by future commercial industrial workers with lead in surface soil.

So we've identified an area beneath Building 503 that has high lead content, such that it could potentially be a danger to future workers in the area. So one of our goals is to mitigate that risk. Okay.

So second goal or remedial action objective is to prevent direct contact by hypothetical future residents or other sensitive users which include, you know, students or daycare, toddlers, that kind of a thing, young children, and lead in surface soil as well as subsurface soil. So down to ten feet below ground surface.

Prevent -- third remedial action objective is to prevent exposure of hypothetical future residents or other sensitive users to PCBs in subsurface soil. Subsurface soil is soil from the surface to ten feet below ground surface.

Prevent -- fourth, fourth remedial action objective is to prevent exposure of hypothetical future residents or other sensitive users to concentrations of -- very long here -- 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene, ethylbenzene, meta and para-xylene, ortho-xylene in soil gas that may pose a potential risk through vapor intrusion into indoor air.

So one of our concerns in subarea one is, there's pockets of VOC's that can potentially cause vapor intrusion issues.

In subarea two we have -- we have two Remedial Action Objectives. The first is to prevent exposure of future commercial industrial workers to concentrations -- from concentrations of TCE, trichloroethene in soil gas that may pose a potential risk through vapor intrusion to indoor air.

And prevent exposure of hypothetical future residents or other sensitive users with concentrations of TCE, vinyl chloride in soil gas that may pose a potential risk through vapor intrusion to indoor air.

Okay. And then we also have what we want to prevent the use of groundwater for drinking water, and prohibit other uses of groundwater without authorization from regulatory agencies in subareas one and two.

So that covers the Remedial Action Objectives for the site.

And then at this point -- okay. So we have, we've identified the contamination; we've identified the risks from the contamination; and then we move into, okay, so what are we going to do about it? So that's here.

The remedial alternatives is our attempt to mitigate those risks and allow the site to be redeveloped. So we've identified -- more or less we've identified three remedial alternatives, excavation, monitored natural attenuation, and institutional controls. And the alternatives are some combination of these different remedial options.

Alternative one is no action which is a basic requirement of the law just it gives you a baseline, something to compare to, what if you did nothing, right.

Alternative two is institutional controls saying, okay, well we know where the risks are, can we just prevent people from entering those areas.

Alternative three, excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil; monitoring of the contaminated areas; monitored natural attenuation; and then institutional controls.

Alternative four excavation, additional excavation, much more than is identified for alternative three. Again, off-site disposal and future monitored natural attenuation.

And then there's some short-term IC's until if and when the monitoring shows that the risks have been mitigated to a point where there's sufficiently reduced risk to sensitive receptors.

Okay. So to step through them in a little bit more detail. Again, as we said, alternative one is basically the no further action, and it's just a necessary alternative to review.

Alternative two with the institutional controls, this basically, like I said, keeps sensitive receptors, people out of the areas where there's contamination and they could be negatively impacted. So it would prevent sensitive uses including residents, hospitals, schools, daycare facilities within, what is it, subareas one and two.

IC's will require an evaluation and, if needed, mitigation of vapor intrusion into buildings. So this would be for commercial uses. So if for a commercial use in a, in identified areas. So on this poster board those areas are identified with the black dashed line, this box. This specific area here in subarea two would have an IC for future industrial/commercial uses.

IC's are implemented to restrict soil disturbing activities. Essentially you can't dig without proper approval.

The effectiveness of IC's would be verified through annual inspections and five year reviews.

The restrictions run with the land and are enforceable by DTSC. And all of these, again, are applicable to subareas one and two under alternative two.

Okay. Alternative three is a little bit more nuanced. We would be looking at, you know, excavation with monitoring and institutional controls. So under alternative three we would excavate contaminated surface and subsurface soil to protect future commercial industrial workers in subareas one and two.

So if you look on the poster board, these like seafoam green squares here, these would be the areas of excavation.

So this area here under Building 503 is the surface, would be the zero to, I believe it's, I think it's one foot where we would go in and remove this surface soil that has shown high lead concentrations.

This area here in subarea two we would remove soil down to 20 feet, because that's where we've identified the chlorinated compounds, and that's the soil vapor issue. This would address the soil vapor issue here.

Okay. Then we would also have the monitored natural attenuation following the excavation for approximately five years. That's a rough estimate.

IC's would be required, and mitigation of vapor intrusion into buildings in subarea two would be required.

Say if a building was constructed in this area here, kind of at this Azuar Drive, J Street intersection, there would be a requirement for the developer to sample for soil gas and look at impacts, potential impacts to any workers that would be in this area.

And there would also, again there would be IC's to prevent, you know, the IC's would require the sampling. And then the IC's would also prevent sensitive uses within either subareas one or two. I'm sorry, IC'S are institutional controls.

Okay. Alternative four which would be a much more aggressive excavation in both subareas one and two, it would target a lot of those other compounds that we discussed, identified in the previous slide that showed, you know, the benzene, the xylenes, the 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, all those types of compounds, the PCBs, we would go after and remove those compounds so that the subareas one and two would be essentially usable for not only commercial industrial uses, but also sensitive uses including residential.

So that's what, yeah, this second bullet where it talks about more extensive both depth and locations. So we would have excavations, the one underneath the building, for example, under, beneath Building 503, this excavation would go to ten feet instead of one foot.

There would be multiple other excavations that are shown, I believe. They're in the proposed plan, they're not in the actual tonight's presentation, but those excavations are shown in the proposed plan.

So here table three, which is on slide 30, it shows how the various remedial alternatives were evaluated. So we go through -- this is somewhat of an art, I guess you could say. It's subjective. But then we also tie some hard, try to put some numbers to the different alternatives here in this last column.

So what you'll see, the no action alternative is the cheapest, okay, which is obviously one of the things you look at.

But then you're also looking at how effective would it be; right? Is it going to get the job done? I mean, are you going to be able to use the site? Is it going to reduce contamination at the site? So forth; right?

So what you see here is we have four different circles. The kind of like the -- what do you want to call this? -- like a quarter shaded circle shows that you have a poor outcome, half shaded is good, three- quarter shaded is very good, and a fully shaded circle is excellent.

So you kind of go down and you can compare these. And you weigh, you know, the various alternatives against each other. Keeping in mind, you know, public health, future uses, and so forth.

And we've identified what you can see here is that alternative three is shaded blue because we've identified this as the most reasonable and preferred alternative for activities at IR-17 Building 503 area.

So yeah, I mean I think it's -- and I guess the final thing I'll say is you'll see like -- so for like long-term effectiveness, it's very good. It's not excellent, alternative four is excellent; but again, you're weighing all of the different criteria when you're trying to pick your, pick an alternative.

So to go a little bit more in depth on alternative three and why we selected this one as our preferred alternative.

It provides protection to human health and the environment by removing contaminated soil, the shallow soil that's beneath Building 503 that has the lead contamination. And it also addresses the source of the soil gas contamination down in subarea two.

It meets the federal and state applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, also known as ARARs. The legal requirements basically; right? It's saying that it's in full compliance with legal requirements for the site.

Bullet three here says, right, provides long- term protection of the environment through permanent removal of contaminated soil.

Its short-term risk to the environment is low. I mean, we know how to do excavations, we can handle the risks, dust mitigation, those kinds of things.

And it allows the redevelopment of the site in a manner most consistent with the City of Vallejo's 2008 Mare Island Specific Plan.

And here this slide 32 is a smaller version of the poster board that I've been referring to. And again it just, it shows you the areas that would have institutional controls, the areas that would be excavated and, yeah, that's what it shows in the subareas.

Okay. So as was said earlier, we're accepting, we're almost there to the point of verbal comments, but we're also accepting mail, fax, e-mail, however you want to get your comments to Janet Lear. If you want to -- we're accepting those up until June 25th.

And you have the contact information also for Patrick and Jesus there.

All right. So next steps. Well, tonight is step one, we're having our public meeting which is part of the public comment period.

Then we're also -- then following the close of the public comment period we would prepare a responsiveness summary to answer and address public comments.

Then we'll produce a Record of Decision/Remedial Action Plan, and that would be reviewed by regulatory agencies. In that plan we would select the selected alternative, so the preferred alternative or some alternative that is modified based on public comment would be documented in the Record of Decision.

So that the record -- and then we would move to the remedial design, remedial action work plan phase where we would actually provide the details on how the work would be done.

Then the remedial action would be implemented. We would have -- and then move onto annual IC's and five year reviews.

So kind of the short-term schedule is, again, the public comment period runs from Tuesday, this past Tuesday through June 25th.

Public meeting tonight.

We envision having the Draft Record of Decision at the regulators sometime in around July, August time frame, Summer 2015.

Final ROD, Record of Decision going to regulators for review fall, sometime November 2015.

And then again you have the acronyms page.

And that's the end of the formal, I guess, presentation. And open for any questions.

MR. COFFEY: Reggie, when was Building 519 demolished?

MR. PAULDING: 519, I do not, I don't know. It was -- I don't believe -- it was not demolished as part of that 1998-99 excavation.

MR. COFFEY: That's what I was assuming because it was vague and it just kind of said between that period of time, so –

Did it have anything to do with the remediation?

MR. PAULDING: Again I do not know. Sorry. But we will -- I mean as we're taking comments here, I think that's something that we can definitely get back to you on. I don't know if it's in the feasibility -- it's not in the feasibility study, but it's definitely something we can get back to you on. I don't know. It's unfortunate I don't know the history.

MR. COFFEY: And the drawing kind of shows that there's something beneath Building 503. Are there any plans for 503?

MR. PAULDING: We, the Navy does not have any plans to demolish 503. So right now --

MR. COFFEY: How about getting into the floor?

MR. PAULDING: So Building 503 is on piles, so what the plan, the -- kind of the rough plan is to do what you call vacuum excavation. We would go -- so you can get -- there's enough space beneath Building 503 to get in there with hoses and vacuum out the top foot of soil.

MR. COFFEY: Has the ground been sampled underneath there?

MR. PAULDING: Oh, it has, yeah. There are --

MR. COFFEY: To any depth?

MR. PAULDING: It's been sampled. I mean we do have sample data down to approximately ten feet. That's what why we know that we do have an issue beneath Building 503.

I'm trying -- if you go to slide -- I'm trying to find the actual slide that shows, you know, the sample points.

MR. COFFEY: Uh-huh.

MR. PAULDING: Here it is. Slide 20 or slide 19, I guess it's number 19. So we have -- so here's Building 503, right. You see there's these three samples that are beneath the western end of 503. So these samples got down to some depth, and we have metals results, and it shows that there's lead contamination at those locations.

MR. COFFEY: Light contamination?

MR. PAULDING: Lead.

MR. COFFEY: Lead?

MR. PAULDING: Yes, lead.

MR. COFFEY: Oh, lead.

Mr. PAULDING: So no, the Navy has no plans for demolishing 503.

MR. COFFEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Any further comments? Questions?

MR. PAULDING: There's a much more extensive what we call glossary in the actual proposed plan on some of the acronyms. So the acronyms are only, I guess, spelled out in the presentation, but if you look in the back, pages ten and eleven of the proposed plan, you can see more, some more detail.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula, do you have questions? Comments?

MS. TYGIELSKI: I'm writing one down.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Shall I ask a few questions while you're writing it down?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Cause I can see you're doing something there.

Can you, on slide twenty, can you tell us what the source of the PAH's, polyaromatic hydrocarbons was?

MR. PAULDING: It's -- I mean there's many sources. It's not necessarily easy to say. It can come from burning various things, I mean different woods, plastics, those kinds of things. It could have been –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That's what I'm familiar with on other sites, like at area H-1, so I'm just curious what might have, they might have been doing.

MR. PAULDING: Well there was, I mean it's -- in that period between 1911 and 1938 when they were filling in, you know, the soil, it could have been, who knows, you know, just from the fill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In concentrations?

MR. COFFEY: Didn't you say that was dredge material?

MR. PAULDING: Yeah, it is dredge material.

MR. COFFEY: So why would there be –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And why would it be in certain concentrations? I mean, is it ubiquitous then or is it in specific locations?

MR. PAULDING: It was definitely in specific locations.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Probably wouldn't be from the dredge material.

MR. COFFEY: No.

MR. PAULDING: We don't -- unfortunately I don't, we didn't -- we found PAHs, there were some elevated concentrations, but they weren't necessarily risk drivers. So when we evaluated human health risk and we looked at the various compounds at the site, although PAHs were identified as being elevated in certain areas, they weren't really driving health risk as far as cancer or non-cancer risk.

The ones that were driving cancer and non-cancer risks were the specific compounds that we identified on -- let me see here what slide that was. I don't see it here exact -- oh, this slide here where it talks about 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, ethylbenzene, m and p-xylene, o-xylene, as well as the lead and PCBs were the ones that were really driving human health risks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Then on slide 22 would you have been able to achieve unrestricted use if you'd spent into alternative four -- I'm just trying to remember -- you spent like an extra $5 million is what you'd need to do to get to that?

MR. PAULDING: That's our estimate, yes. And again, it would be -- I mean, yeah, it would be additional money, additional excavation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And how high is the -- in -- on slide 24, how high is the lead content below 503 that you're trying to reduce in, by removing the first, looks like half a foot, not a foot.

MR. PAULDING: Okay, half a foot. Right, the surface soil zero to a foot. It's -- so the remediation goal is 346 milligrams per kilogram, and that's in the proposed plan.

The concentrations beneath the building were, that's on page six in the proposed plan, the remediation goal. But I think the concentrations were between 500 and a thousand beneath the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So you think, you're fairly confident that just taking a half a foot away would reduce it down to acceptable level for commercial industrial?

MR. PAULDING: Yes, because we would remove -- we would remove that half foot a soil, but then we would also replace the soil. So we would put clean fill. I didn't -- you're right, I did not mention that as part of the remedial alternative. Not only would there be the removal, but there would be replacement with clean fill.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Lennar had a similar situation I think under this building that's just down Railroad a couple of doors. Steve, you were there. Did you use similar technology and how deep did you have to go? Do you know by any chance, Sheila or Steve? Sorry to put you on the spot there.

MS. ROEBUCK: It really varies but –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm sorry, you might have to use the microphone. Sorry to put you on the spot, I know this is totally informal what I'm asking you to answer because I know you're not, you don't have, you're not prepared to --

MS. ROEBUCK: No, I'm not. But I would say is that when we've done remediation of soil for lead, we also take confirmation samples so we know that we've met the commercial industrial standard.

So I'm not sure but I would assume that that half a foot would be what your expectation is, but if after that half a foot is excavated, if samples show that you haven't met the goals, you continue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that so?

MR. PAULDING: I mean those -- that level of detail would be included in the remedial action, in the plan. So I mean, no, that is definitely standard practice, you would, I mean, you wouldn't -- once you did your excavation you would absolutely collect confirmation samples following the confirmation sampling.

If it did show that there was continued elevated concentrations we, I mean, we may or may not, because it depends on, see, the future risk or the future use of the site would determine how we would proceed. I mean, like, it depends on concentrations and what the future use of the site is.

So at that point it would really have to go to, I guess, some kind of decision tree, and we would evaluate it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it looks to me like the future use of the site is for the City of Vallejo to squander that building like they have every other building, the north end of the island, and spend exorbitant amounts of money breaking up perfectly good buildings. But -- so it sounds like you should -- it's sort of difficult situation because your future uses just –

MR. COFFEY: Sit there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- sit there and be wasted, and then you have the difficulty of going in under a building that they're probably planning to tear down, and try to snoop around with a little vacuum cleaner and clean up when, you know -- have you considered the cost of just tearing it down for them? Is that $5 million?

MR. PAULDING: We have not. No, the Navy doesn't evaluate cost for demolishing buildings.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, unless it's part of the environmental cleanup. All right. Well, I won't get into that. It's probably something political or something outside of the scope of this meeting or the Restoration Advisory Board, which I feel like I can talk about at the same time because you're using our Restoration Advisory Board meeting for a public meeting, so --

So it sounds like from your preferred alternative that your bullet on exposure of hypothetical future, I might as well not ask that question, you say you would go to as deep as ten feet, so you're not going to do that because you're not going to do alternative four, that's pretty obvious, with the five million dollar additional price tag on it.

Vapor intrusion into indoor air. You say you have VOC pockets. How are you going to, how are you going to address those? Was I not clear on that? I don't -- just ask the question here because I guess I didn't, I didn't understand what you were going to do about that.

MR. PAULDING: Right. So the plan for, so there's -- the major VOC pocket or chlorinated is down in subarea two right here in this -- so if you remember, Excavation C that was performed in 2010 was targeted at trying to address the chlorinated solvents that were identified in this area. Unfortunately, it didn't address it.

And we followed that up in 2013 with a pretty aggressive sampling. We placed, I think it was, fifteen or so soil gas monitoring points. We collected groundwater samples, additional soil samples to try and bound the extent of the chlorinated compounds, that plume.

We believe we did that, and that's identified by this, by this, again, seafoam green rectangle here which is also in the presentation.

But, so that -- the plan to address this area of contamination is to excavate to 20 feet under alternative three so that -- and then fill it with clean fill material so that it will be usable for commercial industrial uses.

But then there's also, to use the pocket term, there's pockets of contamination along Azuar Drive. If you remember, there's a pipe, there was a pipeline that ran north-south here and connected over. So there's some here.

There's other areas that are in, outside of the previous excavation that we've identified, there's still some areas of contamination here.

There's some areas north of Building 503 and so on.

So in order to have the site appropriate for residential use we would also have to go in and excavate those additional areas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But they won't be, there won't be -- those will not be a factor for industrial/ commercial?

MR. PAULDING: Right, that's correct. Based on the modeling, you know, based on the time spent at the site and so forth, those areas were not identified as producing elevated risk for a commercial industrial worker.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On slide 26, can you explain a little bit more maybe for the audience and also, I mean, for people who are not Restoration Advisory Board members, but also just where do you, because it is a part of the alternative three package, what evidence you have and what, what contaminants would be suitable for monitored natural attenuation?

MR. PAULDING: So the monitoring, the future monitoring is targeted specifically to soil gas, and it would be specifically in subarea two under alternative three. And it would target vinyl chloride and trichloroethene compounds.

And the wells, I mean the design has not been -- I mean, that's something that would be, you know, designed down the road, like actual locations of wells and that kind of a thing --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You're proposing to use that as alternative three, which is your preferred alternative, and it would be curious -- I would be -- I'm curious to know whether you have any data that leads you to believe that natural attenuation has already been taking place?

MR. PAULDING: Well, I mean, I guess we -- unfortunately, no, we don't. We've done two sampling events specifically for chlorinated compounds in this area. They haven't necessarily shown any attenuation.

But we're envisioning, I guess -- I mean I wouldn't call it necessarily natural attenuation, we're monitoring attenuation based on the removal of the source, right. So we -- so this again, this rectangle here, we envision that that is the source material that's below ground. Once we go in and we remove that material we envision, I mean I think it's reasonable to expect that concentrations would significantly drop. But again, that's why we would have the institutional controls that would remain in place until we actually proved that there was a reduction in contamination.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. I'm very curious about number, on slide 28 you mentioned something, maybe you could embellish your comments, stating that you would be requiring the developer to do something, monitoring something or removing something?

MR. PAULDING: So, yes. As part of the institutional controls, once the property is transferred, it would be the responsibility of the transferee, I guess I should use a more generic term. But the transferee, whoever that would be, to -- so if you wanted to build in, for example, right, you wanted to build inside this area, right. This is a defined area. It would be, you know, in the deed, and they would be identified as an area that would require sampling and some form of, I mean there's multiple different ways you could do it.

You could place barriers, you could have passive forms of air that would allow, say, the vapor to disperse before it entered the building; you could have blowers; you could have more active

forms of engineered controls that would prevent contamination to enter the building. So there's different ways that you could mitigate the, say, risk to workers that would be in a space that was over this area. But that would all be, there would be some requirement in the documents that, the legal documents that would require whoever took possession of the property, they would be responsible for looking into the risks and addressing them in some form.

MS. TYGIELSKI: That sounds –

MR. COFFEY: That's insane. Who in the world would do this?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This brings up the same topic we had about two months ago or four months ago or whatever.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Over and over again, institutional controls.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Where you're leaving something for somebody else to try to figure out.

MR. COFFEY: To take responsibility.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: When it's your responsibility.

MR. PAULDING: Well, we're not recommending alternative two, keep in mind, right. We're –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: This is in alternative three where I have the notes.

MS. TYGIELSKI: This is in alternative three.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Vapor intrusion in the buildings under subarea two, and that's under alternative three on page -- I already noted that I'm referring to page 28.

MR. PAULDING: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. So on slide 28, so alternative three, we are proposing to remove this area of contamination. I'm sorry, I thought you were talking about alternative two.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

MR. PAULDING: Sorry. Alternative three, this would be removed. And what we were talking about, that wouldn't, that's not a part of alternative three. Alternative three the Navy is going in, proposing to go in, excavate this material, sample and do post excavation sampling to identify, to confirm that the material has been removed and the contamination has been reduced.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. COFFEY: So clarify. So what she was talking about, those restrictions will not be present in three?

MR. PAULDING: Not -- no, no, not in three. So in three, alternative three, the way we envision alternative three playing out, right, is we -- the plan is to remove the soil, to follow the soil removal up with five years of monitored natural attenuation, or monitored attenuation, okay.

If at the end of that five year period this area has not been sufficiently reduced, then there would be options; either A, right, continued monitoring; and/or B, there would have to be some additional, right, there would have to be something else done, but that else has not been defined.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I think that we should probably address this in more detail in the responsiveness summary. But I also would like to note that for the Navy to design and implement a program for a building that we don't know how it's going to be constructed is –

MR. COFFEY: Or used.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: -- or used is really not something we can do. But we will go into more detail in the responsiveness summary and provide some examples of, in more detail, if that would be -- I think that probably would be best. Cause this seems to be a. –

MR. PAULDING: An issue.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: An issue. So we'll talk about this in detail.

MR. PAULDING: We have a question in the back.

MS. FIGUEROA: I am Patricia Figueroa. And on page 22 it says there's no risk to ecological, no ecological risks on the site. And then on the table three there's a, the first category, overall protection of human health and the environment; how do you define environment and ecological?

MR. PAULDING: Okay. So in table three human health and the environment is grouped together. So it is -- it's kind of an all, this is an all-encompassing category, so it's not specific to -- it's not an either/or, and it's, it's not saying -- I mean, the two statements are not contradictory, first of all.

And what we're saying, this is trying to get at something slightly different than the statement that you identified. This here is saying is there -- would the activity protect future use for humans and the environment. And what we're saying is that alternative one in this case, the no action alternative, which also includes, it doesn't include IC's, right, or institutional controls; alternative one implies that the Navy would just walk away from the property, do nothing, have no future plans to do anything and, you know, whatever happens, happens; right? That's alternative one.

And that is not -- because of the lead contamination, because of the volatile organic contamination at the site, for those two reasons alone alternative one is not protective of human health.

MS. FIGUEROA: How can that be no ecological risk and contamination?

MR. PAULDING: So ecological risk is evaluated differently than human risk or human health risk. And the contaminants -- so there, I mean, there's a lot of detail that goes into things like slope factors for cancer risk.

And when you look at things, when you look at the compounds and the constituents you look at different things or different impacts on humans versus on what they call target animals, target species.

And, I mean, there's numerous and a very, you know, a lot of work that went into evaluating ecological risk versus human risk. And there was -- I mean, the risk levels just don't show up for the target species with these compounds at the depths that they are at and the concentrations that they are at.

So, for example, the VOC contamination that's identified in subarea two, it's at a pretty deep depth; right? That's why we're saying, we're targeting a 20 foot excavation. And typically when you look at, say, like animals, they're not burrowing, say, to 20 feet, and that's why we don't foresee that as a risk to animals.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just had a couple more questions. I just want to state that, concerning alternative three in this whole building, Janet's statement that the Navy says they can't design a long-term remedy if you don't know what the building's going to look like on the site or something like that, then that's not your responsibility; I would think that you could consider in alternatives for the Remedial Action Plan, or the remedial plan or whatever that is. You could consider making that area a parking lot or a park or something like that where you wouldn't have to address some actual building over that property as part of an institutional control in my opinion. So I'm just going on the record with that.

MR. PAULDING: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then on page 29 -- okay. Well, forget it cause alternative four you're not going to do, I already know that, so –

Yeah. Similar to -- I think for consistency, probably you want to be consistent, you stated in alternative three on page 31 that at 503 you would remove lead to one foot on this slide, whereas in the previous slide it says up to half a foot. So you should probably be consistent. And then -- or else I misunderstood what you said. So just go over the notes and confirm that.

And then this is the first time, on page 31, that the word "environment" as far as I can tell comes up, protection of human health and the environment. So I didn't see where you had done any analysis of the impact to the environment, so maybe you could explain that. Again, maybe, maybe I didn't understand what you just –

MR. PAULDING: No.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Maybe you were answering her question ahead of my question, so is that the same thing?

MR. PAULDING: I mean, we did evaluate impacts to the environment. We specifically -- so the work that was done in the wetlands, the adjacent wetlands, subarea four, was -- all that work was done specifically to evaluate risks to the environment. We've also collected all of the soil samples, all the groundwater samples that were done are collected, were evaluated to look at risks to targeted species in the environment.

So what we had said was, very early on in the presentation, was that based on the work that was done that there was no identified risk. See, so here on slide 20 -- 22, I guess it is, "Ecological risk assessment identified no ecological risks associated with the site."

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Even if you had, I can see that you have an exception for groundwater, but even if the groundwater had a contaminant in it that would reach the river, which there's a very shallow groundwater there.

MR. PAULDING: There is. There is shallow groundwater at the site, but based on -- so there are, so there's tables, there's all kinds of things that you can look at, the Water Board provides guidance for this exact situation.

And based on the concentrations that we have at the site, comparing those to the tables and the guidance from the Water Board, there's no -- there's no reason for concern, right. There's no evidence that what's at this site is reaching -- is reaching the Mare Island Strait. And further, I mean we do have downgradient wells that also support that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Great. And my last question is on Slide 32. How did you evaluate subarea three and conclude that there was no, no future requirement to do anything? Because you indicated that it's a parking lot now. But how do you know there's nothing under it?

MR. PAULDING: Okay. So if you go to slide 19 in your packet.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. PAULDING: You'll see that there's quite a number of samples here in subarea three. So again, what we did -- so the way we approached the site was we broke it up into different -- these different subareas. And one of the reasons to do that was to -- was to look at kind of sites based on or the areas based on use, historic use and future use. And so what we did was we -- I mean -- and we had a very, we had a very good number of samples in here, and we evaluated risk just the same as we did in the, in subareas one and two, we also evaluated risk in subarea three.

And based on -- based on review of, say, historical records, historical area photos and so on, there really wasn't, this area wasn't used for anything other than a parking lot going all the way back to World War II. And the samples also verified that. We didn't see any contamination in that area.

Sheila.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. I just have one sort of comment and question. With respect to slide number 32, which is also your preferred remedial alternative poster board that you have, you reference industrial IC and sensitive uses IC. And normally what I'm used to is, when I talk about commercial industrial controls through institutional controls, normally that restricts against sensitive uses.

So when I look at this I thought, when you said sensitive uses IC, that you were talking about having a restriction against sensitive uses; no hospitals, residences, daycare centers, and schools for kids under eighteen, those things would be restricted. And that's what you're talking about with the sensitive use IC.

MR. PAULDING: Yes.

MS. ROEBUCK: But then you have industrial IC in your legend. And I think from your discussion what your expectation is, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you're worried that even after your excavation you may have a soil vapor problem, and you're trying to address the potential for maybe an engineering control or something down the line. Is that right?

MR. PAULDING: Yes. Well, it's not that we're worried, it's that we want to be protective. So the plan as it's, you know, the rough plan right now is that the area identified in the black dashed line, that square, would have an IC that would have a way of, you would have a way of removing it; right? Once you hit like, say, a target with the -- cause remember, alternative three also has monitoring associated with it. So you would monitor it. Once you hit a point that showed that there was no longer a risk at that area, then that IC would go away.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yeah. And I guess what I would just ask that you consider is the IC's are usually imposed at the end, and what you're going to do in the interim is this excavation, which is great because it could remove the need for it.

So, you know, at this point this interior IC that you're proposing is, it just seems like you don't have the data to know you're going to need that, and you may, but it just seems like you're trying

to decide about something that you may not actually need. And you say you're going to do five years worth of analysis of soil gas, so you're going to have a lot of information, and so, you know, I just don't know that that IC is something you could really decide on right now.

But, you know, consider it yourself. It just seemed odd to have the remediation and the IC in the same general place.

MR. PAULDING: Okay.

MR. PAULDING: All right. Any additional questions? Comments?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Paula, you have some?

MR. PAULDING: Paula wrote hers down. You going to give us a written comment?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yes.

MR. PAULDING: That brings the public presentation to a close.

(Thereupon the public meeting was concluded.)

MR. PAULDING: And I think, Sheila, are you next?

MS. ROEBUCK: I am. Neal was supposed to be here but he's on jury duty.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: They have night court?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So you want to take a ten minute break?

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

III. PRESENTATION (Sheila Roebuck [Lennar Mare Island]): *Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) Update and Path Forward - 2015*

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Let's go ahead and get started again. Our next presentation is the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel update and path forward, and Sheila Roebuck from Lennar will be doing that.

MS. ROEBUCK: Should we wait for Myrna? Oh, here she is. Okay. The answer is yes. Okay.

So Janet just gave you the title of the presentation. What I want to do here, and I know, I was just talking to Myrna, that you don't want to hear a lot of things about what we've already done, you would rather here more about what we're going to do. So as we go through this I'm just going to try to point out in the things that we have done how that contrasts with what we have left.

So we're going to talk about what we've done in 2014 in the field in terms of documents; what we've gotten completed; and then tell you what we're going to do in 2015; and our projected schedule for hopefully closing out the remainder of the environmental work on the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel.

This shows the areas where we did fieldwork in 2014. There are fifteen sites here, and they range from some pretty small sites, for example, Building 144, what we did there is we put in one temporary well and we've been taking some samples. So it's very simple work. Contrast that with, you know, Building 637 where we had, you know, thousands of cubic yards of soil that

we removed. So it's highly variable. But there were, as I said, fifteen sites. So remember that number as we go through to talk about 2015.

The next few slides are really just a short description of the work that was done at the various sites in 2014. And I'm not going to read all the words because you can do that.

But what I wanted to point out here is that most of the remaining -- most of the work that we've been doing has been in investigation areas C-1 and C-2. And in future years that's going to be the case as well. Investigation Area B.2-2, that Building 637 work is the last physical remediation work that we expect in that investigation area.

In investigation area C-1 we've done a number of things, PCB sites, polychlorinated biphenyl sites, and fuel oil pipeline sites, FOPL sites.

We've also done some work on Installation Restoration Site 03, and the sediments just east of the quay wall that are contaminated with some petroleum hydrocarbons.

In Investigation Area C-2 we've also done some work over the past year at five or six sites. So a lot of the work that we have been doing has related to either petroleum hydrocarbon contamination or PCB contamination.

In Investigation Area C3, as I mentioned, we did -- you know, I'm just going through this looking at my stuff and not even looking at yours. Okay. The Building 144 that, again, I mentioned that was just a temporary well installation and sampling. We've done some regular groundwater monitoring at a number of sites. The Building 637 area work is done, there will be no more groundwater monitoring there. Fortunately we didn't have any contamination groundwater that exceeded the regulatory criteria.

The other three shown here will continue to have some additional monitoring, and you'll see that as we go through the 2015 work.

Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To jump back to five. Can you tell us what you're monitoring for at Building 866? I know it's in C-2 and you already passed up C-2, but -- I've seen a lot of equipment out there when I drive by every day, but I don't know what the heck they're doing.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. Well Building 866, if you'll recall, was a giant building that's been taken down. And that area was cleaned up for commercial industrial reuse. And it was satisfactory for that. But LMI decided that we wanted to clean it up to unrestricted standards. And in the process of that, the Water Board asked that we install a well to evaluate petroleum hydrocarbon contamination that I think had been associated with an underground storage tank. And what we found was that there was significant contamination there.

And so what has been done is a continuing effort to, one, get the well in; and two, take groundwater samples. And with that work we are looking at it over time, and we've also looked at it a couple of ways. We looked at it without any silica gel cleanup and we looked at it with silica gel cleanup. And that -- the difference between those two has been really significant, but the Water Board has been not looking favorably at the silica gel cleanup method. So we're still working on that one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I don't mean to just like dig in here.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But this is an example of what I personally would find of interest. And I think that -- ooh, I'm so tired of this topic, you know that? Because I seem like the only person, maybe I will be the only community member after Mike moves to –

MR. COFFEY: Texas.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- Texas, and it will just be Paula and me unless we can conjure some more people up who want to put up with this kind of stuff.

But thank you, Mike, for sticking with us for so long.

I've been trying to say that surely you are doing something or thinking about doing something that you haven't done yet. And so here we are having this what we did do. But this sounds like it's kind of a juicy topic. And the Restoration Advisory Board is actually founded under a law that asks us to approach the responsible parties and the regulators with an eye towards thinking about early and often communication about environmental cleanup. That is before you have clearly defined what you're going to do on a site and begun doing it.

So I would remind my regulator friends that that is our purpose, and I would remind our RP friends, responsible party friends, that that is our purpose.

So while I don't mind, and I've said this so many times it's beginning to sound like I'm a wife of somebody's, but the fact is I really don't mind, you know, resting, sitting back after 21 years and saying, gee, we have done a fantastic job together. But I really don't want to sit here and disobey the law, which is what have we got ahead of us and how are we going to be helpful to you in helping you get the work done.

So, please, could I have that on the agenda for one of the upcoming Lennar Mare Island topics, please?

MS. ROEBUCK: I've noted that you're interested in that topic, Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thanks.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. So we already talked about this slide, so I'm just going to go past it.

This is the reports that we submitted in 2014. I'm not going to make you listen to every single word on this, on these slides, I'm just going to point out a couple of things.

We have, as you'll see in the next two slides, there are many reports that we've had submitted. We -- some of these have been reviewed and approved, and we'll talk about that. But a couple of them that are really important to us that we have to get through so that we can present them to the RAB and the public in a public forum are the C-1 and the C-2 RAP.

The Remedial Action Plans for those investigation areas are going through the review process, and the next step will be public review copy of those. And so those -- of all the reports that are here, those are probably the most important to get us to be able to move those areas through to completion.

As you'll see on the next slide, there are, as I mentioned, quite a few reports related to polychlorinated biphenyl sites and fuel oil pipeline sites. Those generally are, at this point, relatively simple and usually things that we think we've got cleaned up. There will be a few that we will be working on in 2015, and I'll talk about that as we go. But for most of these we think

that the remediation that needed to be done has been done, and a number of those have been presented to the RAB over the years.

The other thing that I would point out is the land use covenants that we submitted for review in 2014, of the ones that have been submitted, we've gone back and forth with review with the regulators, only one of those has been executed, and that's the investigation area B.1 land use covenant. The others are in various stages of review. And they have related to three Investigation Areas, B.1, C3, and H-2.

We have got, gotten no further action certification on a number of sites here. Again, these are mostly petroleum hydrocarbon sites or PCB sites. So petroleum hydrocarbons at Building 811 or associated with the fuel oil pipeline sites. There are also, as I mentioned, PCB sites.

The other thing that I wanted to point out was, and I'm not sure that everyone would know this, but investigation area D1.3 north, which is the success center, that area has gotten closed out. We've gotten no further action certification on that parcel. And the pre-decision covenant that was in place there has been removed. That's been cleaned up to unrestricted standards.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What were you cleaning up?

MS. ROEBUCK: Oh, at investigation area D1.3 the cleanup that we did that was the last thing that we did was lead-based paint and soil. So we had actually done that in -- many years ago.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MS. ROEBUCK: And the -- over time the paint had degraded, especially on the side that's associated with the weather, and so before repainting that the paint was tested and found to have some lead, even though it was scraped and repainted before, and so it was again scraped and repainted, and then the soil around the drip lines was tested.

And it was interesting when we were talking about the depth of remediation, when we initially did it years ago some of the remediation was, you know, a couple of feet. In this most recent remediation we had three inches. So anyway, that was the most recent one that we did.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Have you -- I mean, having an old house that has lead paint on it, have you studied a lot why paint peels? It isn't just because it's weathered. It isn't just because it's shitty paint, which it is, American paint is not very good; but it's actually, actually has a lot to do with moisture in the building a lot of times, and how that's, its pathway is to come out of the siding. And it could be moisture that's from the, a roof or roof leaks, other pathways where moisture builds up and then it comes out. And it, no matter what you think you've done to prep, sometimes you aren't prepping for paint to stay on, you're prepping for paint to stay on for a few years until you can scoot. And that's most American paint and the way that it's applied.

So I'm just curious about what you did since this is the second time you've remediated that property for lead, what you did to make sure that that –

MR. COFFEY: Doesn't reoccur.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- that the job was done.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, I think that the time before –

CO-CHAIR HAYES: That would be another good presentation. Hello. Thank you for bringing it up.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well that's, again, work that's been done many years ago.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But then it had to be redone, and this would be a very interesting thing for those of us who have been here that long, as you have. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, with that exercise we didn't expect that we were going to find lead-based paint because we had already remediated it.

MR. COFFEY: You thought.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You hadn't stripped the paint.

MR. COFFEY: You thought.

MS. ROEBUCK: So when we looked back on it, you know, there are some contractors that do a better job than others. And I think, for example, we've gone through a similar exercise in investigation area H-2 because we want to be able to close that out. And we were concerned that there was some peeling paint there. So we went and inspected all the buildings there, and there were maybe eight of them that were of potential concern. And what we found is that a number of those buildings were in really good shape and they didn't have peeling paint, and none of the soil was contaminated. Cause we tested again because we wanted, after the experience we had at the success center we wanted to just feel more comfortable that H-2 is okay.

MR. COFFEY: Ironic that it's at the success center.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Unsuccessful success center.

MS. ROEBUCK: But I think it's a combination that the work that was done on the success center Building 733 and 737 could have been done better.

And this time we used a contractor that we have a lot of faith in, and they did, we think, a really good job. And we have repainted it with non-lead-based paint.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, sure. I'm sure you have.

MS. ROEBUCK: So we don't have an expectation this problem is going to reoccur. I mean, will the paint peel? Maybe. But we don't expect it's going to have lead-based paint because we've remediated that building twice and we've repainted it with non-lead based paint. But it may yet peel.

But for you, for example, with your home, most homes that are older, you know, if they were painted before 1978, it's likely that there's lead-based paint there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, sure.

MS. ROEBUCK: And, you know, HUD deals with that, it's usually not somebody like DTSC. So that's, you know, what most homeowners will deal with. And, you know, whether you deal with that at a property transfer or something, I don't know.

But for Mare Island, we dealt with lead-based paint on buildings, scraped, repainted, and cleaned up the soil in 2005. That work was done a long time ago.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So what about like you've already, DTSC has already certified like captain's row and all of that, because you already did that work, how are those houses holding up and? I mean this is a topic, huh, and we better not waste our time tonight but, you know, I think that you bring up a good point. If we hang around long enough we'll get to evaluate, you know,

how well performing certain remedies are. And I think that would be a topic that would be of great interest.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, in captain's row, for example, that's an area that has unrestricted reuse.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MS. ROEBUCK: There is no, no role that the DTSC currently has unless there's a new problem that comes up. We've remediated that soil. We've remediated all the contamination that we found there.

So we would not go back to D1, D1.1 and D1.2 to look in that way. What we do is we deal with those things as asset management issues, so if something needs to be painted we repaint it. But we wouldn't, we wouldn't look at it from a lead-based paint standpoint because we've already cleaned that up.

Okay. So moving on. Okay. Just some photographs. This was Building 637. We've talked about that with the RAB. We did soil characterization, excavation, restored the site, did groundwater monitoring. We have done all of that, and we have submitted our report describing the implementation and requesting site closure for that. And that's in review with the regulatory agencies.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And is that for unrestricted use?

MS. ROEBUCK: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So that would be for housing and other sensitive uses?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MS. ROEBUCK: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think we should congratulate you if you can get it through the regulatory hurdle, that's an achievement.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, we're working on it, so hopefully the Water Board is going to give us comments back on the report, you know, within the next month we hope.

And investigation area C-1, again I mentioned IR-03 which is the northeastern part of the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel. There are -- there's another photograph here in the lower right of pilot test implementation at industrial waste pump station four and C-1. And then there's at that couple of PCB sites that were worked on there.

Oh, that's weird. I don't know what happened to that.

MR. COFFEY: This page intentionally left blank.

MS. ROEBUCK: Well, I'm sorry, but the photographs are in your handout.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yep.

MS. ROEBUCK: But for some reason they are not on the slide. That's so strange.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You want to borrow a handout?

MS. ROEBUCK: I have one, fortunately. This is just photographs of work that went on in 2014. Fuel oil pipeline sites. PCB sites. And the well installation I mentioned and we talked a little bit about it, the Building 866 area.

Again, no photo, but here it is on the slide. I don't know why that happened. I apologize for that.

This is the installation of the temporary well at building 144. I'm going to mention that a little bit as we talk about 2015. It's a temporary well that we are putting in, - that we have put in, and –

MS. TYGIELSKI: What does OWS stand for?

MS. ROEBUCK: Oil water separator.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Okay.

MS. ROEBUCK: I'm sorry, Paula, I should have said.

That there was an oil water separator in building 144 that was removed, but it created some contamination of groundwater by petroleum hydrocarbons, and so that's why the monitoring well got put in.

Okay. So now we're going to move to 2015, what we expect to do. And again, I mentioned that in 2014 we did fifteen sites where we had fieldwork. In 2015 we expect to do fieldwork at six sites. So it's less than in the past and that's -- we think that's really good news because it means we're getting the place cleaned up and ready for reuse. And we've done that with the input and help of the RAB. And I just think we should all, you know, celebrate that we're getting closer to the finish line.

Building 121 is a site that has petroleum hydrocarbon contamination that's being cleaned up on a concrete floor.

The next four sites noted here are all PCB sites that are being cleaned up.

And then the last bullet is just describing the groundwater monitoring program that we are using at a number of sites, some of which we've already talked about.

And let's go to the next slide, the reports that we expect to submit or have submitted.

The investigation areas B.2-2, D1.3 south, which is the southern part of that investigation area adjacent to the Marine Corps Firing Range, and then for investigation area H-2 we expect to submit the implementation reports for the investigation areas as a whole for those.

As I mentioned earlier, we're really working to try to get the RAPs done for investigation areas C-1 and C-2.

We've got various PCB site reports that we expect to submit; three of them in investigation area C-2, one in C-1. And what I'll point out is that with the Remedial Action Plans, we pretty much know what we believe the remedies are going to be for the remaining sites like these PCB sites, but until we have the RAPs done, you know, we can't -- we can't say we're finished because we haven't got the road map approved.

So in some of these other sites that are shown on this or the reports shown on slide seventeen are individual sites, not entire investigation areas. And I just want to point out a couple of things.

The land use covenants, there are eight documents that we're submitting related to land use covenants. So as I mentioned at the last RAB meeting, that's a big deal for us to get these land use covenants through in order to achieve closure.

And in investigation area C3 we do have a final Remedial Action Plan. So once we do these land use covenants and do one other site, which is the building 144 oil water separator site that I'll talk about, we think we're going to be ready for closure of that investigation area as well.

One of the things that we talked again about with the land use covenants is that we have to do the annual inspections. We do five year reviews as well to make sure that we evaluate the efficacy of the remedy, so that if there's any problem with the remedy we can have the best chance of identifying it and addressing it.

So moving forward. As I mentioned, we don't have a lot of sites left that we believe require physical remediation. There are some sites where, for example, investigation area C3, it says here on the fourth bullet, "Only one more site to close out IA-C3."

What that actually means is that with building 144, oil water separator, we have some groundwater contamination, and we have one well right beside the building that, beside the feature, the former oil water separator that had contamination. So we were going -- it's about, I don't know, about 150 feet from the strait, I think, maybe a little less than that. And we worked with the Water Board to try to say, okay, we have contamination in the building, do we have a problem potentially with contamination that could reach the strait? And so we put in another well.

And what we found is that the well inside the building looks good. In other words, the contamination has -- the concentrations have declined and there are -- it doesn't appear to be a problem. But the new well that's outside the building and a little closer to the strait has higher concentrations. But we only have a couple of rounds of sampling on that well, and so what we need to do is take some additional samples so that we can evaluate whether there's a trend, and then work with the agencies and use that data to say do we need to do more or not?

So, as I mentioned again, most of the sites, most of the physical remediation that needs to be done, that remains is in either investigation area C-1 or C-2. The goals that we have for 2015 are to get a no further action certification on investigation areas B.2-2, which is where Building 637 is, and investigation area H-2.

We will be submitting the investigation area-wide implementation reports to the regulatory agencies within, you know, the next month or couple of months. And we hope to be able to finish that process by the end of the year.

Again, we want to resolve the building 144 oil water separator groundwater quality issue and evaluate if there's anything more we need to do there; finalize the RAPs; and do whatever remediation remains in those investigation areas C-1 and C-2.

So our expectation in terms of schedule for no further action certifications is listed here. And everything is estimated. I mean it's all dependent on how quickly we get the reviews done and comments or responses to any regulatory comments made when our, you know, reports actually go into them. So there's definitely an uncertainty associated with some of these things. And we -- but we do hope in the next year that we can close out three sites.

For example, investigation area B.1, all that work is done, we're just waiting for a no further action certification letter from DTSC. Everything that we needed to do with the land use covenant, the remedy complete, you know, all those documents, the operation and maintenance plan, that's all done. So that, I think if we didn't get that done, I'd be shocked.

The other two, B.2-2 and H-2 will be a little bit more challenging, but we do hope to do them in the next year. The others are two to three years out.

But we hope that we're getting closer and closer to actually cleaning this up and being finished.

MR. COFFEY: I'm coming back for that day.

MS. ROEBUCK: So if you have any questions I can take them now.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So when you say you have physical -- majority of sites requiring physical remediation are in C-1 and C-2, how many is that?

MS. ROEBUCK: We have six that we intend to do physical remediation on in the next year.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: If you have few required physical, few sites that require physical remediation, if not physical, then I would hope that you could come back to us and tell us what hurdles you do face which the RAB members might help you with.

MS. ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Any other questions?

MS. TYGIELSKI: It's good to see progress.

MR. COFFEY: Light at the end of the tunnel.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Sheila.

MS. ROEBUCK: Thank you.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. So we are at administrative business. And if you have any comments on the meeting minutes from last time, please get those to Myrna or myself.

So I'm just going to march through the focus group reports.

Community and natural resources we don't have a group leader right now, so skipping to technical.

MR. COFFEY: We don't have a group.

MS. TYGIELSKI: No report.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: No report. Okay. City report. Erin.

MS. HANFORD: Sure. Thanks. I wrote a couple things down. Thanks. Let's see. Just an update. As you can probably all see, the demolition of building 755 in north Mare Island is nearing completion. It's been a long project but glad to see it go.

The next big project that I'm aware of is the western approach to the causeway bridge. I spoke with our folks on that and they're expecting to start the project in early July. It's a six month project. And they're going to keep one lane open, and that will be the lane -- let's see if I get it right because I didn't write it down -- the lane coming to Mare Island will be open and -- during most of that time. There will be a couple of small closures when they're doing pile drivings and things like that. But that was the concept.

And I asked the folks to try to put something on our website to update folks on what's going on with that project. There's already a project description, but I asked them to put, you know, more bridge closure, those kinds of things, updates on that site.

And then we're just continuing due diligence on north Mare Island.

That's all I have. Any questions? Okay. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Next we have the Lennar update.

MS. ROEBUCK: Which I think I've already given.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You've pretty much covered it all.

MS. ROEBUCK: Unless you want to listen to it again.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar [Weston Solutions, Inc.])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update, Dwight.

MR. GEMAR: Short and sweet.

MR. COFFEY: Very short.

MR. GEMAR: As Michael mentioned, yeah, it's a concise report this month.

Well, we have one document that's being reviewed by the regulators, and that's the investigation area H-1 annual remedy status report for the last year. This is the area that includes the historical landfill. And so we're expecting a concurrence or comment letter from DTSC pretty soon.

And then there's one document that's being internally reviewed by the Navy, that's the Remedial Action Plan Record of Decision for Investigation Restoration site -- or Installation Restoration Site 05 and the adjacent Dredge Pond 7 South and the Western Magazine Area. And those, again, are the sites that are west and south of the golf course. So that's under review by the Navy, and then will be going to the regulators pretty soon.

And then for investigation area H-1 itself, other than the usual monitoring of the groundwater collection system. We do have two wells that we're going to replace in June that have an obstruction in the casings, and we use those wells to monitor groundwater levels. So since we can't get the probe to the bottom of the well we need to replace those wells, so we're going to do that in June.

That's it. Any questions?

MR. COFFEY: Okie dokie.

b) Regulatory Agency Update (Patrick Hsieh [Department of Toxic Substances Control], and Elizabeth Wells [Regional Water Quality Control Board])

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So regulatory agency update.

MS. WELLS: Okay. So let's see. The Water Board, we're trying to continue plowing through documents that are turned in because they keep coming in and they keep coming in..

But a couple things that I wanted to report. One was I had a about an hour and a half conversation last week, I think, with a professor, assistant professor I think she is, from Touro University. She called to ask about documents, where they're available, and to ask some general questions about Mare Island, because she teaches the environmental health and safety class and she wants her students to do a real life evaluation. And so she was asking about the history of Mare Island and that kind of thing.

So I referred her to the repository at the library and to EnviroStore, the Department of Toxic Substances Control database, and to Geotracker, and walked her through a few of those things.

So you may or may not get a phone call, all of you, every single one of you, from this particular professor.

And then the other thing is that we have at the Water Board, our meeting in June 10th, we have a rescission of a 1987 order that is going to be considered by the Board that covers about eighteen sites. And of those eighteen sites, the majority of them are either closed -- well, all of them are either closed or they're being done under other regulatory instruments.

So we haven't dropped any site, but we're trying to clean up some of the historical documents and activities that have been going on.

So then we finished a project where we went through what's going on with all of the underground storage tanks with Lennar Mare Island. We tried to clean up all our files and everything and make sure that when this entire project is done in, you know, six months, there won't be any underground storage tanks left.

And so our next project is going to be looking at all of the underground storage tanks that the Navy had out here just to make sure that we have them all tied up and ready to go.

And that's it. Any questions?

MR. HSIEH: So I don't think I have very much to report. Just working with the Navy and trying to review and turn around documents in a timely manner.

Working with the Water Board and Fish and Wildlife as appropriate.

And, you know, I'm just -- I'm still relatively new, and as we're working on the handoff from Janet, I'm working with her pretty closely and so she's been available. And so as the time goes on, you know, I'll have more and more responsibility and I'll know more about each piece as we go on.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Co-Chairs' Report, that's me.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And me.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And me.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's us. The monthly progress report from the Navy was over on the table. Not too much going on this last month.

We did start a PCB remediation, sampling and remediation project at one Building, 743, which is within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel.

The remaining buildings are down in investigation area one in the southern portion of the island, collecting some samples to assess the presence of polychlorinated biphenyls. And that project will be ongoing through the end of the summer.

We submitted three reports this last month, and we received comments back on three reports. So that's a good sign.

Anyway, that's all I have to report so I'm going to turn it over to Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. I had a call this evening, it was pretty extensive, and it brings up a question. An individual had apparently approached the City of Vallejo trying to learn when the south shore was going to be transferred. And that is slated to become part of the regional park, I might note.

And the city of Vallejo reported to the individual that it was slated to be transferred from the Navy in 2020, and that's five years from now. And it seems to me like there's a lot of work to be done yet. And if the Western Magazine, IR-05, and Dredge Pond 7 South, according to Heather at the last meeting, was about two years out, and its environmental work has been completed, I was just wondering how accurate a five year transfer time would be for the entire south shore and whether, if that's unrealistic -- which I kind of feel like it is -- where those numbers come from, those time frames come from, and whether they -- it might be time to update them. That's one question or comment topic.

The next one is I think that we're quite a bit past due for a Restoration Advisory Board tour, so we need to set a date for that. Might help us get a better feel for some of these sites that Sheila has brought up as well as, you know, Navy sites. Just generally kind of where we are.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then lastly, just to let you know that San Francisco Bay Osprey Days, the third annual, is scheduled for June 26th through 28th, so that's the very end of this next month coming up. And we have appreciated in the past the Navy arranging for access to some extent on the historic south shore.

And all I can say is we have a ton of baby great blue herons, great egrets, and we have osprey either on their nest, 16 total, in Mare Island and on the other side of the river, or having already hatched. So I cannot say how many, but a bunch, how about that?

And so we're really excited that once again Mother Nature seems to be making a place for herself and her young in our preserve. And I think it's demonstrating that as you have your land use decisions made, you know, maybe ten, fifteen, twenty years out, and then you begin to see how those are playing out, it's an exciting process, whether it is the natural world or the, you know, economic, historic, whatever. It's just very rewarding to see those shifts taking place in use.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Well, I'll start looking into the RAB tour dates and maybe send some e-mails out and see if we can figure out a date that works for the group.

But in the meantime, thanks, everyone, for coming.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what about the date thing?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I'm going to have to get back to you on that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And were you referring to the South Shore Area or PMA or both?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, the person was asking for typically about the historic south shore, but I assume that you have a technology you're using to project on based on budget and technical difficulty. So I'm just -- I think it would be important for us to know how that –

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Sure.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- how you're generating that and whether it's on target or not.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Very good. Thanks, everyone, drive safely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, public comment period.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Public comment period?

(No response.)

MR. COFFEY: Seeing none?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:32 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Proposed Plan/Draft Remedial Action Plan, Installation Restoration Site 05 (IR05), Dredge Pond 7S (DP7S), and Western Magazine Area (WMA)
- Presentation Handout – Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) Update and Path Forward
- Weston Solutions Mare Island RAB Update
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, May 28, 2015