

**MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING MINUTES
HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2006**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, September 28, 2006, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G Street, Mare Island, Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:08 p.m. and adjourned at 8:59 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael Coffey
- Paula Tygielski
- Kenn Browne

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

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- David Godsey (Navy Lead RPM)
- Tony Megliola (Navy)
- Brian Thompson (SF Water Board)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)
- Cris Jespersion (Weston)
- Chip Gribble (DTSC)
- Michelle Trotter(DTSC)
- Steve Farley (CH2MHill/Lennar)
- Paula Bohio (CH2MHill)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Kelly Ryan (Tetra Tech)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Bob Bancroft
- George McPherson
- Diji Christian
- Sal Gonzalez

RAB Support from CDM:

- David Lange (CDM)
- Doris M. Bailey (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)
- Carolyn Moore (CDM)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Hello, everybody. Welcome to the September, 2006, Mare Island RAB meeting. We'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the BRAC environmental coordinator with the Navy.

Attendees introduce themselves as requested.

MR. LANGE: Hello, my name is David Lange, with CDM. I'll be replacing Darlene McCrae in the RAB support.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, everybody. We'll go ahead with our first presentation. It's actually not Dennis Kelly. It is going to be—it is a Kelly. Kelly Ryan with Tetra Tech. She'll be presenting the—an update on the D1C85 former degreasing plant, some work that the Navy is doing.

**II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *D1C85 Former Degreasing Plant Update*
Presentation by Ms. Kelly Ryan, Tetra Tech, Inc.**

MS. RYAN: Hello, everybody. Am I on? Good evening, everyone. I'm here to talk to you tonight about the former degreasing plant, in specific, the expanded site inspection (SI) report that was submitted in June of this year.

Just a quick overview. We'll get started here. I'm going to go over the site location and history, previous investigations, and then talk about the expanded SI specifically. The investigation, the risk assessment, and findings, and then recommendations. Now, hopefully everybody has both the handout, which is the slides, and then the larger figures. There are three figures. And as we get to those in specific I'll point them out. You'll see on your handout sheet they're very small, so you would not be able to look at them, you know, without seeing the bigger sheet.

So just to orient everybody, the former degreasing plant is in area C2, sort of the central middle part of Mare Island. This area was used primarily for heavy industrial uses. And even though this is a project that the Navy is maintaining control over, even though this is, you know, in the area for other early transfers. So, flashing back to the 1950's, this is a picture of the site. I'm going to point out a few key features here. So this is building 742. Right at the very end of it here, the small building is the former degreasing plant. And there's a couple of key site features or points of interest for the site. I'm going to point them out here. There are two sumps. Right here is the grinder foundation sump. Here is the location of the grease trap sump. And then there's one manhole—that we'll talk quite a lot about—manhole 85, which is here. Now, this site is about 300 feet west of the Mare Island Strait. This will give you an idea of the distance from the Strait.

The plant operated from the forties to the seventies. It was cleaning metal parts that remained in building 742, which was doing ordnance. It was an ordnance machine shop. The degreasing plant itself consisted of four tanks, two lye, and two degreasing tanks. And these tanks were removed, and the site was filled—or these were filled, the tanks, in 1971. Now, practice at the time was to allow the discharge wastewater to go down to the floor drains through these two sumps that I mentioned, the grinder foundation sump and the grease trap sump. And then—in particular, the grease trap sump had its own line that went to the storm drain system.

Now, the site right now, just so you know, is vacant and has been vacant for some time. Now, flash forward in time to 1994. Things have changed. The plant itself was removed, as I mentioned. The grinder foundation sump is actually now under a building. There's a small metal building here which is actually a loading bay for 742. So this covers over where that one sump was, the grinder foundation sump. And you can see just the general area. This area has either buildings on it or

pavement, there is just not one whit of dirt, plant, or anything at the surface. And because of that there's an extensive storm water system. Basically the area west of Railroad Avenue on the surface by the system, takes the water out to the Mare Island Strait, basically to one outfall, outfall 26, but to some degree also outfall 25 when there is a lot of rain or there are high tides. Especially with those two combined. So this is looking down flat on the site. And you can see this is your first figure. And the big pages. This area here is where the former degreasing plant was. This is the new bay or loading dock area that is extended off of 742. I'm going to try to focus in a little bit here. There. Right here we have the grinder foundation sump location underneath the Bay. There's the grease sump right here within the confines of the original building. And then we have—right here is manhole 85 which is another key part of this site. So just to talk a little bit more about why that manhole is important. The storm water system, as I said, this area is completely paved, it's collecting a lot of runoff to head off to Mare Island. Manhole 85 has become a low point in the storm system. It was originally designed different, but the area has settled and there's some crushed pipes. And actually you can see these yellow areas here denote portions of the line that we know are crushed. So the storm drain doesn't actually function the way it was, basically it slopes in reverse and water doesn't flow the way that it was initially planned. And in '85 that manhole is a low point for that system.

Okay. Key previous investigations. The first one was the storm drain cleaning. This was in 2001, It moved accumulated sediments from the manholes inspection and video logging. And this was what noted that the pipes were, in fact, damaged by settling and had been crushed in some cases. Testing of the sediments showed that there were volatiles and PCBs in six of the manholes that discharged to manhole 85. And to give you an idea of the highest values of the volatiles that were found, there was tetrachloroethene, also known as PCE, at 59,000 parts per million. A big value. And trichloroethene, or TCE, at 10,900 parts per million, another big value. Now, as part of this activity, the sediments were cleaned out of the manholes. And then after the -- cleaning the water, the standing water in the manholes was tested. And there was reduction in the amount of volatiles that were found in the standing water. But at the time the Navy decided to go ahead and plug manhole 85, and then actually the neighboring one along the lateral line, manhole 84. That was a major lateral line feeding a lot of storm water into 85, and so the thought was by blocking those or plugging those up with bentonite, it would limit any further migration of the problem. Following that storm drain cleaning and plugging of those two manholes, there was an initial site inspection. That was done in 2002. And the purpose was to investigate the source of these volatiles, and then evaluate also the Mare Island Strait sediments at the outfalls to see if there was any impact to those.

The soil samples were not that exciting, as it turned out. There were very few detections, basically a handful with chromium, lead, PCBs, and hydrocarbons. And we'll get into why that was in a few minutes. The groundwater samples did have volatiles, as well as PCBs, some hydrocarbons, and metals, but it wasn't the PCE and the PCB that were found in sediment, those were the really big numbers. It wasn't those, it was chlorobenzene that was found this time around. Now chlorobenzene is also a solvent used in degreasing, at least that was the degreasing plant idea. Now, in terms of the PCBs and metals, there was thought that those might be higher because of groundwater samples and particulates. And those type of particulates tend to, you know, absorb metals and PCBs and can change results so that a grab groundwater sample would have higher results for those than, say, a grab groundwater sample taken from a well in the same area. So that's the soil results, the grab groundwater. And the third is the sediment samples at the outfalls. The

sediments looked good. There really wasn't any problem with them. The only thing that was noted was nickel that was higher than some of the comparison criteria that we were using, but that value was also consistent with what are known to be ambient values in nickel in our estuary. Very briefly, this investigation, a fuel pipeline investigation in 2000, it doesn't really figure into our SI report with the recommendations now. So remember it now for at the very end. Basically this investigation excavated, abandoned, and flushed two segments of the pipeline to the southeast of building 742. There was a limited number of samples collected, but they did show TPH, specifically fuel oil in the soil. To give you an idea, the highest concentration of fuel oil was 10,000 parts per million.

So, after those previous investigations, the expanded site inspection investigation was done, and that's the report that was issued in June 2006. So the work that was done, there were three main goals or purposes. First was to investigate the source of the volatiles at the former degreasing plant. And that consisted of a soil gas survey, soil borings and groundwater samples to further evaluate the storm water system as a preferential pathway. And to do that a tidal influence study was done. The third goal was to confirm the results of the grab groundwater samples. And to do that, monitoring wells were installed and sampled. So this is your second figure, the results of the soil gas survey. The highest concentration of chlorinated volatiles was detected in the former footprint of the former degreasing plant; in specific, right here and right here. You can see these probably better on your figures in front of you. But the results for that—for one soil gas point in particular, the highest had PCE at 2,600 micrograms per cubic meter, TCE at 9,000, CIS 1,2-DCE, another chlorinated solvent, at 100,000 micrograms per cubic meter, and then vinyl chloride at 180,000 micrograms per cubic meter. So these are some real big numbers. Now, these soil gas results were compared to industrial environmental screening levels for ESL's from the Water Board to help evaluate the data. But numbers that big, you'll see how these affect the human health risk assessment when I get to that. Soil and groundwater results, this is your last figure. Now, one of the goals was to evaluate some of the PCBs that were found in manhole 85. So there were additional samples taken around that manhole. And it looks like the PCBs that were found the first time around were really the limit of the PCBs that were found at the site. The surrounding samples, dust, the concentrations fell off, and they were well below the industrial PRG of .74 PPM for PCBs. Now, these are just the groundwater results here. But basically, again, the soil samples were not that interesting. The PCBs were delineated. There were some low levels of chlorinated volatiles. One boring—I'm going to point it out here and you'll see it on your figure—but it's SB-16 -- you have to get close to see it up here—I can't read it either. It's in the footprint of the former degreasing plant, but the one soil sample that was at all interesting had 2,200 PPB of chlorobenzene. But for the most part, it wasn't the soil samples that were the drivers for the site.

However, groundwater results—if you look at the groundwater samples in your figure, you're going to see the chlorinated solvents. And we had vinyl chloride, chlorobenzene, and PCBs. And, in particular, the vinyl chloride is going to be something that affects the risk assessment. You can see the results on your figure. But again, primarily you see your red dots right here in the former degreasing area plant, and then again around the manhole. So how did—the last part of the puzzle is the tidal influence study. And actually you can look back on your sheet and I'll show you where the two piezometer pairs are. They're approximately up here and down here. Their difference is about one hundred feet between them. The ones that are closest to the Mare Island Strait, they did, in fact—this is the northeast pair—they did, in fact, show that there was preferential traveling of

materials in the corridor, and they did show tidal influence. The ones that were further in, another hundred feet closer, closer to actually where manhole 85 is, did not show that.

Now, wrapping that information together into the human health risk assessment. Now, both—this is an industrial area, so the expected typical reception would be the industrial worker. The risk assessment does both and—evaluates both the industrial and residential scenarios. And in this table, the first two columns are the industrial, the second two are the residential. And then you'll see that the soil samples in the evaluation, basically the risk for the industrial worker, found more or less within the risk range. However, that is not the case when you get down to both the groundwater vapor intrusion and the soil vapor intrusion. These risks are above the risk range. And the results here indicate that some action needs to be taken at the site to address these risks. Now, to help understand what is driving these risks, the vinyl chloride is the primary contributor to the risk that is associated with the soil gas vapor intrusion. And chlorobenzene is the—oh, I'm sorry—vinyl chloride is the primary contributor in both cases for the vapor intrusion. So it's just not a healthy compound. And in both cases that is what is driving the risk above the risk range. In the case of the hazard indices—and this is the non-cancer hazard indices—those are driven by other chlorinated compounds, specifically the DCE and the vinyl chloride. But again, these are hazard indices greater than one. So like for the cancer risk, we're looking for risks above one times ten to the minus four. That's the upper end of the risk management range. Not to say that you wouldn't take action within the risk management range, but these are over that. And then for the hazard indices you're looking for an indice that is greater than one. So the findings were that the former degreasing plant is the likely source of these chlorinated volatiles, and that the manhole 85 is acting as a secondary source. The storm water system can act as a preferential pathway for groundwater contamination. The PCB contamination is limited and defined in soil. And the risks that are posed by the vapor intrusion, both for groundwater and soil, are risks that require further action under CERCLA.

So there are five recommendations from the report. First is excavation at the footprint of the former degreasing plant for a couple of different reasons. One, to remove sources, such as the grease trap sump and line, if they're still present. These areas are covered, and in some cases have a building on top of them. It's, you know, difficult to know what is exactly going on underneath the ground. And then to also remove secondary sources such the contaminated soil. The second recommendation is further inspection of the grinder foundation sump. That's a sump that's to the west of the degreasing plant. Right now there is an existing oil water separator there, which may be the original sump that needs to be investigated further. And then also to collect samples that are along an IW line, an industrial wastewater line, that runs through a portion of the site. The third recommendation is to install additional wells. We have some idea of the extent of the groundwater impact, but towards the southeast additional information is needed. Also need to assess whether there are any other potential upgradient sources, and whether these groundwater contaminants that we are finding are being detected consistently. It's important to know what's happening with the groundwater over time. Fourth, address the petroleum contamination from the nearby fuel oil pipeline. That was the report that I had talked about earlier. Basically the pipeline was removed but the soil was left in place. And that needs to be addressed. And then we wrap that together into a remedial investigation that would evaluate not only human health, but ecological risk. The risk assessment that was performed in the SI was a screening level risk assessment, and this would be a more full evaluation. That's a summary of the report. Are there any questions?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Oh, there are questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What—back to you plugged manholes along the—this is way back near the beginning in the storm drain cleaning, they were plugged with bentonite.

MS. RYAN: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In what form was that? I mean, I've heard of plugging lines with concrete, but I don't know how the bentonite gets—

MS. RYAN: It was my understanding it was chips in the line that went into the hole. But I'm not familiar with that action. But it was chips of bentonite that were placed in, and then once you add water to bentonite it swells.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It swells.

MS. RYAN: Yeah. So I believe that's how the material went in as a material to plug the lines.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On all those high numbers that you—of TCE and those things that you said were really big numbers.

MS. RYAN: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess I got lost between those numbers and the human health risk assessment where you only had vinyl chloride presenting a human health risk. And then do you do an ecological risk assessment? Or is that that there's no—I mean, there's a tidal influence, but is there any pathway to ecological organisms?

MS. RYAN: Well, I'll do the ecological part first. So when they did the SI, the initial thought was to look at the sediment out in the Mare Island Strait. Because the site is completely paved, there's no habitat, but to look at how it might have impacted an adjacent area that does have ecological habitat. But part of the information that was missing was an evaluation of the storm lines that didn't happen until this very last date. So now that that has been done, and tidal influence has been noted, the recommendation is to perform an ecological risk assessment in the remedial investigation.

Now, some of those really big numbers, the biggest numbers were in the sediments that were in the manholes, and those were cleaned out, so they were removed. In terms of some of the volatile degreasing compounds, they are not the worst. They're not great, but they're not the worst thing when they are not degraded. But what happens to most chlorinated solvents is they go through a degradation change, and they end up with vinyl chloride. And vinyl chloride is not very healthy and it tends to hang around much longer. So the reason—that's why the vinyl chloride numbers drive the risk, and that's—even though those numbers were not very big—but that needs to be taken into, you know, the whole total picture of the risk, but—since the risk just from the vinyl chloride is above the risk range. There are other things that do contribute, just

in a different way. And in some cases like -- to be specific, the chlorobenzene contributes actually more to the non-cancer hazardous risk, driving that up. Did I answer all your questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have a question. It's kind of about manhole 85 and manhole 84, they were plugged with bentonite. Does the area flood now?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good question.

MS. RYAN: That I don't know. Does it flood? I'm looking at David.

MR. GODSEY: Well, the area always flooded. The storm drain system in that area is dysfunctional. As a matter of fact, the subcontractor we had out helping us clean the line has been called out to Mare Island a number of times specifically to help clean out that line. And so that area does flood. There are flow reversals on the storm drain system that leads to flooding away from the manhole but not towards the Strait. So, yes, it does flood, and it probably still floods today even with the bentonite in it. So I don't think it really makes a difference.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Okay. Now. I forgot what I was going to ask. Anyway, on page three under expanded site in the SI finding. At the bottom of that box it says, "Risks require further action under CERCLA." I tried to match up those letters with something in this presentation but I couldn't. What is CERCLA?

MS. RYAN: CERCLA is the—

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Comprehensive—

MS. RYAN: Comprehensive—my brain just went because I stopped talking. Go ahead, I don't have my microphone either. It's Comprehensive Environmental Resource—

MR. SILER: Response.

MS. RYAN: Response Liability Act.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Liability Act.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's a federal law.

MS. RYAN: It's also called the Superfund law.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Its the Superfund law, and it's what the Navy follows at several sites to do the environmental cleanup. Dwight.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

MR. SILER: Actually Michael we're going to do a reversal here, Dwight is going to go next and then I'll go next.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: So next will be Dwight Gemar to do the IA H1 field work update.

**III. WESTON PRESENTATION: *IA H1 Containment Area Field Work Update*
Presentation by Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston Solutions**

MR. GEMAR: Okay. Well, sorry for that delay. My name is Dwight Gemar, I'm with Weston Solutions. And as Michael indicated, I'm going to give an update on field work associated with the investigation area H1 containment area.

This is work that is funded by the Navy through a grant to the city, and the city in turn has retained Weston Solutions to implement the requirements of that grant, which includes environmental closure of investigation area H1 and a couple of other sites. For those of you that might not be familiar with the location of this area, it's located in the west central part of Mare Island. This is the causeway bridge here coming in from Vallejo, and this area over here is where the new housing exists. The cleanup requirement or the remedy for this site is—includes a containment barrier over a 72 acre area within the 230 acres. And that containment area is shown here in kind of green on this version, but more yellow on your handouts. It's located in the southern part of the investigation area H1, and it's surrounded by some seasonal non-tidal wetlands and former dredge ponds. And again, this is the new housing area over here about a quarter of a mile or so from the site. As a reminder for a lot of folks, the selected remedy for the horizontal barrier consists of several layers.

The first layer—first of all, there's a compacted foundation layer of soil that is prepared over the existing waste materials with a minimum thickness of two feet. And then a gas collection layer consisting of a geocomposite is placed over the foundation material. And as a show and tell I have a piece that I'll pass around. This is the geocomposite for the gas vent layer. It goes with the fabric side down against the soil. And this provides basically a very permeable conduit for gas to migrate up along this layer, and it passes up to high point vents that are placed in the cap. This type of fabric or geocomposite also serves as the drainage layer up here, which is a different sheet, but it's the same type of material. And in that case it goes this way with the fabric up against the soil, and this allows any rainfall infiltration through the soil to percolate through the fabric and then pass underneath along these channels. So it—it's the same material that serves two different purposes in the cap design. The next layer from the bottom up that goes above that geocomposite vent layer is what's known as a geocomposite clay liner. And this is a very thin material about a quarter of an inch that is filled with very low permeability bentonite. And it serves as basically a backup to the high density polyethylene geomembrane that goes above it. And again, the purpose for this, as someone mentioned with the bentonite chips, is this serves kind of a similar function. If there were to be a leak in the geomembrane, then this geocomposite clay liner underneath would swell and

seal that leak. I have an example of that material as well that I'll pass along. It's in a bag because it does have clay in between the geotextile on either side of the material. But that goes above the vent layer—the gas vent layer. And then we put down a layer of 60 mil thick high density polyethylene geomembrane which is what this material looks like. We actually have two different kinds. We have smooth, which is this type of material for the slopes that are less than ten percent. And then for slopes that are greater than ten percent, we have a textured version of this which provides greater friction, and in between the materials on either side of it. And then, as I mentioned, the geotextile material that's going around is also used—or geocomposite material is used as a drainage layer above, and then we put two feet of soil on top of all of that. So the cap system construction sequence, as you might surmise, starts from the bottom up. So the first thing we do is we place and compact the foundation material in order to provide a smooth surface with no protrusions, no rocks, etcetera, for the geosynthetics to be deployed on top of it. We also grade the site so that there's adequate drainage of rainfall above the geosynthetics. And then we place the geocomposite soil gas vent layer, followed by the geocomposite clay liner within the RCRA permitted areas. And above that is the high density polyethylene membrane. And finally, the geocomposite drainage layer. And then after that we spread two feet of soil on top of the geosynthetics using a low ground pressure dozer. And we also install vent pipes at the high points to allow for venting of primarily methane that's generated by the decomposing waste so that it does not accumulate underneath the landfill geosynthetics. And then, lastly, we'll hydroseed the surface, the soil cover with native grasses for erosion control.

So most of my—the rest of my presentation is basically a series of photographs to show kind of the process in action. In this particular photo, this is a subgrade preparation, and you can see a smooth drum roller compactor that is vibrating and compacting the soil to make a nice smooth surface on which these geosynthetics will be deployed. And here is a roll of the geocomposite soil vent—soil gas vent layer that is going on top of the prepared subgrade. And, again, it's assisted by the forklift with a piece on which they can just unroll the geosynthetics. And the geocomposite clay liner is deployed in a similar fashion. It's basically like a giant roll of toilet paper, and the guys grab it and start pulling. It's very heavy. You know, you might have surmised when you looked at the sample, if you can multiply that by hundreds of feet by the width of this roll, it's a heavy piece of material. Then the next product that goes down is the high density polyethylene geomembrane. And in this case the material is overlapped and it is fusion welded using a special machine that has a set temperature and speed, and it basically automatically travels along the seam. And this gentleman here, you know, makes sure that it's tracking correctly, and it's not getting off course as it were, and it's maintaining its proper speed and temperature. And what that does is it basically seams both sides of the overlap in order to provide a leak-tight joint, if you will.

And I have another example of that. Where this is a coupon cut from a piece of seam weld—or a seamed weld—a welded seam. And if you look at it from this angle, you'll see a little gap between the two pieces of the two seams on either side on the overlap. And what that is, that is used to do an air pressure test of the seam. The gentlemen will put a needle in one end of this seam, and put it up to pressure with air to about 30 pounds per square inch, which is about similar to what your tires are on your vehicle. And then they'll wait several minutes and determine if there is any leaks which would be indicated by a decrease in the air pressure. So that's how you do a non-destructive test of the liner. So if you want to look at that from the angle or the end angle, you can see that little gap where the air pressure test is applied. And before we put the cover soil down, this is the

final product, which is that geocomposite clay liner that I mentioned. In this case, again, the fabric of the drainage layer goes on the top against where the soil will go. And then in this case the panels are overlapped, and the grid pattern, the grid material that is noted on the sample is tie wrapped every so many feet or inches, depending on where the seam is. And then the overlap is heat bonded together so that the dirt doesn't get into the—or get underneath this material. The water will go through, obviously, but not the soil. And then the final step in the process other than hydroseeding is to provide a two foot soil cover over the material. And, again, we use dozers with wide tracks, which provide very low ground pressure, and they very systematically and carefully push the soil out over the geosynthetics so as to not damage the geosynthetics. And once you have two feet of dirt on top of the geosynthetics, then you can operate, you know, any kind of machinery on top of it. You can see here one of the gas vents. And one of the—in addition to being labor intensive, placing these various levels, layers of geosynthetics also requires a good deal of quality control and quality assurance which starts basically at the factory. Weston retained an independent laboratory to actually go to the factory and sample each roll of material that was destined for Mare Island. And we run a number of tests on it to make sure that those rolls pass the requirements. And that's in addition to the manufacturer's own testing.

Once the materials are loaded on a truck and delivered to the site, as they're being unloaded we check to make sure that the roll numbers that we are receiving are the roll numbers that were tested at the factory. It's not uncommon for the factory to sometimes make a mistake and to put the wrong rolls on a truck. And so if those rolls—roll numbers don't match our numbers that we have confirmation testing on—or conformance testing on, then we set those aside and they need to be returned to the manufacturer. But if the roll numbers match up, then we check to make sure there's no damage in transit. And if none, then we can use it on the site. We have a number of folks that observe every facet of the operation from the subgrade preparation to the overlaps for the panels on the geosynthetic layers, and also on the air testing that is done on the seams that I mentioned.

And also we do destructive tests. Every 500 feet of the seam we actually cut out a piece of the seam and run some additional tests on it. And I have some examples of that that I'll pass along—I'll pass around. This is actually smooth and textured material. And the tests that they run in addition to the air channel pressure test is they'll basically pull on either end of this—of these samples and determine when it fails. And there's a certain criteria that has to be met in order for that seam to be considered good. And then they also do what they call the pull test, which they'll basically yank apart each end of the seam on either side of the channel; and, again, will determine where that—where those materials pull apart. And, again, it has to be at a certain minimum value in order to pass. So I'll pass these around. These are both the textured material, which is the rough surface of the geomembrane, and then the smooth. So there's lots of testing. Weston by itself has seven folks that do nothing but quality control. And then, in addition, there's an independent quality assurance engineer who comes onto the site periodically to observe the operations.

And from time to time we also get dignitaries that show up. This happens to be Michael Bloom, David Godsey, and Dave Clark from the Navy who came by. And here are—one of our QC personnel is explaining the pull and peel test that's done on these coupons—the coupons that are moving around. And occasionally we even allow the regulators to come to the site. There is Chip on the far right, our independent QA engineer is on the left, and Bob King is kind of in the middle. Izzat Amedea of the Navy ROICC is in the photo as well. So they're getting a briefing of the

activities. And that was a couple weeks ago. In terms of the work schedule. We plan to implement the cap in two phases. Because of the large size of the area, it can't all be done this year. So the phase one is in the western two-thirds of the containment area. And we're hoping to get that done by basically mid-November. And then the remaining part of the site to the east, which we call phase two, will be done in 2007. And we have, of course, some other activities going on parallel with this. So that's what I had as an update. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: No questions, I guess.

MR. GEMAR: I'll be around.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just a comment, on your presentation I noticed you have quality quality personnel.

MR. COFFEY: One of Weston's quality quality.

MR. GEMAR: Oh, well, we're double of quality. But you can tell I put the slide together because it didn't have quality.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's just full of quality.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Dwight.

MR. GEMAR: Thanks for pointing that out.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Is there—this is our first public comment period—our first public comment period. Is there any public comment? If not, we're going to go ahead and take a break, and we'll let Neal set up for the next presentation.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

**IV. LENNAR MARE ISLAND PRESENTATION: *Lennar Mare Island Land Use Covenant Update*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar.**

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. We're going to get started. Next up is Neal Siler, and he's going to present an update on the land use covenants.

MR. SILER: Well, thank you, everybody, for coming in. Can everybody hear me without using the microphone? Nod your head yes.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I can, yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No, you have to use it.

MR. SILER: I have to use the microphone.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's harder on older people.

MR. SILER: I've been told I'm loud.

MR. FARLEY: Separate issue.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In the way you dress or how you—

MR. SILER: All ways.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. SILER: Okay. My name is Neal Siler, and I am the environmental manager for Lennar on the eastern early transfer parcel of the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard. I'm going to talk about the land use covenants that we're using as either partial or full remedies, and give you an update as to where we are in that process. And how I'm going to talk about that, I'm going to run through a little bit of background about land use covenants. I'm going to talk about some of the program components that have been put together to date; talk about some of the land use covenants that we have actually put into place on a portion of the island; gonna talk about what I see as anticipated land use covenants in the future; talk about some of the challenges; and after that, I'll open it up to questions from the audience.

Now most people always hear these terms about LUC's and land use covenants, but I want to make sure everybody knows what we're talking about. For this presentation what I'm really talking about is a written instrument or an agreement that's designed to prevent exposure by the public to concentrations of chemicals that are residual concentrations of chemicals that are left in place either during or after we cleaned out the island. What they actually put in the land use covenant, they specified the restrictions on the real property, and in so doing they affect the title. And how they affect the title is actually they are tied to the land itself, and they are said to run with the land. So future property owners—the current property owner and future property owners will be affected by these land use covenants that are put in place. And how the future property owners get notice of that, these land use covenants are recorded in the county recorder's office and attached to the deeds, and they remain in effect until either they are terminated by actually doing some other action at the site, or modified. And when that gets done, it's done with an application to DTSC, and actually DTSC has to approve those modification determinations. So just to give you an idea of some of the background for this and where you can find this in the statutes in the State of California, the major sections are the California Health and Safety Code, and also the California Civil Code. There are minor sections in the California Government Code that correspond to the land use covenants, and also in some ways, when you're dealing with school sites, in the Education Code. Where this really started coming up in California was around 1987 when DTSC made a recommendation that they wanted to develop a policy where land use covenants were considered to be a partial or full remedy for contaminated sites.

Now, the first time I ever came across a land use control was right around 1996. And that's when most people started really seeing these things coming into vogue was around 1996, when I worked

on a hotel site in the South Bay where we actually put a commercial industrial restriction on that site. And that was done with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Now, around 1999 some of the regulations got changed where DTSC was to actually maintain a list of these sites so that the public can see them on the—had access to them. And I went and checked today on that site, and I want you to know that Chip, Henry, and Bill and everybody at DTSC, and Michelle were doing their job, because all those land use covenants that we recorded on our portion of that property are on that website. And around the year 2000, 1999, and even when I was doing this in 1996, the question always came up when you put these land use covenants on these properties, how do we know that people are going to comply with these as they move on into the future? And that was always a question even back in 1996 and from the time these were actually recommended or even started being developed. In around 2000 some draft regulations were floated around, and those actually became law in 2003, the final promulgation of those. And what happened in that is that you still have to specify the restrictions on the property, but now there has to be a full—what's called implementation and enforcement plan, that's how the regulation reads—that says how are these controls going to be enforced, implemented as you go on through—as a land transfer—excuse me—as the property is transferred. And what that has actually come down to us now, that is called, in our parlance, an operation and maintenance plan. So here are some of the program components of the land use covenants. You actually have the land use covenants themselves. What you usually see in a land use covenant, you see a description of the site. You're going to see a history of the site. You're going to see potentially what the sources were. And what is the maximum concentration of chemicals that are left in place. You're going to see those environmental restrictions on the property. And some of those things I talked about earlier, like running with the land, they're going to be affecting the title, they have to be recorded, the future property owners, occupants, and lessees have to be notified of these land use controls. Those are in a section called general provisions. Some other things that usually have come up are some other sections, and I'll talk about those later when we talk about specifics of the land use covenants that are in place in investigation area D1.2 on our portion of the property.

In addition to that, there are some agreements that are put in place, and those agreements are usually between the covenantor—which in our place that's going to be Lennar—and DTSC. And potentially we may have some agreements with the city. And there potentially could be some agreements between DTSC and the City of Vallejo. So those are all being worked out right now. In addition to that, as we move forward, we're trying to get a third party entity on board who will actually do the oversight for the implementation and enforcement of these land use covenants, and we're going to have to get an agreement together with that county right now or whatever that entity would be. And actually I've negotiated that agreement with them, and I'm waiting for some of these other agreements to fall into place so that we can go ahead and get the full implementation of that program in place. And what they're going to be actually doing is they're actually going to be implementing this implementation and enforcement plan. And as I mentioned, that's now called an operation and maintenance plan of our portion of the property. And it includes the implementation and enforcement plan, and the long term of the covenantor, the future property owners, DTSC, and the other responsible parties that would be involved in implementing these land use covenants.

Okay. The next thing I'm going to talk about is some of the recorded land use covenants that are actually in place on the eastern early transfer parcel of Mare Island at this time. And for portions of the property that we have not received no further action certification on, there is actually an

overarching pre-decision covenant that really has all the restrictions except for one. There's an additional one, some of the new ones that fall into place for the parcels that we've closed, except for the ones that are unrestricted land use which have no restrictive covenants placed on them. And those controls are basically a prohibition of sensitive uses of that property. You couldn't have any residences on it, you couldn't have any schools for people under eighteen years old, no daycare centers, no hospitals. Now, in investigation area D1.2, which is the first investigation area where we actually have land use covenants in place, all those comments were recorded on March 31st of 2006. And those are the ones that you can find if you go on the DTSC website. So those eleven land use covenants are actually a regional land use covenant which carries all the environmental restrictions that are included in the pre-decision covenant, plus there's one on the growing of the plants for human consumption in native soil. So that's the additional one. The reason that that one's on there is the risk assessment that was done for the property does not include any kind of a risk assessment for the consumption of soil. Chip?

MR. GRIBBLE: You're only talking about the land use covenants for the eastern early transfer parcel?

MR. SILER: That's correct.

MR. GRIBBLE: But there are others listed there; is that correct, or you didn't notice, on the Web site?

MR. SILER: Oh, yeah, I just looked for ours. But my understanding is on the Web site, DTSC has all the land use covenants that are in place up to this time. I only looked at the ones that I'm responsible for. In addition to that regional land use covenant, there are some site specific land use covenants, and those are mainly for polychlorinated biphenyl sites, or PCB sites, and those are regulated by both DTSC and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. And the types of covenants are basically the commercial industrial land use restriction. There are some where there's surface encapsulation. Some where there is encapsulation by a transformer that was an active transformer. And some that are low occupancy sites. And I'm just going to show you some examples of each of these sites. This is building 605 in investigation area D1.2. It's the former telephone exchange. And if you look at the floor, you'll see this area right here that the cursor is going around, this floor has some residuals PCBs on it. So the remedy was to actually—to put coatings on this floor. And then as we go into the future that coating will be maintained. So this coating here is actually about two major coatings. The underlying coating underlying this upper gray surface is a deep red. So if you actually got through this surface, you could actually see the red coating, and you'd know that that top coating had been breached.

Other types of PCB sites that we have in investigation area D1.2 are ones where there's encapsulation by an active transformer. And this only occurs at sites where we actually have active transformers in place. So the transformers that are sitting on these pads, building 872 and building 1322 which are up in the former hospital area and what is now Touro University, encapsulation is by the transformer itself on these sites. So there's the transformers right there. There's an epoxy coating around the outside of the transformer, so those are going to be maintained. Now, one of these sites is actually Carolyn D'Almeida's favorite site, and it's this site right here, building 229. And this is actually a low occupancy site. And really what this is—pertains to is on top of the

elevator right here, if you go up on top of here, there's actually the elevator equipment room. And if you can see in here, there's actually still some oil that is still in the area that actually has some PCBs in it. But because this is not going to be an area where people are normally going to be going, it can be closed under a low occupancy restriction under U.S. EPA TSCA regulations. And this right here, this is building 671, and this is another low occupancy site. And this is an electrical substation that actually is in a portion of D1.2. And this site will eventually be closed. But to go ahead and start doing the remaining development that we have in that area, we're going to actually build a new substation along the side of this. Once that substation comes on line, then we'll go ahead and remediate this site. We'll apply to go ahead and take the restrictive covenant off that area at that time. Now, some of the future anticipated land use covenants that I see—and I'll go through this by investigation area. In investigation area B, there's actually going to be two. They'll be this regional land use covenant. And you'll see as I go through this there will be some where I talk about a regional land use covenant, and some where I talk about an investigation wide land use covenant. And the difference there is there will be portions of investigation area B that will be developed for residential use. That means that we've cleaned up those sites to unrestricted land use standards and, therefore, there's not any reason to have the restrictive covenants on those property any longer. But other areas that we've actually cleaned up to commercial industrial standards, they will remain to have the restrictive covenants on the property. So in investigation area B.2 it's going to be the regional land use covenant which will be in the commercial industrial area.

And also there's one PCB site, which is a PCB site in building 455, that will have another land use covenant. And that, again, will just be for commercial industrial restriction at that area. And in investigation area C.1, which is the area that is—as you first come out of the island across the Mare Island Strait bridge right there, you look off to your left, there's going to be ten land use covenants. There will be a commercial industrial restriction on that entire portion of the property. There are also going to be five PCB sites that are going to have land use covenants on them. And this site is going to have something different on it, too, besides the investigation wide commercial industrial restriction and also the PCB sites. There's going to be two cap maintenance land use covenants where the remedy is proposed to be the cap, and we need to maintain that cap. And that's actually at building 461 and building 273. 461 is one of the buildings right as you come across. It's right off to your left right there. And the chemicals of concern underlying that is lead. And in building 273, which is down a-ways, the chemicals of concern there are volatile organic compounds and chromium. In addition to that, there are two areas in C1 where we anticipate two ground use land use covenants where we don't want to do anything that would influence the natural flow of the groundwater in that area. So monitoring wells are going to have to be maintained, we're going to keep the monitoring points open. We want to make sure that nobody is going to be there trying to trap groundwater or put up barriers that would actually alter the flow of the groundwater in that area. Now investigation area C2 we're looking at thirteen land use covenants, again, the investigation area wide; eleven PCB site land use covenants; and one cap maintenance land use covenant; and that is actually at building 678 which is very close to building 742, which Kelly showed you on the sites in the first presentation here. And the chemical of concern there is asbestos. Investigation area C3, we're anticipating eleven land use covenants. Again, the investigation area wide land use covenant. And ten PCB sites.

And one thing I should point out is all the PCB sites outside of area D1.2 except for one site in, I think in investigation area C3, they're only going to have commercial industrial restrictions. You're not going to see the surface encapsulation, encapsulation by transformer, or the low occupancy, except for that one low occupancy, at any of these other sites. The final area where we're going to have a future anticipated land use covenant is in H2. And there's just going to be one land use covenant over installation restoration area 10, and actually 13 will be a part of it too. And the chemicals are concern there are the PCBs and also poly nuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. They did some transfer of storage back there so they had some oil and they had some PCB waste in that area. So that will be over that entire area, and it will be, again, a commercial industrial restriction. Now, challenges in developing these land use covenants. And although they've been in place, and have been utilized, as far as my experience in about the last ten, eleven years, we're really on the leading edge in actually putting together this implementation and maint—enforcement plan, excuse me, or what's called right now an operation and maintenance plan. So we're trying to get everything into that, and make sure that we have a document that will provide us with workable solutions. And one of the things that we're struggling with is some of the conditions that are placed in the land use covenants. We had a meeting one time where a representative of DTSC said that any molecule of dirt that's taken off any of these areas that has commercial industrial restriction has to be accounted for. And I have a real hard time figuring out how I'm going to account for that, except to set up the guard shack again, and basically search everybody as they go on and off the site, you know, to make sure they're not carrying any dirt off it. So that's a challenge that we have to work through.

Another thing that we have to work through is, again, that additional restriction that appears in some of our land use covenants, which is the growing of plants for human consumption in native soil. Well, if I see anything that's in the actual ground or in a planter box or on somebody's roof, I'm going to have to assume that that's native soil, because there's a thought that potentially if somebody had seeded the top soil, saying that they planted it in the top soil, I still wouldn't have any way of knowing that, so my inclination is to basically say you can't grow any plants for human consumption in these areas. So that's something that we're struggling with. Timing and logistics is something that we're struggling with. We're trying to get all these different agreements in place, trying to make sure that we have everything that's in place. One thing that we're doing is we're going to be working with the city to upgrade their computer program to get that in place. We're working with—to make sure it's compatible with the entity that we would hire to go ahead and implement this program. And we're trying to get all these agreements in place with DTSC and Lennar and DTSC and the city and how these things are worked out. In fact, those things have a tendency to change as we go along and people go on and think about it. So just trying to get all these things together is a pretty major chore.

One thing we wanted to do that is to make sure we maintain open communication. And we're trying to do that. We're going to be doing that through, obviously, presentations here at the RAB, and we're going to be doing some public workshops, putting up some signage on the island as we develop it to let people know exactly what types of controls are in place on the site. And then to do this, we're going to try and ensure a seamless implementation to make sure that, as we go into the future, that we don't have any hiccups. And as I perceive this is that I plan on being here for probably the next ten years. And if we turn this over to another entity to actually do the operation and maintenance, I see that as a transitional process. So I'm going to be involved for at least five

years. And one of the things that we have to do in the land use covenants is we do an annual inspection report, and then there's a five year evaluation report. And so there is a way of going back and taking a look at it and saying, "Does this really work or doesn't this really work? And what adjustments do we need to make to make sure that this is working?" So we're going to be involved in here for a period of time, although at some point you know, LMI, Lennar would plan to sell all of this property off, and we're not going to be here. But we want to make sure there's a good program in place to take this on as we go into the future. So with that, that is really the end of my presentation. So if anybody has any questions I'd be glad to answer them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You said that everything is terribly complicated with the city upgrading the computer system and all of that. Gil, you said at the last meeting that Neal wasn't at that you weren't actually doing anything and hadn't for some time. I'm confused because I guess what I really am concerned about this land use control issue is not whether it's on a DTSC website that's currently maintained, I mean that's great, and not whether you're encumbered with all these various, you know, issues, but at what point the public—let's say—realtors, potential buyers, potential general contractors that would be remodeling the property that a buyer would get, when—me as a RAB member—when am I going to be able to pretend, let's say, go over to the—or for real go to the building department or go to the planning desk and ask about a piece of property and then see how the system works? When am I going to be able to go to—let's say—a website, and see what property has what restrictions? So that if I'm deciding to go to either—my business to go to building 742 or building 652, you know, be able to weigh what restrictions I'm going to be faced with, and whether I want to proceed with a proposal to purchase one property or the other. When is that system going to be up and running?

MR. SILER: And I can't give you an exact date.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't think we need an exact date, where are we going? Timeframe?

MR. SILER: When it will be up and running is the fact that right now, essentially, there is no need for a system like that in place because Lennar is the property owner, and we also have an agreement with the Department of Toxic Substance Control to actually do the implementation and enforcement until another entity comes on board. So while we're the property owner, we know what's going on at that site.

So once we start transferring the properties, at that time we're going to sequence this so that those programs are in place to make sure that those property owners then go ahead, or future property owners or people who work on the site can go ahead and look that information up. So—and where it will come up at, it's going to come up on a building permit. If you want to pull a building permit—and one of the things that we're going to be working with the city on, is we're going to modify what comes up by computer screen that says, there is a land use covenant in this area and, therefore, there are certain restrictions that you're going to have to be aware of before you can go ahead. Now, as far as when we sell the property to people, we're going to be giving them the notification in our disclosure statements of the land use covenants, what is expected of them, what types of responsibilities they would have, what type of responsibilities Lennar would have as we move on into the future.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't doubt that you're going to be doing that; however, we had a whole lot of very upset homeowners over a particular land use adjacent to their property that was really unrelated to their land that was apparently buried—they claim buried in a disclosure package of about 500 pages. And what I'm talking about is as—sure, if someone goes to the extent to pull a building permit, they are fairly well along in their thought process and their planning process to be pulling a permit on a piece of property. That's not early and often enough I don't think. I think when—you want your realtors to be able to access that information, your economic development staff, your—you know, chambers, and your various trades organizations. Because primarily I look at most of these properties that you have these land use restrictions planned for as non-residential properties. And so I would think that the—that those entities would want to speculate on the use of the property long before they're going to the desk to get a building permit. So when will that be?

MR. SILER: Well, again, I can't tell you exactly a date that that will be in place.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm not asking you an exact date, as you know. I'm actually asking for a general timeframe maybe. When in your—when in your process is that going to begin to be available?

MR. SILER: I would think that would be set up and running, I would say, within the next six months. Well.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Well, then, we'll check back with you then.

MR. SILER: As far as the people who are buying the property, they're going to have notice on the deeds because the land use covenants are reported on the deeds. Any other questions? Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: Just a point of clarification. So fifty years from now there's a consensus that—this is making a lot of assumptions fifty years from now—the community concludes that this really doesn't function very well, and they want to undo these things and clean them up. And who—at that point, if that were to all happen, who would be responsible for cleaning them up?

MR. SILER: Well, it depends. And if Lennar is in place, we're always going to have some residual interest in these properties. And depending, at that time it could well be that we are the entity that may have to clean those sites up. But it also could be that the Navy, depending on where we are in this process, could potentially be the entity that would have to clean these sites up.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You haven't talked anything about where the money's going to be coming from to implement this program. Do you have any—

MR. SILER: No, I really don't have—I'm not prepared to talk about that at this time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I think that would be good for you to come back to us with. That would be of great interest, as well, to me.

MR. SILER: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Neal. Next is the administrative business and announcements. Does anybody have any comments on the last RAB meeting minutes from September—

CO-CHAIR HAYES: 7th.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: -- 7th? Thank you. If you do, please get them to either Myrna or myself. Do you have any announcements? Okay.

VI. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: -- With that, we'll go into the focus group reports. And community is still vacant, so our natural resources.

a) Community

Vacant.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Jerry's not here.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Technical, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I have nothing to report this week. Nothing to report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Gil for the city.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: There are no Mare Island environmental issues pending before the city council.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Lennar, Steve.

MR. FARLEY: Thanks, Michael. I have a couple of handouts as usual; a couple of spreadsheets, and an eleven by seventeen handout. If you didn't get one yet, snag 'em over at the front table. Let's start off with the spreadsheets. Our normal list of documents that are in review for your perusal, and both those that are in review and forecast. So take a look at those. If you have any questions about those documents, feel free to give me a holler, I'll be happy to talk to you about them. In our eleven by seventeen handout there isn't much new this time. The—most of the

information that is in the lower right-hand corner in terms of documents in review, upcoming documents, environmental site closure status, most of those are as they were in our last RAB meeting earlier this month. The—in sort of the center of the figure there's a label that says UST 231. That's a location of a former underground storage tank where we're going to be doing some soil gas monitoring sometime in the next couple of weeks. On the left-hand side of the figure are some guys in some protective PPE for their health and safety while they're doing the work. They're inside Building 84 is the old brick, and they're removing the floor inside there. It's part of a PCB site, so they're removing the concrete in the floor. And the main thing about this activity is that both they're inside, and we want to keep the dust down, so one of the major efforts was to use water to control dust while working inside the building. In the upper right corner is the location of the former underground storage tank. We're doing some excavation there to remove some contaminated soil associated with those tanks—with those former tanks. And the other thing is the small blue dots that are in the—or circles that are across the EETP area are the locations of PCB sites that will be worked on as part of the indoor air PCB work plan—or not the indoor air—the indoor PCB work plan that we're implementing now. So that's all I have for this month. Any questions I'd be happy to answer.

f) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

MR. JESPERSEN: Thanks, Michael. Everybody should have a copy of the handout, otherwise there should be some more up on the front desk there. Earlier this month we received some partial comments from DTSC on a document that's entitled the RAP Final Area H1 Remedial Design Plan. And since that's addressing some remaining cleanup activities pertaining to the remedial action plan that was approved back in August, and some items that we're trying to resolve here are the cover soil acceptance criteria and the confirmation sampling protocol for hot spot excavation. And we're hoping to have this document in October. Dwight gave you a nice presentation on the ongoing work at the area H1 containment area cover. As he mentioned in his presentation, we're shooting for 40 acres of this cover to be completed this fall. Right now we've got about fifteen acres of that done. And we're going to be doing some additional work this fall, including removal of some of the hot spot soil from the surrounding seasonal wetlands. And we're also in the process of waiting on DTSC to review a request from the Navy to relocate about 15,000 yards of material that's stockpiled at the adjacent defense reutilization and marketing office site, bring that over to area H1 as foundation material for the portion of the containment area cap that's going to be installed next spring. And then you can see a couple of photographs of the ongoing work there. And then, finally, we've been continuing to do work in the Western Magazine area. We've been investigating geophysical anomalies. And so far we've found over 500 live munitions items and 3,500 inert munitions debris items. Most recently we found a small disposal pit, and found a number of the items there, including stuff back from the Civil War era, the Spanish American War era, and the Vietnam War era. So a pretty wide ranging bunch. And in the photo you can see, as Wayne put it, the catch of the day, as pulled out earlier in the month. So that's all I have for this month. I'd take any questions if anybody has any.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Chip Gribble/Brian Thompson)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Cris. Regulatory update is next. Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: We are—as Cris said, we’re trying to complete the remedial design plan for investigation area H1. We still have a handful of issues we’re trying to work through, but we’re definitely moving forward. We also spent some time out there doing some oversight, and we didn’t notice any problems. Okay; we liked what we saw. Okay; we had a smile on our face.
(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What was the reason?

MR. COFFEY: There was nothing wrong.

MR. GRIBBLE: We also had a meeting—and I don’t know if you’re going to talk about this, Michael, or not. The Navy had an ordnance meeting that we participated in, and I think that might be a good topic for an upcoming RAB meeting, this—you know, the new direction that the Navy is proposing to go in and that we’re considering. So I think that may be good timing to have that sooner. But it involved—the short of it is it involved a lot of reviewing of historical documents. And, in effect, trying to develop a much more detailed conceptual model for the south shore PMA areas to then allow a differentiation of risk across the site. Which really is analogous to what we’ve already done for the dredge pond areas. So I think it’s something that, you know, might have a wider audience of appreciation. That’s about it.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks. I don’t see Carolyn. So Brian.

MR. THOMPSON: Most of my attention has been on the investigation area C—is this working?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah.

MR. THOMPSON: The Investigation area C2 remedial action plan and looking at the supporting documents behind that. And that’s about it.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. I have the Navy update here. We actually recently completed a bathometric survey of portions of the Mare Island Strait and Carquinez Strait. You kind of see an image of a picture down there kind of showing what it kind of detailed. But you can see in the narrative here that it was a bathometric survey that uses sound navigation ranging or sonar systems to collect depth information. And we’re going to use this in our remedial investigation for the offshore sediments. And that was completed in the week of September 11th through the 15th. And we’re still—as you can see down there, a summary report characterizing the TPH in the DRMO, and we’re still planning field work for the fall. We issued one document this last month since the last RAB meeting. The draft final RI for investigation area F2. And we also issued some field variance forms for the F1 area for our upcoming sampling.

In addition, we received comments from DTSC and the Water Board on our site management plan. And the Navy is working on addressing those comments currently to get back to the agencies as far as addressing the comments. And we received one set of comments from the Water Board on site 17. We had a BCT meeting a couple of weeks ago, and our next one is scheduled for November

9th. And the last item is the early transfer. Basically since our last meeting everything is still the same, status quo, we haven't—we're still waiting on a proposal and additional discussions. And that's it. Any questions? No. Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Just a couple of announcements. One, for regulators and potentially for early transfer proponents, the city being one of them—and this won't be information new to you, Gil. But if you're interested in taking a look at the draft of the Regional Park Task Force report, it's embedded in a request for proposals that the City of Vallejo has out for a consultant to help complete and finalize that report. But you can go to the City of Vallejo's website, and then go to the Economic Development Department, and at the very bottom of their website—or that page is the RFP listed. And responses are due, I think it's October 23rd. But it might be helpful to you to see at least what the draft of the proposal by the Regional Park Task Force is. Since a number of you are on the task force, you might also like to see what—how we compiled what you worked on for the last three years for the City of Vallejo. And then finally, just maybe something that Ken would have announced if he'd been on this agenda, so I'll announce for you.

MR. BROWNE: Go ahead.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or I'll let you. I'll let you announce.

MR. BROWNE: The Sierra Club this Saturday 9:00 a.m. at the south gate, we'll be doing a walk out along the south shore to pier 35 and back. So if you're interested, be there at 9:00 o'clock.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Any—this is our second chance for public comment. Any other public comment? Chip.

MR. GRIBBLE: I'm not really public, but a comment that I'll make public.
(LAUGHTER.)

MR. GRIBBLE: Michelle Trotter is going to be leaving the project, and I do want to acknowledge her participation for the last several years. I can't even—was it five years?

MS. TROTTER: Three—three and a half. Not that I'm counting.

MR. GRIBBLE: Three and a half. We really appreciate her help on the project, and we'll miss her. Richard Perry—I think you've all met him, most of you have met him—is going to be taking over the public participation specialist role for Mare Island.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, Michelle, if we'd known we would have baked a cake for you for sure.

MS. TROTTER: Don't need it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But at least a round of applause I think would be in order.
(APPLAUSE.)

MS. TROTTER: Just one comment. Do I have to use the microphone one last time? Even though I know you can all hear me. I hate microphones. Can you hear me? Oh, there you go, it's on. I just wanted to thank everybody. I really enjoyed working on this. I have developed a lot of communications skills working with you folks along with some technical stuff. And I really appreciate Chip's help in guiding me through the technical documents through the last three and a half years. And definitely I hope I still get a Christmas card from Dwight so—I always look forward to that. So anyways, I do appreciate all of your guidance in the past three and a half years. And I, you know, am saddened that I am taken off the project, but there's other work to be done. So thank you.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Michelle. Any other public comment? If not, we will adjourn.

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

The following handouts were provided during the RAB meeting:

- Presentation Handout – Former Degreasing Plant Expanded Site Inspection (SI) Report
- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area H1 Containment Area Field Work Update
- Presentation Handout – Land Use Covenant Update
- CH2MHill/Lennar Mare Island Deliverables Schedule September 2006
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard September 2006

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:59 p.m.)