



DRAFT

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

HELD THURSDAY, September 21, 2011

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, September 21st, at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:08 p.m. and adjourned at 9:08 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
- Jerry Karr
- Maurice Campbell
- Wendell Quigley

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

- Janet Lear (Navy Co-Chair)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy)
- Ryan MacLure (Navy)
- Reginald Paulding (Navy)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Cris Jespersen (Weston)
- Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)
- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board)
- Janet Naito (Department of Toxic Substances Control)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Dan Glaze
- Troy Campbell
- Jeff Morris

RAB Support from CDM:

- Carolyn Moore (CDM)
- Doris Baily (Stenographer)
- Wally Neville

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. Let's go ahead and get started. Welcome, everybody, to the Mare Island Restoration Advisory Board meeting. I'm Janet Lear, I'm the Navy co-chair. And we'll go around with introductions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Myrna Hayes, the community co-chair, Vallejo.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, community member.

MR. KARR: Jerry Karr, Vallejo resident, Napa Solano Audubon Society.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, Mare Island resident.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, Mare Island -- RAB member from American Canyon, but I want to live on Mare Island.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MS. WELLS: Elizabeth Wells, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board).

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

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

MR. JESPERSEN: Cris Jespersen, Weston Solutions.

MR. PAULDING: Reggie Paulding, U.S. Navy.

MR. MACLURE: Ryan MacLure, U.S. Navy.

MR. GLAZE: Daniel Glaze, Mare Island resident.

MR. MORRIS: Jeff Morris, Remedy Engineering.

MR. CAMPBELL: Troy Campbell, Remedy Engineering.

MS. DREYER: Marie Dreyer, U.S. Navy.

MS. MOORE: Carolyn Moore, CDM.

II. PRESENTATION: *Installation Restoration Site 04 Data Gaps and Remedial Investigation Update*

Presentation by Mr. Reginald Paulding (Navy)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we have two presentations for you tonight. Reggie Paulding with the Navy will be presenting on Installation Restoration Site 04 data gaps, and remedial investigation update. And then after that we will have a presentation by Neal Siler of Lennar Mare Island on the investigation Area D1.2 Five-Year Review. So we'll go ahead and get started with Reggie.

MR. PAULDING: Welcome, good evening. So as Janet said, I'm going to speak about Installation Restoration Site 04 data gaps and remedial investigation update. And if you guys have been around for a while, you'll remember that in January of 2010 you had a presentation on the remedial investigation for IR-04. So this will be an update to that, and then we'll tell you where we're headed in the next year or so. You should have also picked up an eleven by seventeen packet with photos. So what you'll see in the presentation, there will be photos in the slides, and for each one of those there's a corresponding eleven by seventeen that goes along with

it. So, in the presentation I'll be talking about the site history. I'll go over the previous investigations and actions. I'll talk about the conceptual site model. We'll go over the revised draft final remedial investigation, which was submitted in January 2010. We'll talk about developments since January 2010. We'll talk about the proposed planned data gap investigation and what's next.

So, the first figure is the site map and you have a corresponding eleven by seventeen. This is IR-04. What you'll see here is that it's down in the southern end of the island down along Mare Island Strait. You'll see there are five subareas. Subarea one and subarea four are referred to as the upland areas. You have subarea two, in the southern area, which is the paint can disposal area. We have Subareas 3A and 3B. Subarea 3B being the wetlands area. And 3A where the green sand or the abrasive blast material was used and stored. Originally, IR-04, prior to development, was tidal wetland area. Two to twelve feet of imported fill was placed at the site to raise it up. By 1932, IR04 was used for storage of items such as lumber, anchors, buoys. By 1944, we started to get some more infrastructure in the area. We had the electrical transmission towers built here, and you start to see railroad tracks, pavement and other buildings in the area. By the 1950's we start to see dry docks, ships and submarines sandblasted. We've got sandblasting going on in the area, and repainting of components for ships and submarines, because IR-04 was used in the period between the forties and up until about 1992 for painting of the ship components.

There are two main buildings in IR-04, Building 900 was built in 1955 and Building 1300 which was built in 1975. By 1992, sandblasting and painting activities have been moved to Building 750 in another part of the island, IA-C2. So, jumping into the investigations that were performed out here at IR-04, it begins in 1983 with this initial assessment study, during which we asked the workers at the facility what kinds of activities were going on, what kinds of paints they were using, what was in the abrasive blast material, just to get a feel for if there were some kind of potential environmental issues at the site. Based on that 1983 initial assessment, we went out in 1987 and installed some borings and collected soil samples. And so, as part of that study, we identified metals –(including chromium, copper, lead, and nickel) as potential environmental issues. We followed that up with a preliminary assessment/site investigation (PA/SI) in 1994. We installed more borings and collected samples at those two buildings, 900 and 1300. Based on those results or as a follow-up to those results, we moved into our Remedial Investigation phase.

The first phase of the RI was in 1981 with 63 borings and 128 soil samples. We followed that up in 1993 with the Phase 2 investigation, and another 240 borings. And as a result of the 1993 work we identified TPH as a concern in the area. So back in 1987 we identified metals, and as a result of the work in 1993 we identified TPH. So then moving forward, in 1997 we did this Green Sand Characterization which, if you remember, that was the abrasive blast material that was used and stored at the site. So, we sampled the green sand and followed that up in 1999 to 2002 with the Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment of Greensand. And what that showed was that green sand had chromium at some elevated levels; however, it was determined that it was not a risk to the industrial workers at the site. And then in 1999, we installed seven groundwater monitoring wells and analyzed those samples. So moving forward, 1998, there was an Unexploded Ordnance Intrusive Investigation, because IR-04 is just north of the Production Manufacturing Area which munitions were manufactured ...

(Thereupon there was a short discussion off the record due to temporary power loss to stenographer's equipment.)

MR. PAULDING: Okay. So, IR04 is adjacent to IA F1 which is also known as the Production Manufacturing Area. So, we included IR-04 in this intrusive investigation to rule out any unexploded ordnance items. During that investigation they identified 260 metallic or magnetic anomalies; however, no ordnance items were identified. However, we did find this previously unknown paint can pit area which later became Subarea 2. So in –2008/2009 timeframe, we did this Time Critical Removal Action to remove the green sand or sandblast material (abrasive blast material has several different names). We excavated 290 cubic yards of that material, and used it as subgrade for the engineered cap at the landfill, IA-H1. The excavation was backfilled with approved fill material from a residential development in Napa County. One of the main purposes for this figure is to show the coverage of sampling at the site, but you can also see the excavations that were done. The green and purple dotted lines show the areas of the removals that were performed between 2007 and 2009. And you'll see that the majority of those activities were in Subarea 3A, and down in the Paint Can Pit Area, Subarea 2.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Where is Subarea 2 again?

MR. PAULDING: Subarea 2 is like a triangle shape right here.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Paula, there are some big figures.

MR. PAULDING: You have a separate big page.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: The big figures are a separate handout there.

MR. PAULDING: Okay. This figure shows the depths of those removal actions. And what you'll see is the purple is the deepest, went down to twelve feet. And then these were more shallow excavations or removal actions for the green sand. A lot of the material was definitely clustered up in this area where they had used a lot of the green sand to bring up the ground level. And then the blue lines running across here– A, B, and C – those are the cross-sections which you also have copies of in your packet but were not included in the presentation. So here we are at the conceptual site model. I'll give you a brief introduction to what we think is going on out at IR-04 and how things got to where they are. So, what you'll see is this brown area. That's the green sand abrasive blast material. This is the wetland area. This is the tidal mudflats. This is Mare Island Strait. You have Buildings 900 and 1300. You have the electrical substations. You have this former Paint Can Pit Area, which is Subarea 2. What you'll see here is you'll see these squiggly lines showing the materials from those paint cans getting down into the soil and leaching into the groundwater. We interpret the groundwater flow to be towards Mare Island Strait. So we get the volatile organic compounds impacting the groundwater in this area. And we have the green sand, the metals from the green sands up here. And then we also have some TPH, the petroleum hydrocarbons up here in the Building 900 and 1300 area. So the Remedial Investigation Report that was submitted in January 2010 contained a couple things which I'll go through briefly. So we had the five subareas for IR-04, Subareas 1, 2, 3A, 3B, and 4. Subareas 1 and 4 were grouped together and referred to as the Building 1300 and other upland subareas. Subarea 1 and 4 had TPH above screening levels, but that was limited to soil. Subarea 2 was identified -- that's the Paint Can Pit Area, identified for volatile organic compounds due to the presence of those discarded paints. VOC's included the chlorinated solvents that I'm sure you're all very familiar with –tetrachloroethene; cis- and trans-1,2-dichloroethene; trichloroethene; and vinyl chloride. The sandblast area, that was identified as Subarea 3, and again that was metals including chromium, cadmium, and lead. TPH was also identified above screening levels in 3A. And then what you see here, the next few slides are a series of those figures that show the sample

locations, the sample concentrations. And in all of these figures gold is -- it's the reverse, I guess you could say -- gold is bad in this situation because it's above our screening criteria. Green is good because it's non-detect usually or below the screening criteria. And blue is also below screening criteria. So you'll see petroleum, you'll see where you have the gold dots which are up in the upland areas, Subareas 1 and 4, and then some in 3A. Metals you'll see are in the Subarea 3B, mainly where we didn't remove the green sand, the sandblast material was left in place. You'll see VOC's. We have the one in soil here in the Subarea 2 in the Paint Can Pit Area. And here in the groundwater figure you'll see more gold again in Subarea 2.

So, we received agency comments in March and July of 2010. Based on those comments the Navy put together a response to comments and submitted those in September of 2010. And we discussed those with the agencies on three occasions, September 2010 and January and March 2011. Based on the number of and the level of the comments received, we decided that the best step forward would be to go back out to IR-04 and collect some more data, both soil and groundwater, because there was some data gaps. And the consensus was we needed more data to properly assess both the extent of the contamination and the risk. So now I'm going to talk about some of the developments that have gone on since January 2010. So, in May of 2010 we received concurrence from the Water Board that groundwater in the IR-04 area (the shallow groundwater) does not meet beneficial use criteria. The Water Board granted a beneficial use exception for the groundwater at IR-04. We also received concurrence from DTSC for a portion of installation restoration site 14 known as the J-line, also known as the industrial waste sewer, that runs along in the northern portion of IR-04. And we've also closed out two PCB sites in IR-04 – Building 900 and building 1300 were closed – and we're currently doing remediation at Building 782 for PCBs.

So the data gaps investigation is set up to answer these four questions. (1) Assess the lateral and vertical extent of soil impacts. (2) Have chemicals in the soil impacted groundwater? And, if so, do we have sufficient information to assess those impacts? (3) Do soil and groundwater impacts pose a risk to human health and the environment? (4) And, if present, does the potential risk to human health or the environment warrant an evaluation of remedial action in a feasibility study which is the next step in CERCLA. So at this point we've awarded a contract last month to go out and perform a data gaps assessment. We're in the process right now of putting together a work plan to go out and collect soil and groundwater samples which, you know, will be distributed to the BCT for review and comment.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you just say what the BCT is, because we do have some visitors here tonight.

MR. PAULDING: Yes, of course. The BCT is made up of the regulatory agencies; the DTSC, Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Water Board, and the EPA, as well as the Navy. Currently the contractor is creating a data gap methodology document which we will review with the BCT, and that will be our template for our work plan. And we're going to have a meeting to discuss our methodology. Our goal is to do this in January 2012. August 2012 is our goal for finalizing the work plan. We plan to get out in the field and actually do this work, collect these additional samples of soil and groundwater, in September and October of 2012 – so, basically a year from now. And then we would follow that up with what we desperately hope is our final remedial investigation report.

MR. COFFEY: Not bloody likely.

MR. PAULDING: So based on all of that, if you guys have any questions – I will make my best effort to answer them. So let me know.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd like to raise a question. I'm looking at your timetable on page four, and it says from 1950 to 1980, components of dry dock ships and submarines are sandblasted and repainted. Now, there was a lot of work that went on previously at the yard, and I'm questioning if there are any historic record of sandblasting that took place before? I have a specific reason why I'm asking that question, and I'd like to get an answer if I could?

MR. PAULDING: Of course. So, prior to 1950 is the question were they sandblasting?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I'm sure sandblasting was going on, and I'd like to know what the record reflects. I guess San Bruno was in charge of the records at that time, and I know a lot of records were lost from San Bruno before they went down to San Diego.

MR. PAULDING: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: And submarines, etcetera, and many of these ships were in the south Pacific and came back for repairs, and that's why I'm asking the question.

MR. PAULDING: Okay. What you're saying is that there may be some kind of, what, radiological impacts?

MR. COFFEY: Or lead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, exactly. I was a co-chair at Hunter's Point, and the results of sandblasting. There was a lot of contamination there, so I'd like to know about that. And it's just funny, I'm looking at the timetable, 1950 to 1980, when a lot of major work – ship building and reconstruction, and especially like the ship the Indianapolis was reworked here and then sent to Hunter's Point. So I'd like to know about those records.

MR. PAULDING: Well, I personally don't have or haven't seen them.

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe the Navy does.

MR. PAULDING: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I guess also to follow up on Maurice's questions, I think he would probably also want to know if the sandblasting started here at this location in the fifties, you know, where it might have been done on the yard prior to that.

MR. PAULDING: Prior? Well we can definitely identify --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And what sites there were.

MR. PAULDING: From the limited background work that I've done, I haven't come across an answer to either of your questions, but we can definitely look into it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay.

MR. PAULDING: For sure. Anyone else?

MR. KARR: At what time was the green sand started being used as the abrasive material rather than sand?

MR. PAULDING: So -- all right. I do -- actually I have that information.

MR. KARR: That's what I was hoping for.

MR. PAULDING: That I do know. Green sand was used from about -- approximately 1950 to 1975. So the reason green sand is such a big issue at Mare Island was because they really didn't institute controls of the material, you know, how to properly dispose of it and so forth until about the mid-1970's.

MR. KARR: Thank you.

MR. PAULDING: Yeah, no problem.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You -- let me see. On this slide --

MR. PAULDING: Okay. Is that the petroleum?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Petroleum and soil, I guess.

MR. PAULDING: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, also I guess VOC's.

MR. PAULDING: Well, they're very similar.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm just looking at the wetland area, Subarea 3B wetlands.

MR. PAULDING: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And petroleum in soil it shows that there are several hits that are below industrial comparison criteria which you have listed at 2,500 milligrams per kilogram rather than non-detects out there. The questions that you are using as follow-up questions, and those are addressing risk based on human health and the environment, it seems to me if you have an active wetland and you're trying to fit it into an industrial comparison criteria, that's not going to work out very well. So I'm assuming that's the purpose of this additional risk evaluation impact -- impact risk evaluation for human health and the environment?

MR. PAULDING: Well, you're correct in that we definitely have two different purposes for this property. There are concerns in the wetland and it is one of the things that we're definitely looking at in the risk assessment and the feasibility study. So, I guess I agree and the DTSC agrees, and we're definitely going to be doing more work to address the risk to the environment in the wetland area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Because it was my understanding, my recollection that when that - - is that a time critical or a non-time critical removal action -- was done with, that 29,000 --

MR. PAULDING: Cubic yards?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- cubic yards, that there was an acknowledgment by the Navy at that time that all that they were doing was getting the abrasive sandblast material out of the upland area, and that you would be coming along and addressing those -- that contamination of the wetland area at a later date. And I guess -- maybe I didn't pay total close attention to your presentation, or I need glasses or something (which is probably true) -- regarding what your findings are for sandblast grit in the wetland areas. What your amount is.

MR. PAULDING: Well, I didn't really -- I mean what I presented is the fact that we know that the sandblast grit contains metals above our screening criteria.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. PAULDING: So if you look at the figure that shows metals in soil.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Metals, okay.

MR. PAULDING: You will see that there are lots of gold locations.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, yeah, right. Okay.

MR. PAULDING: So we know that there's a risk in those areas associated with the sandblast material, and we haven't developed what the remedial action will be in this wetland area. But we will have to do something.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well again, on that metals page then with those gold dots, your legend refers to those as being above industrial comparison criteria – there's not even a legend level for the environment. So here again I guess I'm wondering if there wasn't -- what your purpose was or what your strategy? I mean this has been maybe about 700 years ago there was an article about this area having contamination coming off of it. There was an article in the Chronicle when our RAB was just in its infancy, about this being the -- some of the important habitat for crab in the bay, for bay crab. And it was identifying this as a high risk site already. So I'm just curious about why you're just now saying, well, we probably are going to do it -- unless maybe I'm misunderstanding -- but well, we should probably, you know, do what DTSC and the Water Board want and talk about risk for human health and the environment. Why didn't you get that -- jump right on that, you know, hop right on that bandwagon? Why am I looking at data that's only for industrial comparison criteria?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Can I take that?

MR. PAULDING: Please.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: One of the things that Reggie didn't include in this presentation, and I think it's mostly because of the way the data's presented, is there was an ecological risk assessment done with the data. It just doesn't lend itself to screening criteria and comparison to screening criteria on those kind of figures. We are committed to doing appropriate remedial action in the wetlands at this site. We want to continue evaluating the nature and extent of the contamination for the rest of the site, and when we do remedial action, then we will address the wetlands as part of our remedial action for the entire site. So, we have evaluated ecological risk and we're continuing to collect additional data to fill data gaps that have been identified. And the presentation may give the impression that we haven't done ecological risk assessment, but we have. We're just collecting additional data so that we can complete the RI and move forward. I hope that helps?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Well maybe better next time to at least acknowledge that, all those long lists you had.

MR. KARR: I'm curious. In all of these contamination graphs, I don't see any boring that exceeded two and a quarter feet in depth.

MR. COFFEY: There are a lot of them.

MR. KARR: Or at least that's reflected on the chart.

MR. PAULDING: Well, on the figures you're correct. Because typically we had two sets of figures for each, say it was the metals, the VOC's, the petroleum. And in the January 2010 remedial investigation report, you have surface, which was like the zero to two and a quarter

feet, and then you have deeper samples which was everything deeper than 2.25 feet in this case. So, those figures with the deeper samples do exist, they were not included in this presentation, but they are in that January 2010 document.

MR. KARR: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PAULDING: You're welcome.

MR. KARR: I'm getting old. I can't remember that long ago.

MR. COFFEY: She did say it was 700 years ago.

MR. KARR: I was there for that one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: He was.

MR. PAULDING: Okay. Thanks, everyone.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you, Reggie. Our next presentation is Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island, on the Investigation Area D1.2, Five Year Review.

MR. COFFEY: Will there be dancing girls?

III. PRESENTATION: *Investigation Area D1.2 Five Year Review*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler (Lennar Mare Island)

MR. SILER: Okay. Before I start, there should be two things you have to look at. There's a presentation, and then I have an eleven by seventeen figure that shows investigation Area D1.2. So you should have both of those. So, it seems hard to believe, but on March 31st of 2006 we signed the land use covenants for investigation Area D1.2. 2011 marked the fifth year that we were doing annual inspections, and so what we had to do is also do a Five-Year Review as part of the requirements for administering those land use covenants. Now, what I'm going to do tonight is talk about the findings of the Five-Year Review by going through, discussing a little bit about the Five-Year Review process, give you a description of the area and some background, talk about the land use covenants that have been recorded in investigation Area D1.2. talk about the findings of the Five-Year Review, and the recommendations for going forward.

Now, for those of you who don't know what a land use covenant is, or a LUC, it's a written instrument or document that describes the procedures required to protect the public from residual contamination that's left in place above unrestricted land use criteria. And it can actually be put on the property while cleanup is occurring or it can be done after clean up has occurred. And usually that cleanup that occurs, it occurs above that unrestricted land use level. Now, it affects title to the property because it runs with the land. It is always attached to the deed. It's recorded in the county recorder's office, and it remains in effect until it's removed or modified, and there's a formal process to do that.

Now, one of those requirements of the land use covenant is to do annual inspections, and then in the fifth year you do the Five-Year Review. And you do that because constituents of concern have been left on the property above the unrestricted cleanup level. Now, the purpose of this review, and what you're always trying to ask: is that remedy that we put forth five years ago still protective of human health and the public? So, what we did to evaluate that was we notified the regulatory agencies and the city of Vallejo that this Five-Year Review process was being initiated, we did that in February. After that we set forth a public notification in the paper of the Five-Year Review process. Then what we did was we looked at all the technical reports that we

had done already in place for investigation Area D1.2, looked at the land use covenants that were in place, looked at the annual inspections, and looked at some of the property transfer documents. We did site inspections, just like the annual inspections that we always do, to make sure that the areas of concern were in compliance with the general and specific requirements of each of the LUC's. And then we published a report that was provided to the DTSC and the EPA in March of 2011. Now, once that report is finalized it will go on file into the public information repository at JFK Library, and there will also be a second notification that goes into the paper indicating to the public that this Five-Year Review process has been completed. So, for those of you who aren't familiar with investigation Area D1.2, it's located in the south central portion of the eastern early transfer parcel, which is the property that Lennar Mare Island owns. It's this property here. Also runs up here to this portion of the property right here through this area, part of it being residential. And then this area here, which is the 27 acres that were originally part of the investigation Area D1.2 land use covenant. In addition to the 27 acres that were part of this area right here, there were fifteen polychlorinated biphenyl sites that had PCB specific -- excuse me -- land use covenants on the property. So investigation Area D1.2 had about 200 structures on it. Eighty-nine of those structures that were not believed to be historic were demolished at one time. The historic uses, while the Navy had the property, were residential in this area. They were commercial, medical, and recreational. And the main medical facility was down here, which is now part of the current Touro University campus. Now, one of the things that has changed since we actually recorded the LUC is that there's been a number of property transfers that have occurred. So, as I mentioned, originally there was 27 acres that Lennar Mare Island was responsible for that were part of the investigation Area D1.2 commercial area LUC. In addition to that, there were fifteen polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) sites. Currently Lennar Mare Island is only responsible for 19 acres of the investigation Area D1.2 commercial area, and twelve PCB sites that are covered by nine LUC's. The reason is there have been quite a few property transfers that occurred in 2010. Forty-four acres of property that have been cleaned up to unrestricted land use was transferred to Touro University, but what was on that 44 acres of unrestricted property were three PCB sites that had been covered by two land use covenants. And those PCB sites were Building 1322, Building H72, and Building H73. Then in June 2010, Alden Park, which is approximately five acres, was transferred to the City of Vallejo, and that's part of this 27 acres. September 2010, Chapel Park, which covers an area of about three acres, was transferred to the City of Vallejo. Go ahead, Myrna.

COs-CHAIR HAYES: So, is what you're saying that when you do these property transfers, you don't have the continued responsibility for the land use monitoring on the PCB sites?

MR. SILER: That's correct, because those obligations will be transferred to the next property owner. That's why these land use covenants run with the land, they run with the property itself and with the title to the property.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well I understand that. But this is the first that I understood that you were also transferring responsibility for long-term monitoring to the landowner.

MR. SILER: That's correct. That's always been the case.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I don't ever remember that. So how do we know? Where do we learn that Touro University's doing this -- their monitoring, for example?

MS. NAITO: They submit annual reports to us.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But how do we learn that, the Restoration Advisory Board or the public?

MS. NAITO: I can bring it up when we get notice of a property transfer.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, we do have notice of a property transfer. So who's the point of contact for Touro University? Who does that monitoring? What department? Where are their reports, you know, in the repository? Does the public get noticed, like Lennar's noticed, on this Five-Year review? Does it go -- does the five year monitoring coincide with the five years or from the five years, or is it five years from transfer or five years from the placement of the land use covenant?

MS. NAITO: It is every five years. It is every five years. So Touro, at the same time Lennar turned in -- well, maybe a month later, after Lennar turned in their Five-Year Review or their draft Five-Year Review Report, we received one from -- a combined report from the City and Touro University covering the other property. And yes, I will make sure that I upload the letter notifying us of the transfer into our database, into our EnviroStor database. And in the future I will make a note of that at these meetings. And for contact information I can go ahead and forward that to you if you'd like.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The report itself, the monitoring report. This is exactly --

MR. COFFEY: What we talked about.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, you can talk about it, Mike, instead of me. I mean this is exactly what the problem was --

MR. COFFEY: 2006.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Way back, right, 2006 and before when we --

MR. COFFEY: We asked how we were going to get notified.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, and how all of this mish mash was going to be able to be kept track of by the public, by the community.

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You have contaminants out there, then how does the public learn that they're there? How do we know? I mean, Lennar is still participating in the Restoration Advisory Board, but now none of these other parties have any responsibility apparently to do that. So how do we -- how does the public, whether it's the RAB or not, how does the public learn whether they're being protected or the environment is being protected on these transferred properties?

MS. NAITO: Okay. There is an operations and maintenance agreement plan that everybody has to follow. There are also requirements in the land use covenant for inspection reports and compliance with our Five-Year Review. Actually, I don't think that is in the current land use covenant -- Five-Year Reviews. But it does require compliance with our DTSC requirements, and one of DTSC's requirements is a Five-Year Review. So those requirements run with the land.

MR. COFFEY: We knew that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We know that. Sorry, not to be, you know, jumping on you. At least I'll let you finish your sentence.

MS. NAITO: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: It's that, how does the public learn whether --

MS. NAITO: For a specific property, how do they know who to go to?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. And how do they know who to report if there's a problem, if the PCB warning signs have been taken by a copper thief or dropped on the ground cause the cable tie fell off or whatever? I mean, where is that accountability for the public? And that's what we asked way back in 2006. That's what we went round and round and round with. That's what the Navy actually suggested -- that we invite another company to come in and evaluate. And we -- and that proposal that we considered, there was going to be automatic monitoring that every time the planning -- the building department got a permit pulled -- notice it was going to automatically report --

MR. COFFEY: Notification in the newspapers.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- to the Restoration Advisory Board, to the regulators, to a whole host of stakeholders. This is just such a perfect example, not to waste your time, you'd like to probably finish this presentation, but it's such a perfect example of what we said was going to be a problem. And as far as I'm concerned --

MS. NAITO: Okay. Maybe at a future RAB meeting we can make a presentation, a joint presentation about the operations and maintenance requirements.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We've had those presentations. We wrote those. I mean, not to be smart, but no, we know all that. What I'm saying is --

MS. NAITO: Well, it's what we're doing as a department to oversee those activities.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But if you're not communicating those to us, and if the responsible party is not communicating it to us, the broad us, and you don't have a web portal, and you haven't ever showed us how to go in and access that, then it's as good as not taking place --

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- in the public mind. And this is exactly what we said was going to happen. Michael is going to say something, I can see that.

MR. COFFEY: What we had talked about way back in 2006 when we had all these meetings about the land use covenants was that, how was the RAB Board, or how was the public in general going to be notified? We were told very specifically how we were going to be notified. There was going to be newspapers, there was going to be frequent and clear comments to the RAB Board. I mean, all that type of stuff, that there would be notifications. That was what we were told way back when we made this point, how were we going to be notified? How was the public going to be notified? We talked about open websites. Was there going to be a website that it was going to be posted on? And who was going to have access to it? How was there going to be access to it? We were assured all these things. That's what Myrna is talking about, we were told all these things were going to happen. Here it is several years later, and exactly what we said was not going to happen did not happen.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Lennar assured us it was way too much money to do that -- to make those basic tools available, even though there were companies that were presenting to us, making proposals to Lennar, to the agencies saying, "We can do this for a nominal fee." Lennar said,

"Oh, it's too much." And they were going to beep -- and the City said, "Oh, our software couldn't possibly link with your software." And they said, "Oh, yeah, it was super simple." So I think the agency and the responsible party, Lennar, has fallen down on the job. And here's our first discovery of it, just kind of by coincidence. And it's very troubling that no one, you know, that we have no way of knowing, you know. So that's Touro and so there's someone there and so they're doing something, but let's say it was any other private business, you know, what we've read about someone, you know. Well, let's say Building 680, you know. Each individual landowner, how do they know and how does the public know that they're doing their monitoring work?

MS. NAITO: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And it's a failure just as we, you know, predicted it would be. Right here we have a failure.

MR. COFFEY: One of the things that we were talking about way back when, too, was how certain entities were going to be able to notify the public. We were talking about, I remember specifically we were talking about the way cities notify the public about certain aspects, posting paperwork, all that kind of stuff. Has Touro University, if they have a five year plan or a five year monitor, and they're supposed to have that public information. Is anywhere at Touro University, is any of this information posted where the public can see it openly? Or any other LUC person have any of this publicly posted like they do for the cities?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's the responsibility of the landowner to notify DTSC and provide the report to DTSC. DTSC is paid, this isn't a freebie. They're paid to make sure that these guys do it, and they have the capability of fining them if they don't do it.

MR. COFFEY: Right.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So the notification is not from the landowner, because quite frankly, you're going to have thousands of them out here someday hopefully. I wish it was tomorrow. But -- so it's going to be via DTSC if there's going to be any notification, because the individual landowner, he's the guy writing the checks to make sure that these reports are getting made, and then, you know, providing funding to DTSC to review and maintain these reports.

MR. COFFEY: So then we're going to lay the responsibility directly on the shoulders of the DTSC to make sure that in some way, shape, or form the public is going to be notified, in general, whether it's the RAB or whether it's the general public, of any of this information?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I think DTSC has a responsibility of whatever the law requires them to do, and I'm not that familiar with the DTSC laws to tell you that they're required -- what their notification requirements are.

MR. COFFEY: There's your next RAB presentation.

MS. NAITO: I'm working on that, I'm writing it down.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I know very well that we had the conversations about when a property owner pulls a permit that the building department, in the scenarios that were presented to us, the building department would have, for example, with the one company that was giving a presentation to us, would have like five days to notify various parties that someone had pulled a permit that could potentially affect that PCB or that land use covenant and property. So, none of that has happened. So there is no way, even for the property owner's general employees to know

whether -- I mean, you know, I'd say 99 percent of Touro University's employees and students don't know that there's a process that's being gone through to maintain their protection or their safety on a piece of property that has a land use covenant on it.

MR. COFFEY: So then basically what we're saying here, in tie-in with what Gil has to say, is we need to find out exactly what the extent of the law is on public notification. Whose responsibility is it and to what extent is it anybody's responsibility to let us know -- right? So, we have to find out what the breadth of that law is. And since the DTSC is the one directly responsible for it, the DTSC needs to notify us for all of these land use covenants who is it and to what extent it is their responsibility to notify the public.

MS. NAITO: Are you talking about notification of a property transfer --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

MR. COFFEY: No.

MS. NAITO: -- or are you talking about notification of work on a piece of property? I'm just trying to make sure how I design this --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, you could go back to our thousands of hours of conversation on this in our minutes.

MS. NAITO: I'm going to need you to pinpoint it, because my 2006 files take up --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So do ours. Ours are the same size yours are. We can go try to look for it in the same place. But, you know, maybe Neal can help out. But the fact is, this is the problem that we foresaw. We tried to get Lennar to, you know, step up to the plate on this, and, you know, you didn't, and here we are now with the same question. And sorry we're stuck right here on your first slide, but it's right there glaring right at us.

MR. SILER: Okay, moving right along. So, the type of remedial actions that were completed in investigation Area D1.2 dealt with the inspection and cleaning and the removing of residual solids on installation restoration program Site 14, which is the old industrial wastewater treatment system. We cleaned up lead-based paint that had flaked off the building into soil around 87 residential and commercial properties. And then at a number of different PCB sites, eighteen PCB sites, we did removal actions. We did encapsulations, either by surface or by transformer; had a use restriction on them, either industrial or occupancy or a combination of these things. And that resulted in ten PCB-specific LUC's at fifteen PCB sites. Now, the three sites that didn't end up having LUC's on them were Building 497 AL#01, Building 521 AL#01, and Building H83 AL#01. And I would say that the 497 and 521 sites, those are within the commercial area land use covenant for Investigation Area (IA) D.1.2. I would think that the commercial, at least the cleanup was the commercial standards. H83 is one of the hospital sites that is now on present Touro University, and I'm confident that was cleaned up to unrestricted land use standards. And then the last thing that was done, again because this 27 acres was cleaned up to commercial and industrial land use, we placed the IA D1.2 commercial area LUC on that 27 acres.

Okay. Now, the way this is today is that for the Five-Year Review, we looked at the nineteen acres that were bound, and they're bound by Railroad Avenue to the east, Walnut Avenue to the west, Connolly Street to the north, and 8th Street to the south. And the reason that we had to do this was that as we cleaned up the area, there were some constituents-of-concern, and this is the

cake mix for the constituents-of-concern on Mare Island, which is petroleum hydrocarbons left up to 1,500 milligrams per kilogram; lead, which is up to 940 milligrams per kilogram; and then PCB's which range from 0.22 to 0.63 milligram per kilogram. So just so you know, the 0.22 is the residential cleanup standard. So if you were below that, you would have unrestricted land use. So when you're in this area, and the commercial industrial cleanup standard is 0.74 milligrams per kilogram, you're in this area where you haven't cleaned it up to the unrestricted land use so you need the LUC. And that's the same with these other constituents also. Now, this commercial area land use covenant only is a use restriction, and it's a restriction on sensitive uses. And those sensitive uses are residential, they are hospital, daycare and schools for persons under eighteen years of age. In addition to that, there are some rules about moving soil on the property, and those are the soil transportation disposal and reuse rules. And those are part of the operations and maintenance plan. And there are things that the City would have to decide if somebody was going to excavate soil and transfer it, that those things were complied with.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Who in the City has that responsibility?

MR. SILER: That would be the Building Department, Public Works.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And they know that?

MR. SILER: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What did you ever do about the VA clinic being within that area?

MR. SILER: Well, the VA clinic is a clinic, it's not a hospital, so it meets the commercial/industrial land use standard. Yeah, they don't have people there that would be in there for surgery or be there for overnight stays, so it would not meet the unrestricted land use requirement. Just like any other doctor's office in any other commercial setting. So as I mentioned, I couldn't find an aerial shot that showed the entire area, so this right here is Railroad Avenue, that's the eastern boundary. Walnut Avenue on the other side right here is the western boundary. You can't see Connolly Street – it's right to the north of building 253, 237, and 253; right here. The southern boundary right now is 8th Street, which is right here, which is the boundary between Alden Park and Farragut Plaza. This area right here is Alden Park which was transferred to the City. This area is Chapel Park which has been transferred to the City. Now, the PCB-specific land use covenants that we looked at on the property are -- come in three categories; the industrial use facilities, Building 237, 253; AL#01, #02, and #03 (it's just the ground floor, the second floor, and the third floor); Building 944 AL#02; then building Q1-7A. And again, this is only for industrial use. It prohibits those sensitive uses on the properties. Low occupancy restrictions are Buildings 229, 521, 671, and 781. And then we have one engineering control site which is Building 605 AL#01, which is the ground floor which has surface encapsulation over the LUC's that were left in place. And there's one room – I think it's room 201 on the second floor – and that's the AL#02 site, that again has the surface encapsulation left in place. Now, the next five slides that I show you will show you examples of those areas. Jerry, do you have a question?

MR. KARR: Yeah, just curious. What's the definition of low occupancy?

MR. SILER: Low occupancy, if it is non-porous media, you can stay in there for 840 hours a year. Restricted to that time – 840 hours – which equates to 16.8 hours a week. If it's called bulk PCB waste, which is more like – I think of it as porous media, and the definition, if you look at

it, it says it's soil, sediment, sludge, but it can be other things, and in some cases concrete and asphalt can be a porous media – then that's 335 hours per year or 6.7 hours per week.

MR. KARR: So that's a personnel exposure limit, not a crowd number?

MR. SILER: Yes.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good question.

MR. SILER: So, these are the industrial use sites. Here's Building 237 right here. Building 253 you can see the ground floor, and then you have these two floors that are above it. This is Building 944. And this is my favorite because this is about an eight by nine foot PCB electrical substation, Q17-A. And at one point there was a big fight over whether this was going to be low occupancy or not. And as we looked at it, we finally came to the conclusion that it really didn't rise to that level.

MR. KARR: No more than fifty people at a time.

MR. SILER: Exactly.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: On something like 237 or 253, when you're saying industrial use only, is that -- and that's just because of these three spots or some indoor air quality overall or what?

MR. SILER: It's not indoor air, it's actually the amount that was left in place. That comes from a document that Lennar signed as an intervenor, which is the CA/FO, which is the consent agreement final order which was signed with the U.S. EPA. And what it has is alternative site cleanup requirements. And when you do certain things, like an industrial use restriction, you can't have any PCB's above ten milligrams per kilogram left in place. The average has to be five milligrams per kilogram, and that average is based on the 95 percent UCL.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So an industrial use, let's say at Building 237. Could there also – I don't know what the criterion is for industrial use – could you have like a three-day use or something like that for something other than --

MR. SILER: You know, I'd have to take a look at that. I would doubt it. It's possible depending on what the three-day use is. A good example is Building 253, because we actually had this leased at one time, and this was used as a warehouse. So, that's a good industrial use as a warehouse in here. Okay. So the low occupancy sites, and there are two types. The ones you're looking at right now associated with Buildings 229 and 521, these are the equipment rooms on top of the elevator shafts. And you can see there's that one protruding right there on Building 229. And here's this one on Building 521. And there is the equipment itself right there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So, are you talking about all of these uses limited in these specific areas on these buildings?

MR. SILER: Well, the use prohibition for these is still going to be the restriction on the sensitive uses. But what you have on these is you don't want somebody in there for any kind of appreciable amount of time.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: But it's just for these locations in the building?

MR. SILER: Just for these locations in the building, not the entire building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And does that apply for the industrial use only scenario?

MR. SILER: No, but the way it is on those industrial use, it's the entire footprint of the building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, okay. And these are just these facilities --

MR. SILER: -- it's actually the elevator and the shaft itself.

MR. COFFEY: Bummer.

MR. SILER: Now, the other two types of low occupancy sites that we have are electrical substations, which if you've ever been in one you wouldn't want to spend more than 6.7 hours a week anyway. This is Building 671, this is station A. And then this is Building 781, station C, which is affectionately known as the green monster.

MR. COFFEY: It is pretty pukey.

MR. SILER: This one is open air. The reason we did this is that we had to have power to these areas. And I think these are going to eventually come down. This is going to come down first. It's the one that sits right on the corner of Azuar and Kansas.

Now, the one engineering control site which has surface encapsulation is Building 605, and this was the old television -- telephone, excuse me, switch area. And this is the ground floor right here, you can see the surface encapsulation here. It's actually two coats of epoxy paint that are contrasting colors. If you see one of the contrasting colors through the top of the gray, then you know it's been breached and you have to repair that. This is that room 201 that is AL#02 which is on the second floor. Jerry.

MR. KARR: Yeah, I just felt I should inform you that that hot water heater is not installed per the City of Vallejo building code.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. SILER: Well, that's because it was installed by the Navy.

MR. COFFEY: No pan, no strapping.

MR. SILER: Okay. So the findings of the Five-Year Review. After we looked at all the reports, looked at all the previous inspection reports, did the inspection, we found no issues that breached any of the requirements of these land use covenants. They are functioning as they were intended. One of the things that we did was the notification. When we have tenants, they're notified, and it's one of the requirements of the lease that they have appropriate obligations, or new landowners, they have appropriate obligations as a component of the property transfer or of the lease obligation. And these are remaining protective of human health and the environment. Now, that doesn't mean that we're done, we're still going to continue to do annual monitoring. And in 2016 we'll be doing another Five-Year Review. But one of the things that we do want to do is we want to update these commercial/industrial, commercial area LUC because of these property transfers. So we want to update the legal description. There's probably going to be an LUC that covers our 19 acres. It looks like the DTSC would like Touro to -- not Touro, but the City of Vallejo to have another legal description for the property that it owns, Alden Park and Chapel Park. And there's a new operations and maintenance plan for the eastern early transfer parcel. And we need to reference that plan in this LUC. It wasn't referenced in the old LUC, so the new LUC will reference that. And we want to ensure that the LUC requirements are consistent with what the requirements are of the operations and maintenance plan. Now, the one other thing we have to do with Building 605, AL#01 and AL#02, is we have to finalize a specific operations and maintenance plan for that to make sure that the cap (the integrity of the cap) stays in place, update a cost estimate for annual operation and maintenance, provide financial

assurance for that, finalize an O&M agreement for that building, and provide the O&M as required. And as I mentioned before, we're going to continue with the annual inspections and reporting. And we're going to complete the next Five-Year Review in 2016. So with that, that ends my presentation. If anybody has any other questions, please feel free to ask them now. Mike?

MR. COFFEY: Neal, what's the building directly across from Alden Park?

MR. SILER: That's Building 47. You're talking about Farragut Plaza right there?

MR. COFFEY: Yes, Farragut Plaza.

MR. SILER: Yeah, that's Building 47.

MR. COFFEY: Doesn't that have a sign on all the doors saying PCB's?

MR. SILER: PCB's. And that does not have a specific LUC associated with it, but there's a potential that you're going to be in that 0.22 to 0.63 range, somewhere in there, so that's covered by that entire IA D1.2 commercial area LUC because you're not above it where you'd have a site specific PCB LUC on that site.

MR. COFFEY: What is the plan for that building?

MR. SILER: The plan for the building is commercial.

MR. COFFEY: Because I mean it looks like it's completely boarded up right now. Is there --

MR. SILER: Yeah, there has to be a lot of work done to that building so --

MR. COFFEY: It's one of the coolest buildings on the island, it's a shame to have it --

MR. SILER: It is great. It's a great building.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And, Neal, how much money have you spent to date on monitoring in that five year plan?

MR. SILER: You know, the monitoring itself does not take very much time, you know, for these sites. And I don't have a specific amount of money that we have spent. The one thing that we did do was we, at one time in Building 605, and when we were still responsible for Building 1322 -- this is back in 2007 -- we noticed there were cracks in the epoxy, so we replaced that. And also there -- it looked like somebody had gotten something on top of the epoxy in that building, in that room 201 in Building 605. So, we replaced all that. That was under like \$15,000. So that was the biggest thing that we did in those areas is to go ahead and upgrade that. But, you know, it really doesn't cost a lot of money to do the operations and maintenance on these use sites, or even on this one engineering control sites that we have in the area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Is that because that's just embedded in one of your long list of things you do? Or do you hire contractors to do this?

MR. SILER: Well, what we did here is we hired an independent contractor to do the Five-Year review to take a look at everything. But really how it's worked out in the past is that Lennar Mare Island and DTSC have traditionally gone out and done the inspections together. Now, this year Lennar Mare Island and our contractor went out and did independent inspections.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And Gil says that you pay DTSC for the oversight for this. How much is that?

MR. SILER: We pay DTSC for the review of the documents that they look at, or anything that they do for that type of, you know, procedure, or any kind of protocol that they do with that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So how much was the contractor to do the Five Year Review?

MR. SILER: The contractor was about -- I think about \$35,000 -- somewhere in that range.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And then how much do you pay DTSC?

MR. SILER: I couldn't tell you off the top of my head.

MS. NAITO: I couldn't break it out just for this, but our annual oversight costs are about a couple hundred thousand, maybe a little bit more. I can get you a specific number --

MR. SILER: Well, yeah, but that's not for the --

MS. NAITO: But that's not for this.

MR. SILER: That's for their entire oversight cost.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. SILER: I would say that the oversight cost for this, you know, if it's under five percent of that amount, I would be surprised.

MS. NAITO: Under or over?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Not more than.

MR. SILER: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What do you envision, after whatever your pull-out date is, who's going to do this and how much is it going to cost?

MR. SILER: That will be up to the regulatory agency, DTSC, and the landowners at that time. But those requirements will be passed onto those subsequent landowners. And how they accomplish that and meet the goals of the operations and maintenance, I think we have to leave that to them.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, thank you for your presentation. I think it leaves a lot of concern on my part and I -- sounds like Mike's part too.

MR. COFFEY: A lot of unanswered questions.

MR. SILER: Anybody else have any questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And this brings up a question that I'll just throw in now to just get the Navy and DTSC cross-ways. Whatever happened to the PCB's that you said you were going to do something about at Station G that Island Energy owns and the City of Vallejo own in double, double ownership, where it was transferred to both parties with PCB's on site?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Marie is going to answer that question.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And you said you were going to clean it up.

MS. DREYER: I think you're talking about down near the -- just inside the entrance to the PMA SSA area; is that correct?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I am.

MS. DREYER: That's Building 824/A912. It's currently being worked now, actually. The Navy submitted a settlement letter between us and the legal counsel's of -- is it the City of Vallejo?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Yes.

MS. DREYER: And we have an agreement that the Navy takes on -- is taking on full responsibility to clean up that site. And we are actively cleaning up. Actually we are down to two hits at about three parts per million each. And we think we'll be finished up with that cleanup after one more round of scabbling the concrete and then testing the soil underneath.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And that's in that electrical transformer right there inside the gate --

MS. DREYER: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- on the right-hand side?

MS. DREYER: Uh-huh.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's a surprise. I'm glad I asked.

MS. DREYER: No, we jumped on that one.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Actually, jumped on it after about fifteen years.

MR. COFFEY: That was quick for the government.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, that's not bad. It will be interesting to see at least photos of that so that we could have some evidence of your work.

MS. DREYER: Okay. I can send something up with Janet for the December meeting.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. Or you can put it in one of your monthly thing you do when we aren't meeting.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Sure.

MS. DREYER: Will do.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. This brings us to our first public comment period. And Wally has set up a nice, new podium over there for any public comments, if we have any?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right. Now, we have a ten minute break and treats. We have cupcakes. They're from Miguel; is that correct?

MR. QUIGLEY: Uh-huh.

MS. NAITO: Wendell did not cook them.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: And the cookies are from the Navy.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Janet Lear)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So we are at administrative business. And I just had a couple of things. I sent out an e-mail to everyone that it's time for us to renew or to vote on RAB co-chair. We got a self-nomination from Myrna with her goals, and I think I sent it to everybody. I was

going to go ahead and hold the vote tonight, but since it is a RAB community member only vote, and we're missing several --

MR. QUIGLEY: Two.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I think it would be best if we wait until our regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday in December.

MR. COFFEY: Why don't you just do it by e-mail? Why does it have to be here at the meeting?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: You want to do it by e-mail? We can do that.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I haven't looked at my e-mail in three months.

MR. QUIGLEY: They called me wanting your phone number to make sure you knew about today.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So you want to just do it in December then at our next meeting?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Sure.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: So we'll go ahead and do that. And the other thing is, of course, the July meeting minutes. So if there are any comments, please get those to Myrna or myself. Did you have any other --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The December meeting is not on our normal time, right? As I remember, isn't it the first week because November goes to December?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Right. Yeah, it's because our November meeting is always Thanksgiving, so we --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Could we know what the date is?

CO-CHAIR LEAR: It's December 1st. At the same time, same place.

MR. COFFEY: Same time, same channel.

MS. NAITO: December 1st.

MR. COFFEY: Same bat time.

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So now we're at focus group reports. Community report, Wendell.

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: I am happy to report good news.

MR. COFFEY: There is a community.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, and our community here on Mare Island is growing. We have now welcomed Blue Homes to Building 680, which is absolutely awesome. And we're hoping at the end of three years that they'll be up to 190 in staff. And the possibility of Building 759 has been purchased, and they're talking about in the future putting in a brewery -- a beer brewery. Awesome, huh?

MR. COFFEY: Micro, public?

MR. QUIGLEY: Yeah, a microbrewery, pretty awesome.

MS. NAITO: We want the tasting room.

MR. QUIGLEY: You want what?

MS. TYGIELSKI: A tasting room.

MS. NAITO: A tasting room.

MR. QUIGLEY: Oh, they're going to have a tasting room. They're going to have a tasting room and --

MR. KARR: What other kind of breweries are there, Wendell?

MR. COFFEY: Real breweries.

MR. KARR: You said a beer brewery, that's the only one I know about.

MR. QUIGLEY: Micro.

MR. COFFEY: Micro.

MR. KARR: Oh, but they make beer?

MR. QUIGLEY: We hope. We hope. I'm not a beer drinker, I don't care. But they'd also be doing wine.

MS. DREYER: Do you know who it is?

MR. QUIGLEY: I don't. All I know is they're from Southern California. And I'll get that info for you. Another thing, I was at a meeting yesterday at Touro University, and the Touro students have discovered the Mare Island San Pablo Bay trail and are using it daily. So that's a real good thing. And our Neighborhood Watch have -- we have caught five more squatters and run them off, sent them back over the bridge, so they -- maybe they went to Benicia.

MR. KARR: They can't go to east Vallejo, that's where I live, so --

MR. QUIGLEY: And the last two things. One, the City Council has come forth with a new plan for some of the old buildings on the north end of the island, they're going to try to get some companies to come in, and they will give them all the old Redwood growth if they will take down the buildings. I think that was a fabulous thing. And last Saturday Stephanie, thanks to Stephanie Gomes and Fighting Back, we had our graffiti team painted out the last of the graffiti on the north end of the island. So ends my presentation.

MR. COFFEY: Beautifully done. Fantastic. Loved every minute. It was spell-binding.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I just want to add to that at this very moment, to keep the groundswell of good news going, that while you were painting out graffiti on the north end of the island, 152 volunteers under my able leadership were cleaning up trash from the causeway to the bridge. And the City of Vallejo had gotten a garbage company, or whatever we call them now, had gotten in ahead of schedule -- ahead of that cleanup to clean up 24,000 pounds of garbage because I asked them to.

MR. QUIGLEY: That's great.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So it was a big deal day. So those 152 good church folk did several dumpsters full in addition to the 24,000 that got picked up during that week. So don't go dump garbage over there; okay?

MR. COFFEY: Other side of the causeway.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Lennar side.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: American Canyon.

(LAUGHTER.)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Natural resources.

MR. COFFEY: American Canyon gets plenty of Vallejo's trash.

MR. KARR: I don't go there that often. As I pointed out at maybe the last meeting I attended, the new trail out to the Bay and the fact that all our shore birds are moving down. Just yesterday there was some information posted to the North Bay Birds, which is a list server in the area that us bird nerds go look at. And there were two or three different species of shore birds that are extremely rare, and they were seen by very reputable birders out on the pond, and then the old Fagaras unit down north of the Alco, the metal building. And that's part of what the base closure and rehabilitation is about. It's not only for the people. A lot of these pond areas and stuff are providing very valuable habitat to the critters. And then I never heard of Blue Homes in my life until it was in the paper that they're coming to the old machine shop. And then here's the September/October issue of Audubon magazine, and here's an ad from Blue Homes. I still don't know anything about them, but I know that Audubon does vet their advertising, so that leads me to think that they have a pretty decent reputation, at least in some circles. So that was good to see.

MR. COFFEY: Gosh, then I wonder if they're going to get a \$254 million government loan.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, they're probably going to be putting their models up on Lennar's empty \$1.5 million plots. It would be a good deal. It would be better than having goats, I guess.

MR. QUIGLEY: I like the goats.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Or with the goats.

MR. QUIGLEY: There you go.

b) Technical Report (Paula Tygielski)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Technical report, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Nothing to report.

c) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: City report.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Nothing to report.

d) Lennar Update (Neal Siler)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Lennar update.

MR. SILER: Okay. Tonight I will be taking the guise of Steve Farley, so I will be stepping out of my Neal Siler hat into Steve Farley's hat. You should have an eleven by seventeen figure that shows you an update for September 2011. And there are a number of documents that we're submitting and trying to get approved to do a number of PCB site cleanups. The most recent one was Building 746 UL-01, which is the PCB site in Building 746, which is shown on the left, the

picture on the left-hand side of the handout. We're also working on Building 225 PCB site and a number of fuel oil pipeline segments. And some work that we have completed that the report has just been submitted to the regulatory agencies. We're working on a number of different work plans to get back out into the field. You can see them listed there on the upcoming documents. One of the other areas that we recently submitted some site characterization documentation is shown in the upper right hand photograph which is the location of oil houses 434, 862, and cistern 36. And so hopefully when we get comments back from the regulatory agencies, we'll start to get the work done there. So that really is the conclusion of our report for right now. If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

MR. COFFEY: Where is cistern 36?

MR. SILER: Cistern 36 is on this side of the property right here, and then the oil houses are back in here where this concrete pad was.

e) Weston Update (Cris Jespersen)

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Weston update.

MR. JESPERSEN: I have a handout that hopefully you all have. First item is just a status of various documents that we have submitted or will be submitting to the regulatory agencies. And you can read that at your leisure. I'll skip down to Investigation Area H1 firefighting training area hydroseeding. And back in late 2010, Weston completed installing a two foot soil cover over the former firefighting training area. And that's the area where we previously had located our office support trailers for the work we're doing on the landfill. And we completed this two foot soil cover by hydroseeding the area last month. And that's for long-term erosion control purposes. So you can see the hydroseeding taking place. Next up is the Area H1 groundwater extraction trench status. And we continue to operate the groundwater extraction trench system. To date, we've extracted over 29 million gallons of groundwater. And this groundwater has been discharged to the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District storm sewer. During the last two months we've had some oil extraction observations. And the source of the oil is from the former waste oil sump at IR 02, that's located within the Area H1 containment area perimeter, soil bentonite slurry wall that was installed back in 2004. And a total of 2,118 gallons of oil were removed and disposed of off-site in August and September. And I know both of our regulators, Janet and Elizabeth, kind of arched their eyebrows when they read that, and I wasn't involved in this. So, I will have Dwight make a more formal report of this the next time when we get together --

MS. NAITO: Thank you.

MR. JESPERSEN: -- to explain why we got such a big hit there. But to date we've only extracted 6,803 gallons of oil since the system started operations.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Out of about four million that could be being extracted.

MR. JESPERSEN: Let's hope that's not the case. Next up is the survey of the annual settlement markers in the Investigation Area H1 landfill. And we completed an annual survey of the 53 monuments that are installed in the containment area. These monuments are to document whether or not we're getting any kind of significant settlement to the landfill cap system that we've constructed. And they measure settlement ranging from 0.01 feet to 0.62 feet, with an average settlement of 0.16 feet from the 2010 survey. And as we expected, the area with the higher settlement values were observed on the eastern side of the landfill which was the most

recently built section, and typically as the material is in-place, the settlement decreases to the lower values.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Why would settlement matter?

MR. JESPERSEN: You can get differential settlement which would cause the landfill to crack. And that's one of the reasons when we build a landfill with the heavy compaction, we try to get everything in place. But just the weight of the soil itself, because there's the Bay mud, you have some settlement.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. JESPERSEN: And finally, Investigation Area Site 05, pothole excavations and soil disposal activities. And there were three areas where we excavated based on soil samples that had been collected and the DTSC had identified them as data gap areas during their review of the Draft Final Remedial Investigation Report for IR-05, and removed approximately 220 cubic yards of impacted soil and excavated them. They were characterized for disposal as non-hazardous waste, and sent off-site for disposal between August 26th and 29th of 2011. And one other thing that's not on the handout, since several of our RAB members have mentioned using the trail, unfortunately we had to close the trail temporarily this week for a couple, three days. We're doing some additional work for the Navy on the paint waste area, and we're having to run some heavy equipment across the trail to access the borrow from one of the dredge ponds. And so there was a sign like this posted on the entrance gate which was blocked off, but it announced the trail would be closed between September 21st and 23rd, and again next week between September 26 and 28th due to construction and the safety of people out there. And we will have it – the trail area – open on the weekend so the public can access it when we're not operating the heavy equipment out there. But it's good to hear that the Touro folks are making use of it.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes.

MR. JESPERSEN: And that's all for the Weston report.

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

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Regulatory update.

MS. NAITO: I got nothing.

MR. COFFEY: She's all tuckered out, man.

MS. NAITO: I'm tired.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Have some cookies.

MS. NAITO: It's warm in here, it's outside of my comfort zone. Seriously, I got nothing today, other than a lot of notes on what I have to do next time.

MS. WELLS: The DTSC and the Water Board have been continuing reviewing reports and providing comments to the Navy and Lennar.

MS. NAITO: And CH2M Hill.

MS. WELLS: And CH2M Hill. And one thing I wanted to tell the RAB is that Mr. Kaiser's position, he was a senior geologist in the Department of Defense section, is actually going to be filled. I know, it's exciting. And so interviews have happened internally and the process is proceeding. I don't know when we'll find out who that person is, and I don't know if Mare Island

will be assigned, will stay with my current supervisor Alec Naugle or if it will be assigned to the new person. So if it's assigned to the new person, we'll make sure that that person comes out and introduces himself or herself to the RAB.

MR. COFFEY: Gets a proper dressing down.

MS. WELLS: Yes. And it's not allowed to say "nothing to report", and might have to bring snacks. And on that note, I would like to thank Miguel and the Navy, I enjoyed my cookies.

MS. NAITO: Who else brought cookies? Somebody else brought cookies.

MS. WELLS: The Navy brought them. And if someone would like to volunteer for the next meeting, now's a good time.

MR. COFFEY: I'll do it next time.

MR. QUIGLEY: Ooh, steak sandwiches.

MR. COFFEY: Not even.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Sausages on a stick.

MS. NAITO: I'm not sure we'd want to talk to each other after that.

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Okay. So co-chairs' report: I'll go ahead and do the Navy report and then turn it over to Myrna. The last month we did a review of the information repository. There were approximately 36 documents identified as being damaged there, and so those were repaired and returned to the library. We did conduct PCB removal actions at 505A, 782, and 824/A912 which is the one that Marie spoke of just a moment ago. There's a photo on the Navy monthly progress report of the work being conducted at Building 782. The work at 505A consisted of removal of a PCB contaminated discharge pipe. And there was soil removed at 782. And some concrete scabbling at Building 824. So, we still have a little bit more work to do at each of those sites, but it's progressing.

During the last month we submitted two reports and we received DTSC and Water Board and EPA comments on the Draft Final Investigation Area F1 Remedial Investigation Report. And comments from the Water Board and DTSC on the non-tidal wetland area investigation at Installation Restoration IR-17. And we received comments from the Water Board on a work plan for UST 993-4. So, we had a BCT meeting today and discussed some upcoming projects and some comments that have been received. And that's all. We will be having our next RAB meeting December 1st, and I will be sending out another monthly progress report next month via e-mail.

MR. COFFEY: You're not going to highlight the significance of this month and that ship?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: The New York.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Good point. Yes, we have USS New York as our photo. And I did not even notice that.

MR. COFFEY: And do you know why that ship is so special? Because that ship was actually made with materials from ground zero.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I did not know that.

MR. COFFEY: Yes, it was.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thank you so much for sharing.

MS. DREYER: Janet's learned a lot today.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: I have, about many, many things.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: There's more to come with my report coming up.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: All right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All right. Well, first of all, I want to thank the Navy and Geomatrix and their subcontractor, something like Zapata Blackhawk or something like that, for -- for the demonstration that they did of their demo technology that we learned about at the last RAB meeting through Herb Nelson.

MR. COFFEY: Herb.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right. They really had a tough time of it. Their keys got locked in the rental car, the keys to the ConEx box, and they couldn't get their unit out to show until the president of the company drove up from San Jose, and their keys are locked in the rental car, and the rental car company isn't coming to get them out.

MR. COFFEY: It's a rental car, break a window.

MR. QUIGLEY: Call AAA.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Anyway, it was an excellent demonstration. A lot of people gathered around, and one of my volunteers took a Youtube -- or a video, and maybe we can get that converted to a Youtube with some help. If anybody wants to help us, we would be very happy to have some help. And it was, I thought, a very effective demonstration and very, very interesting to people. I want to thank you for the flyer that came along with that for informing the public about munitions. And since the Navy won't give us munition items for display -- educational display -- we have a wonderful volunteer who is now lathing them himself in black walnut and hand painting the rotating bands that are most incredibly detailed projectiles. In fact, they alarmed Dwight greatly when he walked in. So come on down and see our fake projectiles, cause we're producing them up to -- we know -- he has a five inch as well. So just go to EBay, we get the shells, polishing them up, get the lathe out, make our own munitions, screw the Navy. By the time they get their old derelict stuff to us we'll have a state-of-the-art munitions museum, and we'll be informing the public along with their really well done little flyer.

MR. COFFEY: Myrna's own terrorist organization.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yes. Yes. Yes. And it wasn't my idea either, that's what's cool. And the very finest item in our collection just arrived two weeks ago, and it is that long awaited -- five years I've waited for this projectile. No one knows, it's a pre-1930, something after World War I, maybe a 60 millimeter, that has been converted to a lamp. It's been hand hammered by a Naval Ammunition Depot employee. There was a contest.

MR. COFFEY: That's cool.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And the shell is beautifully hammered. Gil, being the artist, would appreciate it -- with roses, butterflies. And it has three lights off of it. It's really a cool thing. So come down and see our display, I'm very proud of it.

MR. COFFEY: Don't ask don't tell lamp.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Speaking of your trail and that's -- remember, that trail is a remediation -- part of the final remedy to reduce the risk of the public's exposure to munitions. So, we want to thank ourselves for urging the Navy and their contractor to eventually -- to build that trail that has become so popular. And another indication of its popularness is that Lennar actually installed a sign for it, a highway sign. And it also has over 1,450 hits on our website on its page. So that's cool. Two more things, I think. Wendell can't hear me talk about this because he is a member of the Architectural Heritage and Landmarks Commission. For those who will be considering on October 13 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall in the regular commission meeting, the long awaited evaluation of the appropriateness of the replacement of Russian gravestones in the cemetery without permission, and without a whole bunch of other things. But that, again, has been on -- being readied by the City that that hearing, since the action took place illegally somewhere around August 25, 2010. So if you do have any kind of feelings about, beliefs about the -- maintaining the integrity of a U.S. military cemetery, the oldest Navy cemetery in the Pacific, and you feel compelled to visit that hearing, I would encourage you to. I would encourage you to speak about your concerns or your issues or your -- whatever you want to. That's a public process, it's our right, and you can also go to our website, MareIslandpreserve.org, and there is a button now called Russian Navy, and you can learn more about what some of the experts we've been working with recommend regarding that action. And you'll also begin to see links to documents -- material about the Russian Navy's visit to Civil War San Francisco where those six sailors ended up being a part, you know, dying during their stay here. And I want to note that we have these used copies of a fabulous book that are available for donation, \$10 donation to the Preserve called "Friends in Peace and War, the Russian Navy's Landmark Visit to Civil War San Francisco." It has many chapters on Mare Island and their involvement here, their stays here, their love stories from here. And it's written by C. Douglas Kroll who was then in the Navy reserve as a chaplain. And he now teaches at College of the Desert. And I can just highly recommend the book. It's a good, easy read, and very well documented. And again, just a \$10 donation for that, or you can go buy it in full price out on Amazon. And just two more things: (1) Mare Island Haunted Trails and Tails on the Saturday night before Halloween. Get scared in bunkers and cemeteries down at the south end. Then you'll get some resuscitating refreshments afterwards. So here are flyers for that. (2) And Skulls and Bones of the Rowser Garden. This is the actual skull from the Rowser Garden.

MR. COFFEY: You put it there, didn't you?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I did not. I was accused of putting that skull there, but there's an entire skeleton of a cow in the garden, and we have not pulled the French broom because that cow is lying in state there. However, my dog put that skull in the middle of the road and my friend took a photo of it. So I'm going to be giving a guided tour of some of the weird things that we found in the Rowser Garden on Saturday, October 8 at 3:30. And then just in case you want to learn about all the other cool things we're doing here on the Island to promote this wonderful place and get people out, here's the schedule of events for the next couple of months, including the Lost Boats of Mare Island Memorial that we'll be holding on Sunday, October 16. 1:30 flag raising at Morton Field -- this will be our fifth year. And at 2:15 services at berth six, including the memorial service, the wreath laying for the seven submarines built at Mare Island and lost at sea during World War II, and refreshments. And a special presentation by Weston Solutions' wonderful friend of ours Larry Maggini, who writes a lot of their work plans that end up being a

part of here on the environmental cleanup. And he has written the book, "The Lost Boats of Mare Island," that will also be available that day. But his presentation this year is called, "Richard Heatherington O'Kane and the Lost Boats." You probably know him, Medal of Honor recipient, many, many, many other accolades, commendations. And probably the most painful thing that could ever happen to any commander of a boat, his boat went down. The Tang was built here, lost at sea, he survived along with a handful of his men. Of course, they were in a prison camp -- picked up by the Japanese and placed in a prison camp where he, when the Americans came in, he was only 88 pounds and he was selected to be left to die, and people gathered around and said, "No, you gotta take him." But he lived his whole life with that tremendous loss -- that he came home and that his men did not. So I've already seen Larry's presentation, and it is very, very powerful and very, very interesting. He has a long, many ties at Mare Island with the Wahoo, who he was the executive officer aboard when Commander Dudley Morton was the commander, and that's what Morton Field here is named after. So anyway, I think that's it. And thank you very much for coming out today.

CO-CHAIR LEAR: Thanks, everybody. See you next time. Drive safe.

(Thereupon the proceedings ended at 9:08 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Installation Restoration Site 04 Data Gaps and Remedial Investigation Update - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-2, Aerial Photograph Circa 2004 - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-5, Sample Collection Locations - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-7, Location of Cross-Sections and Extent of 2007-2008 TCRA Excavation - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-8, Cross-Section IR04A to IR04A' - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-9, Cross-Section IR04B to IR04B' - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-10, Cross-Section IR04C to IR04C' - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 1-14, Conceptual Site Model Current Site Features - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 2-1, Chromium Concentrations in Soil and Sediment 0-2.25 Feet Below Ground Surface - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 2-2, TPH Motor Oil Concentrations in Soil and Sediment 0-2.25 Feet Below Ground Surface - Navy

- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 3-1, Volatile Organic Compound Concentrations in Soil and Sediment 0-2.25 Feet Below Ground Surface - Navy
- Presentation Figures – Installation Restoration Site 04, Remedial Investigation Report Figure 3-3, Volatile Organic Compound Concentrations in Groundwater - Navy
- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area D1.2 Five Year Review – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Features within the Eastern Early Transfer Parcel (EETP) – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Presentation Handout – Mare Island RAB Update September 21, 2011 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard September, 2011

RAB Meeting Minutes Comment/Correction Form

Meeting Minutes: September 21, 2011

RAB Member: _____

- I would like a copy of the final minutes of the above noted meeting.
- No comments or corrections to these minutes.
- See comments or corrections listed below.

Page No.	Line No.	Comment/Correction	Reviewed by	
			BEC	Hayes

Each RAB Member, please submit this form to:
Ms. Janet Lear or
Ms. Myrna Hayes

RAB Meeting Agenda Request/Comment Form

Meeting Date: January 26, 2012

RAB Member: _____

Agenda Item No.	Request/Comment	Reviewed By	
		BEC	Hayes
1			
2			
3			

Submit form to Janet Lear or Myrna Hayes