

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, June 16, 1999

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

ATTENDANCE :

Bill Collins	Foster Marshall
Richard Mach	Neal Clements
Carla Fargo	Bob Logan
John Locke	Debbie Wankier
Laura Hunter	Stephanie Kaupp
Marilyn Field	Mark Bonsavage
Stephen Dirtadian	Rafat Abbasi
Jerry Bailey	Steve de Young
Steve Hammett	Ed Kleeman
LaConta Coleman	Mike Hammond
Rick Phillips	Richard Dittbenner
Art Van Rooy	Ken Mitchell
Kim Edwards - Channel 10 News	
David Villegas - Channel 10 News	

1 CORONADO, CA., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1999, 6:35 P.M.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: I think we should start. Carla
4 can catch up.

5 Thanks everybody for coming to the Naval Air
6 Station North Island Restoration Advisory Board
7 meeting. We have a full agenda for tonight. In
8 fact, we actually have a few more things for tonight
9 than originally proposed, and at this time I'm going
10 to let Laura Hunter say something.

11 MS. HUNTER: Great. Thanks, Bill.

12 I'm going to just take a couple of minutes
13 of your time. We must announce that after five years
14 of membership on the Restoration Advisory Board, the
15 Environmental Health Coalition is resigning in
16 protest of the Navy's continued refusal to include
17 the public regarding the collective impacts of its
18 operations on our community's health.

19 We can no longer sit at the table in good
20 conscious while the Navy is all ears about the harm
21 of the past but completely deaf to community concerns
22 about the harm they are causing today.

23 The refusal to allow the RAB to discuss
24 issues such as the Navy's creation of new waste sites
25 and the refusal to allow public comment on the Draft

1 Pollution Prevention Plan, their obstruction of an
2 informational committee for the hazardous waste
3 facility, and the continued failure of the Navy to
4 release relevant information regarding the health
5 impact of its future operations such as the nuclear
6 homeporting project compel us to resign.

7 We're resigning in protest to draw attention
8 to the fact that the Navy uses the existence of the
9 RAB and the community representation on it to give
10 credence to its public outreach and represent a
11 caring attitude towards protecting its neighbors.
12 However, the attitude toward the public regarding the
13 ongoing pollution of our community is entirely
14 different.

15 If the Navy truly cared about us, it would
16 allow the dialogue and input to take place on all of
17 the pollution it causes and on all of the impacts and
18 threats to our health.

19 We certainly respect the participation of
20 other community members in this process, but urge you
21 to look critically at how this plays out; how the
22 Navy's operating regarding your interests, your
23 health, and your input.

24 When the Navy is ready to allow a public
25 dialogue about their complete impact to the health of

1 this region, we would be more than happy to
2 participate in such a dialogue.

3 I have copies of my statement for the RAB
4 members. Thank you.

5 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Laura.

6 We have a statement from Richard Dittbenner.

7 MR. DITTBENNER: Yes, Bill. I would like to
8 state, as you have pulled from the table, I'm also
9 resigning from the RAB this evening.

10 I've thought long and hard about it. This
11 certainly is no adverse reflection on you or Richard
12 or Mark Bonsavage, who I've been working with during
13 these past several years.

14 But as Laura from the Environmental Health
15 Coalition has indicated, I, too, believe that the
16 Navy is not serious about addressing in a
17 comprehensive way the serious environmental problems
18 we have and their role in those.

19 You are well aware, because I have copied
20 you on e-mail some of my concerns, so these are not
21 new to you. I am concerned that thoughtful community
22 citizens who are members of the Environmental Health
23 Coalition, myself, and some members of this RAB,
24 perhaps, when we attempt to meet with the powers
25 that be in the Navy here, they rebuff, they refuse,

1 they marginalize, they attempt to discredit, and they
2 attempt to interfere with the exercise of our rights.
3 That's not going on in this committee, but it's
4 happening in a broader sense.

5 When the Navy brought to this committee a
6 concern about the elemental mercury spill in San
7 Diego Bay, although it was not, strictly speaking,
8 part of the restoration activity of this base,
9 nevertheless, this committee, and the Navy in
10 particular, thought this was a good place to handle
11 in a comprehensive manner these environmental issues.

12 So what it comes down to is when the Navy
13 wants to air something, it will come here but it
14 doesn't allow a reciprocity by the community.

15 So I feel that under those circumstances
16 it's not appropriate for me to continue to window
17 dress in such a forum. And I think Laura's comment
18 about at such a time in the future I'll look at it
19 again, but I'll look at it again when the Navy has a
20 different attitude.

21 We're going to be here long after people
22 revolve in and out of this Command. It's our
23 community, and they should be talking to us. After
24 all, it's a democracy or I thought it was.

25 The interagency task force chaired by the
26 EPA, a working group of public participation in all

1 public agencies, has given very clear guidance on
2 what ought to be the goals of all federal agencies,
3 and the navy in San Diego falls far, far short of it.

4 And over there on the table I have a letter
5 that I sent to Secretary Cohen that addresses all
6 that I've said here in a more comprehensive manner,
7 and I would invite all of you to get a copy of it and
8 look at it.

9 Again, this is no adverse reflection on any
10 individual member of this RAB because I've enjoyed
11 the time I've spent with you; but there's a broader
12 issue involved here.

13 Thank you, Bill.

14 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Richard.

15 And there's still one more item. I received
16 a letter from Clifford Jordan, and he's indicated to
17 us that he can no longer attend the meetings. I
18 think he's been on the RAB for quite a while, and I
19 asked Carla to check with him to see if he wanted to
20 still be on the RAB or get any of our documents. I
21 know he doesn't want the thick and heavy documents.

22 MS. FARGO: I haven't gotten a hold of him
23 yet. It's on my list. I haven't seen him in a while
24 either. It could be that he has just decided to move
25 on.

1 MR. MITCHELL: Bill, Captain O'Brien found out
2 late this afternoon that Laura was planning on
3 resigning tonight. We didn't know that Mr.
4 Dittbenner was also, and he just wanted to say that
5 he was sorry to see that you were leaving.

6 He said that Captain Steuer, the previous
7 CO, passed on to him that you were what we in the
8 Navy would call a "plank holder." You were one of
9 the founding members of this organization; and they
10 said that your input was always very welcome at the
11 table, and that you really brought a lot of the
12 issues to the RAB and to the Navy that made us stop
13 and take a second look at some projects.

14 He says that -- Captain O'Brien reiterated
15 that you've got his phone number; that if you want to
16 talk to him that he would be pleased. He would like
17 for you to call at any time like that. He said he was
18 sorry that some of the issues that we were
19 discussing with the RAB we were not able to work out.
20 The main thing is what the charter of the RAB says on
21 a national level, and which you were looking at it to
22 do on a local level.

23 So he said thank you very much for all of
24 your support. He appreciates it; and if you need
25 anything, to call him.

1 Richard, like I said, I didn't realize you
2 were leaving until tonight. But, again, any input
3 from the community we are pleased to take and we are
4 pleased to work with. And, Laura, thank you very
5 much.

6 MS. HUNTER: Thank the Captain for me as well.

7 MR. MITCHELL: I will.

8 MS. FARGO: I would also like to say that I
9 worked with Laura really for only a very short period
10 of time both on the RAB and the RABTAC, and I will
11 greatly miss your input into the RAB.

12 If you can't be a member through the
13 Environmental Health Coalition, maybe you can just be
14 a member or get someone to present your views because
15 I think we all appreciate your input. I'll miss you
16 both.

17 MR. MITCHELL: One other little thing, Laura.
18 I don't expect you to wear this in public. We give
19 friends ball caps, so the next time you're out
20 tramping in the woods or something, you can wear
21 that.

22 Thank you, Bill.

23 MR. COLLINS: And I thank both of you, too,
24 for being on the RAB. Actually, Laura was on our
25 Technical Review Committee that we had a few years

1 before the RAB also and did participate. At that
2 time we only met two or three times a year.

3 Let's move along, and we're at the items for
4 the approval of the meeting minutes for March 31st
5 and May 20th.

6 (At this time Laura Hunter, Richard
7 Dittbenner, Kim Edwards, and David Villegas left the
8 meeting.)

9 MR. MACH: If you recall, last month there was
10 concern about the March 31st meeting minutes. Carla
11 said she had extensive comments at home that she was
12 going to send to me, but she and I spoke and she
13 couldn't find her comments and said go ahead and
14 finalize them. There were no other comments at the
15 April meeting.

16 So unless anyone has any further comments, I
17 would make the motion that the March minutes are
18 approved, and then we can move on to the April
19 minutes.

20 MR. KLEEMAN: I just have a question. Is
21 there a quorum necessary for the RAB to take action?

22 MR. COLLINS: That question comes up
23 frequently. We have never as a RAB firmly said 51
24 percent of the people or whatever. As long as
25 there's a fair representation, I would say that --

1 MS. FARGO: And it depends on what the issue
2 is. Approving minutes --

3 MR. COLLINS: Approving minutes are not
4 critical.

5 MS. FARGO: If it was an action or a policy or
6 a documentation, then maybe.

7 MR. MACH: I think with the two resignations
8 we're probably right at the quorum level. Pretty
9 close.

10 MR. COLLINS: I would think that we're good
11 for tonight. That would be my call.

12 MS. FARGO: I will second the motion to
13 approve the April minutes -- March minutes.

14 MR. COLLINS: Ayes? Sounds good. The March
15 minutes are approved. Now the --

16 MR. MACH: The April minutes, the only
17 question that came up was to add in the questions
18 before the responses for Laura's questions. Those
19 have been done, so those were already approved at the
20 last meeting with the incorporation of the questions.
21 So that was done and was mailed to you. You should
22 have a copy of that, so there should be no need to
23 vote on that again.

24 MS. FARGO: Was that mailed out with the May
25 minutes?

1 MR. MACH: That was mailed out --

2 MS. WANKIER: There were two separate
3 mailings. And there's more on the back table there
4 if anybody needs them.

5 MR. MACH: And with that, we're on to the May
6 minutes.

7 MR. COLLINS: Were there any comments on
8 those?

9 MRS. KAUPP: I noticed in the May minutes they
10 don't include comments or questions made by the
11 public and some of the other community members
12 because myself and Marilyn Field and Laura had asked
13 some questions and made some comments, and I'm just
14 kind of curious as to why they weren't included in
15 the minutes.

16 I think I had asked why NASNI was not
17 considered as a Superfund site, and if additional
18 monies would have been provided for NASNI if it
19 wasn't a Superfund site; and I think Marilyn had
20 asked questions.

21 So I'm concerned that the public
22 participation aspect is not documented in the
23 minutes, so I'm kind of curious as to why that change
24 happened.

1 MR. COLLINS: It may be because -- I mean, I
2 believe we have a statement now that a person can
3 find the full dialogue that took place in the
4 transcript, which is in the library. We have tried
5 to -- we're actually trying to keep our minutes down
6 to four pages for budgetary purposes.

7 MS. FARGO: I think she has a good valid
8 concern. If it was a point that was brought up and
9 we discussed, it probably should be in the minutes.
10 I'm not sure how our transcriber transcribed the
11 minutes, but they should probably be more inclusive.

12 MR. ABBASI: I believe -- I was not here, but
13 Jennifer was here, and she tells me there was three
14 questions: one of them was NPL related.

15 MR. MACH: Right.

16 MRS. KAUPP: Yes. And I know Marilyn Field
17 had asked a question and then Laura Hunter had asked
18 a question.

19 To me it seems the minutes are more of a
20 synopsis of the presentations versus participation.

21 MS. FARGO: I have to agree with that because
22 I think if someone wants to read the verbatim
23 transcript, that's well and good. But if we're going
24 to do minutes, they should be representative of the
25 meeting. Even short, but it still could be
26 representative of everything that went on.

1 MR. COLLINS: Well, we can fix these. We can
2 adjust them.

3 I think it's a good point because if you
4 spent your hour or two at a RAB meeting and you've
5 asked what you would consider to be an important
6 question, then you would like to at least see that
7 somebody else recognizes that it was important, too.

8 MS. FARGO: Perhaps for the record, we should
9 request anyone speaking from the audience to state
10 their name so that it would be in the minutes. That
11 would be a little easier, also.

12 MRS. KAUPP: And then how do we get those
13 questions into this set of minutes?

14 MR. MACH: I'll take that comment. We'll go
15 back through the transcript and pull out the
16 questions and add them in, and we'll go to approve
17 them at the next meeting.

18 MR. COLLINS: We may paraphrase it, both the
19 questions and the answers to shorten it, but we will
20 recognize that the question was asked and give an
21 answer.

22 MS. FARGO: That's what we do with everybody.

23 MRS. KAUPP: The question and then the answer?

24 MS. FARGO: Right. Just to try to be as
25 complete as you can. I know it's hard.

1 MRS. KAUPP: I have one other thought, also.
2 This is not about the minutes, but somewhat related.

3 The agendas seem to be too full, not enough
4 time for the public participation with questions.

5 And these are very technical meetings for
6 me, and I ask a lot of dumb questions, and I feel
7 like with such a full agenda we don't have that
8 opportunity. We're only allocated ten minutes for
9 questions and answers, and I don't feel that's long
10 enough.

11 So I'd like to request for the next time
12 that perhaps it could be cut down.

13 MR. COLLINS: That's a good point. I think we
14 can do it, and this isn't the first time. It's
15 happened many times. We've had so much to talk
16 about what's going on in the IR program at North
17 Island, and then when we throw NAB Coronado in, we
18 have even more that it does become difficult to talk
19 about everything and then to provide time for
20 questions, too.

21 So maybe it's a good idea that we only have
22 two or three topics at the most in any one night, and
23 it may be that we have to vote on whether or not next
24 month we want to have Site 5 or Site 9 and have
25 people raise hands because that would be like the
26 third topic, and we can't please everybody.

1 I think that would be a good thing if we
2 stuck to no more than three major presentations at
3 the RAB and allow more time for discussion.

4 MR. MACH: I think if you're going to start
5 dropping topics off, you need to start considering
6 either starting the meetings earlier and getting all
7 the topics in or having meetings more often if
8 there's that much information to put out; otherwise,
9 you'll get a lot of information about a couple of
10 topics, but the rest of the base will be moving ahead
11 and you may not know what's going on.

12 MR. COLLINS: I think there's a way around
13 that. And, of course, it means more work for us in
14 the Navy, but we could prepare a summary sheet on
15 other topics of projects that are going on that we're
16 not going to present that night, whether it's a half
17 a page synopsis of what's going on at a particular
18 site. We can cover that. And then maybe the next
19 month the person reading through that synopsis might
20 say, "Well, why don't you focus in on this particular
21 topic and bring us up to date." Would that work?

22 MRS. KAUPP: I like that idea if we could have
23 an ongoing synopsis and an update of the different
24 cleanup sites. That makes sense to me.

25 MR. COLLINS: I don't think that would be too
26 difficult. We prepare reports for management and for

1 the state and for other people, so it's just
2 assembling one more little report out of many. We can
3 do that.

4 MR. KLEEMAN: I would just observe that you
5 certainly allow questions throughout the meeting, so
6 it's not fair to say that you only have ten minutes
7 to ask questions because during any particular
8 presentation we are able to ask questions.

9 MRS. KAUPP: However, at the last meeting
10 there was very little time for questions and answers
11 because it was such a full agenda. There was a lot
12 of presentations with that.

13 MR. VAN ROOY: That happens to us fairly
14 frequently.

15 MR. COLLINS: Okay. We will try something
16 new. We'll make the minutes more informative in the
17 future to take into account the questions; and we'll
18 also come up with a summary sheet that we can have
19 for various projects going on that we're not going to
20 address at that particular RAB meeting, and we'll
21 limit ourselves to let's say three presentations. I
22 think that will work, and we will revise the May
23 minutes then.

24 Okay. Then moving along, our first topic of
25 tonight, San Diego Bay Munitions Preliminary

1 Assessment, the update presentation, and Steve de
2 Young from Bechtel National will present that.

3 MR. De YOUNG: Thanks, Bill. Is that clear?

4 As Bill said, I'm Steve de Young. I'm with
5 Bechtel National. I'm the task order leader for a
6 study known as the Preliminary Assessment of
7 Munitions in San Diego Bay Primary Ship Channels and
8 Stennis homeporting beach replenishment areas.

9 We spoke before this RAB a few months back
10 when we were kicking the project off, and I thought
11 I'd go back over a little bit of the introductory
12 material to explain why we're doing this preliminary
13 assessment, and then bring you up to date on some of
14 our findings, some of the areas that we're looking
15 at, and some comments we've received on a Preliminary
16 Draft Work Plan.

17 In 1997 as part of the base realignment and
18 closure activity, the Stennis aircraft carrier was
19 homeported down at San Diego at North Island in this
20 area. To accommodate that homeporting of the nuclear
21 aircraft carrier, the bay and outside the mouth of
22 the bay needed to be dredged to a deeper depth to
23 allow the ship to enter the port.

24 Due to the El Nino conditions down in
25 Southern California in the 1996-97 time frame, the
26 decision was made during the permitting of the

1 project to take some of the dredged sand material and
2 relocate it to a number of offshore areas here at
3 Mission Beach, Del Mar, and an onshore area up at
4 south Oceanside beach.

5 In September of '97 as material was being
6 placed on south Oceanside beach, munitions were
7 discovered on the beach by beach goers. The beach
8 was immediately shut down, and the Navy initiated
9 removal of the munitions, a long-term evaluation,
10 scans of the beach. What was discovered were eleven
11 20-millimeter rounds, two 81-millimeter mortar
12 rounds, and two small caliber rifle rounds.

13 This continued through March of '98 when it
14 was determined that there were no more munitions on
15 south Oceanside beach and that was discontinued.

16 In the interim period, the Department of
17 Toxic Substances Control and the Regional Water
18 Quality Control Board sent letters to the Navy
19 requesting information on the issue, and the Navy's
20 response to that in part was to begin this
21 preliminary assessment.

22 I should point out I've got a copy of my
23 handouts in the back. Some of these are a little bit
24 busy, so you may want to have that to follow along.

25 As I described at the last presentation, a
26 preliminary assessment is the first step in the

1 CERCLA process. It's typically limited to an
2 evaluation of archival records, interviews with
3 individuals who have some knowledge on particular
4 issues, and looking at things like aerial photographs
5 as well as a public outreach exercise.

6 Since the initiation of our records reviews
7 in January, we have reviewed local, Navy and U.S.
8 Army UXO or Unexploded Ordnance Incidence Reports.
9 These are maintained only from the years 1995 through
10 1999. We're making an effort at this point to locate
11 records prior to that point, but it looks like they
12 were only maintained at the base or at the bases down
13 here for a period of three years.

14 We've also reviewed numerous aerial photos
15 from multiple sources including the bases here, the
16 national archives in Laguna Niguel, the Port District,
17 and the San Diego Historical Society.

18 We've looked at maps and records, volumes of
19 them at the Port District, as well as the bases here
20 in the region.

21 We've interviewed Explosive Safety Officers
22 from the area bases, those people who are most
23 knowledgeable on munitions, handling practices,
24 what's typically done.

25 We've contacted various Navy and military
26 retiree organizations and that's continuing. This is

1 in an effort to get interviews to have people who
2 served down in this area to provide us information
3 historically over the length of time that the San
4 Diego area has been in Navy operations, to provide us
5 information on any past munitions handling practices.

6 And we've spent many weeks up at the
7 National Archives in Laguna Niguel looking at records,
8 and to date we've probably looked at 50 linear feet
9 of records that are maintained at the National
10 Archives.

11 I mentioned one of the sources of
12 information that we looked at were the Unexploded
13 Ordnance Incidence Reports. Whenever there is a
14 discovery down here, a report is filed for the
15 individuals within the Navy who go out and respond to
16 that incident. We discovered that in 1999 two M1
17 demolition blocks that are approximately a half a
18 pound or a pound in size were discovered at the Fleet
19 Industrial Supply Center Fuel Pier.

20 In 1999 at Naval Station several small arms
21 rounds and a Marine locator device or a flare were
22 located during a dredging operation at Pier 3 at the
23 Naval Station.

24 In 1997, 127 rounds of 25 millimeter
25 ammunition -- some of this in a munition belt and

1 some of it was laying on the bay floor -- were
2 discovered at Pier 1 and 2 at Naval Station.

3 Also in '97 a three-inch ceremonial round
4 was discovered at Pier 1 at the Naval Station; and
5 the records indicated that there were numerous
6 Marine locator devices or flares that had washed up
7 on beaches throughout this period.

8 And, again, we're trying to go back and
9 locate additional records earlier than the -- or past
10 the 1995 point.

11 At the National Archives -- and these are
12 records that go back for many, many years -- there
13 were a couple of interesting findings. In 1943 there
14 was a record of six depth charges being accidentally
15 discharged into the bay. The records indicate that
16 all six of the depth charges were located and
17 removed.

18 In 1941 there was a plane crash in the bay.
19 There was an indication that two Mark 9 bombs and a
20 Mark 3 depth charger were lost in the bay. They
21 conducted a response to that; went through July of
22 1943 when the two bombs were located, and it was
23 determined to destroy those in place, and that did
24 occur.

25 And from what we he can tell from the
26 records, in 1943 they did not or as of 1943, they had

1 not located the depth charge. There's no record
2 indicating that, but we're continuing searches for
3 that record.

4 One of the things that we picked up through
5 actually one of the RAB meetings here was a
6 recommendation that we talk to the local divers
7 association, and as a result of that, there was
8 mention made of a sunken patrol boat. As it was
9 passed onto us, it was actually in the bay and it was
10 supposedly destroyed in place. We went back and
11 searched many records and couldn't find any incidence
12 of that occurring in the bay.

13 What we did discover is that about a mile
14 and a half from Point Loma a patrol boat was
15 discovered in about a hundred feet of water, and this
16 was back in 1983, and it was in fact destroyed in
17 place. However, that incident was well outside of
18 the study area that we're looking at here, so I just
19 thought I'd mention it because it was brought up at a
20 RAB meeting.

21 In December of last year we issued a
22 Preliminary Draft Work Plan describing how we were
23 going to go about conducting the preliminary
24 assessment, and as a result of that, we've received
25 comments back from the Environmental Health
26 Coalition, one of their reviewers at the University
27 of Maryland, and from the City of Coronado.

1 I'd like to briefly touch upon what I think
2 are the main points of those comments. We're still
3 waiting for comments from the Department of Toxic
4 Substances Control on the Work Plan; and when we
5 receive those comments, we'll finalize everything and
6 issue the Final Work Plan with more detailed response
7 to these.

8 EHC's first comment was that because no data
9 -- meaning analytical data -- will be collected
10 during the PA, it's a foregone conclusion that the
11 Navy will decide on No Further Action.

12 As I described briefly this evening and at
13 the first RAB meeting, as is described in the Work
14 Plan, preliminary assessment does not include
15 environmental sampling. The purpose of this study is
16 to pinpoint areas where there is a potential impact
17 where future environmental sampling may be warranted.

18 So you take a large area, you look at those
19 subareas within that larger area, and that's where
20 you focus your attention on the next phase of the
21 study.

22 They also indicated that diver studies
23 should be done extensively in the project area, and
24 again, that may well be warranted, but it's not
25 something that we do in a preliminary assessment.

1 There was a question on the aerial
2 photographs and why we looked at aerial photographs
3 that actually doing video photography in the bay
4 would be more relevant to what we're looking for. The
5 reason that we looked at aerial photographs is to try
6 to determine if there were uses that have changed in
7 the region over time; if there were weapons loading
8 piers or perhaps anchorages that might have been used
9 20, 30, 40 years ago that are not indicated on any
10 current photos or figures.

11 There was a comment that we not restrict our
12 review only to Navy munitions. This study is, of
13 course, being conducted for Southwest Div for the
14 Navy. However, any indication in any of the records
15 that we find of other arms of the military down here
16 that may have had some impact on munitions in the bay
17 is included and will be included in our report.

18 There was a question we include Imperial
19 Beach which received munitions and recently had
20 munitions wash up on shore. And, again, the focus of
21 this study is the primary ship channel, the areas
22 that are determined at this point to be the most
23 likely to be impacted in future dredging operations
24 within the bay.

25 EHC commented that potential receptors
26 included in the PA should include future beach goers
27 and consumers of San Diego fish. It's a good

1 comment, and we have included that in our risk
2 evaluation portion.

3 And finally, that we include a full review
4 of maps. We got a comment from Laura that through
5 anonymous phone calls to the EHC, somebody had
6 identified the Weapons Disposal Area north of the
7 Coronado Bridge. And in all of the records that
8 we've looked at, there's no indication of any Weapons
9 Disposal Area. There are utility corridors in that
10 area; but, again, we're continuing to look for that.
11 In fact, I was going to ask her tonight if she could
12 provide me additional information, so I'll contact
13 her outside of this.

14 The comments from Theodore Henry at the
15 University of Maryland -- and, again, these are
16 comments on the Work Plan -- that the use of the term
17 "potential presence of munitions" should be avoided
18 in the Work Plan. We'll go back and clarify that
19 when we're using the term "potential presence," we're
20 talking about the potential to locate additional
21 munitions during dredging activities.

22 His comment was that "EHC should request the
23 opportunity to review and comment on draft fact
24 sheets." We have one fact sheet out at this point.
25 To my knowledge, they have not requested that they
26 review the drafts of those.

1 He commented that the Work Plan should be
2 more specific on how the sources of information will
3 be reviewed during the preliminary assessment. And
4 it's a good comment we will incorporate. Now that we
5 have a lot of those activities under our belt, we'll
6 incorporate how we're looking at records, how we're
7 identifying them and evaluating them.

8 He commented that other installations,
9 agencies, and past commanders should not only be
10 interviewed for the PA but we should ask them about
11 information for other places to look or other people
12 to talk to, and we have in fact been doing that
13 throughout our interviews.

14 EHC should meet with Southwest Div to
15 explore potential findings of the PA. The decision
16 matrix should be developed so that we can determine
17 how decisions are going to be made, how they'll
18 impact future studies, and that's a good comment that
19 I expect to be incorporated during the review of the
20 draft PA plan.

21 And that possible options for conducting a
22 Site Investigation or a Site Inspection, I should
23 say -- that's the next step in the process -- should
24 be included in the PA. At this point that's not
25 within the scope of what we're doing. If we get
26 later into the process and it's determined that that
27 might be relevant, we'll evaluate it at that point.

1 We have one comment from the City of
2 Coronado that "Anything short of some physical
3 sampling will tell little, and such sampling is
4 certainly justified." Again, the purpose of the PA
5 is not to do sampling. It's to do records reviews
6 and interviews. So that comment may be relevant
7 during the site inspection phase.

8 MR. KLEEMAN: Pardon me. I saw two comments
9 in that last paragraph.

10 MR. De YOUNG: "Moreover, sampling should be
11 considered for wider portions of the bay, and also
12 for beach areas in Coronado that have been augmented
13 by bay dredge materials," the general comment being
14 that sampling should be considered, and at this point
15 it's not within the scope of the preliminary
16 assessment.

17 We're conducting a community relations
18 activity in support of the preliminary assessment. To
19 date we've developed an interview questionnaire and a
20 list of interviewees that's been reviewed by a
21 Public Participation Specialist at the Department of
22 Toxic Substances Control. The Navy has sent out
23 letters to more than 60 individuals requesting that
24 they participate in the community relations interview
25 process, and for this RAB I believe that Carla Fargo
26 and Sandy Kaupp are on the list. If they haven't
27 received the letter to date, they will receive it.

1 But we'd also like to recommend that any other
2 members of the RAB who would like to participate in
3 that get in touch with Lee Saunders.

4 And the next step in the community relations
5 activity is to begin conducting these interviews. So
6 far we have received requests for two interviews, and
7 we will be conducting those in addition to all the
8 other interviews over the next four to six weeks.

9 As far as the schedule is concerned, the
10 preliminary draft PA report we're anticipating in
11 August of this year. The Work Plan, depending on
12 when we receive the DTSC comments, we're looking at
13 July of this year to finalize the Work Plan.

14 As I said, community interviews are going to
15 be conducted this month and next month, and we're
16 looking at a Preliminary Draft Community Relations
17 Plan in September of 1999.

18 At the last round of RAB presentations there
19 were a number of comments that were made during the
20 RAB meeting, and one of those was that there should
21 be a way for people to anonymously report
22 information. To support that, we've opened up an 800
23 number where people can anonymously or otherwise call
24 in and provide information.

25 We're also, as part of the community
26 relations along with that, issuing a number of public

1 notices and papers just to try to get more of the
2 former Navy employees to provide information on the
3 process on past munitions handling practices.

4 And that's it. Any questions?

5 MR. COLLINS: We have time for a few
6 questions.

7 MR. FARGO: I just want to clarify that the
8 map -- the colored map, do we have a copy of that
9 included as part of the record?

10 MR. De YOUNG: We can get you one.

11 MS. FARGO: Only because you referred to it in
12 your presentation, and that really has to be a rule,
13 I think, with all presenters. If you have anything
14 you refer to, we need to put it in the record. I'm
15 sorry I'm being a stickler.

16 MR. De YOUNG: That's fine. It's the same
17 map that we used last time.

18 MS. FARGO: Do we have it from last time's
19 presentation, then, maybe?

20 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Probably from January.

21 MR. De YOUNG: Both of these were in the last
22 presentation.

23 MR. VAN ROOY: I'm just going to make a
24 comment.

1 I was involved in a project in Pearl Harbor
2 about 20 years ago where we were looking for sources
3 of pollution, and we put ads in the newspaper asking
4 former workers to come in and be interviewed, and I
5 was amazed at the success we had. Somebody who worked
6 there in 1933 remembered these varied pipelines, and
7 I would think the same thing could be done for
8 munitions.

9 MR. De YOUNG: Okay. Good.

10 MRS. KAUPP: I don't understand the area that
11 the munitions is concerned with. Is it just in the
12 bay waters?

13 MR. De YOUNG: The area that we're concerned
14 with is what we're calling the primary ship channel,
15 and this entire area outlined in black here is the
16 bay, of course; the purple area here denotes the
17 Stennis homeporting dredge footprint; and the green
18 area is indicative of the primary ship channels. So
19 it's those areas within the bay where you would have
20 expected to see Navy vessels that performed or have
21 munitions on board. It's obviously the anchorages
22 around the bases.

23 MRS. KAUPP: So are you going back to the
24 areas, for example, around the quay wall between
25 Piers 1 and 2 where munitions were found in the past?
26 Is there a potential for other munitions still?

1 MR. De YOUNG: The fact that those were
2 discovered in the past would be a finding in a
3 preliminary assessment.

4 MRS. KAUPP: I'm a little concerned with the
5 area that was dredged for the new pier for the
6 Stennis that's now covered up. Does that have the
7 potential of having munitions inside that area?

8 MR. MACH: The CDF.

9 MR. De YOUNG: The CDF. I don't know the
10 answer to that. I mean, certainly we haven't
11 discovered anything other than the munitions that
12 were located as part of the eel grass mitigation
13 area.

14 That went into the CDF, did it not?

15 MR. MACH: All the sand that came from the
16 eel grass mitigation area was screened prior to being
17 placed into the CDF. Ultimately it was dredged from
18 the turning basin and put in there. I don't know the
19 answer to that.

20 MS. FARGO: But is your question is there a
21 potential that munitions may have been covered up?
22 That's a different issue. Not what was put there was
23 dredged but was covered up.

24 MRS. KAUPP: It's both, really, because if the
25 Stennis is parked right there, it's only the

1 potential for any future explosive activity or
2 anything of that nature if something happens there.

3 MR. COLLINS: Let me address that.

4 The area in the bay where we built the new
5 rock wall dike, there won't be any munitions there
6 because we dredged all that material and then put it
7 behind the rock wall; and then behind the rock wall
8 itself up to the shoreline is now buried by several
9 feet -- up to 40 feet or more of sand, and we will
10 not be drilling through that looking for left over
11 munitions or anything.

12 In the future if somebody wanted to -- let's
13 say a few hundred years in the future if somebody
14 decided to remove that construction project to do
15 something else, that is something that they would
16 have to consider as a possible construction
17 constraint, and they might go looking for it then,
18 but we won't be looking in that particular area
19 because there's no way for a human to come in touch
20 with it right now.

21 MR. KLEEMAN: I'm a little confused as to what
22 the logic was in choosing just the major ship
23 channels for doing the analysis or focusing on the or
24 having your analysis focused in those areas.

25 And the reason I say that -- well, two
26 reasons: you have a recreation marina right in this

1 area -- I think it's right there -- and this land
2 area next to it. When they did the analysis, perhaps
3 a dozen years ago or more of a proposed recreation
4 facility, they discovered substantial munitions
5 buried in that area. Now, I couldn't tell from the
6 Naval documents how it got there, whether it was
7 there because it was an area that was used for target
8 practice, whether it was there because somebody had
9 dropped it in the bay and it was dredged and was
10 placed there because of the dredging or whatever.

11 I thought I remembered that they also
12 mentioned in that report that they had tried dredging
13 off of that area and the dredging had an explosion
14 from what they were dredging up, so that would
15 suggest to me that this area has a problem.

16 In addition to that, I know that somewhere
17 in the middle of the bay you had an area I think in
18 the '30s for seaplanes to take off and land.

19 MR. COLLINS: That's correct.

20 MR. KLEEMAN: And I would think that if you
21 have problems of things dropping off of ships, you
22 probably have problems of things dropping off of
23 airplanes that are preparing to take off or land. So
24 I would think that the problem is more extensive than
25 the area you chose to focus on.

1 In addition, our comments that you covered
2 in the presentation here suggested that there is sand
3 that was dredged from the bay that was placed on
4 Coronado proper, and I'm not sure why the decision
5 was made that since it was already there and not out
6 in the bay, it shouldn't be a concern of the Navy.

7 I would think -- I know a large part of that
8 area that was recently dredged is now off limits
9 because it's a wildlife area, but that doesn't mean
10 that it should just be ignored. And as to the
11 possibility that if something was dropped off of a
12 ship that it could end up being on our beaches, and
13 I'm not too sure -- I know that some dredged sands
14 were placed on the ocean side of the beach for the
15 Navy property; and while that property is still Navy
16 training, you have quite a few people walking along
17 that beach going all the way down to Imperial Beach
18 and back.

19 So I'm just wondering why you limited your
20 analysis the way you did.

21 MR. BONSAVAGE: I'll explain it to you.

22 Basically because the munitions that were
23 discovered -- remember, "discovery" is an important
24 word when it comes to the PA -- were part of this
25 project, this dredging project. So that's why we

1 limited it to that project because we discovered
2 munitions as part of that project.

3 So if we were to go -- and then the next
4 step would be, well, can we find out where these came
5 from, the munitions that were discovered during this
6 project. So that's really the focus of this study.
7 And while we're doing this, if we start gathering
8 reports of munitions here, munitions there, munitions
9 there, then we'll have to address them.

10 But the idea is we wanted to keep it
11 manageable, and so we really wanted to find the
12 source of the items that were found as part of this
13 project. So that's really why it's focused and kind
14 of limited in scope on this.

15 MS. FARGO: But are not all -- you've done
16 your records review and these interviews, and it
17 seems you've uncovered information of other munitions
18 in the general area, so are you in fact going to
19 cover all of it? Everything you find and follow
20 every lead if it's a munition having any proximity to
21 the bay, is that going to be within the scope of the
22 final PA?

23 MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, I think you really have
24 to look at what the reports tell you. If I have --
25 if I get a report that's saying there's a large
26 amount of munitions buried in this one place, then

1 that would tell me to go out; but if I have a report
2 like an anonymous phone call saying they saw two
3 bullets on the beach, well, it's hard to act on
4 something like that. So really if we get some good
5 hard information that there's something there, well,
6 of course, we'd do something about it.

7 MS. FARGO: Well, I guess I'm still asking the
8 same question, though, that Stephanie is asking.

9 Is the preliminary assessment scope going
10 to change based on the final report? At least, is it
11 going to change based on what you find?

12 MR. BONSAVAGE: Of course. Of course. If you
13 find something that would fall under CERCLA as saying
14 this is significant, this constitutes an SI, then,
15 yes, we would act. We would say that this falls
16 under our regulations that we can move under. Yes.
17 If something came up that was significant, yes, we
18 would change it.

19 But what I'd really have to do is see the
20 report that you're talking about. I guess you said
21 there was a report?

22 MR. KLEEMAN: I have two copies of it in my
23 office.

24 MR. BONSAVAGE: That's what I'd need. I need
25 to get a hold of that to see what it says because
26 that's exactly what we're looking for.

1 MR. KLEEMAN: That's a Navy report, not mine.

2 MR. COLLINS: I want to add something.

3 The area that's now the wildlife refuge, I
4 believe that's not being looked at because it's well
5 documented. The material is there, and it's in a
6 controlled environment, buried by more than eight
7 feet of sand, and the regulating wildlife body for
8 that area wishes to keep it like that rather than
9 have the stuff dug up to protect humans when there's
10 really no humans to protect because they're not
11 allowed out there, and it disrupts the wildlife.

12 They're willing to compromise in that
13 respect. Keep the humans out and let the birds and
14 the little animals use the surface and everything
15 will be fine and dandy. I think that's one of the
16 trade offs with things that have happened.

17 And I think we have to move on because we're
18 way behind.

19 MR. ABBASI: How much material was dredged?
20 How deep was it?

21 MR. COLLINS: Millions of yards. Over time it
22 was millions.

23 MR. BONSAVAGE: Ten million is close, maybe
24 more.

25 MR. ABBASI: It should be very deep, though.

1 MR. BONSAVAGE: Yes.

2 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Let's move along then.
3 We're a little bit behind schedule, and Richard can
4 talk fast, but it won't be that fast.

5 MR. MACH: If you recall, last month Bill gave
6 a presentation on the IMA/CCR, the Interim Measures
7 Assessment/Current Conditions Report, and in there he
8 told you we've been telling you all about these 12
9 IR sites, but we've really got 140 sites when you
10 take into account all the underground storage tanks
11 and different tanks that have hazardous waste.

12 What I'm about to give you right now is a
13 presentation on one of those areas. It actually
14 encompasses several of these sites, and it's all in
15 one contaminated area.

16 This is the same presentation I gave to a
17 bunch of Navy representatives. We have an annual
18 cleanup conference in Port Hueneme every April. So
19 rather than reproduce the presentation, I'm using the
20 same one. It's on a CD. It's a pretty big
21 presentation, so we'll just go right through this.

22 If you care, there are handouts in the back
23 that have all my slides. There are also areas for
24 you to write notes, if you care, and you can see that
25 this presentation is also available on our Web page.
26 So if you want to take a look at it in further

1 detail, you can because there are video clips in here
2 which I couldn't print out.

3 As you can see here, here's an aerial
4 photograph of NAS North Island. The area that we're
5 talking about is this area right in here. Actually,
6 in particular, it started right where the arrow is
7 pointing to and it's grown over time, and you'll see
8 that as I go through this presentation.

9 A quick overview. We thought we went out
10 there for a nice simple removal action. We were
11 going to remove some free product, all petroleum. We
12 had done a site assessment. We knew about 90 percent
13 of the boundary of the free product. We went ahead
14 and awarded a delivery order to OHM to go out there
15 and remove this free product that was floating on the
16 water table.

17 Lo and behold, we discovered that there was
18 some TCE in our free product. We stopped our removal
19 action, took a step back, tried to decide where we
20 really needed to go with this; used some risk-based
21 decision making to do some additional investigation
22 under the remediation contract so we can hopefully
23 get moving on with the removal action, and I'll go
24 through some of the innovative technologies that we
25 used for that.

26 And then we had --

1 MS. FIELD: What's the free product?

2 MR. MACH: The free product is petroleum. It
3 was jet fuel, JP-5 and some Stoddard solvent.

4 MS. FARGO: And about how much product did you
5 think you might be dealing with?

6 MR. MACH: It was only estimated to be up to a
7 foot thick. We needed about 20 wells to remove it,
8 and I don't recall the exact volume that was
9 estimated. It's small compared to some other
10 problems we have, but it was small.

11 So I'll also go through the groundwater
12 analysis. We've actually completed Phases 1 and 2,
13 and we're getting ready for Phase 3, and I've got
14 some summary slides.

15 So like I said, we had a site investigation
16 done. They detected JP-5 and Stoddard solvent as our
17 free product. As I just said, we went ahead and
18 awarded the removal action contract, and we set out
19 to install our wells.

20 You can see right here this is Building 379
21 right here, this is 397 under here, and this is the
22 edge of 472. We had two little plumes right here,
23 JP-5 and Stoddard solvent; and as you've seen in some
24 of our investigations, the contractor will put a
25 solid line delineating where the contamination is,

1 and they'll put a dotted line where they think, say,
2 "We think it ends right about here."

3 Well, this right here was a dotted line, and
4 we thought "Okay. It doesn't go much further than
5 that." Keep that in mind because in two slides
6 you'll see what happened.

7 So our RAC contractor, OHM, went out there.
8 They had the work plans approved. They installed the
9 20 groundwater monitoring or free product recovery
10 wells, and they put some downgradient groundwater
11 monitoring wells to make sure that that dotted line
12 that we saw in the investigation report was true and
13 to verify that we weren't migrating our free product.

14 And lo and behold, our free product extent
15 grew in size about four times to this. So you see,
16 right here is where our dotted line was, and we
17 thought it ended, and here's our new plume. This edge
18 right here is basically right around an inch. This
19 center contour right here is five feet thick. So we
20 thought "Okay. Now we've just got a bigger plume.
21 We'll move forward with this."

22 We took some lessons learned from the fuel
23 farm where we actually found lead in our fuel after
24 we had begun our removal action. So we decided, you
25 know, we'd better take a look for lead. We were
26 talking to the NADEP workers, and they said, "You

1 know, we used to use TCE in one of the buildings over
2 there. You may want to take a look for that as
3 well."

4 So we said, "Yeah. It would be prudent
5 before we went ahead removing this stuff." We took
6 some additional analysis of the free product. No
7 lead, so we were pretty happy about that. But, lo
8 and behold, we had high levels of TCE in our free
9 product.

10 So this is where we came up with our
11 risk-based sampling approach. We really wanted to
12 get on with our removal action, hopefully, but we
13 needed additional information about the aerial extent
14 of our plume here so we knew the right steps to take.

15 So we started looking at what our pathways
16 were. DQOs -- this is probably a new acronym for
17 you-- that's Data Quality Objectives. It's an EPA
18 approach where you look at what are your problems,
19 what are your end goals so that you make sure that
20 your sampling gives you the data that you need so
21 that you can properly perform whatever it is you're
22 looking to perform, whether it be a removal action,
23 completion of an investigation -- whatever your goals
24 are, your sampling approach is designed
25 appropriately.

1 We had to get a regulatory buy in at this
2 point. We were still dealing with the Water Board
3 as our lead regulatory agency, and that is in the
4 process right now of shifting to DTSC, and I'm not
5 sure if that has completely transferred. I know Rafat
6 and Charles are working together on this, and there
7 will be an official turnover of lead responsibility
8 soon. But up to now we've been dealing with Charles
9 Cheng at the Water Board on this.

10 And we identified two pathways that we were
11 really concerned about. We were concerned that the
12 VOCs, the TCE could volatilize into the building
13 where the NADEP workers performed their jobs daily,
14 and we were concerned that the TCE could get into the
15 groundwater, flow with the groundwater, and get to
16 San Diego Bay. So those were our two risk pathways
17 that we wanted to identify.

18 So we wanted to identify if there are any
19 additional sources of TCE, where it could be coming
20 from because now that we found it, then we need to
21 find out where exactly it's coming from. We knew some
22 sources, but we wanted to verify any others.

23 We wanted to use an isolation flux chamber
24 sampling device to sample the flux or the off gas
25 into the buildings. I'll show you a little more
26 detail of that in a minute. We wanted to look at the
27 free product, analyze what was in the free product.

1 We'd only taken a couple of samples to date so far.
2 And we needed to look at the groundwater on the --
3 the downgradient groundwater flow direction to verify
4 where it has been moved to.

5 So this is a schematic of what our risk
6 pathways were. You can see the purple right here is
7 impacted groundwater. The red is our free product
8 floating on top of the water. These arrows show the
9 air inhalation pathway up into the buildings. This
10 arrow here is showing the dissolved phase making it
11 to the bay.

12 And you see this somewhat dotted yellow line
13 here? That's our A silt. I know we've talked about
14 that in the past. It's at Site 9; also at Site 11.
15 It's an area about 40 feet below ground surface where
16 we've got a silty, sometimes clayey layer that can be
17 anywhere from only a couple of inches up to several
18 feet.

19 We found at Site 11 in the center of the
20 island it was fairly continuous, and we were somewhat
21 happy that it was there at our site thinking if it's
22 there and it acts as an impervious layer, we really
23 don't have to look below the A silt. You'll see in
24 a while that didn't pan out, but that was our
25 premise.

1 So we were looking at our pathways being
2 only above the A silt for this initial round of
3 sampling.

4 So the first thing we do --

5 MS. FIELD: What was the blue stuff on your
6 diagram? The light blue.

7 MR. MACH: The light blue is all groundwater.
8 This is our -- right here, this is all the brownish
9 soil. All the light blue is groundwater. There's
10 that A silt layer beneath the groundwater, and the
11 dark blue over here is San Diego Bay.

12 MS. FIELD: And the purple?

13 MR. MACH: The purple is impacted groundwater.
14 That means that there's contamination in the
15 groundwater. So that's our contaminated plume within
16 the groundwater.

17 MR. KLEEMAN: What is TCE? What's the
18 significance of TCE?

19 MR. MACH: TCE is trichloroethene. It is a
20 chlorinated solvent, and it is one of the major
21 contaminants that we have on North Island here, at
22 Site 9, and several other sites. It's a solvent that
23 they've used to degrease parts, and it has many
24 different applications; and it's been leaked into the
25 environment, and now we're trying to clean it up.

1 So the first phase was to go ahead with this
2 Isolation Flux Chamber Sampling. We decided we would
3 break the buildings up into grids and we would place
4 these chamber sampling devices within those grids.
5 We talked to Charles Cheng about this, and we said,
6 "We want to look at the worst possible cases," so we
7 went in a hundred foot by a hundred foot grid. We
8 used a random number generator to pick what area
9 within that grid we're going to sample from.

10 We would go out to that area, and we would
11 draw a five-foot radius around that point. So we're
12 still picking random samples, but then we would look
13 for the worst pieces of concrete -- if there were
14 cracks or crevices somewhere where you'd have a
15 preferential pathway for the contamination to come
16 into the building -- and we placed our sampling
17 device on top of those areas.

18 We took a total of 24 samples. That
19 includes some duplicates to verify that we were
20 getting consistent results. We analyzed them for
21 TO-14. That's an EPA method for analyzing for
22 volatile organic compounds, VOCs. It includes TCE,
23 some of the degradation products and fuel products.
24 And we compared them to the OSHA Permissible Exposure
25 Limits which is what the industrial workers or the
26 NADEP workers are required to -- the standards that
27 they are gauged by.

1 This is a schematic of a device. This is
2 the device right here. You place it on top of the
3 ground. We've got helium right here which flows
4 through the chamber. As the VOCs off-gas into the
5 chamber, the helium acts as a sweep gas, pushes it
6 into our sample collection device, which is a large
7 plastic bag, and then that bag is sent up to a
8 laboratory for analysis.

9 So this is an overlay of where the sample
10 devices were put. You can see there were two sample
11 devices from each of the hundred foot by hundred foot
12 grids, and you can see that they were laid out
13 randomly. That's just where the number generators
14 said to put them in there.

15 And the results of that were very good. You
16 can see we're about two orders of magnitude less than
17 our exposure limits, according to OSHA for the TCE
18 and the TCA. Some other products were nondetects,
19 so we thought "Hey, we're doing pretty well. We
20 don't have to really be concerned about the air
21 inhalation pathway for the workers."

22 So then we went through with the free
23 product sampling. We wanted to take samples of the
24 free product from each of the wells that had free
25 product in it and analyze them for the TCE and other
26 volatile organic compounds. We also wanted them

1 fingerprinted to know exactly what fuel types we're
2 dealing with.

3 And then we were going to use these results
4 to pinpoint where the release may have come from, and
5 we also want to see what areas of the free product
6 are acting as continuing sources of contamination to
7 the groundwater. If it's saturated with TCE, that
8 TCE will eventually keep dissolving into the
9 groundwater, and we want to know where our major
10 sources are.

11 So this is what our free product plume looks
12 like. I'll double click on this and it will rotate,
13 and you'll be able to see what the plume looked like,
14 where our sampling devices were taken. It really will
15 rotate.

16 MR. KLEEMAN: What would it be? The red is
17 the highest concentration?

18 MR. MACH: The red is the highest
19 concentration. You can see the scale on the left, I
20 don't know why it's not rotating. There we go.

21 I'll click it and stop. You can see each of
22 the individual different wells that are located
23 within the plume. You can see the different
24 thicknesses at that five-foot thickness there.

1 So that's what our free product looks like,
2 and you can see we've identified where the TCE is
3 within that.

4 So now we want to go ahead and --

5 MR. VAN ROOY: I'm sorry, Richard. What's the
6 diameter of the plume?

7 MR. MACH: It's pretty big. I don't know the
8 exact diameter.

9 MR. COLLINS: It's a couple hundred feet.

10 MR. MACH: It's definitely over a hundred
11 feet. We estimate there'd be about a half million
12 gallons of product in there, so less than the fuel
13 farm.

14 MS. FARGO: Half a million gallons?

15 MR. MACH: Yeah, half a million, plus or
16 minus.

17 So we went ahead and -- again, we're still
18 trying to get on with the removal action here.
19 We're not trying to do a whole lot of investigation
20 here, just get the data that we need. So we want to
21 try to minimize our cost and use the existing wells
22 that are out there. That's pretty tough to take
23 groundwater samples beneath several feet of product
24 without just pulling that product down and making

1 everything in the groundwater look worse than it
2 actually is.

3 We also want to look for trends within the
4 groundwater, and so if you're pulling that free
5 product through, it's going to make it a lot more
6 difficult to try to see the trends -- whether you
7 have DNAPL, a dense nonaqueous phase liquid. The TCE
8 will sink. We have enough there that it's actually
9 sunk, and there's more down deeper than it is in the
10 shallow.

11 So how are we going to get through the free
12 product? These are the sample vectors we want to
13 sample on. We picked wells that were all along these
14 vectors. This middle one is a downgradient
15 direction. You can see this is our flow arrow. We
16 also picked two side vectors just in case we're off a
17 little bit on which way the groundwater is flowing.

18 So what we did was came up with an
19 innovative way to get through the free product. The
20 first thing we do is we go out there and we pump as
21 much free product as we can out to where it's only
22 down to a sheen within the well. Then we would
23 install a sleeve into the well. It's got a cap on
24 the bottom so it will punch through, and it should
25 not be pushing any of the free product with it.

1 Once we get it through the free product and
2 to about six to twelve inches below the lower level
3 of the free product, we pop the cap off and pull it
4 up the outside of the sleeve. So now you've got,
5 hopefully, a clean sleeve down through the middle.
6 We used a diaper to wash that out to make sure that
7 there were no droplets that were left.

8 So that will act as a conductor casing, and
9 now we can put our sampling device through that port
10 and not have to worry about the free product that it
11 will now re-accumulate around the outside of this
12 conductor casing.

13 That's a schematic of what we did. You can
14 see right here, this right here is our level of free
15 product thickness. This light purple here in the
16 middle is our conductor casing or our sleeve that we
17 put down through the well. You can see the little
18 cap down at the bottom here. So once that was all
19 cleaned out, we put this -- which is our sampling
20 tube -- down here, and you can see Sample Port 1,
21 Sample Port 2, and Sample Port 3. That's where we'll
22 take three different groundwater samples at three
23 different depths from each well so we can try to look
24 for trends within the groundwater.

25 MS. FARGO: How did you get the sample cap
26 off?

1 MR. MACH: We just popped it -- put something
2 down through the inside and popped it off. It was
3 just a plastic sleeve on the outside.

4 MS. FARGO: So you didn't have to pull
5 everything back out to take it off.

6 MR. MACH: No. That would not have worked. We
7 did put a little bit of engineering into this, too.

8 MS. FARGO: Okay.

9 MR. MACH: So basically these are the results
10 that we found from the sampling beneath the free
11 product. We saw some very high concentrations in the
12 upper portion of the groundwater just below the free
13 product. We didn't see anything really dropping off
14 as we went down with depth, and we started to see
15 something actually increasing on our downgradient
16 side, which could be a potential source. And then
17 on our third elevation we saw we definitely have
18 another source further downgradient that we have to
19 investigate as well.

20 These are all of our results. In case
21 you're wondering, yes, those are pretty darn high.

22 So this is what we think our plume is now
23 within the groundwater. Hopefully, this will rotate
24 somewhat quickly as well. Basically this is going to
25 rotate around, and it's going to show you the depth

1 of the plume, the entire volume, and this is just
2 with respect to TCE as our main contaminant.

3 You can see all the different sample points.
4 That blue right there shows you that it's a well that
5 came through the product, but it was at a low enough
6 level that it didn't show up.

7 Our edge of the plume, as you can see, is 92
8 parts per billion. That's what our cleanup level is
9 or that's what the Bays & Estuary Standard is, as
10 promulgated by the Water Board, so that's what we're
11 using for our limits of delineation.

12 MS. FARGO: So everything in the plume is
13 above the 92.

14 MR. MACH: Everything within this green is
15 above 92, yes.

16 You can see that by using a video like
17 this, you can see a whole lot more about the plume
18 than you could with all the different cut sheets and
19 different things that we put in our reports.
20 Actually, when the final report comes out for this
21 project, it's going to have video on the CD as well.
22 So we'll have to put some cut sheets in for the hard
23 copy die hard reviewers but --

24 MS. FARGO: Is that diagram aligned in the
25 same way that the free product plume was aligned?

1 MR. MACH: Yes.

2 MS. FARGO: But the buildings don't look like
3 they're in the same place. Maybe they are. What's
4 the building in the center of that plume?

5 MR. MACH: Actually, the initial product
6 plumes on the first four pages, no, it's not aligned
7 the same way.

8 MS. FARGO: Just the previous one that you
9 showed us.

10 MR. MACH: The previous one with the video is
11 aligned the same way, yes.

12 MS. FARGO: Thank you. Okay.

13 MR. MACH: I have the same thing for DCE, but
14 it's taking a little while to go through it. I'm not
15 going to show that one.

16 So now we see that we've got this potential
17 downgradient source that we hadn't counted on, so we
18 went ahead and we started with groundwater analysis
19 Phase 2. We needed to complete the VOC delineation.
20 We wanted to use an innovative technology because
21 installing tons of wells like we already have out
22 there is very costly. We wanted to try to save a
23 little bit of money. Again, we want to try and only
24 delineate the plume above the A silt. However,
25 everyone is still concerned that it's getting below

1 the A silt. So once we get to the lateral edge of
2 our plume above the A silt, then we'll go a little
3 bit further and we'll put confirmation groundwater
4 wells deep into the area below the A silt to verify
5 that it hasn't gone through the A silt and traveled
6 underneath the A silt.

7 So that was our plan. We didn't want to
8 drill through the A silt because if it hadn't gone
9 through, we didn't want to punch a hole in there and
10 give it a nice pathway to flow through. That's why
11 we wanted to limit our investigation to above the A
12 silt and then go downgradient and look below the A
13 silt.

14 So we knew about a new sampling technology
15 that's being developed by the Army, their Waterways
16 Experiment Station. It's called a Hydrosparge II.
17 We coordinated with them, and asked them to come out
18 here and assist us with the investigation. They had
19 a grant for some money to develop their sampling
20 tool, so we didn't have to pay for all their costs.
21 They paid for some of their own costs, which is a
22 good cost savings for us.

23 It's an in situ groundwater sampler. They
24 push a probe down into the ground. Then when it gets
25 to a certain depth, they'll just open a port and
26 they'll allow the groundwater to flow into the port.
27 They'll purge that with helium gas. All the VOCs

1 will volatilize out of the water, go up through
2 another tube, and then will be analyzed on site with
3 a direct reading ion trap-mass spectrometer.

4 I've got a schematic of that. You can see
5 here the piston pulls back, the helium comes down,
6 the sample goes up, and goes into the ITMS for
7 analysis.

8 So they pushed about 51 probes out there.
9 We did wind up having some trouble with the
10 Hydrosparge II sampling device. We had a lot of silt
11 in our sand, and it caused some clogging of the unit.
12 We were aware that this might happen, so we had a
13 backup plan which was to have Geoprobe on site, and
14 also to install some temporary wells, take
15 groundwater samples directly out of the temporary
16 wells, and still analyze them with the ion trap-mass
17 spectrometer on the rig.

18 So we did get the entire delineation done.
19 Unfortunately, the Hydrosparge II didn't work as well
20 as we hoped, but we got all the data we needed in the
21 time frame we wanted and at no additional cost.

22 So we're feeling pretty good about ourselves
23 again. We're getting ready to put in our
24 confirmation groundwater wells. We put some within
25 the plume above the A silt to confirm the results of
26 the ITMS and the Hydrosparge sampling that we did.

1 All those results were very well matched, very
2 similar results; and we went ahead and put our three
3 cluster wells in the deep area in the downgradient
4 direction.

5 And lo and behold, we wound up finding the
6 TCE again below the A silt in the downgradient
7 direction. So we weren't quite done yet.

8 This is showing all the different push
9 locations that we had, and you see all the diamonds
10 are the Hydrosparge pushes and all of the circles
11 with the crosses are wells that are within the area.
12 You can see these are our cluster wells in a
13 downgradient direction, and you can see the color
14 coding matches with the relative concentrations, and
15 you can see the different depths at which each of the
16 samples were taken.

17 You can assume that right about this level
18 is where the A silt is, and you can see a couple of
19 wells that have been punched down below the A silt
20 and the sampling results, with this red right here
21 being the downgradient concentration that we're
22 concerned about.

23 And I have two of these plumes, but I can
24 only run one of these. This is really pretty cool.
25 As you can see, it's shrinking. Stop it, and you can
26 see the concentration is going up. So as this thing

1 peels and you start to see how the higher
2 concentrations are in the center, this is telling you
3 what the concentration is on the peeled edge.

4 Again, you can see that is our downgradient
5 beneath the A silt plume that is punched through the
6 A silt. You can see here's where our second hot spot
7 was that we didn't know about. And, again, this is
8 where our initial hot spot was and the free product
9 in this area as well.

10 From our side view it's all going to come
11 back. You can see here is our additional hot spot.
12 Here's our downgradient. Our A silt is right about
13 here. So somewhere it punched through and went
14 across, and that's part of the additional
15 delineation. All this below right here is all
16 estimated based on the different modeling
17 technologies.

18 But as part of what will be coming up as
19 Phase 3 for our groundwater sampling, we're going to
20 be able to get the data below the A silt. I have the
21 same thing for DCE, but it looks exactly the same.

22 So Phase 3, what are we going to do? Again,
23 we're going to coordinate with the Army's waterways
24 experiment station. They have a new technology.
25 It's called the MIP or the Membrane Interface Probe.
26 Again, they have research and development funding for

1 their cost. The cost to bring them out here would be
2 about \$66,000, of which I only have to pay 25
3 percent, so I only have to pay them \$16,000 to come
4 out here.

5 We're also going to couple them with the
6 PUC's SCAPS rig as the direct push method, as well
7 as it's going to save us some money. We don't have
8 to mobilize as many people from the Army there in
9 Oklahoma. And when this was written, we were
10 planning on having them start in May. We've had some
11 delays, and we're actually going to start in July,
12 hopefully. So that's about the only thing that's not
13 up to date on this presentation.

14 So, again, we're going to finish the
15 delineation with the Army. We've actually done so
16 much investigation here that we've essentially almost
17 completed an RI or Remedial Investigation. We
18 continue to keep getting little bits of data. We've
19 written a Field Sampling Plan and a Quality Assurance
20 Project Plan. We'd also written an addendum to that
21 which have both been approved by the Water Board.

22 Right now we are writing a second addendum
23 which we are calling the RI Work Plan. Once you
24 couple the first FSP/QAPP and the first addendum with
25 this Addendum 2, that whole package is being
26 considered now the RI Work Plan so that we'll get the
27 bean for having done a full remedial investigation.

1 That Work Plan is actually coming out on the
2 -- I believe it's the 13th of July. So we'll
3 actually be in the field getting the rest of the
4 data. All the risk assessment and the other stuff
5 that goes into that will still be being reviewed by
6 DTSC. We'll be gathering some of the samples but
7 we're not going to start any of that analysis until
8 we get buy in from the regulators that, yes, this is
9 the right approach with respect to risk. But as for
10 getting all the data, we've got a pretty solid
11 approach for doing this.

12 And we do have enough information right now
13 to go ahead and start some remediation. We're
14 looking at doing some Chemical Oxidation of the
15 groundwater, and we're getting ready to start pilot
16 tests probably in several months, and you'll see a
17 Work Plan coming out on that as well.

18 And, again, our exit strategy for the entire
19 site would be risk based.

20 MS. FIELD: What are the risks?

21 MR. MACH: We still believe that the risks are
22 any air inhalation pathways. The risk assessment
23 protocol is going to require additional sampling
24 above and beyond the isolation flux chamber sampling,
25 so you can't just do direct measurement. You've also
26 got to fully characterize what's in the soil and do

1 calculations in case you have a different scenario.
2 In case you have a residential scenario in the future
3 or some other things, you need to take those into
4 account in your risk assessment.

5 And then, again, we've also got the pathway
6 of the groundwater flowing into the bay, so those are
7 our two risk pathways.

8 MRS. KAUPP: When you do the risk analysis and
9 risk assessment, are you looking at only this
10 particular cleanup operation? Are you looking at the
11 cumulative emissions from all of the cleanup going on
12 in North Island?

13 MR. MACH: We are looking at the risk
14 assessment for this project.

15 MRS. KAUPP: That doesn't make sense to me.

16 MR. MACH: And I understand that, but that is
17 what EPA requires, and that's the way the risk
18 assessment protocols are set up, and that's what
19 we're required to follow.

20 MR. COLLINS: That's the standard methodology
21 nationwide.

22 MRS. KAUPP: Well, a question for DTSC. I
23 don't feel comfortable that they only look at one
24 site -- one set of the numbers versus the cumulative
25 impact on the whole risk.

1 MR. ABBASI: Right. What I would say is I
2 don't know how many other risk assessments are going
3 on at North Island. I think about probably two, the
4 Site 9 removal action and this one right here. So
5 cumulative impact from emissions we think would be
6 significant if there are multiple projects going on
7 and are still emitting contaminants.

8 MR. MACH: But also that the risk assessment
9 for the RI for this site is not with respect to a
10 remediation alternative and off gas from that
11 technology. This is saying the site right now
12 presents a risk of X and so that --

13 MR. ABBASI: That's a different risk
14 methodology; right?

15 MR. MACH: Right.

16 MR. ABBASI: That's a methodology that
17 addresses the investigation part of the work.

18 MRS. KAUPP: But we're seeing something close
19 to the residential community downwind from what's
20 going on at this cleanup site, so I'm just curious to
21 know --

22 MR. ABBASI: That would be addressed when the
23 Navy does their removal action; right?

24 MR. COLLINS: Let me add to that.

1 This addresses the risk if you are on the
2 site, this site with this particular level of
3 contamination for 30 to 70 years at the maximum dose
4 causing yourself to be exposed to every worst
5 situation right at that site. If you add this in
6 with other sites on North Island, your body cannot be
7 here exposed to this risk while it's over here in an
8 area where there is no risk. And factoring no risk
9 in with high risk with other areas, you don't get the
10 true scenario for that human being that would be
11 exposed to that one site and that one risk under the
12 worst conditions. It won't add up, so you can't put
13 it all together.

14 MR. ABBASI: For this particular -- I don't
15 know if you discussed the particular use, but I would
16 assume that you would use the EPA prescribed
17 methodology, which is very conservative. If you want
18 more information, I can share it with you. If you
19 look at the formulas and the input numbers, you will
20 note that it's very conservative.

21 MR. COLLINS: And worst conditions involve
22 breathing this contaminant, eating this contaminant,
23 bathing in this contaminant just about -- getting it
24 on your skin, and having it enter your body from all
25 different directions at different rates based on your
26 body size, and there's a standard body size based on
27 your weight, and at your highest concentrations.

1 That's the number we use to do it. We don't use the
2 average concentrations, which would be more
3 reasonable. And we make this person stay on this
4 site from birth through 70 years, which is not
5 reasonable either.

6 So to get this number, you would assume that
7 you're exposed to the worst possible condition from
8 the time you're born until the time --

9 MRS. KAUPP: It's just one site, and all the
10 other activity -- not only cleanup activity, but just
11 general activity on the base, and I'm living
12 downwind, and I'm very concerned about that.

13 MS. FARGO: So cumulatively do you think if we
14 were to add the exposure to someone living a few
15 blocks away in any residential area on Coronado,
16 could the exposure from all the cumulative effects be
17 anywhere near what the exposure is on your worst case
18 scenario?

19 MR. COLLINS: No.

20 MS. FARGO: Logically it would seem to be no.

21 MR. COLLINS: It will devalue. The risk will
22 go down remarkably.

23 MR. ABBASI: Could I add something to that?

24 The risk methodology that I would like to use
25 would use numerous pathways and the effect of

1 numerous pathways, and the risk number at the end of
2 the day that would be interpreted would be the
3 cumulative impact of all the pathways, considering
4 the most conservative scenario.

5 So in other words, you are looking at
6 cumulative in part, but you are looking at what Bill
7 suggested to you, and the numbers they are going to
8 use are very conservative and they are the maximum. I
9 don't know what they are using in this site, but
10 generally the maximum numbers used, which is again
11 conservative on top of the margin that was used as
12 the risk. So hopefully it addresses what you're
13 saying.

14 MR. COLLINS: One more question and then we've
15 really got to move along. We have a half an hour
16 left. We're going to clearly run out of time
17 tonight.

18 MS. FIELD: Okay. I'll ask one more question.

19 When you talk about the risk, I think we're
20 talking about the risk of the stuff being there now.

21 MR. MACH: Correct.

22 MS. FIELD: Are there any additional risks
23 that are created by the removal action?

24 MR. MACH: Once we get to the point that we
25 choose a removal action, we will have to evaluate any

1 additional risk from that removal action as part of
2 the removal action, but that would be above and
3 beyond the baseline risk assessment for the site as
4 it sits there now.

5 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

6 MR. COLLINS: Thanks, Rich.

7 MR. MACH: Basically I think I'm about done. I
8 had a couple of lessons learned. You can take a look
9 at those; summary of the innovative technologies that
10 we used; who our project team is; and then all my
11 information and my e-mail information, and that is
12 it.

13 MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

14 And, Mark, are you ready?

15 MR. BONSAVAGE: Yes.

16 MR. COLLINS: You have 15 minutes and that's
17 it.

18 MR. BONSAVAGE: Basically we just completed a
19 report called the Extended Site Inspection for the
20 Naval Amphibious Base Coronado. I've got a picture
21 of it here. There is NAB. Most of you are familiar
22 with where it's located.

23 So here's where the -- for NAB there really
24 were four sites that were of concern -- Site 1, 2, 3,

1 and 4. You'll see that there were five at the
2 beginning, but it was reduced to four sites.

3 Just as history, in 1943 the base was
4 established mainly as just a maintenance type of
5 operation; no real industry on the base. The
6 contaminants were mainly petroleum type of
7 contaminants.

8 Probably all the way back to 1984 is when
9 the first environmental type study took place, and
10 they identified four different sites on the base
11 which may be an environmental concern. There was a
12 fifth site. Ed talked about it a little bit where
13 there were some munitions found, but later on you'll
14 see that site was eliminated because of the Water
15 Board. A biologist stepped in and said it was being
16 used by -- I'm not sure of what species.

17 MR. COLLINS: The least tern.

18 MR. BONSAVAGE: The least tern. It was being
19 used by the least tern, so they didn't want to
20 disturb the habitat. So instead of going in and
21 looking at it, basically the items were there and the
22 least terns were using it, so we let them have it.

23 There was another study follow-up called the
24 SI/SWAT. A SWAT is basically an investigation. It's
25 a term from the state, and it really applies to
26 landfills. But that was really what they had back

1 then to look at the site, so we did an SI and a SWAT
2 to satisfy the CERCLA and the state regulations.

3 Site 1 basically was operated from 1969 to
4 1982 -- 1,100 to 3,800 gallons of waste, and it
5 included oils, paints, thinners, basically
6 maintenance type of wastes.

7 And there were two areas of oil
8 contamination. One was the pit and -- I guess there
9 were two pits in the whole area. From the site we
10 collected soil and groundwater from Site 1. I believe
11 one pit was located up in this top portion of the
12 site; the other one down in this area. It was a long
13 extended area for the rest of the site.

14 After the initial investigation, DTSC
15 actually issued a closure letter for that site. They
16 found out there was really nothing out there except
17 petroleum, which is now being handled as basically an
18 underground storage tank site, and under CERCLA you
19 don't look at petroleum type studies.

20 Site 2/4. This is really the only site out
21 of the whole investigation that anything showed up to
22 be significant, any kind of a risk that you need to
23 worry about.

24 It was operated from the '40s to the '70s,
25 and basically it was a burn pit and a disposal area.
26 You'll find anything in there from motor oil,

1 solvents, sandblast grit. I guess they found some
2 small arms rounds.

3 If you look at the picture here, you can see
4 the shoreline is a little bit altered. So really
5 what they did is in this area here, they burned out
6 the waste. They burned a lot of it, and then they
7 basically backfilled over the top of it. You can see
8 the shoreline which runs along here, and this is
9 mainly just a new kind of a backfilled area.

10 Out of the original work that was done, DTSC
11 and the Water Board reviewed findings, and they
12 decided that we should go out and look at the
13 groundwater a little bit more. So we went out and
14 sampled the groundwater. And even after a few more
15 rounds of groundwater sampling, we decided that
16 something else will have to be done out at the site,
17 so we recommended further action.

18 Just to make a note at this site, if you
19 look at it, it's mostly paved. Almost the whole site
20 is paved, and there's actually buildings on top of
21 the site, and the shoreline is mostly rip rap. So
22 there's really no exposure pathway, but you do have
23 -- underneath the pavement you do have soil mixed
24 with different types of wastes.

25 A lot of it's been reduced because of the
26 tides raising and lowering, so over the years

1 basically a lot of the contaminants have washed out.
2 So there are -- really the main concern, there's low
3 levels of metals which are the heavier compounds that
4 are still in that area.

5 So really the further action is these
6 metals. Most of the metals persist, so you need
7 something to control the metals from just keeping
8 them from going out into the bay or raising the
9 levels in the bay. But we really don't see anything
10 -- any large levels of like chlorinated solvents or
11 PCBs or nothing like that. It's mainly they burned
12 materials there, and it's sort of like the waste, the
13 left over material.

14 Site 3 was a paint shop. It was really just
15 recommended for no further action. They really
16 didn't find anything there.

17 So this report is really an extension --
18 it's another extension of the SI which came out years
19 ago, and we just added more information to it because
20 we thought by going out and looking at the sites a
21 little bit further, we could possibly close -- well,
22 we really wanted to close all the sites. But we
23 decided in the report that 2/4 we really needed to
24 look at it a little bit more or do something out
25 there. Even though the risk is pretty low, there's
26 not a lot of hazardous chemicals. It's really

1 there's some metals at the site that may be leaching
2 out and we should do something about that.

3 The second bullet of sediments near Site 2/4
4 and 3 are going to require an RI. At these sites
5 what we found out of this investigation is there are
6 actually elevated levels of metals in the water
7 around this site.

8 Sight 2/4 and Site 3, we did get some metals
9 and one PCB hit in the water at this site. So instead
10 of extending these sites again, what we decided to do
11 is to call anything they got in the water its own
12 separate site. So we're doing an RI which really is
13 just looking at the sediments around NAB, mainly
14 around Site 2/4 and around Site 3.

15 And what we'll do is we'll look at the
16 concentrations of the metals. And if you remember
17 Site 1 where we did some tests on like anthropods,
18 basically an ecological risk assessment to see how
19 these levels are effecting the life in the bay, and
20 so we'll do that for NAB also.

21 Further action for Site 2/4. We're going to
22 do something for that.

23 And we hope to finalize this report in
24 September so it's ready for review. Actually,
25 there's a copy in the library if anybody wants to
26 look at the report. So all in all, Site 2/4 we're

1 going to do more work on, and Sites 1 and 3 are
2 basically closed.

3 MR. COLLINS: If there are no questions, we'll
4 move to the next topic.

5 MRS. KAUPP: Really?

6 MR. MACH: That's me again.

7 MR. COLLINS: And you have five minutes.

8 MR. MACH: I'll do it in one.

9 Basically there's another handout in the
10 back. It's a yellow sheet and you also get a copy of
11 a map. The map is essentially showing the pilot test
12 area. You can see all the different wells that have
13 been installed.

14 OHM has begun the free product recovery.
15 Actually, we're only recovering product out of two of
16 the wells. The rest, no product has floated into the
17 wells. So we're looking into some additional
18 techniques to develop the wells, trying to get the
19 product to flow in better.

20 We're looking at starting up the SVE system
21 about the end of this month and then starting the
22 steam injection a week later. Continue on with the
23 pilot test. And then, again, that will be operating
24 for the next couple of months, as I presented last
25 month.

1 And the Revised Work Plan for the full scale
2 implementation is due out the end of this month and
3 will be out for review.

4 That's it, unless there are any questions.

5 MS. FIELD: Back on schedule.

6 MR. COLLINS: Okay. We're down to the
7 section for public comments, questions and answers.

8 MS. FIELD: Well, my comment is for somebody
9 that doesn't have a technical orientation, a lot of
10 this goes by pretty quickly, and it's hard to -- I
11 know it all makes perfect sense to you, but to me I
12 really have to stop and think about it. And I would
13 just really like it if we -- I know we try to cover
14 a lot of things here, but it would be better to take
15 a little more time in my opinion and cover things a
16 little more slowly so that there would be more time
17 for questions.

18 MR. COLLINS: Okay. And we have a
19 counterpoint to that. We have already volunteered to
20 actually limit the RAB meeting to three major topics.
21 That will give us more time for those
22 discussions/presentations, and then we'll also have
23 more time for questions and answers, too.

24 And in lieu of trying to squeeze so much
25 into a meeting, we will adopt some form of
26 information sheet that briefly describes the other

1 projects that are going on in North Island, so you
2 can pick one of those up. And we won't discuss those
3 at the meeting, but we'll have a little update.

4 MS. FIELD: Great.

5 MR. COLLINS: And we'll do that. And
6 hopefully this will be the last meeting where we run
7 out of time. Almost every meeting we've ever had we
8 have rarely had enough time or finished early.

9 MR. KLEEMAN: As the minutes mention in the
10 April meeting, I mentioned that the City was in the
11 process of trying to appoint somebody to represent
12 the City, and we've only had one volunteer. The City
13 Council originally mentioned having more than one
14 possible representative. I was supposed to attend
15 last time, and I assume no one showed up because I
16 ended up being in the hospital briefly, so I wasn't
17 able to attend.

18 But I've asked that the appointment of that
19 one person be placed on the City Council agenda for
20 July 6th, and I would encourage anybody else who's
21 interested to submit an application to the City
22 Clerk. I'm sure the Council would be glad to appoint
23 more than one or have more than one person to choose
24 from. But I hope that if that happens on July 6th,
25 then that person will be representing us at the next
26 meeting.

1 MR. COLLINS: Okay. That would be great.

2 Along those lines, we are going to be
3 placing an ad in the newspaper looking for new RAB
4 members. Unfortunately, we had two resignations
5 tonight, and Clifford Jordan also resigned for other
6 reasons. He just can't make the meetings anymore, so
7 we need a replacement for him, too. And hopefully,
8 we'll get more than three. But it is hard to get
9 people to volunteer their time to come to a meeting
10 like this. It's not a ball game. Okay?

11 And one other thing, I need to correct one
12 of the statements that was said tonight. On the
13 material and sand that we placed behind the CDF wall,
14 the rock wall, the first sand that came from the
15 mitigation area wasn't checked, and that was on
16 probably day one. The material was hauled over to
17 the CDF. During the night, the tide washed around in
18 there, and that's when we first discovered we had
19 ordnance.

20 So we did go in at that point and recover
21 the ordnance and check the rest of the sand to make
22 sure it was clean. And then from that point on, all
23 the sand that came from the mitigation area was
24 checked before it went to the CDF. So there are no
25 munitions in the actual sand from the munitions area
26 now. It's just a minor correction. It was that one

1 morning when we found rockets in there and it
2 triggered off the ordnance removal action.

3 MR. MACH: But all the sand that was taken on
4 that first load was fully scanned. I was out there.
5 They moved it around with bulldozers, they scanned it
6 at certain foot levels and different depth intervals
7 and they found all the ordnance that was in there.
8 It is clean.

9 MR. COLLINS: It is clean.

10 MR. MACH: So although it didn't go through
11 the screening mechanism that all future loads came
12 through, it was still screened in just a different
13 manner.

14 MR. COLLINS: Correct. That's true.

15 Okay. Let's move on to the next topic which
16 is picking agenda items for the next meeting, and
17 what would you folks like to hear us talk about?

18 MR. BONSAVAGE: Site 10. Actually, I've got a
19 big report coming up for Site 10 which is the
20 smelter.

21 MR. COLLINS: Okay. North Island Site 10. It
22 will be an interesting topic.

23 Anything else? I think we'll have a
24 discussion on getting more RAB members, but leave it
25 up to us.

1 MR. MACH: Well, there was also that survey
2 that was done that kind of calculated about different
3 training. We might start looking at training.

4 Do you want to maybe start to get training
5 based on the output of that? I know we've had some
6 pretty tough, tight agendas, but how ready are you
7 guys to have some training brought on?

8 MR. COLLINS: Why don't we have a training
9 discussion. We'll talk about it. We'll pass out the
10 list again.

11 MR. MACH: I've got the list of them laid out
12 in 1 through 8.

13 MR. COLLINS: Maybe we can get some ideas of
14 how we can get the training for each one, whether we
15 have to import a professor to come teach a class or
16 the Water Board or DTSC can handle part of it.

17 MR. MACH: I'll also take a look and see if I
18 can't find one of the No. 1 or No. 2 training setups
19 for that meeting as well.

20 MR. COLLINS: Okay. And we'll at least have a
21 training discussion, possibly a session. We'll let
22 you know ahead of time which one it is.

23 MR. MACH: And we all get a month off. We
24 won't be back till August.

1 MR. COLLINS: That will cover it. Thank you.
2 And our next meeting, remember, is August 11th. Carla
3 will be the Chair, and it's time to put away all the
4 tables and chairs.

5 (Whereupon, at 8:22 p.m., the meeting was
6 adjourned.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)

: ss.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.)

I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings, on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 640 Orange Avenue, Winn Room, in the City of Coronado, County of San Diego, State of California; and I do further certify that the above and foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 82, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of said proceedings.

DATED: _____,
1999.

Nancy A. Lee