

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

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 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:

- Carla Fargo
- Richard Mach
- John Locke
- Bill Collins
- Debbie Wankier
- Stephan Dertadian
- LaConta Coleman
- Rick Phillips
- Ed Kleeman
- Bob Geilenfeldt
- Richard Wong
- Ken Branch
- Scott Morris

1 **CORONADO, CA., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 1999, 6:35 P.M.**

2

3 MS. FARGO: Let's go ahead and begin the meeting.
4 I'm Carla Fargo. I'm the Community Co-Chair. I will
5 be chairing the meeting this evening. I'd like to
6 welcome all of you that have come.

7 The first order of business, I'd like to have
8 Ed Kleeman introduce the city representative.

9 MR. KLEEMAN: Well, I have been attending the
10 meetings occasionally and rotating with other
11 people; and, as you know, one of those people left to
12 be City Manager in Newport Beach. He was just
13 replaced today by Mark Ochenduszko.

14 Anyway, Mark had been the head of
15 Administrative Services for the City a few years back
16 for about three or four years, and since then he's
17 been City Manager here at the City. So he'll be
18 starting September 20th. He's very familiar with the
19 problems in the City, and so he won't really
20 take much time to bring up to speed.

21 And because of the change over, the City
22 Council did decide at Homer's suggestion -- Homer
23 Bludau's suggestion that there would be a request for

1 a citizen to volunteer to represent the City, and
2 Bob Geilenfeldt stepped forward.

3 As I was explaining to Bob before the meeting,
4 it's still not clear as to how he will interface
5 between this committee and the council. And my advice
6 to him was to after this meeting arrange to talk to
7 the mayor and get more clarification as to what the
8 mayor and the council would anticipate being the
9 relationship. After I talked to you, I spoke to Pam
10 Willis, and she agreed with that recommendation.

11 So it's going to be a matter of time to really
12 feel out how the interrelationship is going to occur,
13 but I will still be the person processing the reports
14 as they come into the city, and so I will probably
15 occasionally be sent out here to monitor.

16 If there are any questions, I'll try to answer
17 them right now.

18 MS. FARGO: Thank you very much, Ed, for your
19 introduction.

20 We also have another guest with us
21 tonight. Rich, would you like to introduce him?

22 MR. MACH: I'd like to introduce Lieutenant
23 Commander Ken Branch. He's the [Media](#)new Public Works
24 Officer for NAS North Island and NAB Coronado. He's

1 replacing Commander GeorgianoGiorgione, who used to
2 attend in the past.

3 So Ken?

4 CMDRLCDR. BRANCH: Good evening. Nice meeting
5 you.

6 MS. FARGO: Welcome. Glad to have your presence.

7 And I guess that takes care of all the
8 introductions that we need to do.

9 Let's go ahead and approve the update to the
10 May 20th meeting minutes. Were there any
11 additions or corrections to the revision that we
12 were all sent? No? Okay.

13 Can I have a motion to approve these minutes?

14 MR. COLLINS: I move.

15 MS. FARGO: Second?

16 MR. MACH: Second.

17 MS. FARGO: All in favor? The motion passes.

18 And then looking at the June 16th
19 meeting minutes, were there any additions or
20 corrections to those? No? All right.

1 Is there a motion to approve the June 16th
2 meeting minutes?

3 MR. COLLINS: Move we accept the June 16th
4 meeting minutes.

5 MR. MACH: Second.

6 MS. FARGO: All in favor? They are also
7 approved.

8 The next order of business for the evening is
9 the RAB training needs.

10 MR. MACH: I put a handout in the back. I hope
11 you all have a copy of it. Essentially it's a front
12 and back page where I listed out the 11 training
13 topics that we had looked at and ranked back in
14 March, and I also attached a copy of that March
15 handout that I provided on March the 10th.

16 I took all 11 of those training classes, and I
17 gave a brief description as to what I thought was a
18 potential way of addressing each one of those issues,
19 and I put them in the order that you guys
20 had essentially voted on.

21 So Relative Risk and Site Ranking
22 Process was the number one wanted training. This is
23 basically a completely DoD function. We have put
24 together the relative risk model so we can compare

1 each of our sites to all the other sites within the
2 Navy and the DoD so we can prioritize funding for
3 those sites that seem to be the worst. It's called
4 the worst first model.

5 We can easily get someone from our staff to
6 come in here and brief that. We can probably do it
7 in 30 to 45 minutes max, so that can easily be
8 done during a RAB meeting.

9 My recommendation at the bottom is to present
10 the relative risk at the next RAB meeting in
11 September. At the same time we can couple with that
12 our FY-00 budget for what we're going to plan on
13 funding for October 1 through September 30th next
14 year.

15 Going down the list, Risk Assessments, this is
16 going to be a really tough topic. I don't know
17 exactly what the RAB's going to want on risk
18 assessment, whether you want human health, whether
19 you want ecological, whether you want both, how much
20 detail you want. From the Navy's standpoint we
21 would be a little leery about us doing the training
22 ourselves because there is so much contention there.

23 I know that both UCSD and SDSU offer
24 environmental training classes. I'm sure we can get
25 whichever one of those or some other professional

1 training organization to come in and give the
2 training on that. This one, depending on how much
3 the RAB wants with respect to detail, could take an
4 entire RAB meeting. It could take an entire weekend.
5 It could take an entire week, depending on what you
6 want to do. We go for three- to five-day classes on
7 this stuff. Three to five days for human health and
8 then another three to five for eco.

9 So at this point I think the RAB needs to kind
10 of think about what they really want and
11 give us their thoughts, and we'll go ahead and set it
12 up.

13 Groundwater: Charles Cheng from the
14 Water Board did a groundwater presentation a couple
15 of years ago to the RAB. It lasted about an hour. He
16 did a great job. Everyone was real happy with that.
17 If you guys want groundwater again, my recommendation
18 would be to bring Charles back; and being that he's
19 with the Water Board, he's a great source to go with
20 the groundwater issues.

21 Innovative Technologies: This topic has many
22 flexible aspects to it, depending upon whether you
23 want just kind of a smattering of all the innovative
24 technologies that are out there and just kind of go
25 over what they are or whether you want more detail on

1 a particular innovative technology. Either way, we
2 can probably do it during the RAB meeting.

3 My recommendation here is pick one
4 technology, do a 30- to 45-minute presentation on
5 that one particular technology in a little more
6 detail; and then after that, have the RAB say "Yeah,
7 we liked it. We didn't like it. Do another one."
8 We'll try to pick something wthat we're planning on
9 doing on North Island for the first one and then go
10 from there.

11 Geology: This is relatively straightforward.
12 We could easily have someone come in and give a quick
13 intro to geology - basic Geology 101, and then
14 discuss some of the specifics with respect to the
15 geology that we have here at NAB and North Island.
16 We could have Bill do it because he is a geologist or
17 get someone else to do it, so that's a pretty easy
18 one.

19 Air Issues Related to Remediation:

20 Again, we had Rosa Salcedo from APCD come in on a
21 previous RAB. She gave a presentation. We could
22 have her come back for that as well.

23 The RCRA/CERCLA Process/Environmental Law:
24 When we first started up the RAB back in June of '94,
25 we got into this whole training issue, and we had a

1 full day on North Island. It's kind of like we had
2 about a year ago, but the first half of the day was
3 devoted to training, and Steve De Young from Bechtel
4 did a whole hour on the RCRA/CERCLA process. We
5 videotaped that entire four-hour session, and that is
6 in the library here.

7 So my recommendation is take a look at that
8 and then come back to the Navy and say, "Okay. We saw
9 that. We have more questions about this, that or
10 whatever," and we'll set up an appropriate training
11 based on that.

12 Site Assessment Techniques: Again, there's a
13 lot of these out there. I would recommend waiting
14 until after we do an innovative technology
15 presentation and then see how we like that, and then
16 we can go with the same thing with site assessment
17 technologies.

18 CEQA Process: That is a state regulation,
19 state requirement that either DTSC or the Water Board
20 implements, and for our stuff it would be DTSC. Our
21 recommendation is to ask DTSC to come do a
22 presentation on that.

23 MS. FARGO: They've never done that?

24 MR. MACH: They have not. We have not requested
25 it or you have not requested it.

1 MS. FARGO: Right.

2 MR. MACH: And TRI Reporting and P2 Plans: These
3 are two topics that -- remember on the survey I
4 said, "Fill in other topics?" Well, Laura Hunter
5 filled in these two. They're not IR related. They
6 are not --

7 MS. FARGO: What are they?

8 MR. MACH: I don't even know what TRI Reporting
9 is, but I think it has to do with air; and P2 is
10 pollution/prevention plans.

11 MR. COLLINS: Toxic Reduction Inventory or
12 Resource Inventory.

13 MR. LOCKE: Release inventory.

14 MS. FARGO: Toxic Release Inventory. So it would
15 not be covered by the RAB.

16 MR. MACH: They're not covered by the RAB.
17 Laura's no longer a member. And so being that these
18 aren't in our charter, I recommend we delete them
19 from consideration for RAB training.

20 So with all that, the first recommendation is
21 to go ahead and set up the first one, the Relative
22 Risk, for next month. And then if you guys wanted to
23 pursue risk assessment for the following one in
24 October, we can go ahead with that. If you think

1 that's too big and you want to set it up for a
2 weekend or something to do that, we can do that as
3 well. We can move then onto groundwater or
4 innovative technologies. Depending on whether or
5 not Charles is available in October or December, we
6 can get him for one of those, and I can set up the
7 innovative technology for the next one, and then we
8 can just go through this list.

9 MS. FARGO: That sounds fine. Before we get to
10 the very first one, the Relative Risk/Site Ranking
11 Process, will the fiscal year 2000 budget be ready by
12 our September meeting?

13 MR. MACH: We won't have the actual approved
14 budget, but we have our plan as to how much we're
15 asking for, how much they put in and said, "Yes, we
16 want this one for North Island." And then generally
17 it doesn't change a whole lot; and if it does, then
18 we ~~want them~~will be tweaking things as the year goes
19 on. But we could get halfway into the year and they
20 could say, "Oh, by the way, we're going to Bosnia.
21 We're taking back some of your budget."

22 MS. FARGO: But you at least have your wish list
23 ready now.

24 MR. MACH: Right. We have our plan.

1 MS. FARGO: And as far as the Relative Risk
2 aspect, you're saying you will explain to us how in
3 the overall Navy scheme money is allocated among the
4 bases -- different bases.

5 MR. MACH: We can show you how we input the data
6 for our sites. Like if we went to Site -- if we have
7 this model, this computer programming, and you go in
8 there and say, "Okay. NAS North Island IR Site 9.
9 We have these contaminants in the groundwater," and
10 you put what the contaminants are and what the
11 concentrations are.

12 You have the same thing in these other ones
13 for soil and these other ones for sediments and
14 everything else. And you're asked a few questions.
15 Is it near drinking water? Is it migrating? And you
16 have like three choices: Definitely not migrating,
17 definitely is migrating, or potentially could be.

18 But once you've filled in all these things, it
19 calculates a number. It ranks it. And you do that
20 for all the sites and it compares them all. And then
21 it also breaks them into like three by three boxes
22 based on where you picked all these things, and you
23 wind up in one of those boxes. And each of those
24 boxes has a letter and a number associated with it --
25 an X, Y or Z and a 1 through 9. And that determines
26 whether you're a high priority, imintermediate

1 priority, low priority, as well as your actual
2 numerical number that is compared to all the other
3 sites.

4 And there is a certain requirement for
5 funding. A certain amount of your budget has to be
6 funded for the high priority, and you can also do
7 some mediums, mediums and low if you can get them
8 closed out quickly, ~~+~~ ~~T~~they're in the way of a
9 construction project, or something else that you need
10 to address the lower ones. So I think it's like 70
11 percent of the budget has to go for high ranked
12 sites, and the other 30 is a little more
13 discretionary.

14 MS. FARGO: And it's not just high ranked on your
15 base. It's high ranked within all of the
16 contaminated IR sites on all Navy bases. Is that
17 true?

18 MR. MACH: Right.

19 MS. FARGO: Kind of.

20 MR. MACH: Well, it's kind of. I mean, you look
21 at NAS North Island, and our budget is \$8 million
22 plus or minus per year. The entire budget for
23 Southwest Div is \$60 million, and so we're getting a
24 good portion of that because we have a lot of high
25 ranked sites. NAB has less sites, less high risk,

1 and so they're getting right around a million
2 dollars.

3 MS. FARGO: They're doing basically the
4 overall scheme of how it is and what controls you're
5 under in going about cleaning up all the IR sites.

6 MR. MACH: Right.

7 MS. FARGO: Okay. I think they ought to do your
8 list of presentations. Does everybody agree?

9 MR. MACH: And Michael Pound, who is in our tech
10 branch ~~of pier collapsing, he~~ offered ~~up~~ to do that.
11 So hopefully he'll be available for that meeting. I
12 have seen him do it before. He's actually done it
13 for us before here, so he does a really good job.

14 MR. GEILENFELDT: That will be the September
15 meeting?

16 MS. FARGO: Yes. And that date will be September
17 16th?

18 MR. MACH: Right.

19 MS. FARGO: And you think about 30 to 45 minutes.

20 MR. MACH: Right.

21 MS. FARGO: Tell him to shoot for 30. We always
22 go over.

1 MR. COLLINS: Remember, we allowed time. We're
2 only going to have three major topics, and we'll
3 allow time for questions, and there should be quite a
4 few on this one.

5 MS. FARGO: Yes. That's what I'm thinking. So
6 give us a good boiled down presentation, and
7 we'll hopefully ask good questions. That sounds
8 great.

9 The risk assessment I agree. I think that is
10 a huge topic. And if anybody -- I don't know how to
11 really tackle the determination of what the RAB
12 members want to know about the risk. I don't even
13 know where to start.

14 MR. COLLINS: We can discuss that in September.
15 Hopefully, we'll have more people.

16 MS. FARGO: That would be a good idea.

17 MR. COLLINS: We can devote a little bit of time
18 to this.

19 MS. FARGO: Okay. So we'll put that as an agenda
20 item for the September meeting.

21 MR. GEILENFELDT: That could possibly be a
22 weekend type.

1 MS. FARGO: Well, the discussion will occur in
2 September, and we'll have to figure out what you want
3 because it is an enormous topic.

4 MR. COLLINS: You may want to sort out the human
5 from the ecological or only do one on one particular
6 night.

7 MS. FARGO: Right. That's what I was thinking.
8 Unless we want to devote --

9 MR. MACH: You may also want to get like
10 presentations from a professor at one of the
11 universities, get the regulators on health risk
12 assessment here so that you can kind of get different
13 perspectives.

14 MS. FARGO: Exactly.

15 MR. MACH: You know, what the Navy looks at and
16 how we want to deal with risks compared to how
17 private industry does it compared to how the
18 regulators want to see it done. Everyone does it or
19 wants to do it a little differently.

20 MS. FARGO: I think that would be good to try to
21 get everybody together, at least those three.
22 Certainly regulators, the Navy. I guess the private
23 contractor industry people and, yeah, not more than
24 an hour on the topic. It's an enormous topic is what
25 I'm fearful of.

1 MR. MACH: Well, if you're going to do it at a
2 RAB meeting, that's going to be tough.

3 MS. FARGO: That's what I mean.

4 MR. MACH: I would say that that would be a RAB
5 meeting that you'd probably want to start early.

6 MS. FARGO: I'm not fond of starting early.

7 MR. MACH: Or on a weekend, but it's solely up
8 to you.

9 MS. FARGO: Let's give it some thought, and we
10 will hopefully come up with a detailed plan in
11 September.

12 MR. MACH: Okay. And I'll talk to Charles Cheng
13 as well about the groundwater and see if he would be
14 available for October or December.

15 MS. FARGO: October, November.

16 MR. MACH: We moved the November meeting to
17 December 1st.

18 MS. FARGO: Oh, we did? No November meeting?

19 MR. MACH: It's almost November.

20 MS. FARGO: Okay. That's great.

21 MR. GEILENFELDT: So the November meeting is no
22 longer November. It is now what?

1 MR. COLLINS: December 1st.

2 MR. MACH: It's on the bottom of the agenda. It's
3 got all three of the future meetings.

4 MS. FARGO: Whatever meeting dates we've set are
5 always printed on the agenda.

6 Now we will talk about Site 10, Non-Time
7 Critical Removal Action Update. Also Rich Mach.

8 MR. MACH: No, Rich Wong. Oh, no, it is me. I
9 guess I get to do the introduction.

10 We have presented once in the past our plan
11 to performing a non-time critical removal action at
12 Site 10 at North Island. This is the low-level
13 radioactive waste slag site.

14 We've gone ahead and awarded a contract to OHM
15 to do all of the up-front paperwork and
16 documentation, the Work-Pplans, the Action Memoranda,
17 the EE/CA.

18 Rich Wong from OHM is here to give you a
19 presentation as to where we're at right now in the
20 process. We've actually done some additional site
21 work to hone in exactly what our technology screening
22 should be looking at. Rich will go through some of
23 that and then give you a schedule as to when we'll

1 have some documents coming out for review, and when
2 we plan on starting construction. So, Rich?

3 MR. WONG: Thanks, Rich.

4 What I'd like to do is make sure everybody's
5 got a copy of this little update form that we put
6 together with Rich that would kind of help guide you
7 through what I'm going to discuss with you.

8 But, first of all, I'd just like to let you
9 know that the Site 10 -- if you're not familiar with
10 the location of the site, it's on the north portion
11 of the island adjoining San Diego Bay.

12 We're working -- the non-time critical removal
13 action pertains to this area near Pier echo, and it's
14 associated with RCRA SWMU No. 134 and 135.

15 The objective of our non-time critical removal
16 action is to mitigate metal and radium impacted soil
17 and slag at the shoreline of Site 10. I apologize for
18 the quality of this overhead.

19 The waste practices that resulted in the
20 accumulation of the slag and ash at Site 10 was the
21 result of a smelter that is no longer operational
22 that recovered metals from aircraft parts that were
23 no longer needed, and the slag from the smelter was
24 deposited on the shoreline of Site 10.

1 The smelter was destroyed in 1976, and in 1995
2 an emergency removal action was undertaken in the
3 area identified by this rectangle, and the emergency
4 removal action was undertaken to take care of two
5 outcroppings of slag that had been commingled with
6 some radium dial sources, and that was completed in
7 '95.

8 The remaining slag, which is illustrated in
9 the orange pattern and in the pink pattern, still
10 remains at the site and has been identified as
11 requiring further action.

12 At this point Oak Ridge National Laboratory is
13 finalizing the remedial investigation for Site 10.

14 Based on Oak Ridge's assessment and our recent
15 studies at the site, we estimate that the remaining
16 slag encompasses an area of approximately 19,000
17 square feet and 37,000 cubic feet of material.

18 Just to let you know what the site looks like,
19 it's a very beautiful site. It's along the
20 shoreline, as we mentioned, along San Diego Bay.

21 What we're looking at now is a picture of one
22 of our engineers collecting some sediment samples as
23 part of the recent investigation that Rich mentioned.

24 This bluff that we are looking at off to the
25 right is approximately eight to ten feet, and that's

1 where the majority of the ash material resides. It
2 doesn't really show that well on this overhead, but
3 the ash layer is in this general area of the bluff
4 face. I've got a close-up of that to help you see
5 what we're talking about.

6 This blue material is the ash material that is
7 the primary risk driver on this particular site.
8 It's very friable in nature, so there's a lot of
9 concerns with respect to human exposure and
10 environmental receptors.

11 So current status, as Rich mentioned --

12 MR. MACH: Rich, the ash is a risk driver from a
13 metal standpoint, not from a radiation standpoint.

14 MR. WONG: That's a good point.

15 Based on the work that Oak Ridge has recently
16 completed in preparing their final RI report,
17 preliminary conclusions have been derived which
18 indicate that the radiant sources that were taken
19 care of during the emergency removal action no longer
20 pose a risk with respect to the wastes on Site 10
21 with respect to this non-time critical removal
22 action.

23 We expect Oak Ridge to submit their report to
24 DTSC on or about August 31st of 1999. And as Rich
25 mentioned, OHM is currently preparing the

1 preconstruction documents in advance of the removal
2 action, and those documents include the preparation
3 of an Action Memorandum, an engineering evaluation/
4 ~~of~~-cost analysis, and a remedial action work-plan.

5 Our current schedule shows us delivering those
6 reports to DTSC for their review by the first
7 quarter of the year 2000, and following DTSC's
8 review, we're hoping that we will be able to release
9 this report -- I'm sorry. Let me take that back.

10 We are going to give the report to DTSC the
11 fourth quarter of 1999 and hope to have it available
12 for public review the first quarter of the year 2000.

13 MR. GEILENFELDT: You're talking about a removal
14 -- physically removing all of this ash?

15 MR. MACH: That's where I was about to go.

16 Basically the work that Rich just talked about
17 when they just went out there and took
18 additional samples, a lot of that was to refine
19 characterization of the waste so that they could do a
20 detailed technology screening to determine what to do
21 as a removal action.

22 Removal action doesn't mean all the time
23 remove. It can also be capped in place, certain
24 containment. All of the data that Rich generated or

1 that OHM generated was put together into a technical
2 memorandum and was given to DTSC and the other
3 regulators on the 28th of July for them to review.
4 All that data was also given to Oak Ridge National
5 Laboratory, and they're going to incorporate all of
6 that data into their RI report, and that's why this
7 Technical Memorandum is not sent to the public for
8 review because it will be incorporated in the RI
9 report.

10 The purpose of presenting that to DTSC and the
11 Water Board back on the 28th was to say, "Look, we've
12 got this material that's here. It poses a risk if
13 you're exposed to it." Most of it's buried under the
14 site. It's in this basically 6 to 12 or 18 inches
15 thick layer that goes into that bluff and is
16 covered~~then starts~~ over.

17 It's not very cost effective to try to remove
18 it and haul it to a distant radioactive landfill to
19 dispose of it. There aren't a whole lot of in situ
20 treatment technologies to use on it, so we're really
21 looking at some sort of containment technology:
22 probably putting up some sort of sea wall or barrier
23 so that the bluff is protected and cannot slough off
24 into the bay; and then some sort of cap on top,
25 whether it be pavement or some other engineering cap
26 on top which will prevent or minimize infiltration of

1 water that will migrate the contaminants down into
2 the groundwater and then out into the bay.

3 We presented that to DTSC and they were
4 amenable to that. They would still want some sort of
5 institutional control when this whole thing is done,
6 which means like deed restrictions and other things
7 when you have a landfill technically this could be a
8 landfill, as to how you're going to maintain that
9 capped site so that it doesn't pose a risk in the
10 future.

11 So that is what our technology screening is
12 probably going to wind up being isn some sort of
13 containment, whether it's a sheet pile driven wall or
14 a constructed sea wall or concrete or shotcrete or
15 what, we don't know that yet. That's what the whole
16 evaluation is that OHM is going to be doing between
17 now and the time they're done with the
18 Action Memorandum and the EE/CA and the Work-Plan in
19 the November-December time frame.

20 MR. GEILENFELDT: So we don't know at this point
21 what the action will be.

22 MR. MACH: I would say that there's a 95 percent
23 chance it's going to be some sort of capping or
24 containment, and it's not going to be excavated and
25 hauled off.

1 There are more risks -- not only is it more
2 costly to excavate, there are more risks because now
3 you have taken this material that is not exposed and
4 you've exposed it. By excavating, it can get
5 airborne. That ash that Rich was talking about,
6 it's very friable. It can get blown into people's
7 breathing zone. It can get blown into the water. It
8 could slough off so that there is more risk due to
9 trying to remove it than there is just leaving it in
10 place.

11 MS. FARGO: And there's no risk posed by leaching
12 into the bay? I mean, it's basically right at the
13 bay's edge and pretty near because of the exposure,
14 so that would be my fear.

15 MR. MACH: There's been an ecological study done
16 by the Navy research lab over at SPAWAR.
17 They've determined that there is no eco risk right
18 now.

19 MS. FARGO: They're not multiple contaminants or
20 what?

21 MR. MACH: I think that it appears that what's
22 happened is, it's not infiltrating down in the
23 groundwater, so it's not getting into the
24 groundwater. **What's happening is is the pipe in**

1 **there is eroding** it and they're just diluting it
2 throughout the bay.

3 MS. FARGO: And that doesn't pose a risk that
4 they require you to take care of?

5 MR. MACH: All the eco risk and the sediment
6 studies and everything they've done there shows that
7 there is no risk. There's been none.

8 MS. FARGO: It's just basically anything that's
9 being ~~resolved~~discharged is in the bay and it --

10 MR. MACH: But it's not good to let it keep
11 polluting, so we're going to try to contain it.

12 MR. WONG: They also have collected
13 groundwater samples in front of the ash and it's
14 shown that there really hasn't been a transference of
15 metals into the groundwater.

16 MS. FARGO: That's good.

17 MR. WONG: And that will be brought out in the
18 final Oak Ridge report.

19 MR. COLLINS: The real risk would be with a human
20 being sitting on the edge of the bluff and rolling
21 around in the ash and inhaling it and eating it.
22 That's where the risk is really and most people don't
23 do that.

1 But in any case, why not remove the threat of
2 the risk, and that's what we're doing through this
3 removal action. By removing the chance for exposure,
4 we remove the chance for any risk.

5 MS. FARGO: Yes. Logically to me and if you're
6 living close to it, I agree. We don't have people
7 out there rolling around in it, but if the wave
8 action is throwing it into the bay and it's in the
9 bay, it's either a problem or it's not a problem.
10 You're saying it's not a problem.

11 MR. COLLINS: Correct.

12 MR. MACH: Correct.

13 MS. FARGO: Okay. It just seems like a nice,
14 finite little source you could get rid of. You're
15 getting rid of a lot of stuff.

16 MR. COLLINS: But it goes back into the hill.

17 MS. FARGO: I know.

18 MR. MACH: Rich, could you put that map back up?

19 MR. WONG: So the only -- the picture that we
20 looked at is just the exposure that we see, but it
21 goes back substantially some distance.

22 MR. MACH: Show us what the scale is on that.

1 MR. GEILENFELDT: Is that that dock where ~~THE~~the
2 Hornet~~ORNET~~ used to be? Is that the location?

3 MR. MACH: It's Pier echo.

4 MR. WONG: Pier echo, that's where the deep
5 submergence~~ts~~ folks have their facility -- their
6 decompression chamber, I believe. I'm not familiar
7 with ~~THE~~the Hornet~~ORNET~~.

8 MR. GEILENFELDT: It sat there for a long while.

9 MR. WONG: DRMO is back on this area.

10 This scale here is about 60 feet, so probably
11 looking at about 120 feet inward from the bluff face.

12 MR. GEILENFELDT: You're saying that slag or ash
13 is 120 feet from the shoreline?

14 MR. WONG: From the bluff face; right. There's
15 about a 6 to 8 foot bluff at the edge of the beach
16 and it extends.

17 MR. GEILENFELDT: So it's not on the beach.

18 MR. COLLINS: It's not exactly on the beach. It's
19 on the bluff. What you're looking at when you're on
20 the bluff is you're looking at -- pretend that you're
21 looking at a pipe, and the pipe extends farther back
22 into the hill.

23 MR. GEILENFELDT: Okay.

1 MR. COLLINS: Now, in this case your pipe is very
2 wide. It's as wide as that orange area, we can
3 seeay, and it still extends back into the hill.

4 MR. MACH: And there's anywhere from two to six
5 feet of overburden on top of that. And if the
6 calculations are correct and if there is 37,000 cubic
7 feet of this stuff -- cubic feet, not cubic yards --
8 disposal costs alone would be over \$4 million.

9 MR. GEILENFELDT: What's a sea wall cost?

10 MR. MACH: It would be a lot less than that. I
11 can't give you the exact number, but it would be a
12 lot less than \$4 million.

13 MR. WONG: That's what we're working on now, the
14 engineering evaluation and then the cost of each of
15 those options.

16 MR. MACH: The total cost is about \$110 per cubic
17 foot.

18 MR. COLLINS: It will more than double the rest
19 of the costs.

20 MS. FARGO: All right.

21 MR. WONG: And the last thing we presented to the
22 RAB today is a preliminary technology evaluation
23 matrix, and that just highlights some of the

1 technology that we're currently looking at, and we'll
2 look at further detail in the EE/CA to help derive
3 what the best option is for mitigating the risks
4 associated with this waste.

5 MR. GEILENFELDT: And this is all that was over
6 by the smelter.

7 MR. WONG: That's correct.

8 Any questions?

9 MS. FARGO: I just have one question on your
10 chart. Under "Class 1 Landfill" you note that "Class
11 1 landfill cannot accept low level radioactive
12 waste."

13 Is this -- I thought that this was basically
14 now just the metal. It does still have radioactive
15 materials?

16 MR. MACH: It has some radioactivity and that's
17 why it has to go to a radioactive landfill, although
18 the risk imposed at the site is not from the
19 radiation.

20 MR. WONG: Exposure from the radiation is low,
21 but it's still -- the restrictions for a Class 1
22 landfill are very stringent.

23 MS. FARGO: Okay.

24 MR. WONG: Thank you.

1 MS. FARGO: I have only one other comment. Rich,
2 we have to have handouts. Well, we have to have for
3 part of the record all of the handouts that you've
4 put up. So I'm going to keep telling everybody, all
5 of our presenters, I want that map you have up there.
6 I'd like it in my little packet. But at the minimum,
7 we have to have it for the record.

8 So if we can put it up on the screen, Carla
9 wants it in her handout. Sorry. I do.

10 MR. MACH: You want them as color photos then?

11 MS. FARGO: No. They can be black and white, but
12 I like to make my notes on them. So black and white
13 is fine. We need probably the color for the record
14 so can we get one color copy?

15 MR. MACH: We'll get a color copy to put in the
16 library.

17 MS. FARGO: Thank you. Just for me if you put a
18 slide up, it better be in the packet.

19 MR. MACH: No more slides.

20 MS. FARGO: I like slides.

21 Thank you very much. That was great.

22 Now, that's really the end of the business for
23 tonight, isn't it.

1 MR. COLLINS: No. This next one has a potential
2 to be lengthy.

3 MS. FARGO: Well, we do want to talk about the
4 RAB membership drive? I went ahead and took a look
5 at our roster, which I have the August 4, 1999
6 version of the RAB attendance sheet, and by my count
7 it looks like we have about 14 members, and that's
8 including our three Navy members and community
9 participants, just about everybody on here. And
10 that's not too bad -- 14 really isn't too bad if
11 everybody comes, and tonight it looks like we have
12 about seven, so it is enough for a quorum.

13 But our guidance document -- our Mission
14 Statement and Operating Procedures Guide states that
15 we shall have approximately 25 members, I believe.

16 MR. MACH: It says our goal would be 25 members.
17 We've never gotten that many.

18 MR. COLLINS: But it's a life long dream.

19 MR. MACH: I think the most we've ever had was 19
20 or maybe 20.

21 MS. FARGO: Well, I think we can do it.
22 Let's be optimistic. We're going to get some new
23 members, and we need to get members from all these
24 categories. Our procedure guide says that there are

1 six categories, and we really need -- we do have a
2 pretty good representation of neighbors and
3 residents, local businesses -- Greg Walker I think is
4 the only one. Does anybody know of any other
5 business people? Base workers. We have
6 PilarLaConta.

7 MR. COLEMAN: This is my last meeting. I'm
8 transferring to Mississippi.

9 MR. MACH: You can commute back and forth.

10 MS. FARGO: I'm so sorry to hear that.

11 MR. COLEMAN: I'll be back 2001. I talked to Ken
12 Mitchell, and I also talked to a couple of people
13 today about joining and because they need some
14 extracurricular activities in their record.

15 MS. FARGO: And we need the representation, too.
16 I would appreciate any word that you can give, and
17 Ken will certainly help us, I'm sure.

18 MR. COLEMAN: There may be somebody coming here
19 shortly.

20 MS. FARGO: Good. I'm sorry to hear about that.
21 All right.

22 And then going on down the list, public
23 interest groups and planning groups, we used to have
24 some members.

1 MR. MACH: Well, we've got the City.

2 MS. FARGO: That's very important. Well, that's
3 some of it. That's the next one.

4 We really don't have any public interest
5 representation now.

6 MR. COLLINS: We could go back and try to find an
7 environmental type group that would like to belong
8 that would participate. That is one of the
9 recommendations for a technical review committee, and
10 we sought out someone and EHC volunteered to
11 participate. But finding another one, you have to go
12 through like a roster of environmental groups in the
13 community.

14 MS. FARGO: Why not invite them all and see if
15 we get anyone? That really wasn't that bad of an
16 idea. I'm just saying it would be nice to have some
17 representation, and how do you choose from the
18 environmentalist interest group roster who to invite?

19 MR. COLLINS: I think you have to look at what
20 their Mission Statement is and try to find one that's
21 comparable to what we do.

22 MS. FARGO: True.

1 MR. COLLINS: Otherwise, you could invite the
2 Audabon Society to belong and they really mostly
3 would count birds.

4 MR. LOCKE: How about ~~San-Dag~~SANDAG? Would that
5 be a good group?

6 MS. FARGO: ~~San-Dag~~SANDAG is another government
7 group.

8 MR. COLLINS: Coronado belongs to them.

9 MR. GEILENFELDT: I'm concerned about -- you
10 know, you talk to other citizens. They're totally
11 indifferent. "I don't care." It amazes me how much
12 complacency there is with items of this nature. I
13 think it's very important.

14 MS. FARGO: I do, too, and I keep thinking are we
15 not advertising well enough? Is the group not open
16 enough? Is it just down right boring? I don't
17 know.

18 MR. GEILENFELDT: I wasn't aware of this until it
19 came out in "The Eagle" about this.

20 MS. FARGO: We've had a little trouble
21 getting a lot of publicity. I think it's just a
22 newsworthy topic, and it warrants an article -- an
23 actual article, but I haven't convinced them of that.

1 MR. LOCKE: I spoke to the "Coronado Eagle" and
2 they said they would do a feature article.

3 MS. FARGO: Great.

4 MR. LOCKE: And maybe I can get Vicki to come to
5 the next meeting.

6 MS. FARGO: I think we should have someone like
7 that. Maybe we can get --

8 MR. MACH: Vicki writes good articles, too.

9 MS. FARGO: -- her to come and then we could have
10 a nice big membership drive. Have her do a nice big
11 write up in addition to Ken Mitchell's ad for new
12 members. I think we should do that and we can get
13 them behind us.

14 I really think some of this stuff that comes
15 out of these meetings is newsworthy to Coronado
16 residents. Maybe it's not going to blow your socks
17 off, but there are some big things going on at North
18 Island, and I think it should be in "The Eagle."

19 Let's see if we can work on that. Would you
20 like to --

21 MR. LOCKE: I'll do it.

22 MS. FARGO: A notice to the general public of our
23 typical meeting but done in conjunction with our
24 membership drive for new RAB members.

1 MR. LOCKE: Okay.

2 MR. COLLINS: As a preface to that, you might
3 want to talk to her privately before that and explain
4 the purpose of the RAB and what we do, and then Part
5 2 can be actually attending a RAB meeting and seeing
6 how it goes on so that we get more of a story in
7 there. We don't really have a lot of action.

8 MR. LOCKE: Would you like to meet together with
9 her?

10 MS. FARGO: Sure. That would be great. Maybe we
11 can do a little interview. And this is Vicki --

12 MR. LOCKE: I forgot her last name.

13 MR. MACH: I just call her Vicki.

14 MR. COLLINS: Vicki at "The Journal."

15 MR. MACH: And to address part of what you said
16 about why people aren't that concerned, I've spoken
17 with Ken Mitchell several times, and at least 50
18 percent of Coronado is retired military and they've
19 been there. They know what we do, and they are
20 comfortable with the Navy taking care of its own.

21 MR. GEILENFELDT: There's a change in the
22 populace. It's like we're seeing more new guys on
23 the street who are buying property. So we're seeing
24 a transition in ownership. So there should be some

1 participation -- interest with these new guys on the
2 street, which is basically why I'm here.

3 MR. COLLINS: Well, as you read the Community
4 Relations Plan, you'll see that we interviewed many
5 people in the community, and it was just for the
6 feeling of the community, and a good part of them
7 trust everything we're doing; the others, some don't
8 care and the rest of them don't trust anything we're
9 doing.

10 MR. GEILENFELDT: And it doesn't matter what you
11 do.

12 MR. COLLINS: Correct. And you'll see this. Of
13 all the people that we interviewed, if they weren't
14 already members, they didn't say they wanted to join.
15 But they mentioned that maybe somebody

16 else would if -- I forget which club we went to
17 where we interviewed the secretary or the president
18 of one of the local clubs like the Rotary Club.

19 MR. GEILENFELDT: What about the residential
20 association -- Coronado Residential Association? Have
21 they been approached about providing --

22 MS. FARGO: I don't even know we have a
23 residential association. What's it called?

1 MR. COLLINS: We interviewed somebody like that.
2 It would be in the Community Relations Plan. You can
3 see what they told us, at least for the person that
4 we interviewed.

5 MS. FARGO: Okay.

6 MR. GEILENFELDT: That is primarily why I haven't
7 attended any meetings, I haven't gotten any
8 information from them. It is primarily retired
9 military that are involved in that, quite frankly.

10 MS. FARGO: Well, we can also maybe try to get
11 interest from the Chamber of Commerce.

12 MR. GEILENFELDT: Call John Overum and see if he
13 can help.

14 MS. FARGO: How are we doing on membership that
15 Ken's called, which basically is why I joined.

16 MR. COLLINS: Advertisements in the paper and --

17 MS. FARGO: And letters?

18 MR. COLLINS: -- we put up fliers before. I don't
19 think we want to send a letter to everybody in
20 Coronado.

21 MS. FARGO: Well, I don't mean everybody in
22 Coronado, but I meant some representative people, and
23 the same letter. If there's an environmental group

1 we want to send a letter to or the City Chamber of
2 Commerce or I don't know.

3 MR. COLLINS: You could have a form letter to
4 send to selected groups.

5 MR. MACH: I remember when we first started the
6 RAB in '94, we actually made up RAB letterhead so
7 that the Co-Chair could write letters and then the
8 Navy would mail them for you. If you're interested
9 in writing a letter, I'm sure we can dig up some
10 letterhead for you.

11 MS. FARGO: Okay. Well, I can make
12 letterhead.

13 MR. COLLINS: It may be in a box.

14 MR. MACH: Or you can make your own letterhead.

15 MR. COLLINS: But it was actually the North
16 Island letterhead, and it was permission from the
17 Captain for the purpose of the RAB to do this.

18 MS. FARGO: That would be great. That sounds
19 fine.

20 So our goal would be by the September meeting
21 our membership drive would be started and we'll get
22 Ken to run his ad. I don't know how many weeks that
23 will take, and then hopefully have all the

1 applications in and new members joining by -- why
2 don't we say December. Is that too long?

3 MR. COLLINS: No. That's probably more
4 optimistic.

5 MR. MACH: Do you think we should put together a
6 membership drive subcommittee?

7 MS. FARGO: Why?

8 MR. MACH: Because you mentioned a lot of things
9 that you want done, but no one's stepped up and said,
10 "I'm doing this and I'm doing that."

11 MS. FARGO: Well, it's me so far is the
12 committee. Anybody want to help me, go ahead. It's
13 my idea. I'll do it, and I'll call for your help.
14 Anybody have suggestions? I don't think it's a bad
15 idea. I may change my mind. I don't know. I feel
16 like we should have a good representation. We should
17 get someone from all of these categories.

18 Some of the regulators, we're going to work on
19 SANDAGanDag. Can you help me get --

20 MR. GEILENFELDT: I don't know anybody at
21 SANDAGanDag. I know that -- Randy Boggess, I think
22 he's involved with SANDAGanDag. He is also a
23 co-editor on "The Eagle." He was in this week.

24 MS. FARGO: Okay.

1 MR. GEILENFELDT: Randy Boggess, B-o-g-g-e-s-s.
2 He would probably be able to give you some
3 information on SANDAGanDag. I think he works for
4 them.

5 MS. FARGO: Good. Well, I'll see what I can come
6 up with and I will report back at the September
7 meeting on my progress.

8 But as far as Ken -- asking Ken Mitchell to
9 get his article ready and run it at least once before
10 the September meeting.

11 MR. COLLINS: John can take care of that, I
12 think.

13 MS. FARGO: I think when I joined, he requested
14 that I attend a meeting and then pick up the
15 application. So if we can get the ad in so that
16 people could see it and call in time to be at the
17 September meeting for the first one, and then we'll
18 see how that works.

19 MR. LOCKE: Okay. He'll have to get that in
20 right away.

21 MS. FARGO: Yes. Okay.

22 And then individuals with technical experience
23 in the environmental field, we seem to have a lot of

1 those through our consultants or is that other than
2 consultants?

3 MR. MACH: There was always a very big push not
4 to allow our consultants to be RAB members.

5 MS. FARGO: Okay. So we've got Foster. Foster's
6 a doctor, and Sandor is technical. I have some
7 technical background. All right. Let's keep looking
8 and see if we can get 10 new members.

9 That's a lot. We won't get that many. Okay.

10 Any other comments on the membership drive?

11 All right.

12 Do we have any public comments? Questions?

13 MR. COLLINS: I have a comment for those people
14 that don't realize this. There's another handout in
15 the back that deals with our other projects that we
16 have going on in North Island.

17 Last month we had a request to limit the
18 topics at the meeting so that we would have time to
19 discuss what was going on for those particular
20 projects. So we agreed to limit our discussions to
21 three major topics. And what we would do for
22 everything else that was going on is provide a little
23 handout in the back with a quick summary of all the
24 other projects going on in North Island. And so this

1 is what we put together for you -- Mark and Rich and
2 I. So we get a little snapshot of the other
3 projects.

4 And from this possibly, if you read this, you
5 can say, "Well, I think that next month we ought to
6 have a presentation on something here."

7 Now, if we do a presentation on a particular
8 topic like tonight, what you'll see in here under
9 Site 10, non-time critical removal action, is just a
10 statement that it was presented. So in that case
11 you'll have a more detailed handout.

12 MS. FARGO: Wow. Are you going to do this every
13 month?

14 MR. COLLINS: We'll do it every month. It will
15 be handy.

16 MS. FARGO: It's a very, very good thing you've
17 done here, Bill.

18 MR. COLLINS: And that way you do have a little
19 bit more of an update on everything over there.

20 MR. GEILENFELDT: This is very helpful, Bill,
21 because everything I have is 1998. This is more
22 current.

23 MR. COLLINS: This is as of this week.

1 MS. FARGO: Well, it would be nice -- would it be
2 possible --

3 MR. MACH: You're going to ask to have this sent
4 out with the mailer, aren't you.

5 MS. FARGO: How did you know? But we need to be
6 able to look at it and digest it to have a topic for
7 the next month or should we just keep it and use it
8 for topics? I never know what to ask for.

9 MR. COLLINS: Well, I figure people are going to
10 actually scan through this while we're at the
11 meeting, and by the end of the meeting -- they're
12 going to be bored some time or other during the
13 meeting at one particular topic or another, and
14 they'll have time to say "Oh."

15 MR. MACH: You know, some people actually show up
16 five minutes early and kind of look through this
17 stuff.

18 MS. FARGO: Not me. Never.

19 MR. MACH: I said "some people."

20 MS. FARGO: Okay. And the reason you can't have
21 this mailed out is it was just ready right before the
22 meeting?

1 MR. MACH: We want it for two things: One, we
2 barely get the minutes out; and two, this way this is
3 as up to date as possible.

4 MS. FARGO: That's fine. I appreciate this. I
5 think this is a great new tool.

6 Any other comments? Okay.

7 Agenda items for the next RAB meeting. We're
8 going to be discussing the relative risk site
9 ranking. Give us another technical one. I'll do the
10 membership drive. Something good because "The Eagle"
11 will be here, hopefully. What about an update about
12 the free product removal? Is that update in here?

13 MR. COLLINS: Yes, it is. About halfway down.
14 It was presented last month.

15 MS. FARGO: I know it was, but it was so
16 interesting, I just want to hear about it.

17 MR. MACH: We should be well into the pilot test
18 by then, and we may have an update to present. You
19 can put that as a possible.

20 MS. FARGO: That's the Site 9 you're talking
21 about.

22 MR. MACH: Right. Site 9 for non-time
23 critical removal action.

1 MS. FARGO: Are you doing free product removal
2 also?

3 MR. MACH: Yes. Free product recovery with soil
4 vapor extraction with steam injection enhancement.

5 MS. FARGO: Okay. Let's put that down for an
6 update. Site 9.

7 MR. COLLINS: It may be short, depending on how
8 far along we've gotten.

9 MS. FARGO: That's fine. If it's short, give us
10 another one. We could have done a little more
11 tonight. We didn't know.

12 What's another big topic? I need to take some
13 time to read this, that's my problem.

14 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'll tell you what. You can
15 think about it for the next few days and just
16 call me or send me an e-mail and we'll put it in.

17 MR. MACH: There's also going to be a mini-update
18 on the training stuff and there's going to be an
19 update on the membership drive, so we've got two
20 small ones.

21 MR. COLLINS: So we'll have two major topics and
22 two smaller topics, and that will pretty much do it
23 for the night. Okay?

1 MS. FARGO: It sounds pretty good, yeah. Okay.

2 And do we need to set any further meeting
3 dates or are we okay with that?

4 MS. WANKIER: I just went to the librarian and
5 we've requested the third week of the rest of the
6 year through the year 2000.

7 MR. MACH: Which day on the third week?

8 MS. WANKIER: They asked me to put in a first
9 request and a second request, and then they'll have
10 to go through their books and calendar.

11 MR. MACH: So by the next meeting we should know
12 what our dates are.

13 MS. WANKIER: As soon as the librarian lets me
14 know.

15 MR. COLLINS: And our first choice is Thursday?

16 MS. WANKIER: Wednesday with Thursday as the
17 alternate.

18 MR. MACH: Rafat's got class on Thursdays.

19 MS. FARGO: Next year?

20 MR. COLLINS: I think the RAB had voted on
21 Thursday last year, and I think Rafat may be done
22 with his schooling by then anyway. He's coming
23 September 16th. He said school wasn't a problem.

1 MS. FARGO: We did vote for Thursday. You're
2 right.

3 MR. MACH: What do you want? We'll go for
4 whatever you want.

5 MR. GEILENFELDT: Go for Thursday.

6 MS. FARGO: Is it fine or do you want her to go
7 and change -- you've requested Wednesday.

8 MS. MACH: We, the Navy, will come whenever you,
9 the public, want.

10 MS. FARGO: Why don't we alternate? Why
11 don't we alternate Wednesday, Thursday; Wednesday,
12 Thursday?

13 MS. WANKIER: Well, I think it's up to their
14 calendar, what they have already scheduled. So they
15 asked me to put in an alternate date.

16 MR. MACH: Try to work with them to try and get
17 it open ended.

18 MS. FARGO: Well, we did vote for Thursday.

19 MR. COLLINS: The RAB did vote for Thursday.

20 MS. FARGO: And they allowed us to have a certain
21 day so they won't give someone else Wednesday or
22 whatever.

1 MS. WANKIER: So you prefer Thursday and then --

2 MR. MACH: We want the third week of each month,
3 Thursday if it's available; if not, Wednesday.

4 MS. FARGO: Correct.

5 MS. WANKIER: She's going to call me anyway.

6 MR. GEILENFELDT: The third week of each month.
7 This going to be for 2000.

8 MR. MACH: Right. This is going to be January
9 through December; however, we normally do not meet in
10 July, and we do not meet in December.

11 MR. GEILENFELDT: No July and no December.

12 MS. FARGO: That's right. Okay.

13 MR. GEILENFELDT: Maybe on Thursday.

14 MS. FARGO: I think that's it for this evening,
15 if there's no further business.

16 MR. MACH: I motion we adjourn.

17 MS. FARGO: Second? We don't have to motion, do
18 we?

19 MR. COLLINS: No, we don't have to.

20 MS. FARGO: We're adjourned.

21

1 (Whereupon, at 7:35 p.m., the meeting
2 was adjourned.)

3

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

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 Wednesday, August 11, 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 50, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of said proceedings.

DATED: _____, 1999.

Nancy A. Lee