

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2000

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: Robert C. Steeves, CSR No. 2147

ATTENDANCE:

John Locke

Richard Mach

Bill Collins

Debbie Wankier

Mark Wankier

Bob Logan

Mark Bonsavage

Daniel Cordero

Leslie Redford

Art Van Rooy

Mark Johnson

CORONADO, CA., THURS., FEBRUARY 17, 2000, 6:35 P.M.

MR. LOCKE: I guess we're ready.

Welcome, everybody, to the 63rd meeting of the NAS North Island NAB, Coronado RAB -- Restoration Advisory Board.

Let's see, I don't think we need any introductions. Everybody -- does anybody feel like we need any introductions tonight?

All right. The January 20th meeting minutes, looking for approval of those, does anybody have any comments?

MR. MACH: Motion we approve them.

MR. LOCKE: Second?

MR. CORDERO: Second.

MR. LOCKE: Dan seconds.

MR. COLLINS: All in favor?

MR. LOCKE: Motion passes.

Our first presentation is from Mark Bonsavage, the NAB ecological risk assessment.

Are you ready to go, Mark?

MR. BONSAVAGE: Yeah, I guess so.

All right. I remember about two months ago I gave a presentation about the ecological risk assessment at Naval Amphibious Base, and during that presentation I basically just explained what an ecological risk assessment was about and what the next step was, and at that point we were just out of the site inspection phase of the process that we go through in investigating sites.

This is a pretty busy flow chart, but basically we were right here where we finished the PASI; and we found that, yes, we did have some chemicals or some pits out in the sediments out at NAB.

So we needed to go to the next step which was an RI, a Remedial Investigation, and that's basically where we expand our investigation a little bit. The RI involves really three -- there's really three phases to an RI. There's where you determine the nature and extent of the

contamination, you do a human health risk assessment, and you do an ecological risk assessment. And because of the nature of the site, we decided to really pursue the ecological risk assessment more adamantly.

MS. LOCKE: Right.

MR. BONSAVAGE: Because really, the sediment is more -- it's more in contact with an ecological receptor than a human receptor; and also that the nature and extent, we would get to that eventually on the site.

Part of this process -- the ecological risk assessment process is there's a lot of steps involved. It's iterative where you need to get together with the people that are interested in the study. That would be the regulators. It would also be any sort of stakeholders or a natural resource trustee like the Fish & Wildlife or NOAA, and you bring in your biologists, your professionals, and basically every so often you get together and sort of review your approach to make sure that your field reads correctly and makes sense.

About three weeks ago we had that meeting, and we had three people from the RAB come to the meeting. We also had two toxicologists from DTSC, and we had a representative from U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and there were a few people from the Navy. And during that meeting, we talked about the draft ecological risk screening which really is just kind of a layout for doing the study, and we just went over what everyone liked about it, what they didn't like about it. And, well, we took it one step further and said, "Here's really some ways to improve it."

Again, that was a meeting that anyone on the RAB could come to or anyone interested, but today I'll just give you an update on really what those developments were from the meeting.

This is where we were doing a study -- it's kind of blurry. It's on Naval Amphibious Base, which is basically down the Silver Strand a little bit south of Coronado, and there's two areas that we're focusing on for this study. One is 2/4 -- 2/4, which is out on the tip here of NAB; and then there's Site 3, which is really along the top here.

Site 2/4 was basically an old burn pit and a sandblasting area where we know that these take different types of waste to burn them and then bury it out there, and there was also some

sandblasting going on. And each of the little "SDs" you see up there is where we took the sediment sample. So we sampled all along the edge -- along the edge of the site in the sediment. This is all underwater here. So we sampled the sediment, and we found that the metals were pretty much elevated all around the site.

For Site 3 we took three samples, and what we found out on Site 3 was there was really kind of a variety of different chemicals. We had a hit of PCB, some semi-volatile compounds showed up, some PAHs showed up, and some pesticides.

So there was a bunch of different chemicals, and they were actually pretty low levels, but still they were above what we call the screening levels where we set up these numbers, where below these numbers there is no reason to be concerned and above these you really need to do further investigation. So that's where we were because we have these concentrations that were above these cutoffs where we couldn't say there was no problem out there at all.

Our study -- we really went through four of these tests, different parts of it, but the main idea was to go through the first three sets where we set up the screening levels, but we ended up going a little further because we knew we were pretty much above these screening levels. Right from the start we knew that, so we had to go a little further down through the process where we wanted to figure out what our assessment end points were and what our measurement end points are going to be.

Now, an assessment end point is basically -- when you're talking about ecological risk, it's what you value. It's what you're placing a value on. It's something that you want to protect. And part of the process is to identify those right up front to say -- you know, to put down on paper what resources do we want to protect because we really can't go out and name every single different species in San Diego Bay, so you kind of have to limit it so you can actually do a scientific study. So that's what we did is we wanted to get an idea of what are the things that we want to protect off of these sites.

Originally we identified what we call the benthic community, and basically benthic just means bottom or bottom of the bay in this case. And the community, in most cases they break it up into vertebrates and invertebrates, and an invertebrate they're smaller animals that basically live in the mud, and we decided that this community is really what supports everything further up the line. Let me get the slide up here.

So in the report that we sent out and also at this meeting we all agreed that the benthic community or the benthic invertebrates are something that are essential; they're valuable to us; basically the foundation for all of the other trophic systems, so it's something we want to protect.

And we also all agree that it is something we can measure, and that's very important; that there's tests out there that we can use to make a determination on whether we're impacting this or not. So at the meeting we agreed that this is something we want to protect.

The next question was -- well, especially the Fish & Wildlife representative, you know, part of their responsibility as being a natural resource trustee is to protect threatening endangered species. And typically they're going to be top-level consumers, so they're going to be further up on the food chain. And the Fish & Wildlife Service representative basically said, you know, "I want to protect the least tern and the snowy plover," which are birds that live basically on the Silver Strand close to the site but not at these sites; but, again, they may feed somewhere around these sites.

Well, we agreed that, yes, it is -- you know, that is something valuable, but we didn't think that -- how's a good way of saying this? -- we didn't think there was a complete pathway to these two receptors, and this is why. If you take a look at the least tern and the snowy plover, they actually feed off of what they call pelagic fish, and in this case pelagic really means water column or they migrate through the water. They move around the bay a lot. And demersal fish is a fish that really lives in the mud.

And we think that this pathway really from the sediment to the phytoplankton is broken, and going up to these birds that feed off this fish is really not the smartest way to go. And if you want to use birds, really, the better bird to use is a bird that weighs or like a diving duck, something that's going to actually come in contact with the sediment.

And so we're trying to reach a middle ground or maybe some kind of fish test that would represent both in some way, but really the pathway for the birds that feed up the water column is really incomplete.

But one of the things that did come out of it is okay. Well, we'll figure that out. So here's one of the benthic invertebrates we want to protect, and we also want to protect what we call waiting birds. We've kind of broken it up into benthic feeders or animals that feed off of the benthic invertebrates.

They feed -- they're in direct contact with it, and that would include fish and rays and different kinds of birds.

So out of the meeting what we -- well, it wasn't quite finalized, but it really was -- you know, the general tone of the meeting was to get away from the water column and bring it back towards the benthic -- this area, kind of bring it into the site, bring it into the sediment. And that's really -- that's really what we -- that was the development of the meeting.

And at this point what we'll do is revise the screening risk assessment, and we're also going to put together a work plan where we'll actually go out and take some more samples.

From the draft and the meeting and just everything that's happened in the last couple of months, I put together this simpler flow chart where it kind of brings you back into what's important to us and what we can measure and what's the smartest thing to measure, and what's really going to give you results that reflect chemicals that may be in that sediment, and that would be to bring it back to the sediment.

And we can do this -- it's a little blurry -- but basically if we do toxicity tests, toxicity tests are directly related to the sediment and chemistry concentrations are directly related to the sediment. And then if we want to go anywhere further up the food chain, we use a bio-accumulation test or some sort of plant or fish, but try to keep it as close to the sediment as we possibly can, and that's really what the revision will reflect is to bring it back to the sediment.

And, again, we'll put together a work plan. We'll actually identify areas where we're going to go out and take more samples, and then we'll run these three different types of tests and then do basically calculations off of this.

And that's it. That's where we are with this.

MR. LOCKE: Any questions?

MR. VAN ROOY: How long from beginning to end?

MR. BONSAVAGE: How long?

MR. VAN ROOY: Yes.

MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, you know, it really depends on next when we go out what we find because at this point, as you saw at Site 3, we've got three samples. You know, that doesn't really tell

me

much.

I don't know -- from the history, I'd say there was no huge industry here. There may not be -- I wouldn't think there would be a big problem, but I've have been told in Site 2/4 we've got more samples, and we've already seen the concentrations tapering off as we go further out from the site.

So we'll go out, take one more round of sample, and if from this test which I think we can probably put together the work plan and go out and do the samples and get results back, it'd be about a year. And if we were to say that we have a good idea of the extent of the contamination, that these tests really cover the area, that it's not -- let's just say if we're not like on the edge of something at this point, a year to get tests back, and you could really draw conclusions from all these tests after the report. So if it doesn't blow up into something huge, I would say in a year you could have some conclusions back from these.

That's it.

MR. LOCKE: Thank you.

MR. BONSAVAGE: All right.

MR. LOCKE: Good job.

Our next presentation is from Bill Collins concerning Site 11, the Remedial Action Plan and Record of Decision.

MR. COLLINS: I have handouts back here. I don't know if everybody got them. You probably need them for both.

This particular project today is taking place at the Industrial Waste Treatment Plant. I don't know how many people know where that is on the island, but it's actually about dead center.

The IWDP area has operated since the mid-70s treating waste. In about 1988 we shut down the surface impoundments that were out there, and the Water Board directed us to clean it up, and it's taken several years for us to get this far where we're trying to come up with a decision on how to do that cleanup. We've investigated it and everything else out there, but we haven't really cleaned up too much, although several years ago we did go in and attack the soil vapor problem from the volatile organic hydrocarbons that were in the soil itself, and we stripped those out, so we have done that

much.

Let me focus this thing. Okay.

When we originally started this program, we conducted a remedial investigation type of study, then we did an engineering feasibility study to look into the ways to clean it up, and that was back in the time period ending in about 1997. And since then, we've had PWC go in and close a number of non-surface impoundments, and I'm going to show you a map of that.

And when they did that, they also went in and they decontaminated a structure, cleaned out any remnant contaminant that might be in there, and tore the structure out and sampled the soil underneath it. And in almost in every case the soil came up clean, but it still left them with groundwater, which is a depth which is contaminated.

So anyhow, we need to find a way to RAP the closure, clean up and final disposition of those particular impoundments and features out there into the total package for this RAP and ROD. A RAP is a Remedial Action Plan. That's a State document; and a ROD is a Record of Decision. That's a Federal document, and the goal is the same.

So what we're doing is we're adding quite a bit of work. Our FS because of that is going to be expanded, and here's the -- not very good.

The original pits that we looked at were the South Pond, the North Pond, the sludge basins and these sludge beds over here, four of them. Now we're adding in several other SWMUs in the area. We're going to close those down at the same time.

The main issues that we have confronted in trying to do this are looking at the ARARS. Those are applicable and relevant. You know what? I botched it. The ARARS.

MR. CORDERO: Applicable, relevant, and appropriate.

MR. COLLINS: Right. Laws, regulations that affect the cleanup of the site, standards that we have to meet.

When this was done under RCRA, that's the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, we didn't have to look into that; but now that we're using CERCLA, which is the Comprehensive Environmental Cleanup Liability Act -- Compensation Act, I think -- we're trying to blend in and go down another path. The goal is the same. We end up with a cleaned up site, a properly monitored site. And that's one thing that we have to work out with the State, so we sent in a request for them to

identify ARARS for us.

And the next thing is the risk assessment. When we did that from the beginning, we did it only for the small area that we were treating. Now the rules have changed over time. There's a different evaluation of risk for some of the metal contaminants out there. The risk has gone down in the eyes of EPA, and in most cases in the eyes of the State, so we have to re-evaluate for that.

And then we haven't really expanded the size of the area, but we've expanded the number of items in it. And we also need to go back and look at the fact that we've cleaned up the VOCs in the soil, so that risk is no longer credible. And we will re-evaluate our remedial alternatives.

We're looking at the soil. Should we leave the soil in place? Should we treat it in place? Should we dig it up and haul it away? What makes the most sense for treating the problem that's with the soil? What's the most economical? What's the best for the community? What's the best for reusing the site in the future? Those things have to be considered.

When it comes to the groundwater, we have to also decide what to do with it. Obviously, we can't dig it up and take it somewhere. So we have to decide whether we can monitor it and that will be sufficient, or whether we should look at monitoring and also look at monitored natural attenuation where actually mother nature takes care of it and destroys the chemicals.

And what do we do with the current well system? Is it adequate for our needs in the future? Right now it's adequate for what the Public Works Center is doing as they monitor the groundwater plume, but is it adequate for everybody in the future? So we'll be looking at that.

And I've got a map here. Actually, this shows you where the wells are around the site. This is the background well. It's clean. And then we have several other wells scattered all over there and some actually a little farther out.

QWC currently monitors 17 of these wells on a quarterly basis and then writes an annual report and submits it to DTSC and the Water Board. And what we will try to do is look at this, give it serious consideration as to whether or not the wells are deep enough or in the right place or could they be in a better place, conserve our needs; and if there are too many wells out there and we're not using them all, maybe we should destroy some of them, plug them so that in the future if something happened, you wouldn't have contamination going down the well.

Well, in the end from that after we've decided what to do and worked out a plan with the State

and what makes sense, then we will prepare this RAP/ROD document. This will take care of all of Operable Unit 11, which is Site 11 mixed in with all these other Solid Waste Management Units that we're going to add into one package. And there will be a chapter in this RAP/ROD too that will contain the recommendations for no further actions for several other SWMUs, Solid Waste Management Units, on the island such as Site 3 and Site 6.

Site 6 has been cleaned up and Site 3 there is no problem. So we will just put them into that same document and hopefully close out quite a bit of North Island's problems as well.

After the RAP/ROD document is signed, we then go into the process of completing a remedial design, looking into firming up how it's actually going to happen. And once we have the design approved and everybody is satisfied with that, then we take remedial action and actually go in and clean it up. And then after that, we'll be monitoring it for many years.

That's pretty much it. Any questions? Okay.

MR. LOCKE: Ed-- Bill Collins is going to do the next presentation.

MR. COLLINS: I could swear somebody changed the agenda because I thought there was a break in there. I was going to get up and then have Rick get up so you wouldn't have to listen to me. Now I have to get up again.

MR. MACH: I put you back to back so that if I got back late, I was still able to get mine done.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

Well, this particular presentation is for Site 9. Site 9 is over in the southwest corner of North Island over near the ammunition pier. If you've ever taken one of the tours and gone around the harbor with your relatives when they've come to town, it's about as far out as you go on a two-hour trip.

Now, I don't think you're going to be able to read any of this. That's why you have handouts.

Along North Island we have five sets of monitoring wells. Generally there's four wells to a set, a couple have five. Anyway, you can see in this area here, here, there. It's because the groundwater flow at this site is in this direction. Therefore, they actually are in the path of the groundwater.

What we've been doing over time is going out there, measuring the contamination in the wells, trying to figure out, number one, how bad is it and what is the effect on the bay? Several years ago we did find out that we had leakage into the bay. We have been working with the State and the Water

Board trying to come up with the answer of why it's happening, where it's exactly happening, and how can we take care of it?

This shows the wells that we sampled. These results are for last April. We have been out in December and January and February measuring water levels, but we don't have the results back -- water levels and water results. And what you can see is that some wells have great contamination or quite a bit of contamination. In this particular well, Monitor Well 19 has almost 26,000 parts per billion of chlorinated compounds. Some of the wells had very little. One of them up here is only one part. That's a shallow well. This well here was quite a bit deeper.

And what we're trying to do, like I said, is measure these contamination levels and then see where the problem is in the bay. And to do that -- that work in the bay, that is -- we use this special syringe, which is a stainless steel tube that's about six feet long, and the divers go in and they push this into the sediment. It's only a quarter-inch diameter, and it takes quite a bit of effort because they push the probe in. They have a syringe to clear any contamination of bay water or sediment water out of the tube. This allows fresher groundwater to come out of the sediment; then to flood the tube, and then we draw off our samples, and we do this at one foot and at five foot.

And these are the points that we have sampled out here, and you can see that in some cases we're getting less than a part per billion, very small amounts; but in a few cases, especially up by Porewater 2 and Porewater 3 we're getting high hits -- 27,000 parts per million and 45,000 parts per million.

We think we have the area where it's escaping pinned down very well. So we're looking at now in the Feasibility Study of how to go in there and intercept that water and prevent future discharges to the bay.

And there's one last thing that we're doing in the bay itself through our Navy group over at SPAWAR. They're a research group. They came up with what they call a Ventrafluxmeter, and they have two styles: one looks like a lunar lander and it plants itself in the bottom of the bay and measures the flux of chemicals coming out of the sediment. And for this site, though, they developed a smaller one, almost a half of a dome, and we used that, and we've measured contamination. And from doing this, measuring these levels of contamination and also measuring the flow rates to the bay, we'll be

able to tell exactly how many gallons of water discharged to the bay from the site, and then we should be able to guess then because it's impossible to measure everything. We'll come up with a scientific answer and our estimate then of what the actual volume of contaminate is that's discharging.

And we do have a few spots out here. The worst chemicals are the 1:1 dichloroethene. That's the second chemical down on the list. That has a target level that we have to meet to clean up, so that's what we're working on.

Anyhow, this information will be coming out in a report form in about one month. The pre-draft was just delivered to me today. We'll try to work up some kind of summary that's easy to understand. The whole book, it's two volumes. It's about this thick, but we wouldn't want you to have to read all of that. Dan will have to read it all or most of it, but we don't want you to have to read that.

And I don't know. Maybe we'll come up with a fact sheet or something like that. And then we'll have a regular presentation with -- we'll use the computer next time. You won't have me flipping slides, and we'll give you the complete story.

Any questions? Okay.

MR. LOCKE: Thanks, Bill.

Our guest of the evening, Richard Mach, is going to do Site 9. He doesn't need an introduction.

MR. MACH: Well, this is just incredible because normally I am the last person and they use up all my time so I have to give a 20-minute presentation in two minutes, and now I have an hour and 10 minutes, so get ready.

MS. WANKIER: Talk slow.

MR. MACH: Actually, real quick. This is going to be my final meeting with you all. I have accepted a position and take over as the BRAC environmental coordinator for Hunter's Point up in San Francisco, so I start next week, and I get to go to their first RAB -- or my first RAB meeting with them next Thursday, so back-to-back RABing it.

Anyways, I wanted to thank you all.

I've had a great time here for the past -- well,

I've been with North Island for six years now but with the RAB for five, so it's been a lot of fun working with all of you.

My update real quick is on Site 9. It's the removal action that's out there, and I've been updating -- basically a quick 10-minute update or so every month on the status of that removal action.

There's not a whole lot more to report. You've got the yellow sheet that we update every month, and you can see on the back page, anything in Italics is what's new or what's happening since the last update.

In the last month, essentially what we have been doing is installing the additional pilot study wells, the new steam injection well and a couple of the new extraction wells, and we just brought all of that back online this week. So there's not a whole lot that's been going on.

Removing additional product. We've got everything in the ground now to hopefully finish the pilot test. And as you can see by the revised schedule, we're looking at hopefully finishing up all of the pilot study work here within the next month or so, and then starting into design of the full-scale system to be implemented in the April time frame; hopefully getting the whole thing in the ground in the June-July time frame; and starting up full-scale operation in about the August-September time frame.

We think that we've addressed all the concerns with the plugging in the formation. It appears that as we were injecting the steam down into the ground, we heated up the subsurface and it worked real well. And as we tried to back off from that so that we only had to put a smaller amount of steam in there to actually keep the ground hot, we were essentially hammering it. We were turning it on and off real quick, and what that did was it pulsed the entire system and started moving some of the fine grain material, the silty material out away from the wells, and it essentially made it bind up on the sides.

So we've got a revised procedure as to how to do this to slowly ramp up the temperature and slowly ramp them down, and that should get that hammer affect out of there which won't bind up the system and will allow all of the great recovery that we've been doing with the steam and the extraction to work real well.

And Bill's going to be lucky enough to take this over from me. I get to hand it over to him on Tuesday and the last of my stuff on Wednesday, and by Thursday it's all his. So it's basically down to just my update and my talk.

Any other questions? If not, this is a nice, quick meeting.

MR. LOCKE: Thanks, Rich. You'll be dearly missed here. You did a lot of work. Even when I wasn't involved with North Island, you're always the hot topic around.

I think that's it for the evening. We've got to talk about the agenda for the next meeting, and any

other comments that anybody has.

MR. COLLINS: You know, one thing before we do that? We handed out this little sheet to everybody. This is so that you can actually rate our performance here of how well we handled the topic, how well we presented ourselves. Did we use crummy overheads? Was it understandable? You can tell us what you think and --

MR. MACH: I don't want any flack either.

MR. COLLINS: You really -- you don't have to turn it in tonight if you don't want to, but that would mean that you'd have to try to remember to bring it next time. But if you want to give us your comments, we'd appreciate it.

And there's another thing. Everybody either received or can pick up another handout that we started recently, and that's the summary of all the projects going on on the island.

What's in here, really, are the topics that we didn't address tonight. You remember there used to be that we'd have four or five topics or more in one night and we'd run out of time, so we've limited it to about three, and we've supplemented it with this. So you should pick up one of these, too. And then when you're reading through this, if you decide that that looks interesting. I wish they'd talk about this at one of the RAB meetings, you can speak up and tell us, and then we'll do something about it.

MR. MACH: Apparently we could have gone through all of them tonight.

MR. COLLINS: We could have done the whole works.

Anyway, this is a handy tool, and it's designed actually for you members to be able to help us. Okay.

MR. LOCKE: All right. Thank you, Bill.

The next RAB meeting is March 16th. Has anybody got any input for topics? If not, I can get together with Bill Collins and Mark.

MR. MACH: I think you should definitely have Site 10 on there. We've had a draft engineering evaluation cost analysis under review by the State and internally with the Navy. We've got comments back from Dan as of tonight, and we're revising that. I'm coming out with an Action Memorandum and a Remedial Action Work Plan, and that will all go out for public review along with the California Environmental Quality Act or the CEQA documentation.

We're looking at a combined review period starting probably in April, so that would be a good presentation to make. In March gets you all ready for the review for essentially a cap that we're proposing for the Site 10 area.

MR. CORDERO: Along with that, did you want to ask the other RAB members if they were interested in CEQA about that time, too?

MR. MACH: That might not be a bad idea. There is -- the CEQA that we just discussed is a requirement that the State has and actually attended the Naval Station RAB meeting back in January. And Maria Gillette, who is one of the CEQA specialists in Sacramento, came down and gave a presentation to that RAB essentially outlining what CEQA is and what the State's required to do and how that whole process works. It was also one of the topics or one of the training topics that was evaluated. It was ranked about six or so out of the 10 or 12 topics that we had. We've already gone through about three of them.

With this new project coming out, it might be a good time to slip her in there and talk about the CEQA, and it will be coming out before it comes up. So that's a topic to work with Dan to get that set up.

MR. LOCKE: Great.

MR. CORDERO: I'll try and get her down here for next month and give a small presentation.

Just a quick comment on -- from a group that was part of your RAB. It was EHC, the Environmental Health Coalition. You actually did receive a compliment from them. We did attend a meeting, this department, on Monday, the 14th, and they were very complimentary to the Naval Air Station North Island RAB. They said it's probably one of the best RABs they've been to, and I'm not talking about just the San Diego area. I guess they do a lot of work across the nation.

So they are heavily involved with military bases, and they did compliment all of you. They are not part of your RAB right now, but they have talked about coming back and talking to us again.

MR. LOCKE: They're welcome.

MR. CORDERO: Okay. I'll extend the invitation.

MR. LOCKE: Great.

MR. COLLINS: I might as well have another minute or two because we're not over.

Last month we had our tour of North Island, and we had a grand total of -- well, John and I gave the tour. We had four people show up, but we took the bus anyway.

MR. MACH: Including you and John?

MR. COLLINS: No. In addition to, and we went out and visited all the IR sites. It was a good little tour, and I did tell the Environmental Health Coalition representative that was there that they were welcome to come back if they wanted. They just need to show up, and we'll talk about it.

And I have one other thing. I spoke with Mary Masters. She's with the TOSC program that EPA has. That's the Technical OutReach Serving Community --

MR. MACH: Services for Community. Pretty close.

MR. COLLINS: -- this past week, and she couldn't be with us tonight, and lately she's been getting this feeling that her services aren't needed down here. And they are willing to come down and work with the RAB and still work with the RAB on solving the problem at Site 9, but they really need somebody to work with, to work with closely.

So I think the RAB members should think about this and decide who that person will be -- who that point of contact will be for her with the RAB. Otherwise, they're going to drop out of the program and the RAB's actually going to lose a valuable resource because otherwise, you have the Navy to listen to. And most people would say, well, the Navy's only going to give you the Navy's story or you have the contractor, and most people would say the contractor's going to give you the Navy's story, and you have the State, and the State usually has a different story than we do, and they should because they're looking at the site from a different aspect: for health, community health, community safety, things like that.

MR. MACH: But hopefully they have the same story.

MR. COLLINS: But hopefully they have the same -- hopefully they agree with us.

So on the outside then you have the opinion of other people, all the RAB members and the community have other opinions on what's important for the site and the community, and this other person working through EPA, and Mary's actually an employee at Stanford University working with EPA.

So you have the chance to get an outside opinion as to who's telling you the truth. Maybe we're all telling you the truth.

Anyhow, so the RAB needs to think about how to use that resource, and if you don't want that

resource, then let me know and I'll tell her that --

MR. LOCKE: Can we make it a topic of discussion for the next meeting?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah. And we'll bring it up again. It will be a short one, I'm sure.

MR. LOCKE: Oh, yeah.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'm done now.

MR. LOCKE: So if everybody is ready to address that because we don't want to release a person like this from the RAB. She wants to do the work, and we just need some help from the community.

So anything else? Last call.

The meeting's adjourned. Help clean up and put away tables and chairs.

(Whereupon, at 7:25 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

: ss.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

I, Robert C. Steeves, CSR No. 2147, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings on Thursday, February 17, 2000, 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 1 to 34, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of said proceedings.

DATED: _____, 2000.

Robert C. Steeves