

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2000

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

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

ATTENDANCE:

John Locke
Bill Collins
Debbie Wankier
Mark Wankier
Bob Geilenfeldt
Foster Marshall
Bob Logan
Daniel Cordero

Rich Wong
Mark Bonsavage
Art Van Rooy
Marilyn Field
Douglas Bautista
Paul Stewart

CORONADO, CA., THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2000, 6:30 P.M.

MR. LOCKE: Good evening everybody and welcome to the 64th Naval Air Station North Island/Naval Amphibious Base Restoration Advisory Board Meeting.

The first agenda item tonight -- I guess I'll do an overview. We're going to have an update on the Site 10 Non-Time Critical Removal Action. The CEQA presentation is cancelled, overtaken by [Vinceevents](#). We're going to have an update on the Site 5 Time Critical Removal Action; Site 9 Soil Vapor Extraction update; an explanation from Bill Collins on the EPA Technical Outreach Services for Communities -- it's TOSC; and then a questions and comments period; and set up agenda items for the next meeting.

The first agenda item is approval of the minutes from the last meeting, February 17th. Has everybody had a chance to read that, and do we have a motion to approve?

DR. MARSHALL: So move.

MR. VAN ROOY: Second.

MR. LOCKE: All in favor? The minutes are approved.

We will go to our first presentation. Mark Bonsavage will give that. It's for Site 10.

MR. BONSAVAGE: Actually, Rich is going to do it.

MR. LOCKE: Richard Wong, our OHM engineer.

MR. WONG: Thanks, John.

First of all, as John said, I'm Rich Wong. I work for OHM. We are the Navy's remedial action contractor.

And what I'd like to do is present what we have in store for the planned non-time critical removal action at IR Site 10 at NAS North Island.

My presentation is organized into two parts: the first part is to provide some background information so you have a feel for the location and conditions of the site that are driving the Navy to undertake the removal action, and then present the recommended alternatives to achieve the removal action objectives.

IR Site 10 is located on the northwestern perimeter of North Island. It is a beach area that borders San Diego Bay, and it encompasses about four acres, and the topographic relief from the beach to the upper plateau is a maximum of about 22 feet.

Here's a picture of IR Site 10 looking towards the east, and as you can see, it's a beautiful beach environment defined by a bluff on the eastern edge.

This figure depicts the extent of the slag ash waste that we intend to remediate.

And now to give you a feel for the nature of the slag ash waste itself, it occurs in two basic forms: one as a welded material. I don't know if you can see this too well, but on the bluff face you can see the rusted color material. That's the slag ash waste that has been deposited on the bluff itself.

The ash consists of both the welded material and a

friable powder-like material. The ash was created by a smelter that was operated

across the street from the late '40s through the early '60s.

Here's a close-up of what the waste looks like at the site. This portion of this photograph depicts the friable ash that we're contending with.

This is just another close-up view of the ash that we have at the site.

And here's a photograph of the welded type of ash that also exists at the site, and this is your more classic type of ash material where you see pieces of porcelain, metal, some wire all in a conglomerate within the ash.

Some of the important previous investigation removal actions that have been performed at the site include a 1995 emergency removal action that was performed to remediate material, such as we see here, that was present in the inner tidal zone of the site. That was completed in 1995.

Currently Southwest Div has contracted with Oak Ridge National Laboratories to conduct an extended remedial investigation.

And I understand that this site or this investigation, Mark, should be completed in the near future; right?

MR. BONSAVAGE: The report's expected in the next week or two, but really it's just being reproduced now. It's going to be distributed.

MR. WONG: So we've been privy to the findings and conclusions of the extended remedial investigation, and we're using the conclusions and recommendations from that report to develop our proposed remedial objectives.

Our remedial objectives for IR Site 10 include four basic elements: We'd like to minimize the erosion of the slag ash waste to the environment. We'd like to minimize the migration of both the metal to the atmosphere and to the groundwater, and reduce infiltration of the leachate that may be produced from the

slag ash into the groundwater. And most importantly, we want to reduce the risk to human ecological receptors to the contamination.

In terms of remedial alternatives that were evaluated as part of our analysis, after evaluating several types of technologies, we basically refined it to four basic components that we looked at.

The first one, rated from least expensive to the most expensive, was containment using a rock revetment seawall and construction of an earthen ~~and~~ cap.

The second, which was just a slight variation of the first alternative, was construction of an earthen cap and containment via a seawall.

The next two involve off-site disposal to Class I and/or low-level radioactive waste to both sites. I should backtrack a little bit and let you know that some of the metal within the slag ash waste contains minor amounts of radium 226. However, according to the Oak Ridge Report, the radiation is not driving the removal action. It's the risks associated with the metal and that's it. So the radium is really not driving the removal action, but it's something that we need to contend with during the removal action itself.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So what percentage of the content that we're discussing here is radium?

MR. WONG: It's difficult to put a percentage on it, but it's very insignificant. We don't have a strong number, but it would be less than 1 percent of the waste would be my guess.

What I'd like to do now is talk a little bit about our recommended alternative. We've been in discussions with DTSC and Southwest Div. I think we're coming together on an approach, and the approach that we recommend is Alternative 1, which was controlling -- minimizing the effect of the slag ash waste to human and ecological receptors by constructing a seawall -- it's located on this portion of the site -- and a rock revetment

constructed on this portion of the site.

And the rock revetment really is nothing more than large boulders that are set to protect the bluff from erosion.

The other component with this particular remedial alternative is to construct an impermeable liner on top of the slag ash waste thereby minimizing the infiltration of groundwater through the slag ash waste and possibly contributing to the degradation of the groundwater at the site.

The third component of this alternative is to construct an earthen cap over the impermeable barrier. And at this juncture we are proposing a two foot earthen cap over the impermeable barrier.

Other key aspects of this design include the construction of a pedestrian path along the site, access to the pier that's located adjacent to the site. Currently those features do not exist at the site.

In addition, we also plan on demolishing Building 380 to allow construction of the proposed plan.

MR. LOCKE: Can you give us a distance how far your colored area is there?

MR. WONG: There is a scale here somewhere. It's approximately 400 feet in this direction and approximately 150 feet or so in that direction.

Some of the advantages of the proposed alternative include that we could minimize exposure to both the workers -- the people that work at the base and the community, since we're not proposing to excavate and transport the waste. That's a key element.

Two, we will not -- this alternative will not require the transportation of the waste through Coronado or any of the other surrounding communities.

And most importantly, it's the most cost effective alternative that will achieve the removal action objectives.

Thank you very much.

MR. VAN ROOY: The impermeable barrier, is that going to be underneath as well as on top of the slag area or is it just going to be over the top?

MR. WONG: Well, that's a great question.

The impermeable barrier will be anchored in a trench at the toe of the slope in these locations and then draped over the top of the waste, and then another anchor trench will be constructed to tie down the impermeable barrier on the back side. So it's just covering the top of it. It's not going underneath it.

MR. VAN ROOY: Then how is it going to prevent any sort of leaching into the groundwater?

MR. WONG: Because the impermeable barrier will direct the surface precipitation along that barrier to drainage that will take it out, so therefore there will not be any direct recharge over the waste.

We do recognize that there is a direction of groundwater flow in this general direction, but the slag ash waste is well above the groundwater table. So groundwater will not contribute to the degradation of groundwater, so really the main concern is to control the direct precipitation.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Richard, wouldn't a high tide situation permeate this rock and barrier that you're recommending here? Wouldn't it be better to have some kind of a preventative -- say a material like a rubber or plastic behind this rock barrier?

MR. WONG: That's exactly what's going to occur. The impermeable material is -- I think the technical name is linear low density polyethylene, and it's a 40 millimeter thick material.

MR. GEILENFELDT: As compared to my garbage bag, what is that thickness?

MR. WONG: Oh, it's probably eight times thicker.

MR. LOCKE: It's 40 mils thick?

MR. WONG: Right.

MR. COLLINS: I think garbage bags are 4 millimetersmils.
Pretty light.

MR. WONG: Good question.

The main disadvantage with the proposed alternative really is that since we're not removing the waste, that it will require long-term maintenance and inspection over the course of the life of the base.

That's all I really had today. Mark, do you have anything else you want to add?

MR. BONSAVAGE: Not unless there are any questions.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Let me ask one more.

MR. WONG: Sure.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You're talking about capping this like concrete or --

MR. WONG: No. With soil. And in fact, we intend to use an existing soil stockpile that exists just off site. So, again, another advantage to this alternative that we will not -- we don't foresee that we'll need to truck in soil to construct our cap through the community.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So there's no removal required at all in your opinion.

MR. WONG: No removal; that's correct. This is a no removal alternative.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Now, we inspected this site in January, and to the sea side there is a rock barrier over on the sea side, as I recall?

MR. WONG: That's correct.

MR. GEILENFELDT: From that rock area down through there?

MR. WONG: Right. And that rock area that you're referring to is a remnant of the emergency removal action that was undertaken in 1995. There were a couple welded outcroppings of slag ash waste in this area. Those pieces were removed, taken to a low-level radioactive waste facility, and this rock revetment was constructed.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So did you incorporate that same quality earthen barrier behind that rock?

MR. WONG: That's correct.

MR. GEILENFELDT: What you're proposing on this side?

MR. WONG: Right. Well, we're going to redo all the rock that you're discussing now; take that off, anchor our polyethylene -- I'm sorry -- our impermeable barrier, and then reinstall bigger rock to protect from the erosion.

MR. GEILENFELDT: On the other side.

MR. WONG: On this side. This side will -- due to the height of the bluff in this area, we feel that we need to construct a vertical seawall.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Is that going to be concrete or is that going to be rock?

MR. WONG: The materials haven't been set in stone at this point, but some of the options that we're looking at are a plastic type of sheet pile wall, a steel wall, and a concrete wall; and each of those different wall systems have advantages and disadvantages, as I'm sure you could imagine.

The steel wall, of course, you have to worry about corrosion; the concrete wall we need to worry about sulfate attack; and the plastic wall is the durability of the wall during that construction.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Can I ask you, sir, what has been the results from the long-term installation of this Site A as opposed to Site B, if I can use that -- if I can break that out.

Let's assume Site A is '95 you did all this removal and you put in this barrier. Let's

call that Site A as opposed to the newer area we're going to have -- we're proposing completion of it as Site B.

MR. WONG: Right.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Let's go back to Site A.

MR. WONG: Okay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: We did this in '95. What have the tests shown since '95 as a result of using this type of polyethylene barrier on Site A?

What have you come up with as far as results? Has there

been any seepage?

MR. WONG: Well, in fact the objectives for the '95 emergency removal action are drastically different than the objectives for this one.

In 1995 they clearly wanted to focus and remove the outcroppings of the slag ash waste that were located offshore. In addition, this rock revetment that you currently see at the site now was constructed solely to protect the bluff from erosion. There is not an impermeable barrier behind that rock. So we really can't take anything away from --

MR. GEILENFELDT: So the problem was actually out in the water.

MR. WONG: Right. For 1995; right.

MR. GEILENFELDT: But you don't feel there's a problem with being in the water on part B.

There's no ash accumulation that has permeated out into the water?

MR. WONG: Maybe Mark could speak a little bit more intelligently about what's gone on with respect to the inner tidal zone, but both Oak Ridge and our friends from SPAWARS have conducted several tests out in the inner tidal zone and have indicated that any material in the beach area does not represent a risk to human or ecological receptors.

MR. GEILENFELDT: The terminology that I should use there is inner tidal area.

MR. WONG: Right. In this area; right. The beach.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Okay. Thanks, Richard.

MR. WONG: You're welcome.

MR. COLLINS: That first area that we did in '95, that's supposed to have a plastic barrier behind the riprap.

MR. WONG: Is that right? I'm not that familiar with '95.

MR. COLLINS: That's before you.

MR. WONG: But I know there is a geotextile material or filter fabric behind the rock.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Then if you have that, did we achieve our

goal then, if I may expound further?

Did we achieve our goal with this barrier? Did it do what you had hoped as far as preventing any --

MR. COLLINS: It did what the Navy expected. It did what they wanted.

MR. WONG: Well, I think, you know, in some of the previous investigations they had collected water samples in the beach area, and as far as what I understand, there has not been any significant concentrations of metals in the groundwater.

Is that correct, Mark?

MR. BONSAVAGE: Sure.

MR. WONG: Any other questions?

MR. BONSAVAGE: Maybe you could give them an idea of a schedule of when we're going to do the construction.

MR. WONG: Sure. Well, at this point, we're still preparing the pre-construction documentation that's required under CERCLA to undertake a non-time critical removal action.

We have submitted the draft engineering evaluation and cost analysis for this project to DTSC, and we're incorporating their comments into the next revision. We expect that we can provide the entire pre-construction documentation package to the regulators sometime in the first quarter of this year.

Depending on the review process and any responses that we need to make to those documents, we're hoping to hit the field in the summer of this year.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You're actually going to do the construction this summer?

MR. WONG: Right.

Is that it? Thanks.

MR. LOCKE: Thank you, Richard.

Our next presentation is from Mark Bonsavage, and it's Site 5, time critical removal action.

MR. BONSAVAGE: In this project what we're going after is an area called Unit 2 at IR Site 5. And IR Site 5 you'll notice here is

basically right next to the -- well, it actually is part of the golf course on North Island. It's pretty close to the property, and there's houses here along the Navy property.

Site 5 is here. Here's a little blow-up of it. What we're going after is this little dot right here.

What this area really represents is groundwater contamination and its volatile organic compounds. Really it's just like old solvents -- old airplane solvents that were dumped in this area.

We know that there were really two, I guess you could call them dump pits or two areas where they took the chemicals and they dumped them in the pit. And this went on -- I'm not sure of the exact extent -- time period, but not beyond the '70s.

From the dumping that took place we went out and basically did a lot of sampling around the Site 5 area of the groundwater, and we found the extent^s of the contamination. We got a pretty good handle on the borders, how far the material really does expand into the groundwater. You can see pretty good. That's a pretty good representation of it.

You can see it's kind of a smear, and groundwater flows sort of in this direction. Now, what this is, this is a slough where there's a storm drain that basically drains in this part of North Island, and the water -- the runoff falls into the drain and then it drains out into the ocean.

Again, remember, this is under water or this is underground in the groundwater. So this is slowly moving towards the slough is what it comes down to. But we have samples in between here that says no, it really hasn't reached the slough yet, but we know over time it may get there.

What we're proposing to do is basically go in and remove the source. We want to get rid of the source or where the largest concentrations of the VOCs are in this area.

And we're going to do that by two ways: Number one, is excavate the soil that we think is -- the area of the soil that we

think is really a source and where the good old dump pits used to be, and we estimate about 100 to 150 cubic yards of material.

And that equates to -- all we're going to do with that material is dig and haul. We'll dig it out and put it in trucks and then haul it to a landfill, and that's about six or eight trucks is what it amounts to.

Our second leg of this to do is treatment of the groundwater, and we're going to focus this on, like I said, the source or the higher concentrations. If you'll recall, we did a few studies of the Site 5 area, and one of the studies that we did is called Monitored Natural Attenuation, and all that really means is you look at it for a while and you see if these chemicals break down over time. If that in fact is happening, how long is it going to take and what other compounds is this going to form?

And what we found is that, yes, it is slowly breaking down over time, but it could take hundreds of years for this to actually completely break down. However, if we go in and remove the source, the smaller concentrations, it will likely break down quicker and our problem will be gone a lot faster.

So what we'll do is we'll go in and do what we call a chemical oxidation, and chemical oxidation basically is injecting certain chemicals into the ground to make the VOCs inert. And we end up with basically water, and some -- what are some of the other -- some ions. So basically you end up with the natural occurring atoms and molecules.

So that's our plan to do a little dig and haul and then do some chemical oxidation at the higher concentrations.

And right now we're in the process of doing a bench and a pilot test. A bench scale test is really when you actually just take some of the material back to the laboratory and see if your chemicals are going to work. And a pilot is when you go out to the site and you run a little bit, maybe you do like

one well or you do a small simulated treatment system at the site.

So the first thing we're going to do is go out to each of our vendors or we're going to look for vendors that can do this type of work, and we know there's like three or four out there or a few, and we'll basically compete them against each other and say given the site conditions, let them do the bench test, and see who comes up with the best results; and the person who comes up with the best results gets the project.

So we're really looking at all of the different vendors right now to see who's got the best technology because they do use different types of chemicals. They're kind of protective of what they use because they're competing against each other. But you're not injecting any dangers into the ground anything worse than the VOCs.

It looks like that will take us up through April and May we'll be looking at the different technologies, and then by June we're going to put together a report with all of these findings in it, and that report will be our remedial action work plan.

And basically that's the report that we need to get agreement on with out the stakeholders to say "Yes. We've got it. This is the right thing to do, and we're going to go and do the cleanup," and that's expected in June.

So we'll be working with Dan, and anybody that wants to comment on this report when it comes out in June before we actually go out and do the work.

So we estimate that if that goes well in June, and we have the report ready and everybody's reviewed it and then we agree that this is the right way to clean up this site, we expect to get out in the field in October, and we expect that we can do the chemical oxidation and the dig and the haul and have this whole sight basically down to our action levels within three to six months.

That's it. That's the project. Any questions?

MR. GEILENFELDT: Mark, that's that site where the approach

is -- the aircraft approach?

MR. BONSAVAGE: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: Airplanes fly right over that right here.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Okay.

MR. BONSAVAGE: All right. Thanks.

MR. LOCKE: Thanks, Mark.

Next we'll have Bill Collins give us an update on Site 9 and continue into the TOSC.

MR. COLLINS: I have no slides to look at that you can hardly read, but you do have an updated handout. For those just showing up, if you don't have one, there's more on the table.

And on the back side there is some information in it. The stuff that's in italics is the new stuff since last month.

Now, on this particular operation we did have some problems recently from the equipment and from mother nature. We did have a problem with some sensors in the carbon units that strip the chlorinated compounds of the vapors. One of them read a high temperature and it shut itself down, quenched itself just like it was supposed to do, and notified the operator that there was a problem. But in the meantime, the machinery had shut itself down so that nothing was passing through.

And we went out and we checked, and we're not exactly sure why we had the shutdown. We've been in discussions with the company that made the equipment, and we're looking at a couple of different avenues with that, and it might be in the computer logic circuit or it could actually be something else, maybe a thermacouple. Something went wrong, but right now we've got it running again. Things are working fine.

One of the other problems we've had out there is trouble with their boiler, and we've got that operating again.

And the weather wasn't cooperating last month either. With all the rain, the water table's coming up. It's cut down on the ability of the

system to extract free product from the site. Now things have returned to normal out there. With good weather and a fully operating machine, we're back up and we're putting steam back into the ground.

And we had machines -- we started that, as the back says, in the middle of February. Right now we're in a trial period of heating up the ground one more time for -- we're going to go for about three weeks total, and we found that we don't have to put as much heat to the ground as we did before to recover a good amount of product. We can go with the smaller equipment out there, and actually most likely keep the steam generation plant that we have right now and the boiler and continue with that rather than have to bring in a big unit.

And what we'll probably do is set it up on one site and heat up the ground. We don't have to get it to boiling. And once we get it hot, the ground soil actually retains the heat very well, and we'll move over to another site, another well, heat that up, and we'll be continually moving around the area heating up the soil.

And what we have found is that when this old fuel is heated up, it flows really easy. It really is like taking the cold syrup out of the refrigerator and putting it in the microwave for 30 seconds, and when you're done, it flows like crazy.

Well, the same thing happens with this fuel. So what it's done is it allows us to extract much more fuel this way. In fact, you can see on the back that since we started up on the steam generation, we've pulled out 2000 gallons of free product from the subsurface. It's quite a bit of fuel. And that fuel had about 20 percent other chlorinated VOCs in there, too. So it's not fuel that you could use again. It's fuel that has to be disposed of as hazardous waste. So it has TCE and different things like that, but we've pulled out 2000 gallons.

And by adding heat to the ground also, what we've done is we've helped other VOCs that were trapped between the soil particles to volatilize off, and we catch them just like we did before in our

soil vapor extraction unit, and we've pulled that off, too. And we pulled off 500 gallons of chlorinated compounds that way, too.

So while the big system has been shut down so that we could practice, get perfect on our steam injection to get back to full scale removal, we actually have pulled off quite a bit of material in the meantime just testing the system, testing our plans.

It's man against mother nature trying to figure this out, and I think we're going to win. We're going to get quite a bit more out of there.

And I don't think we have the total that we've pulled out in gallons on here, but it's close to a hundred thousand gallons -- a hundred thousand pounds. I think pounds is better. That's 80,000 gallons. We've done fairly well.

Once we get this a little more perfected and understand what we can do with one well, we will then do like it says in here.

We'll go out and we'll set up our well array with our heat injection wells and our extraction wells. We'll prepare the site one more time, make sure that we can do soil vapor extraction at the same time over the whole site, and then we'll proceed with the full scale removal again.

It should take -- I still think it will take quite a while to finish up. Another couple of years and we might be safely done with soil vapor extraction and with free product removal, and then we have other things we need to do for the site.

I think that's pretty much it.

Oh, one other thing: We were out at Area 3 of Site 9. That's in the most southwestern corner of the site. We had performed soil vapor extraction in that area and we quit almost a year ago. We pulled off all the vapors, and we've gone back one time and done some confirmation testing to see if there's any rebound, and we didn't find any, so we've kept the equipment shut off. And just recently we went back out again after working with DTSC to take confirmation samples because we want to write the closeout report for that portion of the site with respect to soil vapor extraction.

Once that's done, then we can consider what else to do with that portion of the site with respect to anything else that might be out there as a contaminant.

Things are going pretty good. As long as the weather holds up, I think that was the worst thing that's happened to us recently. Several weeks of rain really cut into the production.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Bill, isn't this normally the rainy season? Did you anticipate this or was it just heavier than usual?

MR. COLLINS: I think it's heavier than normal. I think back in '92 or '93 when January was so horrible and we had floods from Temecula on down, and then the next winter you just get a little rain. I think it was just unusual.

Any other questions?

MR. GEILENFELDT: One more.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You mentioned, Bill, you were extracting this. How are we transporting this off the base? I assume we're transporting this excess.

MR. COLLINS: Special hazardous waste tanker trucks.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So it's the usual standard procedures to transport it off base.

MR. COLLINS: Correct. It goes off to -- it probably goes to Texas. It goes to the incinerator.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Not on Coronado; right?

MR. COLLINS: No, it's not in Coronado. That wouldn't be appreciated.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thanks.

MR. COLLINS: Now, the next topic. There are no handouts, but several years ago when Laura Hunter was a member of the RAB, she spoke to EPA about getting some technical assistance for North Island for the RAB -- not for the Navy to figure out what's going on, but for the RAB so that the RAB would understand what's going on -- to get professional expertise actually

for free.

And she contacted the TOSC group, the Technical Outreach Services for Communitiesy, and they agreed to supply assistance to this particular RAB because of the unique nature of what's in town.

Normally they work with low-income neighborhoods and things like that, but they considered this to be a little unusual, something meaty that they could sink their teeth into, so they assigned a person to help us.

Right now that's Mary Masters. She's a professor up at Stanford University, and she's reviewed some of our documents. And what it's come down to is she needs somebody to work with here. Laura's left the RAB. Carla Fargo is out doing lawyering business in the El Centro area. She hasn't got time right now to put into it. We need somebody on the RAB that's willing to get in there and work with a technical person to understand, to be able to report back to the RAB also, and Mary would be willing to come to the RAB to give presentations.

She needs somebody that's dedicated to being willing to work with her on this and give her advice as to what the RAB wants, what the community is interested in. And she's really only working with Site 9, and that is the worst site, so it makes sense.

But we need a RAB member to step forward and volunteer to do that, to work with Mary. It doesn't require a lot of work on your part, but you have to be more of a liaison with the RAB and the RAB Community Co-Chair and its members, and also on what the community's interested in.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I'll nominate Foster Marshall.

MR. COLLINS: He doesn't want the job, though.

DR. MARSHALL: I've taken on some other things right now, and I'd better back off a little bit.

MR. COLLINS: I think that the RAB really -- well, maybe we ought to think about this. The Navy doesn't really need to. We go out and hire our technical assistance if we need it. But the RAB, you guys don't have any money of your own. USEPA is paying for this

service. It's a good chance to get some of those tax payer dollars back for your own use for your community.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Will we be communicating with this Mary Masters by phone or is she here in town?

MR. COLLINS: No. She's at Stanford.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So we don't have to go up there.

MR. COLLINS: No. No. You just communicate by phone and e-mail, so it's not that difficult.

Now, if you're not ready to make a decision tonight, we can wait one more month.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I would be interested if somebody else is not. I would be interested in being involved in it.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'll leave that up to the RAB to the community members to decide, if you want. Okay? You can talk to the other members and then let me know if they want you or not.

MR. LOCKE: Would you be interested in talking to Mary Masters, also?

MR. GEILENFELDT: I would.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'll get you her number. See me before the meeting's over.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thank you, sir.

MR. COLLINS: So there's that particular issue.

And then there's one more difficult one. Carla called me this week. It was early in the morning. She just left a voice mail. I wasn't at work yet, and I get in about 6:30. And because she's off doing this job in El Centro, and she couldn't make tonight's meeting and she won't make the next two meetings, she suggested that possibly we need to find a new Community Co-Chair.

There's another job that's open now. The elections I think would be around November, December anyway. So that person would be -- if there's a volunteer, that person would be filling in, acting until the next election. So I'd like you folks to think about that, too.

It isn't a lot of work. You read the minutes and help set the agenda, and then pretty much wait a month. Actually, you

wait two months because we've been alternating with the Navy one month and the Community Co-Chair the next month. So I want you to think of that.

And then one other thing to think of that was mentioned in our office is possibly going to quarterly RAB meetings. If that would help attendance and make it more worthwhile to everybody, the Navy is willing to consider it. But it's what the community needs, what you folks want. If you're willing to go to quarterly, that's four meetings a year instead of ten.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I think that's a great idea because we have other meetings that are involved in this with Mark's activities and quarterly Bechtel meetings, et cetera. At Building Site 99 we have meetings down there. With all these meetings -- now, in January we had four meetings actually.

MR. VAN ROOY: Also, we're at the stage of remediation where things aren't moving as fast as they were some years back.

MR. COLLINS: Right. And by going to quarterly, that doesn't mean that if something particularly interesting comes up, that we can't go back to having a few periods with every month again.

In fact, when we formed the RAB, we were going to go to every other month, but things were so busy. You remember, Art. We were doing so much that we ended up meeting every month. We did it for years.

So I'd like you to consider that. I don't know if -- we've only got four people from the community right now, four out of ten.

You want to think about it and let us know and we'll take a vote next month? We'll do that, and then hopefully we'll have a volunteer for acting Community Co-Chair for the RAB, maybe.

And the RAB members will have decided then and Bob will have decided, too, if he wants to be the go-between of TOSC. So there's some important things that have got to be decided.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I'm willing to volunteer for negotiating with Mary Masters, if that's

agreeable with everybody. I will communicate with her.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'll tell you what, I'll give you her phone number and you can call her and talk to her about the job, what she would expect from you. Okay?

MR. GEILENFELDT: Is this technical? You mentioned this term, Bill, technical. Is this hypertechnical, above a layman's intelligence?

MR. COLLINS: No. And she's the one that's expected to be technical and to get it down to --

MR. COLLINSGEILENFELDT: Convert it to my intelligence.

MR. COLLINS: That's exactly right. Get it down to the level that's here in the community; to cut through all the stuff so that we don't sneak something by you, so that the state doesn't twist your arm the other way and you're caught in the middle not knowing what's right and what's wrong.

USEPA is funding this. And you should be able to get then the true picture of what's going on from another viewpoint expressed at the level that the community would understand it at. Okay?

MR. GEILENFELDT: I think that's important.

DR. MARSHALL: I want to just register a thought on Mary. I didn't know her. I might have met her once.

The previous lady who left the RAB was a little bit of a "rebel rouser," and this lady was probably somebody good when we were in our active harsh times.

I would like for her to be a PRN. Do you know what that means? As needed.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, as needed? Well --

DR. MARSHALL: And not make her a part of it so that he doesn't have to get deeply involved, and we would then call her when we have a problem and then let her come down and talk rather than getting all deeply involved in somebody whose -- if you think she's going to talk our language, you're out of your mind. She's going to talk that high, ivory tower language, and nobody's going to know what

she's talking about either.

MR. COLLINS: I don't think it will be that bad. She's working with the El Toro RAB right now.

DR. MARSHALL: Well, I just think that she should be a PRN. If we need her, we'll call her, rather than get too deeply involved in it.

MR. COLLINS: And she really is only involved with stuff that's going on at Site 9. So it isn't something where she'd be here at every meeting, but she is available when the documents come out to read them to see what's going on.

MR. GEILENFELDT: May I ask, was she provided with these documents like we're looking at for Site 9?

MR. COLLINS: Absolutely.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So she would interpret that legally or technically?

MR. COLLINS: Her professional opinion of what's going on, yeah.

MS. FIELD: Well, I have another opinion than Foster's. We don't know whether we need Mary unless she does the work because the whole idea of having a technical consultant to the RAB is to give another opinion and another view, and it's only when you have that other view when you know that there are issues.

So I think it's very useful and in the past has been very useful. And there were other situations where the RAB did have some financial assistance to provide some technical support, and the technical support was very helpful in having community members have a better appreciation of what was going on. And there were some differences of opinion with the Navy, but it was very useful in getting these differences aired and everybody to understand where they were in their difference of opinion.

So I think if Bob is willing to take on this role as liaison, I think it's worthwhile to do it, especially since it's provided for.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Well, think about it some more. We'll have everything firmed up then maybe in one month at our next RAB

meeting, and Bob will either be convinced he wants to be or convinced he doesn't want to be. Okay?

I recommend it, though, really, and it's not costing you anything for this service.

DR. MARSHALL: Everything costs.

MR. COLLINS: You've already paid, though. Nothing additional.

Any other questions? Thanks.

MR. LOCKE: Is there any other issue somebody would like to bring up?

MR. COLLINS: Everyone on the RAB should have gotten a copy of this book this week. It's the "Site Management Plan."

Remember, I believe it was last month I gave a presentation on what was in the "Site Management Plan." Now you've get-got it so you can see what's really in it.

One of the things that this relies on is the thicker book that we sent out last year and that was the Interim Measures Assessment/Current Conditions Report. It was quite a bit thicker, and it described all 140 solid waste management units on the island and gave the history of everything -- what we've done, what we've cleaned up, what we need to do in the future.

This is the book that tries to schedule it all into the future so that we can plan it.

There's our schedule in here with how we see all of the sites progressing to cleanup; our schedule that we have with DTSC for the next two years on how we're going to -- what we're going to be working on each year. You'll get an idea of what documents are going to be coming out. And there's a schedule also with DTSC that goes farther into the future. It's a little bit vague, but that's exactly what they wanted. That's what management wanted -- the regulators and the Navy management.

But this is it. You get 60 days for comments. So if you have any comments on it, please send them to me. You can e-mail me or call me up, send me a fax, whatever you want or send a letter,

and we'll take it into account.

MR. LOCKE: Let's set agenda items for next month's meeting.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I want to make a note. I wanted to thank these gentlemen for taking the time on January 27th on their Saturday off to take us around and show us these sites. It was very good, and it gave me a real insight -- a much better idea and insight as to what you're trying to do here. I know Foster would say the same thing, and I'm sure Marilyn will.

MS. FIELD: Absolutely. Thank you.

MR. GEILENFELDT: And the other thing is I hate to see Mr. Mach leaving. No more Sushi reports. So he is gone.

MR. COLLINS: He's gone. He likes his new job, and I doubt we can get him back.

Some agenda items for next month? Other than a repeat of the one that we just did here, the last one, we'll repeat the TOSC and RAB Co-Chair, those topics.

The Site 9 soil vapor extraction update, we'll have that one more time.

I think we can get CEQA next month. We had a sick child pop up today so mom stayed home. That will probably cover most of the time. We might think of something else.

MR. LOCKE: How about Site 11?

MR. COLLINS: There's nothing new to update.

MR. LOCKE: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: Any other comments? I guess we're done.

MR. LOCKE: We're done. The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 7:30 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

: ss.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings on Thursday, March 16, 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 42, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of said proceedings.

DATED: _____, 2000.

Nancy A. Lee