

1

2

3

4

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

5

6

7

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 2002

8

9

10

NATIONAL CITY, CALIFORNIA

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

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

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A T T E N D A N C E

NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST: Ms. Theresa Morley  
Capt. L.R. Hering

SOUTHWEST DIVISION NAVAL  
FACILITIES ENGINEERING  
COMMAND: Mr. Darren Belton  
Mr. Pete Stang  
Mr. Kevin Brinkman

DTSC: Mr. Douglas Bautista  
Ms. Leticia Hernandez

BECHTEL NATIONAL: Mr. Jerry Bailey  
Ms. Karen G. Collins  
Ms. Carol Yamane  
Ms. Teresa Sherman

PUBLIC WORKS CENTER: Ms. Susan Van Winkle

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE: Ms. Anita Boyd  
Ms. Nancy Lee

RAB MEMBERS: Mr. Peter Bishop  
Mr. Eugene Mullaly

1 NATIONAL CITY, CA., WED., APRIL 24, 2002, 5:45 P.M.

18:26:18 2

18:44:49 3 MS. MORLEY: This is Captain Hering. He's  
17:47:40 4 commander of Naval Station.

17:47:45 5 CAPT. HERING: I'm only going to be here for  
17:47:47 6 just a couple of minutes, so I just wanted to take  
17:47:50 7 the opportunity to thank this group for being  
17:47:54 8 actively engaged and involved in this particular  
17:47:57 9 process.

17:47:59 10 As you know, when I took over three  
17:48:01 11 years ago, I came on board and made a commitment and  
17:48:05 12 I think that, for the most part, we've been able to  
17:48:09 13 live up to that commitment.

17:48:11 14 Through the help of this group, we have  
17:48:14 15 made absolutely certain that the Navy's obligation  
17:48:18 16 to returning the property that we particularly have  
17:48:23 17 responsibility for is given the utmost concern to  
17:48:31 18 make absolutely certain that we return it back to a  
17:48:34 19 safe environment for the local community, so much so  
17:48:38 20 that we didn't accept when we first started the idea  
17:48:41 21 of returning most of our properties to the  
17:48:44 22 industrial standard, but more pushing towards what  
17:48:46 23 would be residential standards.

17:48:48 24 I think as a local community you have to  
17:48:49 25 understand that that's a huge obligation, and I'm

17:48:53 1 glad that the Navy agreed with our philosophy and  
17:48:56 2 where we went to and have returned those particular  
17:49:00 3 pieces of property that we've been working on for  
17:49:02 4 the last couple of years to the point where even on  
17:49:05 5 my own facility now, I have grassy knolls instead of  
17:49:09 6 blacktop and paved areas.

17:49:11 7                   If I wanted to put a child care  
17:49:13 8 development center over what used to be a disposal  
17:49:15 9 site, I now have no threats even for my own people  
17:49:18 10 to be able to recommend to my boss that any one of  
17:49:21 11 those reclaimed sites have been restored to that  
17:49:24 12 condition.

17:49:24 13                   So as a community, you should feel good  
17:49:26 14 that you were responsible for part of that in making  
17:49:29 15 absolutely certain that we've done what we should be  
17:49:32 16 doing as good neighbors.

17:49:35 17                   I pledge to you, and my relief --  
17:49:35 18 unfortunately, had to go off to another meeting in  
17:49:40 19 preparation for part of the turnover on Friday --  
17:49:45 20 but he, too, was committed to making absolutely  
17:49:49 21 certain that we are the first major Naval facility  
17:49:51 22 to close out all of our sites ahead of schedule. So  
17:49:55 23 I think we're right now almost three years ahead of  
17:49:59 24 schedule, thanks to Theresa and her efforts.

17:50:02 25                   Truly, I can't thank you enough, for

17:50:05 1 certainly without the person behind it and pushing  
17:50:07 2 to get the dollars and trying to make my vision  
17:50:12 3 possible, we couldn't have gotten there.

17:50:14 4                   But, anyway, I wanted to say thank you,  
17:50:16 5 and I know there's been some consistency in the  
17:50:20 6 team, and I truly do appreciate your involvement.  
17:50:22 7 As I keep telling the environmentalists all the  
17:50:25 8 time, we're not hiding anything. We're not the Navy  
17:50:28 9 of the '60s and '70s. We are trying to do what's  
17:50:32 10 right. And involvements like the RAB are perfect  
17:50:36 11 examples of how the communities have to be the  
17:50:39 12 spokesperson for making sure that what we are doing  
17:50:43 13 is in compliance with the environmental regulations.

17:50:46 14                   And as I move into the next job, I will  
17:50:51 15 tell you that if there's environmental concerns as  
17:50:54 16 part of that job, I will use the same application  
17:50:56 17 that I did here, and that is, that operations and  
17:50:59 18 environmental compliance are not mutually exclusive.  
17:51:03 19 They just require proper planning and execution of  
17:51:05 20 tasks to make sure that we remain good neighbors and  
17:51:09 21 protect our community and our environment -- my  
17:51:09 22 environment.

17:51:13 23                   So, again, thank you very much for your  
17:51:15 24 efforts. I hope that within the next three years  
17:51:21 25 that this process will no longer be required because

17:51:25 1 we will have a completely clean site and you folks  
17:51:29 2 can live in comfort that we've done the right thing.

17:51:32 3                   Again, thank you very much for your help  
17:51:34 4 and contributions and I do appreciate it.

17:51:37 5                   (Applause.)

17:51:50 6                   MS. MORLEY: I have to say he was one of the  
17:51:51 7 best commanding officers because as far as  
17:51:52 8 environmental, he really pushed a lot of things.  
17:51:54 9 Like the grassy knoll that he talks about are the  
17:51:57 10 vegetative swells for storm water runoff.

17:52:00 11                   And I think, Gene, you were still part  
17:52:02 12 of the RAB when he had that site tour, and that was  
17:52:04 13 one thing that the Environmental Health Coalition  
17:52:05 14 brought up, and I'm glad to see that he really  
17:52:09 15 pushed to make sure that any new facility that was  
17:52:12 16 built had that.

17:52:15 17                   So he's a good guy. Plus he's the only  
17:52:17 18 C.O. that's ever come to almost every RAB -- have  
17:52:20 19 you ever noticed that? -- unless he had a prior  
17:52:23 20 meeting or something. I think that was really neat.

17:52:27 21                   MR. MULLALY: Theresa, do you know where he's  
17:52:27 22 going?

17:52:30 23                   MS. MORLEY: He was going to go to SURFPAC,  
17:52:31 24 and he thought he had been selected to be Admiral,  
17:52:39 25 but I guess he just found out like yesterday that he

17:52:39 1 was going to be Admiral, but he hasn't been given  
17:52:41 2 his command yet.

17:53:17 3 MR. BISHOP: We need to kick this off and get  
17:53:21 4 rolling.

17:53:23 5 Welcome everyone to the RAB meeting for  
17:53:25 6 Wednesday, the 24th of April.

17:53:28 7 We need to take a look at the minutes  
17:53:30 8 from the last meeting. The copies were on the  
17:53:33 9 table. Everyone has had a chance to take a look at  
17:53:36 10 a copy, I would hope, by this time.

17:53:39 11 Are there any questions or comments on  
17:53:41 12 the minutes from the last meeting? Hearing none,  
17:53:52 13 can I have a motion for approval of the minutes of  
17:53:56 14 the meeting?

17:53:57 15 MR. MULLALY: So move.

17:54:00 16 MR. BISHOP: Any second?

17:54:00 17 MS. HERNANDEZ: Second.

17:54:02 18 MR. BISHOP: All in favor? The minutes from  
17:54:04 19 the last meeting are approved then.

17:54:11 20 Introductions. We know everybody.

17:54:21 21 MS. MORLEY: You just have to introduce the  
17:54:21 22 ones that are new.

17:54:23 23 MR. BISHOP: Who's new?

17:54:24 24 MR. BRINKMAN: Kevin Brinkman. I'm an intern  
17:54:26 25 with Southwest Div Environmental with Darren here,

17:54:32 1 and my internship rotates through, so I'm here for  
17:54:34 2 three months total.

17:54:47 3 MR. BISHOP: So will you be with us for the  
17:54:47 4 next meeting, Kevin?

17:54:52 5 MR. BRINKMAN: No. It's my first and last  
17:54:54 6 meeting.

17:54:56 7 MR. BISHOP: And you managed to choose the  
17:54:58 8 one where we're having the beg feed put on. He's  
17:55:01 9 obviously on the way up.

17:55:04 10 I'm Pete Bishop, Community Co-Chair.  
17:55:04 11 I'd like to introduce ourselves around. So Kevin's  
17:55:05 12 the only new guy; right?

17:55:09 13 MR. MULLALY: I'm Gene Mullaly. I'm a  
17:55:09 14 community member.

17:55:14 15 MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm Leticia Hernandez with  
17:55:15 16 the Department of Toxics.

17:55:17 17 MR. BAUTISTA: Douglas Bautista, Department  
17:55:17 18 of Toxics.

17:55:23 19 MR. STANG: Pete Stang with Bechtel.

17:55:25 20 MS. SHERMAN: Teresa Sherman. I'm with  
17:55:27 21 Bechtel. Actually, I'm new, not to the team. I've  
17:55:34 22 been on it two months.

17:55:37 23 MS. VAN WINKLE: Susan Van Winkle, Navy  
17:55:44 24 Public Works Center.

17:55:45 25 MS. YAMANE: Carol Yamane with Bechtel.

17:55:47 1 MR. BAILEY: Jerry Bailey with Bechtel.

17:55:50 2 MS. MORLEY: Theresa Morley, Navy Region

17:55:50 3 Southwest.

17:55:52 4 MR. BELTON: Darren Belton, Southwest

17:55:52 5 Division.

17:55:54 6 And I just want to say that Susan is

17:55:54 7 coming on board with the Southwest Division team.

17:55:59 8 So the next time you see her I hope she's going to

17:56:02 9 be with Southwest Division.

17:56:09 10 MS. MORLEY: We have some other people that

17:56:10 11 we'd like you to hire.

17:56:16 12 MS. BOYD: I'm Anita Boyd, and I'm with DSP.

17:56:19 13 MS. COLLINS: I'm Karen Collins with Bechtel.

17:56:30 14 MS. LEE: I'm Nancy Lee. I'm the court

17:56:30 15 reporter.

17:56:31 16 MR. BISHOP: The first event on the agenda

17:56:32 17 here is Update on Installation Restoration Program

17:56:33 18 Site 3, Karen Collins, Bechtel.

17:56:39 19 MR. BAILEY: Actually, Carol Yamane will be

17:56:42 20 doing the presentation.

17:56:45 21 MS. YAMANE: We have a new fangled projector.

17:57:11 22 MS. MORLEY: Carol, while that's warming up,

17:57:11 23 can I say something?

17:57:14 24 I think it wasn't the last meeting but

17:57:15 25 the one before, one of the RAB members wanted to

17:57:19 1 know about the desalinization plant in Chula Vista.

17:57:22 2                   Was that you?

17:57:23 3           MR. BISHOP: Yes.

17:57:27 4           MS. MORLEY: I found out that it has not been

17:57:27 5 approved. The design has not been approved, so they

17:57:28 6 are not constructing it.

17:57:30 7           MR. BISHOP: Okay. Good.

17:57:32 8           MR. BELTON: Theresa, what was the question?

17:57:34 9           MS. MORLEY: What was the status of that.

17:57:34 10 That was the one that was going to take -- they were

17:57:35 11 going to pump groundwater -- this brackish

17:57:35 12 groundwater from Chula Vista and desalinate it and

17:57:43 13 use it as at least probably reclaimed water but

17:57:47 14 possibly drinking water. But there were concerns

17:57:49 15 about what was that going to do to the water table

17:57:52 16 and everything else.

17:57:53 17           MR. BISHOP: The flow of contaminants.

17:57:57 18           MS. MORLEY: But that has not been approved.

17:58:01 19           MS. YAMANE: Thanks everybody. I'm going to

17:58:04 20 give you an update on IR Site 3, which is the former

17:58:06 21 salvage yard.

17:58:15 22                   IR Site 3 is located in the central

17:58:20 23 portion of the base. It's bordered by Harbor Drive

17:58:31 24 to the east, the Navy Public Works Center

17:58:35 25 maintenance and repair shop to the north, Cummings

17:58:39 1 Road to the west, and Paleta Creek to the south.

17:58:44 2                   The salvage yard operated from

17:58:45 3 approximately 1943 to 1975. During that time,

17:58:49 4 excess Navy materials were brought to the site for

17:58:52 5 incineration, for sale to outside bidders, and for

17:58:56 6 reuse by other Department of Defense offices.

17:59:01 7                   There's three incinerators at the site.

17:59:03 8 One of them in the northern portion of the site,

17:59:09 9 this square here, was used to burn classified

17:59:13 10 documents; and then there were two right here that

17:59:16 11 were used to burn other types of waste materials.

17:59:20 12                   There were also three underground

17:59:22 13 storage tanks, and those are shown by the squares.

17:59:27 14 And also, based on historical aerial photographs, we

17:59:31 15 know that waste was stored in various portions of

17:59:34 16 the site over the years.

17:59:36 17                   Currently the entire site is used as a

17:59:42 18 parking lot. Physically the northern area is

17:59:48 19 separated from the southern area. There's a fence

17:59:53 20 that surrounds a portion of the northern area; and

17:59:56 21 in this photograph we're looking north east, and you

18:00:00 22 can see the fence and you can also see that there's

18:00:04 23 some natural gas dispensers.

18:00:08 24                   This is what the southern area parking

18:00:12 25 lot looks like, and we're just looking south along

18:00:17 1 Cummings Road.

18:00:19 2                   Just a real quick little tidbit on the  
18:00:24 3 technical aspect. The depth to groundwater at the  
18:00:27 4 site is about eight to ten feet below the ground  
18:00:29 5 surface, and it generally flows to the north and  
18:00:35 6 northwest, except very close to Paleta Creek, and in  
18:00:40 7 that area the groundwater is tidally influenced.

18:00:44 8                   Don't worry, I'm not going to talk about  
18:00:45 9 each one of these investigations, but I just wanted  
18:00:47 10 to remind you that there has been a lot of work done  
18:00:50 11 at IR Site 3, and during many of these  
18:00:54 12 investigations, soil samples and groundwater samples  
18:00:57 13 were collected and analyzed.

18:00:59 14                   For instance, just to give you a flavor  
18:01:02 15 of the number of soil samples, there's been an  
18:01:06 16 extensive number of samples collected across the  
18:01:09 17 entire site.

18:01:11 18                   And there's also been some groundwater  
18:01:13 19 samples collected as well. Currently there's five  
18:01:16 20 wells existing at the site, and those wells are  
18:01:20 21 shown in green. If you'll notice, all of the wells  
18:01:24 22 are located in the southern portion of the site.  
18:01:27 23 There are no wells in the northern or the  
18:01:30 24 downgradient portion of the site, and this is  
18:01:32 25 important with regard to the upcoming work that

18:01:36 1 needs to be done.

18:01:37 2                   There has also been four soil removals  
18:01:42 3 conducted. Three the removals were initiated during  
18:01:46 4 construction activities, and the Navy initiated one  
18:01:51 5 removal, a time critical removal action, as part of  
18:01:55 6 the IR and CERCLA programs.

18:01:58 7                   In 1976 there were some soils removed in  
18:02:03 8 the vicinity of the dual incinerators. In 1993  
18:02:08 9 there was some fuel impacted soil excavated when the  
18:02:14 10 underground storage tanks were removed, and then  
18:02:17 11 after the time critical removal action during  
18:02:20 12 construction activities, there was a little bit of  
18:02:24 13 soil removed in the southern part of the site.

18:02:28 14                   In 1997 the Navy conducted a large time  
18:02:32 15 critical removal action that covered a large portion  
18:02:36 16 of the southern area, and that removal action  
18:02:40 17 consisted of excavating soil -- more than 21,000  
18:02:46 18 cubic yards of soil -- and then properly disposing  
18:02:51 19 of that soil off-site.

18:02:52 20                   The boxes on this figure represent --  
18:02:55 21 each color represents the depth that the excavation  
18:02:57 22 extended to, and in the deepest portion the  
18:03:02 23 excavation went to 12 feet.

18:03:04 24                   After the Time Critical Removal Action  
18:03:08 25 was completed and confirmation of soil samples were

18:03:13 1 collected, the Navy prepared and submitted a  
18:03:21 2 Preliminary Final Remedial Investigation Report, and  
18:03:21 3 this report focused on soil. As part of this  
18:03:25 4 effort, a Human Health Risk Assessment was performed  
18:03:29 5 that evaluated potential risk posed by chemicals  
18:03:34 6 remaining in the soil outside of where the large  
18:03:37 7 Time Critical Removal Action excavation was  
18:03:41 8 performed. The risk assessment did not consider  
18:03:46 9 potential contributions from chemicals in  
18:03:48 10 groundwater because the groundwater evaluation had  
18:03:50 11 not been completed, and the study also didn't  
18:03:59 12 evaluate ecological risk.

18:04:01 13                   So that kind of brings us where we are  
18:04:04 14 today. The scope of work that we're planning on  
18:04:09 15 proposing includes completing the groundwater  
18:04:12 16 evaluation. It also includes performing an  
18:04:16 17 ecological risk evaluation, if needed. And I say  
18:04:20 18 "if needed" because our biologist who would perform  
18:04:24 19 the ecological risk evaluation went out to the site  
18:04:27 20 to take a look and see if there were any potential  
18:04:30 21 ecological receptors, and he didn't identify any  
18:04:34 22 potential ecological receptors in the parking lots.  
18:04:38 23 However, if groundwater is contaminated and that  
18:04:41 24 impacted groundwater is flowing to Paleta Creek,  
18:04:45 25 then we need to evaluate potential ecological

18:04:49 1 receptors in the creek.

18:04:52 2                   And then we're also going to re-evaluate

18:04:54 3 potential risk to human health considering the

18:04:58 4 groundwater data.

18:05:00 5                   So the specific tasks that we'll be

18:05:05 6 doing include preparing a work plan that will

18:05:08 7 describe our proposed activities, and those proposed

18:05:12 8 activities will include installing the shallow

18:05:14 9 groundwater wells and then sampling those wells

18:05:18 10 along with the existing wells. There may be

18:05:21 11 additional work required, but the need for

18:05:25 12 additional work will be evaluated based on the

18:05:27 13 results of the groundwater sampling.

18:05:30 14                   Once all of the field work is completed,

18:05:32 15 the Navy will finalize the Remedial Investigation

18:05:35 16 Report.

18:05:36 17                   So where are we today. After the Navy

18:05:41 18 submitted the Preliminary Final Remedial

18:05:45 19 Investigation Report, DTSC provided comments on that

18:05:49 20 report in October of 2000. Because the Navy and

18:05:54 21 DTSC acknowledged that more work would need to be

18:05:57 22 done, they agreed that those comments could be

18:06:00 23 addressed in the next phase of work, which is where

18:06:03 24 we are now.

18:06:03 25                   So we're preparing responses to those

18:06:05 1 comments, and we'll include those responses in the  
18:06:08 2 work plan.

18:06:10 3                   We're also working on developing data  
18:06:13 4 quality objectives which is going to be our road map  
18:06:17 5 for how we do work that's proposed, and that also  
18:06:20 6 will be included and presented in the work plan.

18:06:25 7                   Additionally, we've started working on  
18:06:27 8 some of our supporting plans. For instance, a  
18:06:30 9 health and safety plan is critical whenever we're  
18:06:33 10 doing field work. Then we're going to roll all of  
18:06:35 11 these components up into a Preliminary Draft  
18:06:40 12 Remedial Investigation Work Plan, and we'll present  
18:06:43 13 that to the Navy. They'll provide comments to us.  
18:06:47 14 We'll incorporate that, and then we'll issue a Draft  
18:06:51 15 Work Plan to the public and the agencies for review.

18:06:56 16                   Based on our current schedule, we expect  
18:06:59 17 to issue that in September 2002, and that's where we  
18:07:05 18 are today.

18:07:06 19                   If anybody has any questions, I'll be  
18:07:09 20 happy to try and answer them.

18:07:10 21                   MR. BELTON: Just for clarification, on the  
18:07:14 22 response to DTSC comments -- the regulatory  
18:07:16 23 comments, we may not include those in the work plan  
18:07:19 24 but respond to those before we issue the work plan.

18:07:30 25                   MS. YAMANE: Thank you.

18:07:31 1 MR. BISHOP: What do we think the possible  
18:07:33 2 sources of contamination are?

18:07:35 3 MS. YAMANE: Well, the possible sources of  
18:07:36 4 contamination could have been waste that was brought  
18:07:40 5 to the site and temporarily stored there. From  
18:07:46 6 reports that we have, we understand that some of the  
18:07:50 7 waste was placed in drums, and some of the drums may  
18:07:53 8 have leaked, and some of the waste may have been  
18:07:56 9 placed directly on the ground. So those are a  
18:07:59 10 couple of examples.

18:08:01 11 MR. BISHOP: We dug out a lot of that, and  
18:08:04 12 the sample what we took out was down to where there  
18:08:07 13 was clean soil.

18:08:08 14 MS. MORLEY: In the southern area. We  
18:08:08 15 haven't done any in the northern area yet.

18:08:12 16 MR. BISHOP: So we're thinking there may be  
18:08:12 17 some contamination in the northern area.

18:08:14 18 MS. YAMANE: Uh-huh.

18:08:14 19 MR. BISHOP: And the only possible problem is  
18:08:16 20 that it could get down to Paleta Creek.

18:08:19 21 MS. YAMANE: If groundwater is impacted, yes.

18:08:23 22 MR. BISHOP: But the groundwater flows away  
18:08:25 23 from the creek.

18:08:26 24 MS. YAMANE: It generally flows away from the  
18:08:26 25 creek. Because it's tidally influenced near the

18:08:26 1 creek, there could be a component that part-time it  
18:08:26 2 flows towards the creek.

18:08:28 3                   If the groundwater is contaminated, then  
18:08:28 4 we'll take a look and evaluate which direction the  
18:08:29 5 groundwater is flowing in that area.

18:08:42 6           MR. BISHOP: Have we done any groundwater  
18:08:43 7 samples in the northern area at all?

18:08:48 8           MS. YAMANE: Historically there were some.  
18:08:49 9 Let's see, there's some samples that were collected  
18:08:57 10 in the northern area, but not on the downgradient  
18:08:59 11 edge of the northern area.

18:09:02 12                   So these locations here, there were  
18:09:06 13 samples collected at one time. We don't have any  
18:09:08 14 samples --

18:09:11 15           MS. MORLEY: Of the groundwater?

18:09:12 16           MS. YAMANE: Of groundwater, yeah. It was a  
18:09:15 17 long time ago.

18:09:17 18           MR. BISHOP: Were there any samples ever  
18:09:17 19 collected further north?

18:09:20 20           MS. YAMANE: Groundwater samples? I'm not  
18:09:23 21 aware of any.

18:09:23 22           MR. BISHOP: Not on the site but downstream.

18:09:28 23           MR. BAILEY: Go back to the base map, Karen.

18:09:49 24                   Groundwater samples have been taken at  
18:09:51 25 most of the sites that are identified there, to

18:09:53 1 answer your question.

18:09:56 2 MS. MORLEY: Also, can you point out Site 10,  
18:09:58 3 the boundaries of Site 10. That's kind of what we  
18:10:05 4 would consider downgradient.

18:10:07 5 And then there were also samples -- see  
18:10:10 6 where in between Site 10 and Site 3 where it's kind  
18:10:12 7 of gray where there's some buildings a little bit  
18:10:19 8 more towards Site 3? There were also some UST sites  
18:10:23 9 that have been sampled. Like, for example, 173.

18:10:26 10 And I think there was one of our SWMUs, SWMU 9 and  
18:10:34 11 10, because those long buildings -- the little  
18:10:37 12 northern area that's fenced in is actually the  
18:10:39 13 parking lot for the transportation yard. You saw  
18:10:39 14 all these Navy trucks in there? The new  
18:10:43 15 transportations that went in went over the old ones,  
18:10:46 16 and the old one was a SWMU, and some soil samples  
18:10:47 17 and groundwater samples were done there.

18:10:51 18 MR. BISHOP: It looks like Site 4 is north --  
18:10:54 19 the northern part of Site 4 is north of this Site 3;  
18:11:02 20 right? So if there were samples taken north of  
18:11:06 21 that, then that would be a potential source of  
18:11:09 22 information on contamination if the water flow is  
18:11:12 23 north, which I don't understand why it's north. It  
18:11:15 24 would seem like it would be flowing towards the bay.

18:11:19 25 MS. MORLEY: That is a weird site.

18:11:21 1                   Sometimes you get -- because this was  
18:11:24 2 all backfill and stuff, there was old -- because it  
18:11:27 3 kind of used to be mud flats, sometimes like the  
18:11:30 4 stream used to meander, and they cut a channel, and  
18:11:33 5 the water follows that channel sometimes.

18:11:35 6                   I think isn't that also why you're  
18:11:36 7 getting the results because we don't actually have  
18:11:39 8 an idea why that water flows to the northern part?

18:11:43 9                   MS. YAMANE: We have a pretty good idea. We  
18:11:47 10 have a pretty good idea. In that area it looks like  
18:11:49 11 there's definitely a northern contaminant to the  
18:11:52 12 groundwater flow.

18:11:53 13                   MR. BISHOP: Where does it end up going? It  
18:11:56 14 should be going to the bay.

18:11:58 15                   MS. YAMANE: Eventually.

18:12:00 16                   MR. BISHOP: Or our northern creek it will  
18:12:01 17 probably end up -- Chollas Creek?

18:12:10 18                   MS. MORLEY: Well, it kind of mostly gets  
18:12:13 19 smushed around them, and it will eventually go --  
18:12:15 20 because the quay wall would keep it from directly  
18:12:17 21 going either to the bay or to the creek so that if  
18:12:23 22 eventually it did, it would have to make its way  
18:12:23 23 underneath the quay wall.

18:12:24 24                   And do you know what the gradient is as  
18:12:24 25 far as how south it moves?

18:12:34 1 MS. YAMANE: We don't have very accurate  
18:12:35 2 information on that, but I wouldn't imagine that it  
18:12:38 3 would be a very steep gradient.

18:12:45 4 MR. BISHOP: Okay. Thank you.

18:12:50 5 MS. YAMANE: Thank you.

18:13:11 6 (Recess taken.)

18:29:06 7 MS. SHERMAN: I'm going to give you an update  
18:29:07 8 on IR Site 10, which is the original Rice King  
18:29:10 9 Restaurant site.

18:29:23 10 Site 10 is right here, the L-shaped  
18:29:27 11 area, and you'll be glad to know that the  
18:29:30 12 groundwater here actually does go to the southwest.

18:29:41 13 Here's a recent aerial photograph of the  
18:29:45 14 site with a -- I'll put an outline on it so you can  
18:29:49 15 kind of see where things are. This is McDonald's,  
18:30:03 16 and right along here is the Navy Exchange.

18:30:07 17 Right now IR Site 10 is a paved parking  
18:30:11 18 lot. There's only one building on it, a racquetball  
18:30:15 19 facility right here. This area right here there  
18:30:19 20 used to be Building 321 that I'll mention in a  
18:30:23 21 minute.

18:30:31 22 I'll just mention which roads are there.  
18:30:51 23 This is Ward Road, and this one's Woden, and north  
18:31:02 24 is this way. This is Cummings and Vesta is over  
18:31:10 25 here.

18:31:12 1                   So now looking east from Ward Road, you  
18:31:17 2 can see it's a nicely paved asphalt parking lot now.  
18:31:24 3 That's the current use.

18:31:26 4                   Here is another map showing the site.  
18:31:34 5 This area was formerly unpaved, and it was used as a  
18:31:39 6 storage area. There was a little rail line that  
18:31:42 7 came across like this. This is where Building 321  
18:31:48 8 was located, and it was a former metal finishing  
18:31:53 9 facility. And there was a transformer pad right  
18:32:00 10 here in the northeast corner.

18:32:03 11                   Right now there's six groundwater  
18:32:05 12 monitoring wells on site right along here, and  
18:32:09 13 groundwater flow from here is this way towards the  
18:32:15 14 west.

18:32:18 15                   Right now the Navy has no other plans to  
18:32:23 16 change the use of the site. It should remain  
18:32:26 17 industrial use.

18:32:28 18                   There have been several investigations.  
18:32:33 19 Initially the site was located when they were doing  
18:32:38 20 in 1989 a geotechnical investigation for the Rice  
18:32:42 21 King Restaurant, and they put a couple of borings  
18:32:48 22 in, and as they were drilling, they found a lot of  
18:32:51 23 trash debris -- like there was metal and  
18:32:58 24 construction debris. And also around the  
18:33:00 25 groundwater table about 9 feet below the ground

18:33:03 1 surface they noted hydrocarbon staining and odor.

18:33:10 2                   Later on they tried to put -- they were  
18:33:13 3 going to put in a steam distribution pipeline and,  
18:33:16 4 again, they put in eight borings and hit the same  
18:33:20 5 kind of debris, and the same petroleum hydrocarbons  
18:33:27 6 were noted in the soil samples.

18:33:29 7                   Building 321 during the removal of a  
18:33:33 8 sump, and they removed some floor drains and a  
18:33:33 9 couple of machinery bays, they also took some soil  
18:33:39 10 and sludge samples then, and again, they found  
18:33:42 11 petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil. The sludge had  
18:33:46 12 metals and that type of stuff in it.

18:33:50 13                   The main investigations done there were  
18:33:57 14 in 1997 PWC put some borings in as kind of a safety  
18:34:03 15 feature. Before they demolished Building 321, they  
18:34:09 16 put in 25 borings, took a lot of soil samples --  
18:34:11 17 47 -- and put in five temporary wells just to take  
18:34:15 18 groundwater samples from those.

18:34:20 19                   Then in 1998 PWC prepared a work plan to  
18:34:27 20 gather additional data so they could make decisions  
18:34:30 21 on what to do about the site. In 1998 they did a  
18:34:36 22 soil vapor survey all through the site.

18:34:40 23                   In 1999 PWC went back out again and put  
18:34:44 24 in 33 more borings. As you can see, 80 soil  
18:34:48 25 samples. They installed those six monitoring wells

18:34:54 1 in the southwest portion of the site and sampled  
18:34:57 2 those. And also in '99 and 2000 Bechtel went out  
18:35:04 3 and took three additional rounds of groundwater  
18:35:06 4 samples.

18:35:08 5                   So a total of approximately 140 soil  
18:35:14 6 samples have been taken at the site, and 35  
18:35:16 7 groundwater samples, 83 soil gas samples, and what  
18:35:21 8 they found is primarily semivolatiles, pretty much a  
18:35:25 9 mix. Semivolatiles and volatile organic compounds,  
18:35:26 10 metals, petroleum hydrocarbons in both soil and  
18:35:34 11 groundwater samples. The concentrations in  
18:35:38 12 groundwater are pretty minimal, and the contaminants  
18:35:42 13 in soil are primarily in the top five feet. PCBs  
18:35:49 14 were also reported in a few soil samples, kind of  
18:35:52 15 limited. Particularly the highest concentrations  
18:35:55 16 were found around that transformer pad in the  
18:35:59 17 northeast corner of Building 321.

18:36:01 18                   Possible source areas: For the trash  
18:36:06 19 debris it could have been placed there before the  
18:36:13 20 hydraulic fill was put over the site and then later  
18:36:18 21 the site was constructed on top of that. A likely  
18:36:22 22 source would be the metal finishing activities and  
18:36:25 23 preservation activities they did inside Building 321  
18:36:31 24 and also around it.

18:36:33 25                   The PCBs probably from the transformer

18:36:40 1 pad in the northeast corner of Building 321, and  
18:36:45 2 cosmoline application on metal equipment is a  
18:36:52 3 possibility. They used that as a rust inhibitor, so  
18:36:58 4 that might be a possible source of the petroleum  
18:37:01 5 contamination.

18:37:02 6                   We did a preliminary assessment in 2000  
18:37:11 7 using soil data, and currently right now if nothing  
18:37:16 8 was done to the site, the cancer risk numbers would  
18:37:25 9 be 3.4 times 10 to the negative 6 for cancer risk,  
18:37:27 10 and I guess that's .22 hazard index. This is in the  
18:37:33 11 generally acceptable risk management range. And no  
18:37:38 12 further action we would recommend for that site  
18:37:41 13 right now, if you keep it industrial use, which is  
18:37:44 14 what the Navy is planning on doing if it was kept as  
18:37:45 15 a parking lot and no residential buildings were  
18:37:50 16 built there.

18:37:52 17                   For the residential scenario, the cancer  
18:37:54 18 risk calculated would be 4.2 times 10 to the minus 5  
18:37:57 19 with a 2.8 hazard index. Most of the cancer risk  
18:38:04 20 was from benzo(a)anthracene, which is a semivolatile  
18:38:08 21 organic compound. And you can see it was only found  
18:38:14 22 in 4 of 47 soil samples, so these are pretty limited  
18:38:17 23 areas. And 40 percent of the hazard index was from  
18:38:24 24 Aroclor 1254. That's a PCB, and most of that was --  
18:38:32 25 it says 2 of 47 soil samples, but the highest number

18:38:35 1 was right at the transformer pad.

18:38:40 2                   If we close the site under a residential  
18:38:46 3 scenario, it would likely or could require further  
18:38:50 4 action, possibly removal action.

18:38:57 5                   Right now what we're doing is we're  
18:39:00 6 going to write a Removal Site Evaluation Report, and  
18:39:05 7 that's going to summarize the previous investigation  
18:39:09 8 results and provide you guys the 1998 and 1999 RSE  
18:39:19 9 data. I don't think it's been all in one document  
18:39:22 10 for you, and we're also going to take the soil  
18:39:27 11 numbers and rerun the risk calculations for the  
18:39:32 12 health risk assessment. And then based on those  
18:39:40 13 numbers, we're going to recommend closure options.

18:39:41 14                   Right now if the numbers come out like  
18:39:46 15 they did in the preliminary assessment, then we're  
18:39:50 16 going to recommend that the site be closed under the  
18:39:53 17 industrial scenario and just kept as a parking lot  
18:39:56 18 with no restrictions.

18:40:01 19                   The recommendation would be no further  
18:40:11 20 action under an industrial scenario. There's no  
18:40:14 21 change in current industrial use anticipated. It's  
18:40:18 22 currently paved with just one building and would be  
18:40:23 23 the best use of Navy resources.

18:40:27 24                   Right now we're preparing a preliminary  
18:40:31 25 draft RSE report. There's a lot of data to put

18:40:35 1 together on figures and tables, and we're in the  
18:40:40 2 process of doing the human health risk assessment  
18:40:43 3 calculations. We're planning to get a pre-draft to  
18:40:46 4 the Navy in May and a draft RSE to the agencies  
18:40:56 5 probably in July. That's the schedule.

18:41:00 6 Any questions?

18:41:04 7 MR. BISHOP: Yes. On the second slide, the  
18:41:13 8 first bullet said "hydrocarbon odor/staining near  
18:41:18 9 groundwater table nine feet below groundwater."

18:41:22 10 On the fourth slide it said "minimal  
18:41:24 11 impact to groundwater. Contaminants located in  
18:41:28 12 upper five feet of soil." Five. Nine.

18:41:35 13 MS. SHERMAN: Well, primarily, yes. There  
18:41:36 14 are like petroleum hydrocarbons along the soil --  
18:41:39 15 along the groundwater table, but they're also higher  
18:41:43 16 up, too.

18:41:44 17 I guess the primary -- by "primary," the  
18:41:46 18 ones that are affecting the risk the most -- the  
18:41:55 19 SVOCs, the semivolatile organics, the highest  
18:41:59 20 numbers are in like the first couple of feet, really  
18:42:03 21 1 and 3 feet, and the same with the PCBs. I think  
18:42:09 22 it was like 1200 micrograms per kilogram. The value  
18:42:11 23 near the transformer pad, that was like at a  
18:42:16 24 one-foot depth. And then another one at 3 feet. So  
18:42:19 25 really the ones that are the most important for

18:42:25 1 health concerns in the soil are located above 5  
18:42:30 2 feet.

18:42:30 3 MR. BISHOP: Okay. But back to that second  
18:42:30 4 slide, you say "hydrocarbon odor and staining in the  
18:42:30 5 groundwater table."

18:42:38 6 MS. SHERMAN: Right.

18:42:39 7 MR. BISHOP: Which is old data. This is  
18:42:40 8 1989, so it's some time ago.

18:42:48 9 MS. SHERMAN: Yeah. This was when they were  
18:42:51 10 doing -- they didn't take any samples. They were  
18:42:55 11 just doing the borings and they were getting where  
18:43:00 12 it was saturated. That's usually where you tend to  
18:43:08 13 see hydrocarbon contamination a lot of times.

18:43:10 14 MR. BISHOP: I'm having a difficult time  
18:43:13 15 resolving the statement of "hydrocarbon odor and  
18:43:16 16 staining," which would seem to indicate a fairly  
18:43:18 17 significant amount of hydrocarbons sitting on the  
18:43:21 18 water table, and then a later statement that says  
18:43:23 19 "minimal impact."

18:43:26 20 So something has changed or we have new  
18:43:29 21 data?

18:43:30 22 MS. SHERMAN: Actually, in this geotechnical  
18:43:33 23 investigation, the way that they wrote it in the  
18:43:37 24 report was they said "slight to moderate hydrocarbon  
18:43:43 25 odor and staining." And it was kind of a nebulous

18:43:53 1 thing. But we have seen -- there definitely are --  
18:43:54 2 there is petroleum contamination deeper. I guess  
18:44:01 3 it's there is no risk involved with that -- any  
18:44:04 4 health risk.

18:44:08 5 MR. BAILEY: In the 1989 report no chemical  
18:44:10 6 analyses were run. That was based on observation  
18:44:14 7 and probably PID instrument. When the soil samples  
18:44:18 8 were taken, they were taken at various depths  
18:44:20 9 including down to the water table, and we did not  
18:44:24 10 confirm any significant hydrocarbon contaminants.

18:44:27 11 MR. BISHOP: We have later data in the next  
18:44:31 12 slide based on that. Good.

18:44:34 13 Another question. Slide No. 6  
18:44:39 14 "Preliminary (2000) Risk Assessment Industrial  
18:44:44 15 Scenario." What I'm getting from this is that we  
18:44:56 16 have 3.4 times 10 to the minus 5 cancer risk and  
18:44:59 17 0.22 hazard index, and that's based on the samples  
18:45:03 18 that we've taken, and that is below the residential  
18:45:06 19 risk which is listed here at 4.2 times 10 to the  
18:45:11 20 minus 5; correct?

18:45:11 21 MS. SHERMAN: No. Right. For the  
18:45:14 22 residential cancer risk; right. It's less because  
18:45:19 23 the industrial scenario they used to calculate 0 to  
18:45:22 24 2 feet soil samples because that's more like what a  
18:45:33 25 construction worker or industrial worker would be

18:45:36 1 out there on their job or working on utilities.

18:45:40 2 The residential scenario is much more

18:45:44 3 stringent. They used 0 to 10 feet on all the soil

18:45:47 4 samples through there, and they're also assuming

18:45:55 5 like kids might get out there and dig in the dirt.

18:46:00 6 MS. COLLINS: And eat dirt.

18:46:00 7 MS. SHERMAN: A lot more conservative.

18:46:02 8 MR. BISHOP: Well, what I'm getting from this

18:46:04 9 slide -- help me out as I'm going through here -- is

18:46:06 10 that the -- oh, wait a minute.

18:46:11 11 This industrial scenario, is this what

18:46:14 12 the requirement is for the industrial scenario and

18:46:16 13 then the requirement for the residential scenario?

18:46:20 14 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

18:46:22 15 MR. BISHOP: Oh. And then where are we?

18:46:25 16 MS. SHERMAN: This is where we are right

18:46:25 17 here.

18:46:26 18 MS. COLLINS: The national contingency plan

18:46:28 19 criteria specify that 1 times 10 to the minus 6 to 1

18:46:33 20 times 10 to the minus 4 or one in a million cancer

18:46:36 21 to 1 in 10,000 is the risk management range for

18:46:41 22 cancer. And for hazard index a number in excess of

18:46:45 23 1 is the point of departure for risk management

18:46:48 24 decisions. Under 1 is acceptable.

18:46:51 25 So based on the preliminary risk

18:46:54 1 results, I think that these are the numbers that  
18:46:59 2 represent the Site 10 dataset preliminarily.

18:47:01 3 MR. BISHOP: And those appear to be  
18:47:03 4 significantly lower than the residential risk  
18:47:05 5 criteria.

18:47:07 6 MS. MORLEY: Yes. There's two different  
18:47:07 7 calculations that are a whole set of calculations.  
18:47:08 8 For example, for residential there's different  
18:47:13 9 averages. For example, I think they're assuming 350  
18:47:16 10 days on site because they're assuming you're living  
18:47:19 11 there; whereas, for the industrial it's less days on  
18:47:22 12 site because you're exposed to it during an  
18:47:24 13 eight-hour day, not a 24-hour day.

18:47:26 14 So there's a whole different set of  
18:47:28 15 calculations that are run for 30 years residential.

18:47:34 16 MR. BAILEY: A lot less. There's six years  
18:47:36 17 instead of 24 years as an adult for residential.

18:47:41 18 MS. MORLEY: So it's a whole different set of  
18:47:42 19 calculations because basically you're running -- if  
18:47:46 20 you pass residential, then you have unrestricted  
18:47:47 21 residential use; and then if you run industrial,  
18:47:52 22 that's a whole other set of calculations and whether  
18:47:54 23 you pass that or not, that helps you with your risk  
18:47:58 24 management decisions.

18:47:59 25 MR. BISHOP: Where are we with this site?

18:48:01 1 Can we pass residential?

18:48:03 2 MS. MORLEY: No. It's not that we didn't  
18:48:04 3 pass residential. Between 10 to the minus 5 and 10  
18:48:04 4 to the minus 6 risk management range, typically  
18:48:07 5 though every site that we've had 10 to the minus 5  
18:48:13 6 and also the hazard index is over 1, you're not  
18:48:16 7 likely going to get unrestricted residential closure  
18:48:20 8 without doing something at the site.

18:48:23 9 So if you backstep to industrial, which  
18:48:25 10 this base is, and you run those calculations, then  
18:48:29 11 you fall within the generally acceptable risk  
18:48:32 12 management range.

18:48:33 13 Does that make sense?

18:48:35 14 MR. BISHOP: Yes. All right. Thank you.

18:48:42 15 MS. SHERMAN: Any more questions? Thank you.

18:49:02 16 MR. STANG: Site 2 presentation.

18:49:11 17 Good evening. I'm Pete Stang. I'll be  
18:49:13 18 speaking briefly tonight to Site 2, Naval Station  
18:49:17 19 mole pier, the next step where we're going.

18:49:20 20 I'd like to briefly present an overview  
18:49:24 21 introduction of the site, current conditions and  
18:49:28 22 status, the objectives of the remedial  
18:49:30 23 investigation, tasks that we're going to perform to  
18:49:36 24 execute the remedial investigation, and our proposed  
18:49:40 25 schedule.

18:49:40 1                   The mole pier at Naval Station is  
18:49:51 2 approximately 23 acres in size, triangular, just  
18:49:55 3 south of Paleta Creek. From our earlier talks,  
18:49:58 4 Site 3 is right here, Site 10 is right up in here.  
18:50:08 5 It consists of previously three solid waste  
18:50:12 6 management units, the former collection storage and  
18:50:15 7 transfer unit. It's currently an active industrial  
18:50:21 8 office and parking lot facility, and there have been  
18:50:24 9 two significant soil removal actions performed.

18:50:28 10                   Because of its size administratively,  
18:50:34 11 the Naval Station team has broken Site 2 into a  
18:50:38 12 number of sub-sites. I think from last year's site  
18:50:44 13 tour that Theresa and Naval Station hosted, the  
18:50:48 14 Sub-Site 2A removal action is in this portion of the  
18:50:52 15 site here -- if you recall, the large excavation.  
18:50:56 16 The primary portion of that excavation has been  
18:50:59 17 completed. The site's been backfilled. It's now in  
18:51:03 18 productive use as a paved parking lot. There are  
18:51:06 19 still a few hot spot removals to be executed in this  
18:51:12 20 portion of Sub-Site 2A, as the Navy works with  
18:51:17 21 agency partners to execute that final bit of work.

18:51:21 22                   In addition, here in 2G, the wharf  
18:51:24 23 builder's yard, several years ago in approximately  
18:51:27 24 1996 a removal action was executed to remove  
18:51:33 25 petroleum staining in the former wharf builder's

18:51:36 1 yard. There are the former paint shop, which was  
18:51:41 2 one of the recreation facilities; Site 14, which was  
18:51:46 3 the sand blast grit lay down area; and SWMU 11, the  
18:51:54 4 diver's unit.

18:51:55 5                   The diver's unit has been completely  
18:51:56 6 excavated and SWMU 5, the paint shop, has been  
18:52:01 7 completely excavated at this point through the  
18:52:06 8 removal action at 2A, and a large portion of this  
18:52:11 9 sand blast grit pile lay down area has also been  
18:52:14 10 excavated. Again, 2G removal action was completed  
18:52:18 11 in 1996.

18:52:21 12                   Current status of the 2A removal action:  
18:52:21 13 Most of 2A has been excavated between 10 and 15 feet  
18:52:27 14 below grade. Main excavation has ben paved and is  
18:52:30 15 now in productive use as a parking lot. A grass  
18:52:35 16 storage water collection strip -- I think we talked  
18:52:36 17 about that earlier this evening -- has been put in  
18:52:40 18 place along the north and the east sides of the  
18:52:46 19 removal action, and a portion of the south side of  
18:52:48 20 the removal action triangle to collect storm water  
18:52:55 21 from that current parking lot and to minimize storm  
18:53:01 22 water impact. And the hot spot removal in the east  
18:53:04 23 end of 2A is ongoing.

18:53:06 24                   This is a view looking from south to  
18:53:10 25 north across the 2A removal action area. All the

18:53:18 1 paved area here passed the grass strip was the  
18:53:24 2 former removal action where -- Darren, correct me if  
18:53:27 3 I'm wrong -- about 4 acres to date have been  
18:53:30 4 excavated.

18:53:32 5 MR. BELTON: That's correct.

18:53:33 6 MR. STANG: This is one of the smaller areas  
18:53:35 7 of grass median, and on the far side of the removal  
18:53:40 8 action there is a significant grass perimeter some,  
18:53:43 9 I believe, 40 feet in width.

18:53:50 10 MR. BISHOP: Question. On those grass buffer  
18:53:54 11 strips, is there a curb that goes all the way around  
18:53:58 12 it?

18:53:58 13 MR. STANG: Real soon. That's a good point.

18:54:01 14 Here's our removal action area,  
18:54:04 15 including a portion that hasn't been paved. This  
18:54:09 16 area that I'm outlining a big, lazy "L" here, at the  
18:54:14 17 time this picture was taken wasn't the grass strip.  
18:54:18 18 It is now fully grassed in. Through here between  
18:54:22 19 the road and the parking area, across here, and in  
18:54:27 20 here it's also been put down as grass.

18:54:30 21 Curbing is present right to about here  
18:54:36 22 and within the next week to two weeks we will finish  
18:54:39 23 the curbing along here. There is a mow strip along  
18:54:49 24 here -- in other words, there is a small concrete  
18:54:50 25 divider between the asphalt and the grass, but it's

18:54:54 1 not a raised lip, so it will allow the water to  
18:54:58 2 sheet off of the asphalt into the grass area. And  
18:55:03 3 then there will be a curb area. About 90 percent of  
18:55:07 4 it is complete to date.

18:55:09 5 MR. BISHOP: On the outside.

18:55:11 6 MR. STANG: On the outside, yes. Thank you.

18:55:14 7 Some of the other areas that you can  
18:55:15 8 see, this area right in here was where the wharf  
18:55:18 9 builder's yard removal action took place in 1996.  
18:55:24 10 This is, again, a good news story for Naval Station.  
18:55:28 11 This is a recycling yard where Naval Station has a  
18:55:31 12 significant program to recycle their concrete,  
18:55:32 13 asphalt, metals, paper, cardboard, and the like.

18:55:40 14 Again, a different aerial photo pretty  
18:55:43 15 much showing the same condition from the west toward  
18:55:45 16 the east with Paleta Creek. And, again, as a point  
18:55:48 17 of reference, you can see the southern end of Site 3  
18:55:52 18 where the Site 3 removal action occurred in 1997.

18:55:58 19 The objectives of the RI, the next step.  
18:56:02 20 We are finishing up the removal action that was  
18:56:06 21 conducted as a result of the EE/CA, engineering  
18:56:10 22 evaluation cost analysis, that I believe was  
18:56:14 23 reviewed by the RAB and the public in 1999 as well  
18:56:19 24 as the action memo that was issued by the Navy to  
18:56:22 25 support that.

18:56:23 1                   Coming out of the removal action, time  
18:56:28 2 to go to the RI to basically look now not just at  
18:56:32 3 Sub-Site 2A or Sub-Site 2G, but at the entire  
18:56:33 4 Site 2.

18:56:37 5                   So our approach is going to be to  
18:56:39 6 complete the delineation of soil contamination in  
18:56:43 7 areas not subjected to the previous removal action.  
18:56:46 8 So we're going to be looking at pretty much the rest  
18:56:49 9 of mole pier. As a point of reference, as the  
18:56:56 10 removal action was completed in particular areas  
18:56:58 11 along the side walls and the bottom of the  
18:57:02 12 excavation, a significant number of confirmation  
18:57:04 13 soil samples to demonstrate that the contamination  
18:57:07 14 had been removed were collected. When the clean  
18:57:12 15 fill was put back in, there really should be no  
18:57:15 16 reason to go back and re-sample that.

18:57:18 17                   So what we have are some now known clean  
18:57:21 18 areas of soil. Now we have to go out in the areas  
18:57:24 19 that haven't been excavated, and to a large extent  
18:57:27 20 for those portions of mole pier have not had nearly  
18:57:30 21 as much investigative analysis performed on them as  
18:57:35 22 the areas that the Navy has done that more detailed  
18:57:38 23 analysis and has chosen to do the cleanup in those  
18:57:42 24 areas.

18:57:42 25                   We're going to treat the groundwater

18:57:45 1 across all of Site 2, both below the areas not  
18:57:50 2 excavated and the areas that have been cleaned up,  
18:57:53 3 as a single groundwater unit and conduct the  
18:57:56 4 investigation. There are currently seven wells on  
18:57:56 5 site. We plan to add some more to complete our  
18:58:01 6 groundwater assessment.

18:58:03 7 Conduct a current condition human health  
18:58:04 8 risk assessment. In other words, using both the  
18:58:09 9 soil samples to complete delineation of the site as  
18:58:12 10 well as the existing data from the removal action  
18:58:16 11 that is being completed, evaluate soil conditions as  
18:58:21 12 well as groundwater conditions for human health.

18:58:26 13 Conduct with the Navy and EPA, consider  
18:58:30 14 a Tier 1 terrestrial ecological risk assessment;  
18:58:31 15 establish whether there are receptors present at the  
18:58:38 16 site that could be exposed, plants and animals; and  
18:58:41 17 to evaluate simultaneously if there are receptors,  
18:58:49 18 are there chemicals of concern above the screening  
18:58:50 19 criteria that any of those terrestrial ecological  
18:58:53 20 receptors could be exposed to; and to determine if  
18:58:59 21 groundwater is in hydraulic contact with surface  
18:59:03 22 water with San Diego Bay. And if so, are there  
18:59:07 23 contaminants present adjacent to the surface water  
18:59:11 24 or do we have only localized groundwater  
18:59:14 25 contamination; and if it isn't reaching and won't

18:59:19 1 reach San Diego Bay, there would not at this time be  
18:59:24 2 a completed pathway, and we could attempt to make a  
18:59:31 3 case that there is no completed pathway and  
18:59:35 4 therefore no risk to marine waters.

18:59:39 5                   So far our tasks and elements of work,  
18:59:43 6 we've interviewed some long-term site personnel with  
18:59:47 7 the Navy who have experience with that end of Naval  
18:59:52 8 Station since the '70s and early '80s, and they've  
18:59:52 9 given us some good information on some of the past  
18:59:57 10 practices.

18:59:58 11                   Develop a conceptual site model and the  
19:00:01 12 data quality objectives. I think we've talked about  
19:00:03 13 data quality objectives at a previous RAB meeting,  
19:00:07 14 and that essentially helps guide our investigation.  
19:00:11 15 What information do we need to get? Why do we need  
19:00:14 16 to get it? How are we going to get enough of it?  
19:00:17 17 How are we going to design a study that's going to  
19:00:19 18 get us to our end point?

19:00:22 19                   That conceptual site model and data  
19:00:23 20 quality objectives will then be folded into a  
19:00:24 21 remedial investigation work plan. We'll conduct the  
19:00:28 22 field work where we'll install wells, and we'll  
19:00:32 23 sample both those new wells and the existing wells  
19:00:35 24 on site; take a statistically based grid sampling  
19:00:41 25 approach which will be optimized -- which is one of

19:00:43 1 the steps of the DQO process -- to exclude the  
19:00:46 2 removal action areas to basically maximize the  
19:00:46 3 Navy's resources in targeting some areas that still  
19:00:49 4 need to be investigated and avoiding the areas that  
19:00:57 5 we know through recent cleanup are clean.

19:01:01 6                   Conduct our tiered eco risk and prepare  
19:01:03 7 the RI report.

19:01:09 8                   Our schedule is to provide the  
19:01:12 9 conceptual site model and DQOs, data quality  
19:01:14 10 objectives, in June of this year; issue a draft work  
19:01:18 11 plan to agencies and the public, including the RAB  
19:01:21 12 in September; try to finalize that by December;  
19:01:25 13 conduct field work at the end of this year and early  
19:01:29 14 into next year; reduce that data, create our RI  
19:01:35 15 report, and try to finish that up in 2003.

19:01:41 16                   I'd be happy to entertain any questions  
19:01:42 17 at this time.

19:01:45 18                   MS. MORLEY: Could you explain some of the  
19:01:46 19 things that you had to do between the completion of  
19:01:48 20 field work and why it takes six months to write the  
19:01:49 21 report for that?

19:01:53 22                   MR. STANG: Sure, Theresa. That's a good  
19:01:54 23 question.

19:01:56 24                   When we go out and we collect our soil  
19:01:57 25 samples and we collect our groundwater samples, and

19:02:01 1 we've collected all that data and we leave the field  
19:02:03 2 in February, typically the laboratories have about  
19:02:10 3 30 to 45 days to analyze the samples for them to  
19:02:14 4 reduce the data and issue the giant pile of paper on  
19:02:18 5 a lot of computer disks with a tremendous amount of  
19:02:21 6 chemical and analytical data associated with it.

19:02:25 7                   Because we're treating this under the  
19:02:27 8 Navy's IRP program, that data then becomes  
19:02:31 9 validated. We send that to an independent chemistry  
19:02:34 10 and engineering group, and they take an independent  
19:02:37 11 third-party look at it, and they validate the data.  
19:02:41 12 They can go in and they can say we've looked at the  
19:02:45 13 methods they used and they were correct. All the  
19:02:48 14 samples were collected under proper chain of custody  
19:02:52 15 procedure. We can document that nobody tampered  
19:02:55 16 with those samples from the time they came out of  
19:02:59 17 the ground until the laboratory received them and  
19:03:01 18 analyzed them. The analyses were conducted within  
19:03:06 19 the right time frame; that they didn't leave holding  
19:03:08 20 times -- in other words, some analyses need to be  
19:03:12 21 performed within seven days of the samples being  
19:03:14 22 collected. The samples were received, if necessary,  
19:03:19 23 on ice so the temperature was appropriate. They  
19:03:20 24 weren't compromised during shipping."

19:03:24 25                   At that point we're 50, 60 days after

19:03:29 1 our last field sample came out of the ground before  
19:03:31 2 we have a complete dataset. We'll sit down, we'll  
19:03:35 3 review that data, start looking at what it tells us,  
19:03:40 4 what we need to do to take the particular data that  
19:03:43 5 we've talked about earlier; separate the data from  
19:03:46 6 zero to two feet to maybe look at the industrial  
19:03:49 7 risk component; take the data from zero to ten feet  
19:03:52 8 in the soil column to look at a residential risk  
19:03:58 9 component.

19:03:58 10                   Once we have the data broken out by  
19:03:59 11 these different groupings, we'll assign our risk  
19:04:04 12 assessors to evaluate what is the risk based on the  
19:04:08 13 individual toxicity of every chemical that's found  
19:04:16 14 out there at some level in a baseline risk  
19:04:16 15 assessment.

19:04:17 16                   Once we have that, we also then plot up  
19:04:20 17 the data, put a good cohesive report that looks at  
19:04:26 18 the human health risk, the ecological risk in the  
19:04:27 19 tiered approach, plus the nature and extent of the  
19:04:34 20 different broad spectrum of chemicals; provide that  
19:04:37 21 to the Navy; do some internal storyboarding; make  
19:04:42 22 sure that the Navy and all the technical people --  
19:04:47 23 the managers, Theresa -- all the internal Navy  
19:04:49 24 stakeholders are in agreement that this is the best  
19:04:54 25 approach, that these are the recommendations that we

19:04:58 1 want to bring to the public; and at that point make  
19:05:01 2 any edits or changes or clarify some of the issues,  
19:05:04 3 and then present it to the public and the agencies.

19:05:09 4 I hope that answered your question,  
19:05:10 5 Theresa.

19:05:16 6 Thank you very much, Peter.

19:05:19 7 MR. BELTON: One note on the schedule. I'm  
19:05:20 8 considering pushing that out some because we want to  
19:05:22 9 be out of the field before we start getting  
19:05:24 10 documents on the RI report. That way we stay  
19:05:28 11 focused on what we're doing.

19:05:37 12 MS. MORLEY: Do you guys have any overall  
19:05:39 13 questions? I want to pass these out.

19:05:44 14 I don't know if I showed you these  
19:05:44 15 before. They're the IR Site 6 Murphy Canyon housing  
19:05:48 16 information packets for unexploded ordnance.

19:05:55 17 MR. BISHOP: We talked about it.

19:05:56 18 MS. MORLEY: Okay. So I did bring this up.

19:05:56 19 They have the "Larry the Lizard"  
19:05:56 20 coloring books. You can play with that.

19:06:01 21 Although, to our dismay, we found out  
19:06:05 22 that they're not being handed out as we thought they  
19:06:07 23 were, so that's something that we're going to have  
19:06:09 24 to work on as far as community relations is making  
19:06:09 25 sure that these do get handed out to every new

19:06:14 1 resident that checks in. Apparently what they've  
19:06:17 2 done is keep the coloring book out for children that  
19:06:20 3 were getting fussy.

19:06:25 4                   But it has like a refrigerator magnet  
19:06:27 5 for residents to hang on their refrigerator to make  
19:06:30 6 sure that the kids know what they're looking for in  
19:06:33 7 the canyons and stuff.

19:06:35 8                   That's something that's going to be  
19:06:36 9 coming up as an issue is what kind of community  
19:06:38 10 relations program are we going to do at Site 6. Are  
19:06:43 11 we going to latch onto Tierrasanta or are we going  
19:06:45 12 to have our own? So that might be something that  
19:06:48 13 we'll be looking for your input in because we want  
19:06:52 14 to make sure that the community is informed and this  
19:06:54 15 program is being run properly, if we can't count on  
19:06:57 16 the Navy housing people to do it. They're supposed  
19:07:00 17 to be doing it.

19:07:00 18                   There's also a contractor packet that is  
19:07:04 19 supposed to go out to contractors, and we just found  
19:07:04 20 out that a big job had been completed and the  
19:07:07 21 contractors had not been told that they were working  
19:07:13 22 in an area that potentially contained UXOs. So  
19:07:14 23 that's something that we'll probably be discussing  
19:07:14 24 at a later date, but I just wanted you guys to look  
19:07:18 25 at the packet.

19:07:24 1                   The Army Corps made these for us back  
19:07:26 2 when they were running the program, and they made  
19:07:29 3 thousands. They were stored at the housing office,  
19:07:32 4 and every new resident that checked in was supposed  
19:07:32 5 to be given this package so that they were told  
19:07:37 6 because when the Army Corps had done their five-year  
19:07:37 7 survey, which is part of the long-term maintenance  
19:07:38 8 procedure because you never close a UXO site. You  
19:07:44 9 can never say you've completely gotten all this  
19:07:44 10 stuff, even though they have been swept and gotten  
19:07:47 11 most of it.

19:07:50 12                   The five-year survey -- a lot of the  
19:07:53 13 Murphy Canyon residents, because there's such high  
19:07:54 14 turnover because they're military families didn't  
19:07:57 15 know; whereas, a lot of the Tierrasanta residents  
19:07:57 16 knew because they've been there for a while.

19:08:01 17                   So this is one of the solutions that  
19:08:01 18 they came up with to try to educate people as they  
19:08:05 19 came in.

19:08:06 20                   MR. BISHOP: Besides that, this is not on the  
19:08:06 21 check list.

19:08:10 22                   MS. MORLEY: There's a check list?

19:08:12 23                   MR. BISHOP: When you check into Navy  
19:08:12 24 housing, there's a check list.

19:08:15 25                   MS. MORLEY: Really.

19:08:15 1 MR. BISHOP: Oh, yeah. You've got a check  
19:08:15 2 list for all the things that you have to sign to be  
19:08:16 3 responsible for. You're signing for this particular  
19:08:26 4 equipment and when you check out, they go down the  
19:08:29 5 check list to make sure the washing machine is still  
19:08:32 6 there, et cetera.

19:08:33 7 MS. MORLEY: Do they have to use the same  
19:08:35 8 form for every housing or can that be modified for  
19:08:37 9 specific units?

19:08:39 10 MR. BISHOP: I'm not sure. It seems to me  
19:08:43 11 they are. But it's the Navy. There's always a  
19:08:43 12 check list.

19:08:46 13 MS. HERNANDEZ: Is it like a disclosure  
19:08:46 14 statement?

19:08:47 15 MR. BISHOP: This needs to go on the check  
19:08:47 16 list. Have the new residents been given this? And  
19:08:47 17 there should be a check box and they sign for  
19:08:54 18 everything.

19:08:55 19 MS. MORLEY: We will look into that because I  
19:08:55 20 was kind of concerned.

19:08:59 21 I also wanted to say -- when the captain  
19:09:02 22 was thanking everybody, I also wanted to extend my  
19:09:04 23 thanks, too. We all work together as a team between  
19:09:10 24 the Navy, the regulators, the public and  
19:09:10 25 contractors. We all do this. And I just wanted to

19:09:16 1 also express my thanks, as he did.

19:09:18 2 I think that we have really come  
19:09:19 3 together as a team, all of us in the past few years  
19:09:23 4 and have made a lot of progress on the IR sites here  
19:09:26 5 at Naval Station, so I just wanted to say thank you.

19:09:29 6 MR. BELTON: Theresa, one more note. Do you  
19:09:29 7 want to talk about the proposed plant plan? We're  
19:09:34 8 going to bring that up at the next RAB.

19:09:36 9 MS. MORLEY: In the IR process there's a  
19:09:41 10 thing called a Record of Decision, a ROD, and that  
19:09:44 11 basically formally closes out your sites.

19:09:47 12 We have received letters of no further  
19:09:49 13 action from the regulators on certain sites -- Site  
19:09:55 14 9, 11, and Site 12. So what we're doing is a  
19:10:05 15 proposed plan, which is a community relations plan  
19:10:08 16 basically to bring the public in and say "This is  
19:10:11 17 what we intend to say in our Record of Decision."  
19:10:11 18 And we're going to try to take these -- it's almost  
19:10:15 19 like delisting a site from the IR program.

19:10:20 20 So to try to make it visually  
19:10:22 21 interesting, it kind of looks like on the fact sheet  
19:10:25 22 where it's kind of colorful and it's that same kind  
19:10:27 23 of paper and everything, so we'll be asking for your  
19:10:30 24 input on that, too, before we send that out to the  
19:10:34 25 public. Then we'll discuss that at the next RAB.

19:10:40 1 Here's our newest fact sheet. This is  
19:10:42 2 No. 9 which is -- that numbering series, the ones  
19:10:45 3 that are numbered and this other one that are the  
19:10:49 4 site updates, as opposed to the removal action fact  
19:10:51 5 sheets which are not in color and are one-page  
19:10:54 6 doublesided. So you'll be getting these in the  
19:10:54 7 mail, but if you want an advance copy because you  
19:10:58 8 just cannot wait to read this, you can take them  
19:11:02 9 with you.

19:11:08 10 Of course this is printed on post  
19:11:09 11 consumer recycled paper. I think that's it.

19:11:20 12 What do you guys think about this new  
19:11:23 13 meeting time and about food?

19:11:26 14 MR. MULLALY: I like it because it gives us  
19:11:26 15 an opportunity for people to talk about issues.

19:11:34 16 MS. MORLEY: More like informal so you can  
19:11:38 17 bond and everything.

19:11:43 18 I also have a menu if you guys want to  
19:11:45 19 look at stuff that you like because some people  
19:11:48 20 don't like quiche. You can help me pick out the  
19:11:52 21 next menu because we can pick that out each time.  
19:11:55 22 And if there's other things -- like I didn't know  
19:11:55 23 how many people were coming, so I didn't know if you  
19:11:58 24 like soda or water. I figured most people wouldn't  
19:11:58 25 drink coffee at night. So do you guys want more

19:11:58 1 water?

19:12:18 2 MR. BAILEY: In order to maybe stimulate  
19:12:18 3 maybe more RAB members attending, I would suggest  
19:12:22 4 maybe we make a calling the week before or the  
19:12:27 5 beginning of the week to the RAB members -- the  
19:12:30 6 active RAB members and remind them, ask them if  
19:12:33 7 there are issues that they want to add to the agenda  
19:12:34 8 to try to stimulate more RAB member attendance.

19:12:38 9 If you make the effort to provide the  
19:12:39 10 refreshments, we ought to try to get as many people  
19:12:39 11 as possible to participate.

19:12:45 12 MS. MORLEY: I go by my criteria which is  
19:12:47 13 "There's food. I'll come." That's a good  
19:12:50 14 suggestion. Plus people forget.

19:12:55 15 Do you like the new meeting time where  
19:12:56 16 it's a little bit earlier, then we can go home  
19:12:56 17 earlier and you can come here straight from work and  
19:13:02 18 kind of have dinner, sort of?

19:13:06 19 MR. BISHOP: It works.

19:13:07 20 MR. BELTON: Theresa, on that same note,  
19:13:08 21 we're going to publish this in the local paper, too.  
19:13:14 22 Jerry knows the particulars on the newspaper.

19:13:15 23 MR. BAILEY: "Star News."

19:13:17 24 MR. BELTON: When's that going to go out,  
19:13:17 25 Jerry?

19:13:19 1 MR. BAILEY: It will be not this week's  
19:13:18 2 printing, but the following week.

19:13:22 3 MS. MORLEY: And actually this RAB meeting  
19:13:21 4 went out in the "Union Tribune." We normally don't  
19:13:27 5 put a public notice in because it's quite expensive.  
19:13:28 6 It's something like \$1,400 for a notice; whereas,  
19:13:34 7 the others are a couple hundred. They did let us  
19:13:37 8 put it in the "Community Event" section for free,  
19:13:40 9 but I guess people weren't interested.

19:13:44 10 MS. HERNANDEZ: "Star News."

19:13:46 11 MS. MORLEY: That's the Chula Vista local  
19:13:47 12 paper.

19:13:57 13 I guess that is it then.

19:13:59 14 How interested are you guys in having  
19:13:59 15 another site tour? Are you kind of burned out on  
19:13:59 16 site tours looking at paved parking lots or do you  
19:13:59 17 like those?

19:14:09 18 MR. BISHOP: Well, we get a site tour every  
19:14:11 19 time we come here with the slides. It's a picture  
19:14:13 20 of what's going on.

19:14:16 21 MS. MORLEY: I'd like it one time where we're  
19:14:17 22 were doing field work so you could come out -- maybe  
19:14:21 23 if we could work late one day or something so you  
19:14:23 24 guys could actually come out and see sampling or  
19:14:26 25 what it looks like when they drain fuel. It might

19:14:29 1 help you when we're talking about how the samples  
19:14:29 2 are taken and how careful you have to be in the  
19:14:34 3 chain of custody and putting it in the cooler and  
19:14:37 4 all that stuff so you might have a better idea of  
19:14:41 5 what we actually do in the field and what it looks  
19:14:42 6 like when we actually put a boring in or monitoring  
19:14:45 7 well or something like that.

19:14:47 8                   So I'm trying to figure what kind of  
19:14:48 9 field work is coming up in the future where we  
19:14:52 10 could --

19:14:52 11           MR. BAILEY: Site 4.

19:14:55 12           MS. COLLINS: Site 4 will be in full swing in  
19:14:58 13 July.

19:15:02 14           MR. BAILEY: And it's light longer, so that's  
19:15:02 15 a good possibility.

19:15:06 16           MS. MORLEY: The next one will be in July.

19:15:09 17 Does anyone have a calendar?

19:15:16 18           MR. BELTON: While we look that up, the team  
19:15:16 19 is trying to connect more with the sites, so we can  
19:15:18 20 start in the future to see what the site is like.

19:15:31 21           MR. STANG: Is it the last Wednesday or the  
19:15:31 22 fourth Wednesday?

19:15:33 23           MS. HERNANDEZ: Last.

19:15:35 24           MR. STANG: July 31st.

19:15:38 25           MS. YAMANE: Are there any local fairs or

19:15:39 1 something that you could maybe have booths? North  
19:15:42 2 Island does that in the Flower Show. They have a  
19:15:44 3 booth and they try to connect with people and get  
19:15:49 4 their phone numbers.

19:15:51 5 MS. MORLEY: We used to do that -- we went to  
19:15:54 6 Earth Day every year but we got so badly abused that  
19:15:57 7 we gave up. When they started throwing tomatoes, we  
19:15:58 8 decided "All right. We're out of here."

19:16:05 9 But that's a good idea. I'm trying to  
19:16:08 10 think -- where else have we gone?

19:16:09 11 MS. HERNANDEZ: At the Flower Show we got 13  
19:16:11 12 people to sign up, but the thing is we're going to  
19:16:14 13 call them up to remind them of the RAB meeting and  
19:16:17 14 for FYI information.

19:16:20 15 MS. COLLINS: Because they signed up but they  
19:16:21 16 didn't come to the one after that?

19:16:25 17 MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, last year they didn't  
19:16:26 18 have a sign-in sheet and this year we did. They  
19:16:27 19 said they were going to come, but there was no way  
19:16:27 20 to communicate with them to let them know about the  
19:16:32 21 meeting. So this time we did have them sign in and  
19:16:32 22 they left their phone number so, hopefully, we can  
19:16:32 23 call them.

19:16:42 24 MS. MORLEY: That would be good or maybe --  
19:16:47 25 gosh, I don't know.

19:16:50 1                   Also, there's a contractor working on  
19:16:53 2 the high school curriculum -- remember, the middle  
19:16:53 3 school one? and she is working on one of those  
19:16:54 4 contractors to give the science part of it. So  
19:17:02 5 we'll have one for high school that's probably going  
19:17:03 6 to come out in a couple of months, too. Normally if  
19:17:07 7 you can get to kids, they're excited about  
19:17:08 8 environmental and they might tell their parents.

19:17:15 9                   I think people just don't like coming to  
19:17:17 10 meetings. Our mailing list is pretty big. They  
19:17:19 11 like reading about it, but they don't like to come.  
19:17:24 12 But we'll keep trying any ideas that you guys can  
19:17:28 13 think of.

19:17:29 14                   So July 31st we'll see you.

19:17:36 15                   MR. BISHOP: I probably won't be here for  
19:17:40 16 that one because I'm teaching for National, and I  
19:17:41 17 think I'm teaching on that day.

19:17:52 18                   MS. MORLEY: Everyone eat, drink, and be  
19:17:54 19 merry. We're adjourned.

19:18:11 20

19:18:11 21                   (Whereupon, at 7:20 p.m. the RAB meeting  
22                   was adjourned.)

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )

2 : ss

3 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )

4

5 I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, do hereby  
6 certify that I reported in shorthand the above  
7 proceedings on Wednesday, April 24, 2002, at  
8 "Anchors & Spurs," 2245 Division Street, in the City  
9 of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of  
10 California; and I do further certify that the above  
11 and foregoing pages numbered 1 to 53, inclusive,  
12 contain a true and correct transcript of all of said  
13 proceedings.

14 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2002.

15

16

17

18

19

\_\_\_\_\_

20

NANCY A. LEE

21

22

23

24

25

