

**FORMER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION TUSTIN
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
November 14, 2007
MEETING MINUTES**

The 79th meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Tustin was held on Wednesday, November 14, 2007, at the Clifton Miller Community Center in Tustin. The meeting started at 7:10 p.m. and was adjourned at 9:55 p.m. These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the RAB meeting.

WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS/AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Don Zweifel, RAB Community Co-Chair, welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming to tonight's RAB meeting. He said there were no excused absences from RAB members. He then asked for self-introductions of all attendees.

Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, said that the RAB meeting provides an opportunity for the community to receive input from the Navy and the regulatory agencies. He added that there are a variety of handout materials pertaining to former MCAS Tustin available on the information table. He reviewed the RAB meeting agenda. The key topics for this RAB meeting include: the Environmental Status Update; a presentation on the redevelopment of former MCAS Tustin by the City of Tustin, and a general overview of the Human-Health Risk Assessment process.

He informed meeting attendees he can be contacted by phone or email regarding any questions that may arise and that this also pertains to the regulatory agency representatives. He added that all Navy-produced documents undergo regulatory agency review. The Administrative Record file for former MCAS Tustin, where all project-related documents are housed, is located at the BRAC Office in Building 307 at former MCAS El Toro. The Information Repository, a subset of the Administrative Record file, is located at the Main Library at University of California, Irvine. A handout on the information table provides specific location information. Mr. Weissenborn also explained that Ms. Patricia Hannon, Project Manager for the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Region (Water Board), will be unable to attend because she is on personal leave at this time. Mr. Weissenborn said that Mr. James Ricks, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), is back on the project after completing a temporary assignment but was unable to attend tonight.

OLD BUSINESS

Approval of 8/15/07 RAB Meeting Minutes – Mr. Don Zweifel, Former MCAS Tustin RAB Community Co-Chair

Mr. Zweifel asked if anyone had any amendments to the August 15, 2007, RAB meeting minutes. There were no objections or changes to the minutes. The meeting minutes were approved without amendment.

NEW BUSINESS

Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Environmental Status Update

Mr. Weissenborn provided the former MCAS Tustin Environmental Status Update to inform the RAB members of activities that have taken place since the previous RAB meeting and to detail what the Navy plans to accomplish from now until the February 2008 RAB meeting. The update included maps of the various sites that showed locations of wells, piping conveyances, and the groundwater treatment systems. Photos of well vaults and treatment facilities were also presented.

- Operable Unit (OU)-1A (IRP-13 South – 1,2,3-trichloropropane [TCP] Groundwater Plume) - The Navy submitted the Draft 2006 Annual Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) Performance Report in May 2007. Remedial construction is underway. Additionally, four new extraction wells, 18 new monitoring wells, and 2,900 feet of conveyance piping have been installed and tested. Startup of the system (includes OU-1B - IRP-3 and IRP-12 – trichloroethylene [TCE] Groundwater Plumes) is expected to take place in late December 2007.
- OU-1B North - The groundwater treatment system installation is well underway. Two new extraction wells and six new monitoring wells have been installed and developed. Approximately 3,800 feet of conveyance piping has been installed and tested.
- OU-1B South - The groundwater system installation is well underway. Seven new extraction wells and 13 new monitoring wells have been installed and developed. Approximately 1,750 feet of conveyance piping has been installed and tested. At this time for OU-1, electric service has been impacted due to the recent Southern California fires. Once the electric company has the manpower, they can provide power to the system. Mr. Weissenborn said the new extraction wells are annotated in the Environmental Status Update handout and the Navy can create detailed illustrations for the February 2008 RAB meeting.
- OU-4B (IRP-5S[a], IRP-6, IRP-11, IRP-13W, MMS-04, and Mingled Plumes Area) - The data evaluation is underway following the infiltration test. A technical memorandum describing the data analysis will be provided in the Feasibility Study (FS) Report. Also, a Revised Human-Health Risk Assessment is underway. Following this analysis, the Navy will recommend approximately 10 more monitoring wells for OU-4B. The Navy implemented the Petroleum Corrective Action Plan (PCAP) system in September 2007.
- MTBE (methyl tert-butyl ether) Groundwater Plume (Underground Storage Tank [UST] Site 222) - The MTBE plume system started up in August 2007. The Navy installed three soil vapor extraction (SVE) wells, four soil gas monitoring points, two groundwater extraction wells, and two groundwater monitoring wells. To date, 3.5 million gallons of extracted water has been treated. The SVE process helps reduce the mass in the soil and the Navy is aggressively treating this plume because of the potential for plume migration.

Discussion

Mr. Zweifel asked approximately how much it would cost to install 10 new monitoring wells for OU-4B and where would they be located. Mr. Jim Callian, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), said the wells cost roughly \$5,000 each, so the total cost would be approximately \$50,000. The Navy is going through the process of recommending well locations. Mr. Callian said there will be approximately eight wells in the 1st Water Bearing Zone (WBZ) and two in the 2nd WBZ, and there will be no wells in the 3rd WBZ since at this time there is less than 1 microgram per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) of chemical contamination reported in that WBZ.

In reference to the MTBE plume system, Mr. Zweifel asked at what depth was the water being extracted. Mr. Dhananjay Rawal, ECS (Navy contractor), said water is being extracted from the 2nd WBZ at a depth of approximately 25 to 50 feet below the ground surface (bgs). The concentrations range from approximately 300 to 400 $\mu\text{g/L}$, which is a large decrease from previous concentrations that had been reported up to 10,000 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is following a tiered-cleanup approach agreed upon by BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT), composed of the Navy, the Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), U.S. EPA, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Cleanup levels for MTBE in the tiered approach are as follows for each WBZ:

- 1st WBZ – 300 $\mu\text{g/L}$
- 2nd WBZ – 40 $\mu\text{g/L}$
- 3rd WBZ – 13 $\mu\text{g/L}$

Mr. Weissenborn said the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for MTBE in the 3rd WBZ is 13 $\mu\text{g/L}$. He added that the water in the 1st WBZ is lesser quality than the 2nd and 3rd WBZs, so the Navy is trying to increase water quality in the areas closest to the potential drinking water sources. Data collection and groundwater modeling were conducted, and results were presented to the regulatory agencies for their review.

Ms. Susan Reynolds, RAB member, asked if the 1st WBZ would eventually contaminate the 3rd WBZ due to its higher concentrations. Mr. Weissenborn stated that the Navy is unable to stop remedial activities until the 3rd WBZ reaches 13 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Remediation activities will need to be increased in the 1st and 2nd WBZs to meet the MCL in the 3rd WBZ.

Mr. Weissenborn stated that the budget for November 2007 through September 2008 is approximately \$740,000 for the remainder of the remedial activities. For 2009, he asked for an increase due to additional remedial activities the Navy will be conducting. He said that for 2007, the funds are sufficient to complete the work needed for the MTBE plume, OU-1A North and South, and the next document in the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process for OU-4B. Once this OU-4B document is prepared the Navy will have a solid foundation for remediation at this site. Ms. Content Arnold, Navy Lead RPM, stated that according to the Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA) all schedules are in three phases of fieldwork for OU-4B, which include the FS, the Proposed Plan, and the Record of Decision. The Navy will be able to support all of its current workload with the current funding.

Mr. Zweifel asked if former MCAS Tustin follows the CERCLA process even though it is not a Superfund site. Mr. Weissenborn confirmed that former MCAS Tustin uses the

CERCLA process for determining if remedial actions are needed at the former station and for developing site-specific remedial actions. The Navy is the lead agency and DTSC is the lead regulatory agency providing oversight of the Navy. Together, the Navy and DTSC work alongside U.S. EPA and the Water Board to clean up the former station. Discussions between the agencies and the Navy are mainly over data analysis and/or remediation approaches. Mr. Weissenborn said overall the Navy and regulatory agencies are working together towards the same goal of cleaning up former MCAS Tustin. The BCT provides a forum for the agencies to discuss or share technical expertise for the best possible solutions for remediation.

Regulatory Agency Update - Regulatory Agency Representatives

Mr. Ram Peddada, Project Manager, Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control

Mr. Peddada, DTSC, briefly described what he has been working on since the previous RAB meeting. He said he has been commuting to Irvine every 3 weeks to oversee contractors working on OU-1A/1B and to monitor the progress with the Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) treatment system.

Also, Gov. Schwarzenegger recently signed off on the former MCAS Tustin Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) document, and the 4.8-acre property (in the vicinity of IRP-13S and IRP-13W) will be transferred to Lennar in a few weeks pending the finalization of the deed. Overall, this process of early transfer took a year and a half to complete. Mr. Peddada added that the soil at this property is clean, but Lennar is not allowed to touch the groundwater. Lennar can dig only 5 to 6 feet bgs and all special construction has already been completed, including areas where utility lines needed to be installed at approximately 15 feet bgs. **Note to reader: Special construction involves placement of slurry grout in areas of the trench when it is backfilled, so that groundwater would not be able to effectively flow along and through the trench backfill material.**

Discussion

Mr. Weissenborn said that groundwater remediation is underway. Institutional controls must be followed by Lennar such that redevelopment does not cause a threat to human health or the environment. There is no contaminant-caused threat in the soil and contamination is only present in the groundwater so special lines and slurried conduits were used to prevent seeping of contaminated groundwater into utility trenches.

Mr. Tim Heironimus, Bechtel (Navy contractor), said there are no restrictions on the soil. The main concern is a migrating plume, so when the redeveloper is trenching, they will use clay material for backfill. In this area there are no issues with building houses; the only restriction on the developers pertains to groundwater and they are not allowed to drill wells.

Presentation – City of Tustin Redevelopment Update

Mr. Matt West, City of Tustin, gave an overall update on the redevelopment of former MCAS Tustin. He used a series of maps to point out each parcel and provided a brief description of the redevelopment status of each parcel.

Tustin Field I - a 20-acre site owned by WLHomes, a homebuilder that is doing business as John Laing Homes. Construction of 376 dwellings was completed during winter 2006.

Tustin Field II - developed by WLHomes. Construction of the 189 dwellings was completed in summer of 2006.

Columbus Grove - developed by Lennar/Lyons, will contain 465 residential dwelling units; and 332 permits have been issued. To date, construction of the remaining units is expected to be completed in during 2008.

Columbus Square - consists of 1,075 dwelling units with an estimated completion in 2010. At this time, 647 permits have been issued and nearly 360 units have been completed.

District at Tustin Legacy – developed by Vestar/Tustin Kimco, L.P., is a retail/commercial development consisting of approximately 1,016,000 square feet; and 999,965 square feet are under construction. It includes retailers such as Target and Costco. Phase I was completed in spring 2007 and the remainder of Phase II is scheduled for completion by fall 2008.

Master Developer Footprint “Legacy Park” – is being developed by Tustin Legacy Community Partners, LLC; and is a vertical mixed-use area with retail and housing mixed together. Three phases of work includes commercial, neighborhood/mixed-use, and lower-density units. Demolition work has begun for Phase I and completion of construction is expected to occur in 2009. Phase II is expected to be completed in 2011 and Phase III in 2013. The completion date for Phase IV is undetermined.

Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) – developed the RSCCD Regional Law Enforcement Training Facility that was completed in September 2007.

South Coast County Community College District – developed its Advanced Technology Education Campus which was completed in fall 2007 and was able to accept nearly 400 new students for the current semester.

Orange County Rescue Mission – developed the “Village of Hope” as transitional housing located near Red Hill Avenue. This area is a gated complex with 192 units with a community facility and a chapel.

County of Orange Social Services Agency – is developing Tustin Family Campus, a facility for sheltering abused children, will be located adjacent to the “Village of Hope” near the Community Park. Construction is estimated to begin in 2008.

Tustin Unified School District - will be building three new schools, including a 40-acre high school, a 15-acre middle school, and a 10-acre elementary school. The construction schedule is unknown at this time.

City of Tustin – will develop a 25-acre area Community Park. The construction schedule has not yet been determined. The City of Tustin will be issuing a request for proposals in the near future.

City of Tustin/Orange County Fire Authority – will be developing a new fire station. Construction is estimated to begin in late 2008/early 2009 with an estimated completion date of January 2010. The station will be located near Edinger Avenue.

City of Tustin – will reuse the existing day care center contingent upon environmental remediation. A request for proposals for remediation services will be issued in the near future. At this time the construction schedule is unknown.

County of Orange in Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with Industrial Realty Group – is the developer of Play at Tustin Legacy, an 84.5-acre area Orange County Urban Regional Park, located near Valencia Avenue and Armstrong Road, and Hangar 28. Upon completion of preliminary traffic/market studies, the County will approach the National Park Service regarding public benefit and the conveyance process. The construction and completion schedule are unknown at this time.

Discussion

Mr. Zweifel stated that he was concerned about the demolition of the hangar (Building 28) because of its historical significance.

Mr. West stated that the master developer, along with the National Park Service and state and federal agencies, will be broaching that subject and it is not up to the City of Tustin to determine. The status of the hangar (Building 28) is unknown at this time, since a cost analysis and a historical evaluation of the hangar needs to be completed.

Presentation – Human-Health Risk Assessment

Dr. Kofi Asante-Duah, Navy Remedial Technical Manager, stated that his presentation would provide an overview of the human-health risk assessment process and how it is used to determine risk. He said this presentation is not intended to be specific to former MCAS Tustin, but information pertaining to the former station can be provided at a later RAB meeting.

Dr. Asante-Duah said the purpose of the human-health risk assessment is to examine and estimate the likelihood that exposure to different chemicals will result in some type of adverse health effect (cancer and/or noncancer). The assessment documents site hazards and provides information to decision makers in determining whether or not further remedial action is needed at a site.

For an understanding of the terminology, Dr. Asante-Duah stated that “cancer risk” is the probability of an increased incidence of cancer in people and is expressed as potential additional cancer cases in a population of one million people. Cancer effects in humans from chemical exposure are generally based on the frequency of tumors in lab animals exposed to very high doses. A safe level of exposure, or threshold, is generally estimated from effects on lab animals. Exposure below the threshold is not expected to result in adverse health effects over a lifetime. Noncancer risk is measured in terms of a Hazard Quotient (HQ), which is a ratio of the exposure dose to the threshold dose. The sum of the HQs for multiple chemicals is called a Hazard Index (HI).

Dr. Asante-Duah described U.S. EPA's four-step process that was developed to calculate hypothetical risk. The first three steps are integrated into a risk assessment equation or formula to develop the risk characterization, the fourth step. The four steps include:

1. Identify hazards on site – Background research and data collection is conducted on a site to identify what chemicals or hazardous substances were used. Concentrations of chemicals in soil, air, and/or water are determined.
2. Exposure Assessment – Determine who lived or worked in the area of the site and how much chemical exposure occurred for these people, then a potential dose is determined.
3. Exposure Response Assessment – Determine the amount of exposure and for how long. The relationship between dose and health effects is also evaluated.
4. Risk Characterization – Calculate an estimate of potential risk over time. Risk is the potential for increased incidence of cancer or noncancer health effects.

For the first step in the process, the Navy gathers and analyzes relevant data about a potential problem. Contaminants are identified based on intrinsic toxicological properties, quantity present, potential exposure pathways, and utility as an indicator chemical.

During the exposure assessment the risk assessors need to be aware of who might be involved or impacted on this site (i.e. daycare facility, residential housing, or an office building). Once it is determined who the receptors are and who is at risk, an exposure assessment is conducted to analyze scenarios for which the individuals present on the site might be impacted. For example, is there a child on site ingesting the soil? Or is there an adult who works on the property for 6 to 8 hours a day breathing the air and drinking the water? The risk assessor will calculate the intakes/doses for all significant pathways of exposure.

For residents on the site, a reasonable maximum exposure (RME) scenario has been developed by the U.S.EPA. The RME assumes the resident is present 350 days a year, 24 hours a day for 30 years. Exposure of a child from 0 to 6 years of age is added to that for an adult from 7 to 30 years to equal 30 years. This assumes that concentrations of chemicals in the soil, air, and water stay constant for the 30 years of exposure. Dr. Asante-Duah stated that this maximum exposure is a very conservative process and is meant to determine the worst-case scenario. It was also noted that there are numerous "special" group categories, including expecting mothers who are more susceptible and most likely to pass their exposure on to their unborn child. An example would be excessive exposure to lead. Some of the exposure pathways occur through soil by ingestion, dermal contact, or ingestion of produce; or through groundwater via ingestion, inhalation of vapors, or dermal contact.

Mr. Zweifel asked if there was any impact from radium at former MCAS Tustin. Ms. Arnold stated that radium was not a chemical of concern at former MCAS Tustin.

Dr. Asante-Duah stated at times the toxicity assessment conducted for a site will identify some chemicals that are naturally occurring, but this information still is included in the risk assessment. The Navy is responsible for cleaning up any site contaminated by humans and preventative measures can occur for naturally occurring contaminants. During the toxicity assessment, both qualitative and quantitative toxicological profiles are generated for indicator chemicals to identify any sources of uncertainty. This assessment includes an evaluation for the toxicological weight-of-evidence or strength-

of-evidence of chemicals. This assessment determines all relevant toxicity values or numbers for indicator chemicals. Toxicity values are quantified as cancer slope factors or, in the case of noncancer effects, as reference doses. In this process, conservative values (numbers) are applied as safety factors and ultra-conservative values are applied to make sure nothing is missed.

Mr. Zweifel asked for clarification of qualitative and quantitative profiles. Dr. Asante-Duah stated that outside agencies, in particular the federal Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, continuously compile information on other sites across the U.S. and how certain chemicals affect individuals at these sites. The Navy can use this information to add to their potential list of chemicals to evaluate when conducting risk assessments.

When conducting a risk assessment, the Navy will review the entire scope of potential cancer and noncancer risks based on the effects from chemicals and radiological constituents. Examples of noncancer risks include headaches and kidney and liver problems. The four-step process previously described determines the risk values. The risk values fall into risk categories of unacceptable risks, a risk management range, and acceptable risks.

Cancer risk categories include:

The unacceptable risks are more than 100 additional cancer cases in a population of 1,000,000 (greater than 10^{-4}).

The risk management range is between 1 and 100 additional cancer cases in a population of 1,000,000 (10^{-4} through 10^{-6}).

An acceptable risk is less than 1 additional cancer cases in a population of 1,000,000 (less than or equal to 10^{-6}).

Noncancer risk categories include:

The unacceptable risk is an HI greater than 1. This should be further evaluated.

The risk management range is an HI of 1.

The acceptable risk is an HI less than 1.

Dr. Asante-Duah said U.S. EPA designed the methodology to assure that toxicity or exposure will not be underestimated and that any actual risk will be lower than that calculated and could be zero, but it hardly ever is zero. The focus is on capturing the worst-case scenarios at a site. U.S. EPA and Cal/EPA guidance specifies that for cancer risk, a conservative starting point of 10^{-6} (one in one million) at the lower end of the risk management range (10^{-6} to 10^{-4}) is used when considering cancer risk in cleanup decisions. Also it should be noted that the risk assessment does not predict actual health effects to those living or working in the area of the contaminated site. The original probability that any person, regardless of where they live or work, will get some form of cancer during their lifetime is approximately 1 in 3 people or 0.3. For example, if the cancer risk at a site is 1×10^{-5} (or 0.00001), then the probability of an individual developing cancer increases to 0.30001, if they are exposed at the site for 30 years. Dr. Asante-Duah reminded RAB members that the risk is considered an increased risk or probability. It does not directly state or predict that someone will get sick.

Mr. Weissenborn said the baseline (0.3) does not matter, but it is the overall increase in the likelihood of developing cancer that is important, even though the risk is actually very small. He added that increased cancer risk is the main concern for the Navy. Mr. Callian stated that the Navy typically deals with risk factors by using land use controls

which will take the risk increment to zero (or to the baseline which is 0.3). The Navy can place deed restrictions on property in order to avoid potential risk altogether.

Dr. Asante-Duah added that the Navy puts in considerable effort during the CERCLA process in conducting human-health risk assessments.

Future Topics/Schedule Next RAB and Subcommittee Meetings/Meeting Evaluation and Closing

The RAB requested that the following topics be covered at upcoming RAB meetings:

- Status update of OU-4B with detailed illustrations of well locations.
- Annual Groundwater Report

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for February 20, 2008.

Additional Discussion

Ms. Norby was concerned that she has not received any copies of any documents to review. She stated that the Navy could put the documents on CD or forward an executive summary to RAB members to keep them up to date. She also requested a document sign-up sheet for any RAB members interested in getting hard copies. Ms. Reynolds stated it would be easiest if documents or summaries could be emailed to RAB members.

A meeting attendee asked if it was possible to get a timeline or summary of the Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance parcels.

Ms. Reynolds stated that the RAB meeting was very long and should be more concise.

It was suggested that use of smaller or fewer tables in the meeting room may be helpful since it was difficult to hear.

The November 14, 2007 meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

List of Handouts Provided at the Meeting

- RAB Meeting Agenda/Public Notice – November 14, 2007 (79th) RAB Meeting.
- Meeting minutes from the August 15, 2007 (78th) RAB Meeting.
- Presentation:* "City of Tustin Redevelopment Update," November 14, 2007, presented by Matt West, City of Tustin.
- Presentation:* "Overview of the Human-Health Risk Assessment Process," November 14, 2007, presented by Dr. Kofi Asante-Duah, Navy Remedial Technical Manager.
- Former MCAS Tustin Environmental Program Status.
- Map – MCAS Tustin Operable Units, Major AOCs, and MTBE Plume – February 2007.
- Restoration Advisory Board Fact Sheet/Membership Application.
- Former MCAS Tustin - Where to Get More Information.
- Former MCAS Tustin Marine Corps/Navy Team Contact Information.
- DTSC Public Participation Specialist Tim Chauvel, Contact Information.
- For More Information: Administrative Record and Information Repository Locations.
- Internet Access – Environmental Web Sites
- Former MCAS Tustin Installation Restoration Program - Mailing List Coupon.
- Former MCAS Tustin Installation Restoration Program Advisory Board Mission Statement.

Department of the Navy, "Policy for Conducting Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Statutory Five-Year Reviews," November 2001.

The Under Secretary of Defense, "DoD Policy On Responsibility for Additional Environmental Cleanup after Transfer of Real Property," July 25, 1997.

Department of Defense, "A Guide to Establishing Institutional Controls at Closing Military Installations," February 1998.

Department of Defense, "Institutional Controls: What Are They and How are They Used," spring 1997.

U.S. EPA, "Checking Up On Superfund Sites: The Five-Year Review," June 2001.

U.S. EPA, "Five-Year Review Process in the Superfund Program," April 2003.

Copies of the meeting minutes and handouts provided at the November 14, 2007 RAB meeting are available at the MCAS Tustin Information Repository located at the University of California, Irvine, Main Library, and Government Publications Section. Library hours are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday; 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Friday and Saturday; and 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Sunday. It is recommended, however, that people call the library for confirmation of these hours as they may be modified during final exam and holiday periods. The Government Publications Section may be reached at (949) 824-7362.

Minutes from previous RAB meetings can be found on the internet on the Navy BRAC website: www.bracpmo.navy.mil

Internet Sites

Navy and Marine Corps Internet Access

BRAC PMO Web Site (includes RAB meeting minutes):

Navy web site: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/>

For Tustin RAB information:

http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/tustin/rab_information.aspx

Department of Defense – Environmental Cleanup Home Page Web Site:

<http://www.dtic.mil/envirodod/>

U.S. EPA:

www.epa.gov (homepage)

www.epa.gov/superfund (Superfund information)

www.epa.gov/ncea (National Center for Environmental Assessment)

www.epa.gov/federalregister (Federal Register Environmental Documents)

Cal/EPA:

www.calepa.ca.gov (homepage)

www.dtsc.ca.gov (Department of Toxic Substances Control)

www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana (Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board)