

FORMER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

March 28, 2007

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

The 86th Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for Former Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro was held Wednesday, March 28, 2007 at Irvine City Hall. The meeting began at 6:37 p.m. These minutes summarize the RAB meeting discussions and presentations.

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Darren Newton, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) for Former MCAS El Toro and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and said a variety of handout materials pertaining to Former MCAS El Toro are available on the information table. He reviewed the RAB meeting agenda and the key topics for this RAB meeting are: IRP Site 1, Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Training Range, Feasibility Study (FS) Report, and the regulatory agency update. Ms. Marcia Rudolph, RAB Subcommittee Chair, lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcements

Mr. Newton asked for self-introduction of attendees. Ms. Laura Butler, was introduced as a new RAB attendee. He stated that if she wished to become a formal RAB member she should fill out the member application form and submit it so a formal vote would take place at the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Newton said if RAB members cannot attend RAB meetings to please contact him or Mr. Bob Woodings, RAB Community Co-Chair. It is important for RAB members to inform either of the co-chairs if they will be absent. Mr. Don Zweifel, RAB member, called in with an excused absence. Mr. Ray Ouellette, regular RAB meeting attendee, also informed Mr. Woodings he would not be able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Newton reviewed the handouts available on the information table, including the contact information of the BRAC Cleanup Team. Handouts with Navy and regulatory agency web sites were also available.

Mr. Newton read an excerpt from the RAB Mission Statement as a reminder of the RAB's mission:

"The mission of the RAB is to promote community awareness and obtain timely constructive community review and comment on proposed environmental restoration actions to accelerate the cleanup and property transfer of MCAS El Toro. The RAB serves as a forum for the presentation of comments and recommendations to U.S. Marine Corps (Navy) and Remedial Project Managers (RPMs) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)."

Mr. Newton requested that anyone, who has questions regarding reuse and redevelopment issues to contact Mr. Glen Worthington, Orange County Great Park, or Mr. Jim Werkmeister, Lennar Corporation, for information.

Mr. Steve Malloy, Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD), stated that the Dedication Ceremony for the IRWD potable water treatment plant took place on February 20, 2007. The ceremony included a self-guided tour of the system, and local state and federal representatives were in

attendance. The treatment plant is currently available for viewing; anyone interested can contact the IRWD community relations department for a tour.

Mr. Malloy said that four wells are presently pumping water, and the fifth well is being constructed and is scheduled to be completed in April 2007. The shallow groundwater unit (SGU) for the non-potable water system uses an air stripper to remove trichloroethene (TCE) from the water and a carbon canister to remove TCE from the air that is emitted from the air stripping process. The clean air emitted following the treatment process meets air quality standards. The Navy has been conducting quarterly monitoring at the site to ensure the system is operating as planned. The principal aquifer plant at IRP Site 18 is removing TCE at concentrations that are below the non-detectable limit. Reports for long-term monitoring required by the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) are being prepared in coordination with the Navy. All activities are proceeding as planned.

OLD BUSINESS

Review and Approval of the January 31, 2007 RAB Meeting Minutes

Mr. Woodings asked if anyone had any changes or input to the January 31, 2007 RAB meeting minutes. No objections or input were noted. The meeting minutes were approved without amendment. Mr. Woodings stated that the minutes were “well done.”

Alton Parkway Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Mr. Newton said that prior to Ms. Rudolph’s report on the activities of the RAB Subcommittee; he would address questions raised at previous RAB meetings regarding the Alton Parkway Draft EIR.

Mr. Newton said the Navy had reviewed the Draft EIR, and provided clarification on some issues but no formal comments were submitted. The clarifications pertained to editorial items and were sent via email to Mr. Ted Rigoni, County of Orange, Public Works, Road and Traffic Engineering, and representative for the Alton Parkway Extension project. Mr. Newton added that, in general, Navy had positively evaluated the Draft EIR. Specifically, the Navy requested clarification that the Alton Parkway Extension would: restrict any damage from occurring to the Navy’s monitoring wells south of IRP Site 2; restrict access to the landfill area while completing the program; update the EIR text to be consistent with the Navy’s IRP Site 2 groundwater program; and review erosion control measures to ensure that the Navy’s IRP Site 2 landfill capping project would not be negatively impacted.

Ms. Rudolph’s MCAS El Toro RAB Subcommittee Report

Ms. Rudolph reported during the RAB Subcommittee report how pleased she was that the Navy had provided an updated summary to the RAB regarding the Draft EIR for the Alton Parkway Extension. She emphasized the importance of the document, and relayed her confidence in the Navy’s ability to address each environmental issue at Former MCAS El Toro.

She requested that more information be provided on the Draft Final Defense Fuels Pipeline Closure Report regarding closure of the pipeline that runs from Norwalk to the former base.

Additionally, she said that she had attended the IRWD Desalter Ceremony on February 20, 2007. The event had an excellent turnout of attendees and was very successful.

Upcoming MCAS El Toro RAB Subcommittee Meeting

Mr. Newton stated that a mailer had been issued to the RAB members, requesting contact information for those interested in participating in a RAB Subcommittee meeting that will review the Draft FS

Report for IRP Site 1, Former Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) and Training Range Facility. The RAB Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2007, 5:30-8:30 p.m., in Room L-104 at Irvine City Hall. Anyone interested is welcome to attend.

NEW BUSINESS

Regulatory Agency Comment Update

Mr. Rich Muza, Project Manager, U.S. EPA, stated that the agency is in the process of recommending the signing of the Record of Decision (ROD) for IRP Sites 8 and 12, which would include removal of contaminants from the soil. An Operating Properly and Successfully Report for IRP Site 16 is currently being reviewed for concurrence. Recent reviews have included the operation and maintenance manuals for the SGU well field conveyance system, SGU treatment plant, and the Principal Aquifer treatment plant. Comments on the three manuals were provided during the second week of March 2007. Currently, U.S. EPA is completing review of the Draft FS report for IRP Site 1 and comments will be issued on March 30, 2007.

Mr. Quang Than, Project Manager, Cal/EPA DTSC, and Mr. John Broderick, Project Manager, Regional Water Quality Control Board, were not present. Both agency representatives informed Mr. Newton that they had no prepared statements for tonight's meeting.

Presentation – IRP Site 1, Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Training Range, Feasibility Study Update

Mr. Jim Callian, Remedial Project Manager (RPM), introduced himself, and informed the RAB he joined the IRP Site 1 project team in December 2006. He also introduced Mr. Crispin Wanyoike, Mr. Chris Cavers, and Mr. Hsien Chen, from Earth Tech. He thanked them for being present at tonight's meeting. He invited all interested RAB members to attend the RAB Subcommittee meeting on April 19, 2007.

Mr. Callian said tonight's presentation would provide an overview of the FS Report developed for IRP Site 1. The purpose of the FS is to assure the development and evaluation of appropriate remedial alternatives to address risks to human health and the environment at IRP Site 1. The presentation will focus on the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) and the different remedial alternatives that are being evaluated. There are three sets of alternatives that address soil impacted by munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), naphthalene-impacted soil, and perchlorate-impacted groundwater, respectively.

Information covering the site's size and location at the former station was also presented. The site is located in the northeastern portion of Former MCAS El Toro and covers approximately 72 acres. The different areas at the site consist of the secured range perimeter, Northern EOD Training Range, buffer zone, Southern EOD Training Range, and ephemeral pond located on IRP Site 1.

Mr. Callian explained the FS approach consists of the following general steps:

1. Refine the Conceptual Site Model – This involves summarizing the nature and extent of chemical releases. Identifying impacted environmental media is necessary and is followed by determining the fate and transport of constituents of potential concern (COPCs). An evaluation of potential receptors and exposure pathways is conducted. Risks to human-health and the environment are also evaluated. Future site use is also incorporated into the conceptual site model. The Navy anticipates future site use as continued like-use explicitly as an ordnance disposal training range.
2. Define the Scope of the FS – This involves identifying environmental media and COPCs requiring remedial action alternative analysis.
3. Develop RAOs – These are developed for each COPC and respective environmental media of concern. RAOs are based on protection of human-health and the environment and Applicable or

Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (local, state, and federal laws and policies) also referred to as ARARs.

4. Develop General Response Actions – These are developed to satisfy the RAOs and are specific for each environmental media and associated COPCs.

Mr. Callian explained that the scope of the Feasibility Study includes three key steps.

1. Identify and Evaluate Remediation Technologies and Process Options – These are individually evaluated for their effectiveness to achieve RAOs, technical and administrative implementability, and cost.

2. Develop Remedial Alternatives – Technologies and process options are assembled to develop a range of remedial alternatives. Based on a review of the Remedial Investigation Report for IRP Site 1 and the updated conceptual site model, RAOs and remedial alternatives were developed for the following media of concern:

- Soil potentially containing MEC that poses an elevated explosive safety risk. MEC at IRP Site 1 is primarily fragments and shards of munitions used in training exercises at the former base. However, MEC could potentially contain unexploded primers and other explosive compounds and are treated with extreme care.
- Soil impacted with naphthalene at concentrations greater than Cal-Modified Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) for industrial soil. Naphthalene is a compound in fuels that can be both a semivolatile organic compound and or a volatile organic compound. Being a fuel constituent, naphthalene is a lot more stable than gasoline or finger nail polish remover; it will not evaporate at room temperature.
- Groundwater containing perchlorate at concentrations posing unacceptable risk to human health.

3. Analysis of Remedial Alternatives – Analysis involves applying individual analysis following the nine National Contingency Plan (NCP) criteria. This is followed by a comparative analysis to identify relative advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.

Remedial alternatives for MEC-Impacted Soil

Mr. Chen explained that based on COPCs, potential exposure pathways, and risks to human health and the environment, the RAO that was developed for MEC-impacted soil was to minimize exposure potential to MEC that results in unacceptable hazards to future receptors at IRP Site 1. Mr. Chen stated that the remedial alternatives for the MEC-impacted soil range from the least intensity increasing to the highest intensity.

Alternative M-1: No Action – The No Action alternative is required by the National Contingency Plan and the Superfund Program as a basis for comparison of remedial alternatives.

Alternative M-2: Institutional Controls (ICs) and Access Restrictions

- ICs and access restrictions would limit potential exposure to MEC-impacted soil and cover a range of protective controls and restrictions. Specifically, ICs and access restrictions would:
 - provide for and maintain the integrity of physical controls used to restrict access and unauthorized use of the site;
 - prohibit use of the property for any purpose other than as an EOD training range including land disturbing activities prior written approval of the Department of the Navy's (DON) cognizant explosives safety expert;
 - require that land disturbing activities conducted as a part of EOD training shall

- be conducted under the supervision of qualified personnel;
- allow for potential future monitoring and maintenance activities by the DON and oversight by the FFA signatories; and
- prohibit removal of or damage to security features without prior written approval by the DON.

Alternative M-3: Near Surface Excavation and Off-Site Disposal of MEC Items plus ICs and Access Restrictions

- MEC would be removed from IRP Site 1 to the extent that it does not pose an elevated explosive hazard for the potential future land-use of open space/wildlife reserve.
- Excavation of shallow surface soil containing metallic anomalies to a depth of 1 foot at Northern and Southern EOD Training Ranges. This is necessary for like-use according to Department of Defense (DoD) guidance.
- On-site screening/sifting of excavated soil to remove metallic objects with the use of electromagnetic instrumentation would be conducted.
- Evaluation of metallic objects to assess potential MEC hazard prior to demilitarization and off-site disposal/recycling as scrap would be performed. Mr. Chen explained that most of the objects found at IRP Site 1 are municipal munitions debris; however, there is the potential to find items that have a fuse or powder that could pose a hazard. If these items are found, they are dealt with according to DoD guidance that requires that such items found be saw cut or physically changed in shape to be unrecognizable as ammunition. After this procedure, these items would be sent to a proper disposal facility.
- Backfilling site with sifted soil would also be conducted.

Alternative M-4: Comprehensive Excavation and Off-Site Disposal of MEC Items

- MEC would be removed such that it would not pose elevated explosive hazard for the potential residential reuse scenario.
- Excavation of soil containing metallic anomalies at the Northern and Southern EOD Training Ranges would be conducted. This approach would include iterative application of geophysical mapping and would remove all metallic anomalies. The excavation process would include applying geophysics evaluation and removal steps several times until no more geophysical anomalies are detected or until excavation reaches 12 to 14 feet in depth.
- On-site screening of excavated soil to remove metallic objects would be conducted.
- An evaluation of removed metallic objects to assess potential MEC hazard, prior to demilitarization and off-site disposal/recycling as metallic scrap, would be conducted.
- Backfilling site with sifted soil would also be conducted.

Remedial Alternatives for Naphthalene-Impacted Soil

Mr. Chen discussed the RAOs for naphthalene-impacted soil. Under an industrial reuse scenario, the Navy's objective would be to minimize potential for exposure to soil containing naphthalene at concentrations greater than the California-Modified PRG for industrial soil of 4.2 milligrams per kilogram (mg/Kg). Specifically, this RAO is based on the potential exposure pathways and risks to human-health under an industrial use scenario whereby a receptor is assumed to be exposed to soil from 0 to 10 feet deep. Remedial alternatives were then presented.

Alternative N-1: No Action

Alternative N-2: ICs and Access Restrictions

- ICs would:
 - restrict existing and future land-uses and activities to minimize potential exposure to naphthalene-impacted soil; and
 - allow access for monitoring and maintenance activities by the DON and for oversight by the FFA signatories.

ICs would be implemented by the DON through a Memorandum of Understanding or Quitclaim Deeds and a “Covenant to Restrict Use of Property” depending upon whether IRP Site 1 is transferred to a Federal or non-Federal entity, respectively.

Alternative N-3: Excavation and Off-Site Disposal of Naphthalene-Impacted Soil

- Naphthalene-impacted soil exceeding the California-modified PRG for industrial soil (4.2 mg/Kg) would be removed to a depth of 10 feet below ground surface from the central portion of IRP Site 1 (near Borehole B-1).
- Excavated naphthalene-impacted soil (~110 cubic yards) would be sifted to remove any metallic objects, then sampled and characterized prior to being transported to an off-station disposal facility. Due to the fact that the area is an EOD range and there is the potential of finding MEC, it may be necessary to conduct sifting procedures and geophysical evaluations for metals.
- Confirmation soil samples would then be collected from the sidewalls of the excavation to demonstrate that the removal action goal has been achieved.
- The excavation area would be backfilled with clean soil and compacted.

Mr. Chen used a slide to present information on Alternatives N-2 and N-3. He pointed out that the Northern EOD Training Range is known to have had the most intensive activity. Naphthalene-impacted areas on the slide were discussed, in addition to areas that were non-detect or below the threshold for naphthalene (known as “clean” datapoints). The scientific way to estimate a volume is to go halfway from the “dirty” to the next “clean” excavation pothole and sample. After excavation is complete, confirmation samples would be collected from the sidewall of the excavation area to determine if the preliminary remediation goal (PRG) goal of 4.2 mg/Kg for naphthalene-impacted soil has been met. Currently, the Navy is estimating that 110 cubic yards of naphthalene-impacted soil is present at the site.

Remedial Alternatives for Perchlorate-Impacted Groundwater

Mr. Chen discussed the RAOs for perchlorate-impacted groundwater. The Navy intends to: 1) minimize the potential for domestic use of perchlorate-impacted groundwater that results in non-cancer Hazard Index (HI) of greater than 1; and 2) to minimize potential off-Station migration of perchlorate impacted groundwater that results in a non-cancer HI of greater than 1. These RAOs are based on the COPCs, potential exposure pathways, risks to human-health and the environment, and potential ARARs. A site-specific risk assessment indicated that the concentration of perchlorate that results in a non-cancer HI of 1 for a potential off-Station adult resident is 24.4 micrograms per liter (µg/L).

Alternative G-1: No Action

Alternative G-2: Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) and ICs – This includes documenting and monitoring over time to determine over time how contamination of impacted groundwater evolves. Although certain concentrations may exceed 24.4 µg/L, the biological activity underground will naturally biodegrade the contamination. Mr. Chen explained that groundwater flows into the Borrego Canyon Wash area, and the natural biodegradation in the area is made possible due to indigenous bacteria that use perchlorate as food, changing it into an innocuous material.

Alternative G-3: Containment Near the Station Boundary Plus MNA and ICs – This alternative consists of a containment system along the station boundary to ensure that groundwater passing at the boundary line through would meet requirements for perchlorate. This alternative also consists of two option alternatives.

Mr. Chen explained that perchlorate flows with the groundwater gradient from the north toward the south and IRP Site 2. The detection of perchlorate in the groundwater flow is coincidental with the surface ephemeral stream that runs between IRP Site 1 and IRP Site 2. He also presented a slide that showed data points depicting perchlorate levels at the threshold of 24.4 µg/L and below the threshold of 24.4 µg/L.

- Option G-3a: Permeable Reactive Barrier (PRB) and In-Situ Bioremediation – PRB is a biodegradation approach that allows the environment to become suitable for the indigenous bacteria to grow, multiply and consume the perchlorate. The PRB can utilize trenches or wells to inject the microbes.
- Option G-3b: Groundwater Recirculation system and In-Situ Bioremediation – This objective of this option is the same as G-3 but uses a different technology. The containment is conducted using a groundwater recirculation system, which actively injects the substrate and pumps the water instead of letting the water passively go through.

Alternative G-4: Perchlorate Source Area Control plus MNA and ICs – This alternative consists of two alternatives with different options for addressing perchlorate.

- Option G-4a: Source Area Control Using PRB - This option includes a passive PRB line.
- Option G-4b: In-Situ Treatment of the Perchlorate Source Area using Direct Injection – This option includes numerous injection wells located at the source area. A substrate would be injected with material that would enhance the microbes.

Alternative G-5: In-Situ Treatment of the Perchlorate Source Area and the Selected Portions of Downgradient Groundwater using Direct Injection and PRB plus MNA and ICs – This alternative is similar to Alternative G-4b, but also includes selected portions of the downgradient groundwater.

Alternative G-6: Ex-Situ Remediation of Perchlorate-Impacted Groundwater and Infiltration of Treated Groundwater Plus ICs – *Ex-Situ* means to remove the groundwater from the ground, treat it on the surface, and then put it back into the ground.

- Option G-6a: Ex-Situ Treatment with Fluidized Bed Reactor – The Fluidized Bed Reactor treatment technology is a biodegradation reactor.
- Option G-6b: Ex-Situ Treatment with Ion Exchange – Ion exchange uses a resin bed that allows for surface area to absorb perchlorate from the groundwater. The perchlorate-soaked resin bed is either recycled or disposed of after a certain period of time.

Mr. Callian explained that the conservative nature of the site-specific human-health risk assessment helped derive the promulgated cleanup goal for perchlorate of 24.4 µg/L, and assumes residential, domestic use of groundwater would occur. Residential use includes using the groundwater for showering, dishes, drinking, and cooking for 30 years.

Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Callian then discussed the comparative analysis of the alternatives presented. The comparative analysis is conducted using nine NCP criteria. The nine criteria fall into three categories: threshold criteria, primary balancing criteria, and modifying criteria. He briefly named the nine criteria.

Threshold criteria:

- 1) Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment
- 2) Compliance with ARARs

Primary balancing criteria:

- 3) Long-Term Effectiveness
- 4) Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume through Treatment
- 5) Short-Term Effectiveness
- 6) Implementability
- 7) Cost

Modifying criteria:

- 8) State Acceptance
- 9) Community Acceptance

Mr. Callian explained that community acceptance is evaluated following the public comment period and will be presented in the ROD. He clarified that the FS Report does not recommend or identify a preferred alternative. A preferred alternative will be identified after review of all the alternatives and the evaluation against the nine NCP evaluation criteria. The preferred remedy is presented in the Proposed Plan along with the other alternatives. Comments from the public and regulatory agencies on the preferred remedy and other alternatives evaluated will be presented in the Responsiveness Summary section of the ROD.

Estimated Costs

Mr. Callian provided the estimated cost ranges for the remedial alternatives presented in the FS Report.

MEC-impacted soil costs range from \$250,000 to \$5 million dollars.

Naphthalene-impacted soil costs range from \$191,000 to \$475, 000 dollars.

Perchlorate-impacted groundwater costs range from \$2.7 to \$9.2 million dollars.

The time to achieve the cleanup goals ranges from 20 years to 30 years.

Schedule

Comments from the regulatory agencies on the Draft FS Report are due March 30, 2007.

The RAB Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2007, from 5:30-8:30 p.m., at Irvine City Hall in Room L-104

The Draft Final FS Report is due May 1, 2007.

The public meeting to present the Proposed Plan is scheduled for October 2007.

Discussion

Mr. Worthington inquired if the current plan was to transfer IRP Site 1 property to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Mr. Callian responded that the Navy is transferring the property to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for continued like-use.. Mr. Worthington stated that he thought once the EOD range was closed it would not be transferred for continued like-use. Mr. Newton clarified that the EOD training range is inactive not "closed." The FAA wants the property, and has indicated to the Navy that they [FAA] will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the FBI. It is up to the State of California and the FBI to negotiate any details for continued like-use; the Navy is not involved in that process.

Ms. Rudolph asked if the property is used for like-use, what protection the citizens have that a reoccurrence of contamination will not take place in the future. She further questioned if there was a

technology or practice in existence that could prevent the site from becoming re-contaminated. Mr. Newton replied that the Navy was cleaning up contaminants on the property that had been released during the Navy's ownership of the property. However, if another party introduces a new contaminant on the property, the responsibility would be theirs [the new property owner] to address. Mr. Newton reiterated that the FBI would need to enter into an agreement with the State of California that would include provisions to ensure that the FBI will not contaminate the area or that mitigation measures would be in place. This involves a permit process. Mr. Muza referenced Mr. Manny Alonzo, of DTSC, as a person who was very knowledgeable on this issue regarding the permit process and provisions to ensure property would not become contaminated, and covenant issues.

Mr. Peter Hersh, RAB member, asked if a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is put into place before like-use could occur. Mr. Newton replied that the Navy is going to look into NEPA requirements for the next RAB meeting. Mr. Malloy asked, if the FBI uses the property for like-use, can a distinction be made for chemicals present due to past Navy activities versus future FBI activities. Mr. Callian said the situation would be resolved through DTSC and U.S. EPA's permit process.

Mr. Hersh asked which remedial alternatives for IRP Site 1 are favored by the Navy. Mr. Newton replied that the Navy is currently evaluating all alternatives, and the final decision will come later in the process. Further, Mr. Hersh questioned what perchlorate is broken down to during bioremediation. Mr. Chen clarified that perchlorate is a salt that is absorbed and broken down into chloride ions and oxygen. Mr. Hersh also asked if drought conditions would have an effect on remedial alternatives that address perchlorate. Drought conditions or rainy seasons will not affect the decision regarding any of the remedy alternatives.

Mr. Newton stated that as of right now, the promulgated cleanup goal for perchlorate is 24.4 µg/L. In the event that the State of California promulgates a different standard, the Navy did not want to be in a position where a full analysis had not been conducted. Therefore, the Navy has included an evaluation of the States' health risk goal of 6 µg/L in Appendix A of the FS Report. He noted that the alternative cleanup goal of 6 µg/L (in Appendix A) increases the cost and duration of the remedial alternatives; however, it does not change the technology behind the remedial alternatives.

Mr. Newton further explained that no decisions have been made regarding remedial alternatives. The Navy can either select portions or combinations of alternatives, or evaluate the alternatives from a holistic approach. This subject will be explored more in depth at the April 19, 2007 RAB Subcommittee meeting that will focus on the FS Report for IRP Site 1, Former EOD Training Range Facility.

Open Q&A/Discussion -- Environmental Topics

Mr. Newton explained that there is a pipeline that is approximately 29 miles long that extends from Norwalk to El Toro, running along Irvine Boulevard. Lennar (developer) removed a section of the pipeline from Parcel IC and 2U, which is part of the Navy's Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) #3. The Navy prepared a supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey to define the property, and is currently seeking a closure report from the developer as they remove the pipeline. Once the closure report is received, the Navy will issue the document to DTSC. Following DTSC's approval of the pipeline closure, the Navy will transfer the property.

MEETING EVALUATION AND FUTURE TOPICS

Upcoming RAB Meeting and Subcommittee Meeting

The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m., Wednesday, May 30, 2007, at Irvine City Hall, One Civic Center Plaza, Irvine in the Conference and Training Center. The next regular RAB Subcommittee meeting will also be held on, from 5:00 to 6:00, in Room L-104, at Irvine City

Hall. The RAB Subcommittee meeting for IRP Site 1 will be held on April 19, from 5:30-8:30, in Room L-104.

Future RAB Meeting Presentation Topics

Mr. Newton suggested that future topics include:

- IRP Site 2 Landfill (revegetation)
- Anomaly Area 3
- RAB Subcommittee Report on IRP Site 1

Recent RAB Subcommittee Meetings

The most recent RAB Subcommittee meeting was held March 28, 2007, in Room L-104, Irvine City Hall, before the RAB meeting. The RAB Subcommittee meeting report presented in these meeting minutes provides an update on the latest issues expressed.

RAB Meeting Adjournment – March 28, 2007 Meeting

The 86th meeting of the MCAS El Toro Restoration Advisory Board was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

3/28/07 RAB Meeting Attendance

TOTAL PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE	TOTAL PEOPLE ON SIGN-IN SHEET	TOTAL RAB MEMBERS PRESENT	TOTAL RAB AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT	TOTAL RAB COMMUNITY MEMBERS PRESENT	TOTAL EXCUSED ABSENCES RAB MEMBERS	EXCUSED ABSENCES – AGENCY RAB/ COMMUNITY RAB
27	20	7	4	3	1	1/0

RAB and Subcommittee Meeting and Public Meeting Dates

RAB Members - The list below indicates which dates are currently reserved for RAB and RAB Subcommittee meetings at Irvine City Hall, Conference and Training Center, Room L-102, and Room L-104, respectively. Please note that dates on this list may also serve as combined RAB/public meetings.

RAB and Subcommittee Meeting Dates (meeting space confirmed)	RAB Meeting Conference and Training Center (CTC) or Room L-102 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.	Subcommittee Meeting Room L-104 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Wed – April 19, 2007 - RAB Subcommittee Meeting	No RAB Meeting	Room L-104 – 5:30-8:30
Wed - May 30, 2007 - RAB and RAB Subcommittee Meeting	CTC	Room L-104

Materials/Handouts Available at the 3/28/07 RAB Meeting Include:

- *RAB Meeting Agenda/Public Notice – 3/28/07 RAB Meeting – 86th Meeting.
- *Meeting Minutes from the 1/31/07 RAB Meeting – 85th Meeting.
- MCAS El Toro RAB Mission Statement and Operating Procedures.
- MCAS El Toro – Navy Team contact information.
- MCAS El Toro – BRAC Cleanup Team Members and Key Project Representatives and Administrative Record File and Information Repository Locations and Contacts.
- MCAS El Toro RAB – Membership Application.
- MCAS El Toro RAB – Membership Roster
- MCAS El Toro RAB – Mailing List Coupon.
- MCAS El Toro RAB – Environmental Websites.
- Reuse – Redevelopment Information.
- One-Page Glossary of Technical Terms.
- Former MCAS El Toro- IRP Sites 18 and 24 (Timelines 1985-1999 and 2000-2006), Activities Pertaining to Soil and Groundwater Investigations and Cleanup.
- Buildings/Structures/Facilities Within Leasable Parcels Finding of Suitability to Lease, Former MCAS El Toro, August 2005.
- Environmental Condition of Property (with Carve-Out Boundaries), Former MCAS El Toro, August 2005.
- Department of Defense – Responsibility for Additional Environmental Cleanup after Transfer of Real Property, July 1997.
- Department of Defense – A Guide to Establishing Institutional Controls at Closing Military Installations, February 1998.
- Department of the Navy – Policy for Conducting Comprehensive environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLS) Statutory Five-Year Reviews, November 2001.
- Department of the Navy – Policy for Optimizing Remedial and Removal Actions under the Environmental Restoration Programs, April 2004.
- Department of Defense – Perchlorate Work Group Packet, January 2006.
- Department of Defense – Institutional Controls, Spring 1997.
- U.S. EPA Fact Sheet – A Citizen’s Guide to Natural Attenuation, October 1996.
- U.S. EPA Fact Sheet – Perchlorate Update, March 2002.
- U.S. EPA Fact Sheet – Superfund Sites: Five-Year Review, June 2001.
- MCAS El Toro RAB Inquiry – Environmental Data Quality, September 2003.
- Commonly Asked Questions Regarding The Use of Natural Attenuation for Chlorinated Solvent Spills at Federal Facilities.
- IRP *Presentation* – IRP Site 1, Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Training Range, Feasibility Study Update, Presented by Jim Callian, Navy BRAC Project Manager and Hsien Chen and Chris Cavers, Earth Tech, March 28, 2007 RAB meeting.

* Mailed to all RAB meeting mailer recipients on 3/21/07.

Agency Comments and Letters - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)

- No Items Submitted

Agency Comments and Letters – California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA)

- No Items Submitted

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

- No Items Submitted

California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Santa Ana Region

- No Items Submitted

Copies of all past RAB meeting minutes and handouts are available at the MCAS El Toro Information Repository, located at the Heritage Park Regional Library in Irvine. The address is 14361 Yale Avenue, Irvine; the telephone number is (949) 936-4040. Library hours are Monday through Thursday, 10 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Friday and Saturday, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sunday 12 p.m. to 5 p.m.

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 El Toro RAB information: http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/eltoro/rab_information.aspx

Department of Defense – Environmental Cleanup Home Page Web Site:

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

U.S. EPA:

www.epa.gov (this is the homepage)

www.epa.gov/superfund (site for Superfund)

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

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

www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-IMPACT/2004/April/Day-27/i9203.htm (site for Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat for the Riverside fairy shrimp)

Cal/EPA:

www.calepa.ca.gov (this is the homepage)

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

www.swrcb.ca.gov/ (site for Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board)