

FORMER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

September 26, 2007

MEETING MINUTES

The 88th Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for former Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro was held Wednesday, September 26, 2007 at Irvine City Hall. The meeting began at 6:36 p.m. These minutes summarize the RAB meeting discussions and presentations.

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator for former MCAS El Toro and Navy RAB Co-Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Marcia Rudolph, RAB Subcommittee Chair, lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Weissenborn introduced himself to RAB members and meeting attendees. He stated that he had been with the Navy for about 5 years and had previously worked in the private sector. He expressed his gratitude for the warm welcome he received from the MCAS El Toro RAB members. Mr. Weissenborn then asked for self-introductions of those in attendance.

The RAB meeting agenda was reviewed by Mr. Weissenborn. Presentations will cover 1) Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Sites 18 and 24 Remedial Action Status Update, and 2) IRP Sites 2 and 17 Remedial Action Status Update.

Announcements

Mr. Weissenborn reviewed the MCAS El Toro RAB meeting introduction slides. He presented an excerpt from the former MCAS El Toro Mission Statement and added that in the future he does not plan to use the Mission Statement excerpt unless it is needed. He reviewed the contact information for the Navy team members, the regulatory agencies, the RAB Community Co-Chair, and the RAB Subcommittee Chair.

The RAB meeting schedule was presented. It is based on the assumption of holding meeting every other month (for 2007 the RAB agreed to hold five meetings). Mr. Weissenborn suggested the possibility of switching RAB meetings to a quarterly schedule and that this suggestion does not require an immediate decision. An email will be issued to the RAB members regarding the topic. This was not a statement that I made

Mr. Weissenborn emphasized that he is always available regarding any questions or concerns and that the best phone number to reach him at is 619-532-0952. Mr. Weissenborn stressed that the Navy is here to answer all public questions. He said that there is no secret decision making. The BRAC Cleanup Team (Navy, United States Environmental Protection Agency [U.S. EPA] California Environmental Protection Agency [Cal/EPA] Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC] and Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board]) engage in extended and frank discussions regarding site decisions and it takes time reach mutual consent.

Links to the BRAC Program Management Office (PMO) website were provided, in addition to the regulatory agency websites. Mr. Weissenborn said that not all MCAS El Toro reports are available on the BRAC PMO website; however, important summary information regarding the former station is available. The Department of Defense websites provide a lot of educational material. Additionally, the regulatory agency websites provide information specific to former MCAS El Toro and an abundant amount of general information regarding environmental restoration.

Currently, there is a discussion regarding the possibility of converting the Information Repository hard copy documents into electronic copies for better public dissemination. The Information Repository is located at the Heritage Park Regional Library in Irvine and it provides reports and documents for public review.

The Administrative Record, located at former MCAS El Toro in Building 307, contains all documentation pertaining to the cleanup at the former station. Contact Marge Flesch at 949-726-5398 for more information on viewing documents at this location.

Mr. Weissenborn stated that there were no action items from the May 30, 2007 RAB meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Review and Approval of the May 30, 2007 RAB Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weissenborn asked if there were any comments regarding the May 30, 2007 RAB meeting minutes. No objections or input were noted. Mr. Bob Woodings, RAB Community Co-Chair, motioned for approval and Ms. Rudolph seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were approved without amendment.

MCAS El Toro RAB Subcommittee Report – Ms. Marcia Rudolph, RAB Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Rudolph welcomed Mr. Weissenborn to the MCAS El Toro RAB. She thanked the regulatory agency representatives for their attendance and participation at tonight's RAB Subcommittee meeting.

She stated that she was very happy that the DTSC has finalized the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for perchlorate at 6.0 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) that takes effect on October 18, 2007. She expressed interest in Mr. Weissenborn's thoughts regarding the MCL for perchlorate.

Ms. Rudolph said that she had received the IRP Site 1 Environmental Summary Document and was very interested in learning more. She said it appears there is no mechanism for commenting on the document and inquired if this is possible.

Additionally, she questioned if there was an Environmental Summary Document for IRP Site 2. If so, Ms. Rudolph requested a copy.

She stated that the RAB Subcommittee is pleased with the Navy's direction to group IRP Sites 1 and 2 together in regard to perchlorate groundwater issues. She commented that it was "about time."

Ms. Rudolph asked which technology would be used to address trichloroethene (TCE) and perchlorate in groundwater at IRP Sites 1 and 2.

Mr. Weissenborn responded to the questions raised by the RAB Subcommittee.

- He stated that he would respond to Ms. Rudolph's question regarding comments on the Environmental Summary Document for IRP Site 1 at a later point and report back to RAB. The document is being prepared to support the Fed-to-Fed transfer for IRP Site 1.
- He will investigate to determine if there is an IRP Site 2 Environmental Summary Document and will inform the RAB.
- The Navy accepts the 6.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$ MCL for perchlorate.

NEW BUSINESS

Regulatory Agency Comment Update

Mr. Rich Muza, U.S. EPA, reported that this agency is currently working with the Navy and DTSC to define a new plan to address groundwater for IRP Sites 1 and 2. Soil at Site 1 will be addressed separately and this includes any munitions debris cleanup at IRP Site 1.

The U.S. EPA has approved three operation and maintenance (O&M) plans for the groundwater treatment systems for IRP Sites 18 and 24 for the main TCE plume as follows: O&M of 30 on-site extraction wells, prepared by the Navy; a treatment plant and disposal of treated groundwater via discharge, prepared by the Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD); O&M of three wells and the principal aquifer treatment plant system, prepared by IRWD. Operating systems are in place and are being monitored to make sure cleanup of the TCE plume is progressing.

Also, U.S. EPA and Navy attorneys have discussed the Record of Decision (ROD) for IRP Sites 3 and 5. Mr. Muza stated that he anticipates ROD completion by the end of the 2007 calendar year.

Mr. Quang Than, DTSC, stated that in California on October 18, 2007, the 6.0 µg/L MCL for perchlorate becomes law.

Presentation – Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Sites 18 and 24 Remedial Action Status Update presented by Marc P. Smits, Navy Project Manager and Patty Uematsu, Project Manager, IRWD

IRP Site 24 – Shallow Groundwater System

Mr. Smits stated that the last time the RAB was presented a remedial action status update covering IRP Sites 18 and 24 was in March 2007. Since the celebration for the start-up of the system in January 2007, the shallow groundwater system (IRP Site 24) has been operating for eight months. The Navy has collected groundwater samples at various locations to evaluate cleanup remedy effectiveness. The presentation covered operational status, routine and non-routine maintenance, the capture zone analysis, system documentation, the Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) Report, and the schedule. A highlight of the presentation was showing the RAB how “capture zone analysis” tools are used to evaluate whether the installed remedy matches the intent of the design.

Mr. Smits said the extraction wells for IRP Site 24 were placed in the middle of the plume where the highest concentrations of contamination were present. The wells at the former station boundary were installed to prevent TCE from migrating further offsite.

All 39 extraction wells are operational, with a combined pumping rate of approximately 540 gallons per minute (gpm). Originally, the Navy projected a rate of 550 gpm; thus, the Navy considers the current pumping rate a success. Extracted groundwater is pumped to the IRWD treatment plant for treatment and disposal. As of September 26, 2007, IRWD has pumped and treated 150 million gallons of groundwater. The Navy and IRWD are currently working out communication and programming kinks between the Navy pumping system and the IRWD treatment system. Approximately 250 pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), mainly TCE, have been removed from the groundwater since October 2006, when system start-up and shakedown began. Mr. Smits said that, technically, the system has been operating for about 1 year.

Mr. Smits reviewed the routine maintenance of IRP Site 24. Routine maintenance includes system and equipment inspection that is conducted on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis. Regular inspection of transfer station components is conducted to make sure tanks, pumps, valves, and monitors are fully operational. Collection of groundwater samples at the transfer station and extraction wells is needed to evaluate the system over time and determine if concentrations are fluctuating. Communication is an integral part of the system programming. There are two separate systems – one for accepting extracted water and another for pumping the water to the treatment system. All the kinks have been worked out

and no problems have been encountered. Operations staff “walk the line” on a monthly basis in to make sure that clearances are maintained and redevelopment activities have not negatively impacted the extraction well components or conveyance pipelines. Routine checkups provide security for the extraction well boxes and the transfer station to make sure that the site is not unnecessarily accessed.

Mr. Smits showed a graphic depicting the computer screen of the extraction well field that system operators use that shows all 39 wells currently operating. Mr. Smits explained that the yellow color shown on the screen indicates either a past repair or inspection of certain wells was conducted, or situations where the wells had a low water level.

Mr. Smits stated that an incident had occurred where there was a break to a water main where a contractor was unaware that a pipeline was present. The problem also involved incorrect switching of an isolation valve. Another problem occurred with some of the transfer pumps due to the air stripping process that changes the pH of the treated water. Changes in the pH resulted in scaling. Subsequently, the Navy resolved this problem by adding an anti-scaling agent. Programming issues between the Navy and IRWD systems were also resolved. Additionally, there has been replacement of extraction well pumps and water level sensors. Electrical surge issues have been repaired as well.

A picture of the isolation valves closure was shown. Mr. Smits explained that isolation valve shutoff can lower flow rates. When the water break incident occurred, personnel originally thought that the feeder line was the main line. The valve was shut down and the alarm was activated, along with a relief valve. Navy contractors repaired the situation in less than an hour. This event prompted application of better security measures.

The purpose of the capture zone analysis for IRP Site 24 is to evaluate if the extraction well system is capturing the plume. Initially, the extraction well system pumped at approximately 400 gallons gpm, capturing 90 percent of the plume. Currently, the system is capturing 100 percent of the plume. The capture zone analysis will be conducted quarterly and annually to make sure that the capture zone is maintained at 100 percent. A detailed picture of the capture zone analysis was shown. Mr. Smits explained that particle tracking was conducted in the plume to determine if extraction wells capture TCE within the contaminated water. The process revealed that the system was operating properly. It is anticipated that the plume will continue to shrink, but that some contaminated areas in the middle will take longer to treat and restore.

IRP Site 24 system documents include: the Final O&M Manual for the Shallow Groundwater Unit Wellfield and Conveyance System; the Final Performance Monitoring and Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for IRP Site 18 (off-site plume) and IRP Site 24 (on-site plume); and the Final Interim-Remedial Action Completion Report (I-RACR) for IRP Site 24. All three documents were issued in August 2007 and will be useful in the operation, evaluation, and future modification to the IRP Site 24 system. Additionally, the documents have been placed in the Information Repository and the Administrative Record for public access.

Mr. Smits explained that OPS Report provides an evaluation of system design, construction, and implementation that demonstrate the selected remedy is operating effectively. The Navy is mandated to provide documentation that the remedy has been implemented in accordance with an approved remedial design, is protective of human health and the environment, is enforceable, is based on reliable technology, and is operating within a site that has been adequately characterized.

The I-RACR document, the Quarterly Groundwater and System Operation Data Summary Report, and the Annual Remedy Status Reports (including capture zone analysis) will be used as the basis for demonstrating that the remedy has met the criteria for OPS. After all criteria are met, the OPS designation is provided by the U.S. EPA. The property would then be available for transfer. Mr. Smits reviewed the upcoming project schedule for the OPS Report. The Draft OPS Report is planned to be submitted for a 60-day regulatory agency review on November 15, 2007. Regulatory agency comments on the Draft OPS Report will be resolved, this process involves close coordination between the Navy and regulatory agencies and is followed by the issuance the Draft Final OPS that is scheduled for March 17, 2008. The Final OPS Report is planned for completion and release on April 25, 2008.

Discussion

Mr. Ray Ouellette, RAB meeting attendee, asked how long the system will need to keep operating if the transfer is planned to occur in 2008. Mr. Smits replied that the answer depends on progress over time. The Navy does not anticipate that the concentrations will change over the next couple of months; however, the Navy is aware that the treatment system will still be there and there are some issues that may not be resolved. Mr. Ouellette then asked if there were better alternatives for the use of water after it is treated other than discharge to the ocean. Mr. Smits responded that one option is reinjection, although it has not been used to date. However, only a portion of the water would potentially be able to be reinjected to the groundwater system and reinjection is being evaluated. Another possible option is for treated water to serve as a water supply for irrigation at the Great Park.

Mr. Peter Hersh, RAB member, requested a follow-up RAB meeting presentation on the treated water discharge issue. Mr. Smits said five rounds of data of discharged water have been collected through August 2007 and two of these rounds have been used as a baseline. It may be best to provide an update in January 2008.

Mr. Chris Crompton, RAB member, noted that the removal of 250 pounds of VOCs is a good start. He asked what the original loading estimate was for VOCs. Mr. Smits said that information is in the ROD and he would bring the document to the next RAB meeting. Mr. Crompton also asked if perchlorate issues were part of the reason that the Navy was not reinjecting the water. Mr. Smits replied that the Water Board has a general permit that pertains to reinjection; perchlorate levels are one of the permit parameters, and the permit calls for a limit of 6.0 µg/L for perchlorate.

Mr. Smits noted that soil vapor extraction (SVE) is a component of the groundwater remedy and it will be applied if needed. When groundwater is extracted the water table is lowered. This can leave an area where there may be residual TCE. He explained that when operational, SVE wells can remove the TCE vapors present in the soil. The Performance Monitoring Plan will help the Navy determine the need for SVE wells.

IRP Site 18 – Principal Aquifer System

Ms. Patty Uematsu, IRWD Project Manager, presented the IRP Site 18 Principal Aquifer Update in place of Mr. Steve Malloy, IRWD Principal Engineer. IRP Site 18 is the off-station portion of the plume with lower concentrations of TCE. The Principal Aquifer components consist of three wells (Well 78, Well ET-1, Well ET-2) and the Principal Aquifer Treatment Plant.

Ms. Uematsu said Well 78 is located at the corner of Culver Drive and Warner Avenue in Irvine. Well 78 is a former Irvine Company agricultural well that was rebuilt and began pumping on April 25, 2006 at a flow rate of 700 gpm. The TCE level is currently at 2.5 parts per billion (ppb). If levels increase, IRWD plans to treat the water extracted from this well at the Principal Aquifer Treatment Plant.

A graph of Well 78 flow was shown to show pumping rates. The well has been pumping consistently for a year and a half. In January 2007, there was a two-week period of down time when operations ceased due to low irrigation demand. Lately, there has been less rainfall, resulting in lower production.

Well ET-1 and the Principal Aquifer Treatment Plant are co-located at the intersection of Jeffrey Road and Irvine Center Drive in Irvine. Pumping began on August 16, 2007 at a flow rate of 800 gpm. The TCE level is currently 8.0 ppb. Ms. Uematsu explained the treatment process: water flows through the air stripper that removes TCE vapor from the water; then TCE vapor goes through carbon canister absorbers where the TCE adheres to the carbon. This treatment method allows IRWD to closely monitor the TCE levels.

A graph of Well ET-1 flow rate was presented. Data collection began in March 2007 and there was downtime after six months of operation due to repair and replacement of treatment equipment and pumps. This process was necessary due to the discovery of scaling within the pumps. The pumps were repaired and IRWD added anti-scaling materials consisting of calcium carbonate to protect the pumps. The downtime also allowed IRWD to fix heating element problems and improve the overall system design for the heaters.

Well ET-2 is located at the intersection of Culver Drive and Irvine Center Drive in Irvine in an underground well vault. Pumping began on January 3, 2007 and the flow rate is 900 gpm. TCE concentrations are currently at approximately 1.0 ppb. A graph of Well ET-2 flow rate was shown that also indicated communication errors regarding flow measurement during August 2007 regarding flow rates. IRWD is still working on improving communication errors.

Ms. Uematsu said IRWD has extracted a total of 1.1 billion gallons of groundwater to date. The total mass of TCE removed is 17 kilograms, which is equal to 37 pounds or 3 gallons.

A question was asked regarding whether there are any vapor issues pertaining to the TCE-contaminated groundwater. Ms. Uematsu replied that the groundwater in the Principal Aquifer is located at depths 100 to 200 feet below the ground surface. Vapor issues may occur when groundwater is present at 10 to 20 feet range below the surface, or in groundwater that is closer to the surface. Therefore, vapor intrusion is not an issue at this site.

Presentations – IRP Sites 2 Remedial Action Status Update presented by Rich Pribyl, Navy Project Manager, and Operation and Maintenance Plan for IRP Sites 2 and 17, presented by Crispin Wanvoike, Earth Tech

IRP Sites 2 Remedial Action Status Update

Mr. Pribyl said the presentation for the IRP Site 2 landfill would cover the location of the site, chronology of events, remedial action construction activities featuring before-and-after photographs, and a rundown of the next steps planned for the site.

A slide of IRP Sites 2 and 17 landfill locations was shown along with a slide showing specific areas of the IRP Site 2 landfill. Mr. Pribyl explained that the landfill was originally divided into two parts. As part of the remedy, the Navy collected and consolidated waste from other areas into the main landfill.

Mr. Pribyl presented a remedial action chronology for IRP Site 2:

- Interim ROD issued – July 2000
- Remedial Design (90-percent) completed – June 2002
- Pre-Construction Phase – October 2003 to March 2004
- Test Fill Construction and Borrow Source Evaluation – January to September 2005
- Remedial Action Preconstruction Activities – September 2005 to December 2005
- Final Remedial Design completed – November 2005
- Final Remedial Action Work Plan completed – December 2005
- Remedial Action Construction – December 2005 to the present

Various photographs of IRP Site 2 were presented, along with descriptions provided by Mr. Pribyl to show RAB members progress of remedial action construction at the site.

Waste Consolidation – C1 Area: Vegetation is present in both the September 2005 and current photos.

Waste Consolidation – C2 Area: A total of 100,000 yards of debris was excavated from this area and other consolidation areas (including the main landfill). Landfill side slopes were protected with riprap and jute net.

Overview of Landfill: Old drainage protection was salvaged on the main landfill. The subgrade was graded for drainage and then compacted.

Waste Consolidation Between Landfill Areas A and B: The area between these two areas was filled in and a 4-foot-thick evapotranspirative cap was then installed and covered with topsoil. Over 300,000 tons of soil material was used, which is equivalent to 100 trucks a day for 150 days straight. The flags in the photos indicate the layout for future planting.

Groundwater Monitoring Wells: Before-and-after comparison photos showed the re-established riprap and well coverings.

Well Abandonment: Two unused water production wells were “abandoned” and taken out of service. The Navy restored this area to a more natural state.

Drainage Features: The Navy’s goal is to protect the landfill from erosion by controlling run-on and run-off of surface water. This involves controlling the path and velocity of water flow. Gabion downdrains were installed to control run-off from the landfill and lined-trapezoidal channels and shotcrete v-ditches were constructed to control run-on of surface water.

Geotextile fabric material was placed where riprap runs along the edge of the landfill to provide erosion protection in Borrego Canyon Wash.

Site Access Road and Bridge: The site access bridge and site access road allow for maintenance year round.

Revegetation in Progress: The Navy has installed an irrigation system that has 70,000 feet of pipeline to restore over 40 acres of vegetation to its natural state. Native “volunteer” species have begun to appear and natural resource specialists are diligently working on importing cacti to the area.

Container Plants for Revegetation: There are currently approximately 14,000 individual plant species including native coastal sage scrub, beaver tail cacti, and other native species that have been cultivated for the site. Planting is scheduled to begin the week of September 24, 2007 and hydroseeding will follow. It will take 6 to 8 weeks to determine if planting methods are effective.

California Coastal Gnatcatcher: The revegetation design is based on the local habitat for this threatened bird. It has been a challenge to locate nests on site. Nests are no bigger than a small salad bowl and the eggs are no larger than the size of a marble.

The next steps for IRP Site 2 landfill construction include: the installation of fencing and permanent security features; revegetation of coastal sage scrub habitat for the threatened California coastal gnatcatcher; and the completion of the I-RACR documentation. IRP Site 17 landfill construction will follow a similar construction sequence to IRP Site 2. The next steps for IRP Site 14 are: mobilization and preconstruction activities to begin in fall 2007; cap construction through the spring 2008; revegetation scheduled to begin in fall 2008; and completion of the I-RACR.

Discussion

Mr. Woodings asked if the Navy was still using El Toro Materials as a supplier for the cover material for the site. Mr. Pribyl stated the Navy continues to use this company to supply the specific mixture. The focus over the summer has been on providing enough stockpiled material before the rainy season. The IRP Site 17 stockpile is visible from Irvine Boulevard. The restoration area of IRP Site 2 is 40 acres and will require around 300,000 tons of cover material. IRP Site 17 is smaller and will only require around 85,000 tons.

Mr. Crompton asked if the ratio was 1-to-1 for the replacement of the coastal sage scrub. Mr. Wanyoike explained that different ratios of revegetation are being implemented. In regard to the coastal sage scrub, there is a 1.5 (take out) to 1 (put back) ratio. The habitat quality largely played into the determination of the ratio. Mr. Pribyl said that a “plant palatte” was developed with certain percentages of plants in specific areas. The Navy is adhering to the objectives of the Biological Opinion and full restoration is expected in about 5 years.

Operation and Maintenance Plan for IRP Sites 2 and 17

Mr. Wanyoike said the purpose of the O&M Plan for IRP Sites 2 and 17 is to:

- Monitor the effectiveness of the landfill cap, drainage structures, groundwater monitoring systems, site security features;

- Verify that the constructed remedial systems perform as designed to protect human-health and the environment; and

Implement institutional controls as required in the Final Interim ROD.

Both landfills will be maintained and monitored for a period of not less than 30 years post-closure, or as long as wastes pose a threat to water quality (per Title 27 California Code of Regulations Sections 21180 and 20950).

The O&M Plan describes monitoring and maintenance and of various components and features of the landfill remedy, groundwater, leachate (soil moisture), and landfill-gas (LFG) systems. Specific components requiring monitoring and maintenance are:

- Vegetation (coastal sage scrub and mulefat);
- Settlement monuments;
- Erosion system;
- Drainage system;
- Site security features;
- Access roads;
- Lysimeters;
- Groundwater monitoring wells – program assesses groundwater conditions (e.g., chemical concentrations and groundwater levels) and evaluate the performance of the landfill cover;
- LFG monitoring probes - program assesses whether methane is accumulating and to assess if LFG concentrations exceed thresholds of methane at the site boundary; and
- Leachate program at IRP Site 17 – assesses soil moisture characteristics, if generated, as part of evaluating the performance of the landfill cover.

Mr. Wanyoike reviewed the frequency of inspection for each landfill feature as outlined in the O&M Plan.

- Coastal sage scrub and mulefat – 9 times during Year 1; 7 times during Years 2, 3, and 4; 4 times during Years 5 and 6; annually thereafter;
- Settlement monuments – quarterly until stabilized, annually thereafter, conduct aerial topographic survey every 5 years;
- Erosion – quarterly and following rainfall events in excess of 2 inches;
- Drainage system, site security features, access roads, groundwater monitoring wells, LFG monitoring probes, lysimeters – semiannually for 5 years and then annually thereafter.

The O&M Plan also includes a Land-use Control Plan that describes:

1. Land-use control objectives:
 - Maintain the integrity of the landfill covers by preventing excavations
 - Minimize infiltration of surface water
 - Prevent land-use that results in unacceptable risk to human-health and the environment
 - Protect landfill monitoring systems
 - Preserve access to the sites and associated monitoring systems
2. Legal mechanisms for ensuring the institutional controls are implemented correctly
3. Compliance reporting and notifications to the regulatory agencies
4. Periodic inspections and monitoring for documenting compliance with institutional controls

Mr. Wanyoike reviewed the reporting requirements outlined in the O&M Plan for IRP Sites 2 and 17. Semi-annual reports are issued to the regulatory agencies and include landfill gas and groundwater monitoring results and landfill inspection summaries. Annual reports provide a detailed evaluation of monitoring results and recommendations for optimizing monitoring locations and frequency. Every 5 years, in conjunction with the Five-Year Review, a comprehensive review of monitoring programs and recommendations for optimizing monitoring locations and frequency is completed.

The schedule for IRP Sites 2 and 17 O&M Plan was presented.

Draft O&M Plan – issued September 2007

Regulatory Agency Review – September-November 2007

Draft Final O&M Plan - first quarter 2008

Final O&M Plan – first quarter 2008

Upon completion of construction, initiate routine monitoring and maintenance – IRP Site 2 (first quarter 2008) and IRP Site 17 (fourth quarter 2008)

Discussion

Mr. Woodings stated that the City of Irvine, City of Lake Forest and County of Orange are interested in the Alton Parkway extension. He asked if the transfer of land at IRP Site 2 includes land for Alton Parkway extension. Mr. Wanyoike replied that there is carve-out area leased to the new owner. The carve-out area would not be transferred until after regulatory agency concurrence of the Final OPS Report. Mr. Weissenborn added that the construction of a roadway across IRP Site 2 would be beneficial and a better solution than a cap. However, the issue would be with excavation for utilities and drainage.

Mr. Woodings further questioned who was involved with the project environmental review form (PERF). Ms. Content Arnold, Lead Navy RPM, explained that PERFs are submitted to the Navy by the City of Irvine and Lennar when they request to conduct redevelopment projects on “leased land.” PERFs are reviewed by the Navy to determine if the projects impact the Navy’s environmental program. If so, the PERF needs to clearly state how the action may or may not affect the contaminated area. The regulatory agencies are kept informed and are aware of all PERFs submitted for Navy consideration.

Mr. Randy Kiefer, BRAC Navy Closure Project Leader, stated that he handles PERF issues. He said that the Navy conducts quarterly meetings with landowners and that the County of Orange and the Great Park are kept abreast of these issues, and they have been in contact with the Navy in regard to Alton Parkway.

OPEN Q&A/DISCUSSION -- ENVIRONMENTAL TOPICS

No other topics were discussed.

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, November 28, 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.

Future RAB Meeting Presentation Topics

Suggestions future topics include:

IRP Sites 18 and 24 update

IRP Sites 3 and 5 update

Follow-up on the Draft Annual Report for IRP Site 24

Options for discharged water from IRP Sites 18 and 24

Mr. Weissenborn emphasized to RAB attendees to please contact him regarding any suggestions for future meetings.

Recent RAB Subcommittee Meetings

The most recent RAB Subcommittee meeting was held September 26, 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 discussed.

RAB Meeting Adjournment – September 26, 2007 Meeting

The 88th meeting of the MCAS El Toro RAB was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

9/26/07 RAB Meeting Attendance

<u>TOTAL ATTENDANCE</u>	<u>TOTAL ON SIGN-IN SHEET</u>	<u>RAB MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>COMMUNITY MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>EXCUSED ABSENCES RAB MEMBERS</u>	<u>EXCUSED ABSENCES – AGENCY RAB/ COMMUNITY RAB</u>
23	22	8	5	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 - Nov. 28, 2007 - RAB and RAB Subcommittee Meeting	CTC	Room L-104
Wed - Jan. 30, 2008 - RAB and RAB Subcommittee Meeting	CTC	Room L-104
Wed - March 26, 2008 - RAB and RAB Subcommittee Meeting	CTC	Room L-104
Wed - May 28, 2008 - RAB and RAB Subcommittee Meeting	CTC	Room L-104

Materials/Handouts Available at the 9/26/07 RAB Meeting Include:

- *RAB Meeting Agenda/Public Notice – 9/26/07 RAB Meeting – 88th Meeting
- *Meeting Minutes from the 5/30/07 RAB Meeting – 87th 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 (CERCLA) 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
- *Presentation* – Installation Restoration Program IRP Site 24 System Update, Presented by Marc P. Smits, Navy BRAC Remedial Project Manager, September 26, 2007 RAB meeting.
- *Presentation* – Installation Restoration Program IRP Site 18 Principal Aquifer Update, Presented by Patty Uematsu, Irvine Ranch Water District, September 26, 2007 RAB meeting.
- *Presentation* – Installation Restoration Program IRP Site 2 Remedial Action Update, Presented by Richard Pribyl, Navy BRAC Remedial Project Manager, September 26, 2007 RAB meeting.
- *Presentation* – Installation Restoration Site 2 and 17 Operation and Maintenance Plan, Presented by Mr. Richard Pribyl, Navy BRAC Remedial Project Manager, and Mr. Crispin Wanyoike, Earth Tech, September 26, 2007 RAB meeting.

* Mailed to all RAB meeting mailer recipients on 9/19/07.

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 Sit:

<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.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana (site for Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board)