

**FORMER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION  
TUSTIN RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
February 22, 2006  
MEETING MINUTES**

The 72<sup>nd</sup> Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Tustin held its regular meeting on Wednesday, February 22, 2006, at the Clifton Miller Community Center in Tustin from 7:10 to 9:14 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 to the meeting and said tonight's presentations will be very interesting. He then asked for introductions of attendees. Mr. Darren Newton, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-Chair, reviewed the agenda and said a variety of informational materials on MCAS Tustin are available on the handout table.

Mr. Newton said Mr. Fred Meier has resigned from the RAB and wanted to present a letter of appreciation to him for serving on both MCAS Tustin and MCAS El Toro RABs. He said Mr. Meier was one of the original "Seabees" on Okinawa in World War II. The letter was signed by Mr. Dean Gould, Base Closure Manager Navy BRAC Program Management Office West. Mr. Gould also served as the former BEC and RAB Navy Co-Chair for MCAS El Toro and got to know Mr. Meier personally during that tenure. The letter stated the following:

*"Mr. Fred Meier has been an active member of the former Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Tustin and El Toro Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs) and a charter signatory for over 8 years. As a RAB member, Mr. Meier has served as an expansion of Department of Defense's (DoD) Technical Review Committee (TRC), and has actively served in a public forum for the exchange of information and ideas among citizens, the DoD, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the State. In doing so, he has added significant value to the restoration process at both bases.*

*The DoD sincerely appreciates Mr. Meier's commitment to improving DoD's restoration program by increasing community understanding and support for restoration efforts, improving the technical aspects of decisions, and ensuring responses adequately addressed community concerns.*

*Mr. Meier's contributions have been instrumental to the Navy and the community in achieving the goal of expediting restoration and reuse of these former bases totaling over 6,000 acres. Job well done!"*

Mr. Zweifel said Mr. Meier is a tremendous asset and he will be sorely missed on both RABs.

Mr. Zweifel mentioned that Mr. Ram Peddada, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), was unable to make tonight's meeting and will try to make the next meeting. Mr. Zweifel said it is very much appreciated when notification is provided if someone is unable to attend.

Mr. Newton said if anyone is sending correspondence to the Navy it needs to be addressed to the BEC and mailed to the BRAC office at Former MCAS El Toro. The complete address is:

Base Realignment and Closure  
 Former MCAS El Toro  
 Attn: Mr. Darren Newton, BRAC Environmental Coordinator  
 RE: Former MCAS Tustin  
 7040 Trabuco Road  
 Irvine, CA 92618.

He also reminded everyone that the Administrative Record is located at Former MCAS El Toro at the BRAC office in Building 307. The Information Repository is located at the Main Library at University of California, Irvine. A handout on the information table provides specific location information.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Approval of 7/20/05 RAB Meeting Minutes – Don Zweifel (MCAS Tustin RAB Community Co-Chair)**

Mr. Zweifel asked for any changes or comments prior to approval of the July 20, 2005 and the October 19, 2005 RAB Meeting Minutes. Mr. Dana Ogdon, City of Tustin, motioned to have the minutes approved, Mr. Adrian Morton, RAB member, seconded the motion, and the RAB unanimously approved both sets of meeting minutes.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Installation Restoration Program Status Update – Darren Newton**

Mr. Newton provided an update of the MCAS Tustin Installation Restoration Program (IRP). He gave an update on the progress of Underground Storage Tanks (USTs), Aboveground Storage Tanks (ASTs), Areas of Concern (AOCs) and IRP Sites for Former MCAS Tustin, located below:

	USTs	ASTs	AOCs	IRP SITES
<b>TOTAL (455)</b>	126	25	288	16
<b>No Further Action (NFA) (425)</b>	118	25	273	9
<b>Percent Complete</b>	94%	100%	95%	56%
<b>In Progress (30)</b>	8*	0	15**	7

\* USTs 29A, and UST 222A-I

\*\* being addressed under CERCLA: includes MMS-4, MMS05

**Operable Unit (OU) 1A IRP-13 South - 1,2,3-trichloropropane [TCP] groundwater plume) and OU-1B (IRP-3 and IRP-12 - trichloroethylene [TCE] groundwater plumes)** – The Draft Remedial Design was completed in June 2005. The next steps will be to complete the Draft Final Remedial Design in June 2006. The Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) Report is scheduled for completion in 2008.

For OU-1B, the Draft Soil Removal Report was completed in October 2005. The Final Draft Soil Removal Report will be completed in spring 2006 along with the Final Groundwater Remedial Design. It is anticipated that the groundwater treatment system will be operating in 2007 with the OPS Report scheduled for completion in 2008.

**OU-4 (IRP-6, -5S(A), -11 [Areas B and C], 13W, MMS-04 [Area B])** – Mr. Newton said OU-4A is complete and will no longer be discussed. For OU-4B, the Navy is currently working on an aquifer test at IRP Site 5S(a). Additional sampling will also be completed at IRP Site 6. The Navy has extended the schedule in order to submit a Revised Draft Feasibility Study (FS) Report to incorporate regulatory agency comments from the original draft. The Revised Draft FS Report will also include additional sampling data and information gathered from the aquifer test at IRP Site 5S(a) and is scheduled to be issued September 2006. The Final FS is scheduled for completion in winter 2007. The Navy will recommend the best alternative possible for OU-4B in the Proposed Plan that is scheduled to be issued for public review in May 2007. The Final Record of Decision is scheduled for January 2008.

Mr. Newton said following the previous RAB meeting held on October 15, 2005, the Navy received comments on the original Draft FS Report. He said the key comments were:

The FS is incomplete without data from IRP-5S(a) and IRP-6.

The nature and extent of soil contamination at IRP-6 needs further evaluation.

Groundwater modeling and risk assessments need to be conducted.

For the Revised FS, Mr. Newton said the Navy will take the following steps:

Further develop and evaluate Remedial Action Objectives.

Develop discharge options for the treated water evaluation.

Perform an aquifer characterization at IRP-5S(a).

Incorporate information from the IRP-6 additional groundwater investigation.

Mr. Newton reiterated that the Revised Draft FS Report is scheduled to be sent to the regulatory agencies for 30-day review on September 25, 2006.

Mr. Newton said at the previous two RAB meetings, it was suggested a RAB subcommittee be formed for OU-4B, but after discussion with Mr. Zweifel, they both thought it best to wait until it is closer to the completion of the Revised Draft FS Report later this year.

**MTBE (methyl tert-butyl ether) Groundwater Plume (Underground Storage Tank [UST] Site 222)** – The Navy submitted the Draft Soil Closure Report in November 2005 to the regulatory agencies. The next step is to continue to monitor and evaluate the downgradient portion of the MTBE plume. Development of the Final Petroleum Corrective Action Plan (PCAP) to address MTBE plume is currently underway with a draft report due in June 2006. The Final Soil Closure Report will be submitted to regulatory agencies in April 2006.

**Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) #8** – This FOST includes two carve-outs (COs), CO-1 and CO-4, and was signed in February 2006.

Mr. Newton said he received a letter from Lennar Corporation requesting the two portions of CO-5 (portions of IRP Site 13-W and IRP Site 13-S) be made available for early transfer. These two areas (IRP 13-W and 13S) are the remaining areas of pArceL 24 that was sold as part of the public sale of Parcels 23 and 24 of MCAS Tustin in March 2003. To best inform the RAB of Lennar's request for early transfer, Mr. Newton read the actual request letter from Lennar. He said Lennar is asking for the deed to the property from the Navy while the Navy would continue to have environmental responsibility for the property. He said Mr. Brendan Horgan, Project Manager for Lennar, made the written request. He said the Navy's BRAC Team is requesting authorization from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Facilities), Mr. Wayne Army, to engage in negotiations for an early transfer.

Mr. Dana Ogdon, City of Tustin, said essentially Lennar would take the property before cleanup is certified as complete while the Navy continues its environmental program.

Mr. Newton said typically all environmental work is completed before transfer. Lennar is requesting that a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) be prepared for early transfer. He added that a FOSET tends to have many restrictions primarily to allow the Navy to complete the cleanup of the property. He said that if the early transfer were to occur, there would be no need for a FOST because Lennar would have already been provided the deed to the property while the Navy would retain the CERCLA covenant.

Ms. Susan Reynolds, RAB member, asked how common it is for an early transfer to be granted. Mr. Newton said early transfers have occurred in other parts of the country, but have not occurred at Tustin. He said during early transfer negotiations, it is typical that with a FOSET, the cleanup responsibility for the property are usually transferred to the new owner, to essentially transfer the property "as is." However, Lennar is asking the Navy to continue with the cleanup that is necessary and the Navy would complete the CERCLA process. The remedial action report would certify that cleanup is complete.

Ms. Mary Lynn Norby, RAB member, asked how the RAB would continue to be involved if the FOSET were to take place. Mr. Ogdon said the Navy would not relinquish its environmental responsibility and would continue with remediation and the RAB would continue to be involved. Mr. Ogdon asked Mr. Newton to explain the Governor's role in early transfer. Mr. Newton said the Governor of California also has to concur with the early transfer and DTSC would be involved in overseeing this effort. He said there would also be a public comment period for the FOSET.

Mr. David Placek, Tustin Legacy Partners, asked why the closed out sites are still on the map. Mr. Newton said they are on the map as a frame of reference. Ms. Patricia

Hannon. Project Manager, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) said monitoring is still ongoing at CO-10 - Moffett Trenches landfill. Mr. Ogdon added that the CO-10 is also tied to three drainage channels that are in CO-5. For CO-10 and CO-5, FOST 6 has been prepared and signed. However, the deeds are still being discussed between the Navy and the City of Tustin. Mr. Newton said as a result of the reorganization within the Navy, the FOSTs are now signed by the Director of BRAC Program Management Office West and not the Navy's Southwest Division Captain.

### **Regulatory Agency Comment Update - Regulatory Agency Representatives**

Mr. Newton noted that Mr. James Ricks, U.S. EPA and Mr. Ram Peddada, DTSC were unable to attend tonight's RAB meeting.

### **Patricia Hannon, Project Manager, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region**

Ms. Hannon said since the last RAB meeting, she has reviewed the following reports and documents:

The 60-percent Remedial Design for Groundwater Cleanup at OU-1A and OU-1B.

A work plan for aquifer testing of IRP Site 5S(a).

The Draft FS Report for several sites in OU-4B, her comments concurred with those of U.S. EPA and DTSC stating that the document should be revised and reissued.

The OU-1B Soil Removal Report that documented the remedial action that addressed contaminated soil to prevent TCE from migrating into the groundwater at IRP Site 3 and IRP Site 12.

The Soil Closure Report at UST-222, she concurred with the Navy's recommendation for NFA on the soil portion at this site.

The work plan to further investigate groundwater contamination at the toe of the MTBE plume in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Water Bearing Zone (WBZ). She also observed drilling activities conducted at the site.

Ms. Hannon said that the permit for treated groundwater discharge from the treatment of the MTBE plume is on the agenda for approval before the RWQCB on April 21, 2006. A copy of the permit is available online at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/tentative\\_orders.html](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/tentative_orders.html).

At this website, visitors are directed on how to download the permit order that is up for approval by the Board. She said the RWQCB is requesting comments from the public by April 3, 2006. The April 21, 2006 RWQCB Board meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m., at the City Council Chambers, in Loma Linda, California. She advised everyone to check the website in case this information is updated.

Mr. Zweifel said he was under the impression that the Navy was considering shutting down the BioGAC unit for treating MTBE contaminated groundwater and that the City of Tustin wanted to move treatment unit from its present location. Ms. Hannon explained that the BioGAC unit is a part of the HiPOx unit that is being used at UST-222 for treatment of groundwater. The HiPOx unit is the first unit the water is placed into which oxidizes the water down to acetone. Next, the BioGAC unit removes the acetone. She said the Navy will present information tonight on this issue (see presentation below).

**Presentation -- Program Update on the Petroleum Corrective Action Plan (PCAP) methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) Treatment System at UST-222**

Mr. Marc P. Smits, Navy RPM, said he is responsible for this site, mainly the groundwater portion. At the previous RAB meeting, he had discussed the delineation activities at the leading edge of the MTBE plume and the data is now available. He said the Navy would like to move away from using the HiPOx system because the Navy now needs a treatment system that can effectively treat concentrations of MTBE that ranges from 300 to 900 parts per billion (ppb). The HiPOx system is designed to treat MTBE concentrations in the tens of thousands ppb and system performance was very successful at treating such high concentrations of MTBE. Mr. Zweifel noted that this reduction of MTBE concentrations in the plume is an incredible achievement. Mr. Smits said the Navy is considering using a granular activated carbon (GAC) system that is very similar to the one being used for the using the time-critical removal action (TCRA) system at Former MCAS Tustin.

Mr. Smits said at the previous RAB meeting there were specific concerns regarding the potential for MTBE to be migrating off Navy property. He said the recently obtained preliminary data does not indicate that MTBE is migrating from the Navy property. He mentioned that Mr. Adrian Morton, RAB member, referred to a letter sent by the City of Tustin to the Navy in regard to the work plan for the final delineation of the MTBE plume. Mr. Smits said Mr. Morton's and the City of Tustin's concerns will be addressed. He noted that the Navy's work on this has been completed, but the Navy will still respond to his letter.

Mr. Smits then introduced Mr. Chris Coonfare and Dr. Nick Amini from Battelle, a new Navy contractor to Former MCAS Tustin. Dr. Amini said Battelle took over the contract in October 2005 as subcontractors to ECS to perform operation and maintenance (O&M) of the existing interim HiPOx system. The system has been operating for the last 4 months between 82 and 99 percent efficiency. Downtime was due to power failures or failure of the hydrogen peroxide pump and the oxygen tank level switches. As of the end of January 2006, the system had treated approximately 103,446,836 gallons of MTBE-contaminated groundwater. Analytical results of groundwater samples collected in early February 2006 from wells in the source area have shown a 54 percent reduction in MTBE concentrations since July 2005. The influent MTBE concentrations to the HiPOx system from October 2005 until January 2006 ranged from 240 to 1,100 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). The average influent MTBE concentration to the HiPOx system was 612  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

Dr. Amini provided the statistics on the PCAP system's operational status as of January 31, 2006:

- Total Extracted (PCAP) – 102,504,300 gallons of water
- Total (OU-1A/UST/IRP Sites 3 and 12) – 980 gallons
- Total Treated – 103,446,836 gallons
- Total Infiltrated – 146,171 gallons
- Total Discharged – 103,338,162 gallons

Dr. Amini said from October 2005 to January 2006, 47.69 pounds of MTBE was removed from the extracted groundwater. The sample results indicate a downward

trend in MTBE concentrations over time which is likely due to the soil removal at the source area and the continued extraction of groundwater in this area.

Dr. Amini said the HiPOx influent concentrations range from 200 to 1000 µg/L, but the average is 600 µg/L. Mr. Zweifel asked what the “J” meant in the handout. Dr. Amini said the “J” means the result was below the detection level. Specifically, it is a reporting unit for any compound that is an estimated value of the compound below the detection level. Mr. Newton added that all of the Navy’s data is validated through a third party and during the validation process. He provided examples of causes that would result in such a qualifier being added such as : the sample date or temperature differs or there is a differing calibration. Therefore as a result of validation, the “J” is the symbol for an estimated value.

Next Dr. Amini showed a slide depicting the MTBE concentrations at six extraction wells that illustrated the downward trend of the MTBE concentration. Mr. Zweifel asked if the concentration levels could be predicted. Dr. Amini responded that the Navy would need additional data points to run a computer model to predict concentration levels over time.

Dr. Amini said pump and treat technologies still offer the most viable options for the treatment of MTBE in the groundwater at UST-222. However, at the current concentrations, HiPOx, the advance oxidation system is no longer the most effective option. The Navy has been studying the removal of MTBE using activated carbon and has concluded that pump and treat is the most practical option for this stage of remediation. The accepted remedial goals for MTBE have been established by the RWQCB and are as follows:

- 1<sup>st</sup> WBZ – 300 µg/L
- 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ – 44 µg/L
- 3<sup>rd</sup> WBZ – 13 µg/L

Mr. Smits said these goals were based on modeling conducted and were originally proposed as cleanup goals to the RWQCB in early 2005. In July 2005, the modeling conducted was based full protection of the on the 4<sup>th</sup> WBZ. Information on cleanup goals was presented at the October 19, 2005 RAB meeting. Dr. Amini said Battelle is currently working on the approach for developing the Final PCAP documentation for MTBE in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZs.

He also presented a series of graphics that showed the extent of the MTBE plume in September 2001 and the cleanup progress achieved by fall 2004. For the 1<sup>st</sup> WBZ in September 2001, the maximum MTBE concentration was approximately 25,000 µg/L, and shown in the handout as the red zone. In the blue zone the MTBE concentrations range from 40 to 300 µg/L. In fall 2004, the MTBE in the 1<sup>st</sup> WBZ was less. In the center of the plume, the maximum MTBE concentration is approximately 3,500 µg/L. During the fall 2005 evaluation, the plume center had a MTBE concentration of approximately 1,600 µg/L.

Dr. Amini said in September 2001, MTBE concentrations in the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ were approximately 40,000 µg/L. However, when levels were monitored in the fall of 2004, the maximum concentrations dropped to 3,000 µg/L. Dr. Amini said there is still left over areas of contamination near the carve-out area. In fall 2005, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ, maximum concentrations of MTBE dropped to 1,700 µg/L.

Mr. Newton said at the previous RAB meeting, the City had requested additional monitoring wells to seek clarification on whether or not the plume is migrating. The Navy stated at that time that additional investigations are needed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ to determine if MTBE is migrating off Navy property. Some of those investigations pertaining to the downgradient portion of the MTBE plume have been completed and the Navy is prepared to report what has happened since that time.

Mr. Coonfare presented the results of the downgradient portion of the plume delineation. He said the additional investigation was conducted to address the elevated MTBE concentrations downgradient of the source area. The Draft Work Plan and Sampling and Analysis Plan for the downgradient plume delineation were approved by the regulatory agencies on December 14, 2005. Subsequently, the Final Draft Work Plan and Sampling and Analysis Plan were approved on January 5, 2006. Fifteen cone penetrometer testing (CPT) points drilled were drilled. CPT is a direct push drilling system used to gather information on lithology and soil types and to collect groundwater samples. There were two sampling rows of soil borings, SB-01 through SB-05 in the first row, and SB-06 through SB-15 in the second row, closer to the carve-out boundary. Field crews were able to collect samples from all soil boring locations in the two rows as well as from two sampling points located in the 3<sup>rd</sup> WBZ (SB-03 and SB-11). Mr. Coonfare said the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ samples were collected at a depth of 60 feet below ground surface (bgs). SB-01 was shallower with more silty/sand-type materials at 52 feet bgs.

Mr. Coonfare then showed results from all of the sampling locations and the depth of the samplings. All samples were analyzed in the lab following the U.S. EPA standard methods. All MTBE concentrations were below 1 µg/L reporting limit for MTBE except one location (SB-01) where a concentration of 1.96 µg/L was reported. These data indicate that MTBE has not migrated off the Navy property.

Ms. Norby asked how groundwater flow can effect the MTBE migration. Mr. Coonfare said that the groundwater flows towards two specific wells, 1572MW15D and 1572MW12D, and there have been no detections of MTBE identified in samples collected at these two wells. Ms. Norby further asked if the samples only report what the concentrations are in the well or could there be contamination near the wells. Mr. Coonfare clarified that the investigation is designed to determine if there are MTBE concentrations near the carve-out boundary. He said results from this investigation are positive and that the preliminary data indicate the plume is not migrating off the Navy's property.

Mr. Coonfare showed cross section (A-A') of the soil borings with the scale showing relative elevations. He said they were trying to sample in silty-sand since it is more porous and permeable which allows for groundwater flow. At the screen interval the water passively enters the well. This interval serves as the sample location where water is collected for analysis. For the second cross section (B-B'), the borings consisted of finer-grain material that is less likely to transmit groundwater. For the areas in the soil borings where there was not a clear silty-sand layer, sampling was shifted to the area where the groundwater was most likely transmitted.

Mr. Coonfare summarized the key results of the preliminary plume delineation of the downgradient portion in the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ.

The sandy zone was generally identified at about 60 feet bgs in the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ.

The hydropunch sample containing a MTBE concentration of 1.9 µg/L was collected at 52 feet because of the different geological aspects, specifically this was due to refusal.

Monitoring well IS72MW16D, which had a previous detection of MTBE above 500 µg/L, was screened between 35 and 50 feet bgs. The boring log for this monitoring well indicates the material throughout the boring generally consists of clay.

The preliminary hydropunch data indicates that the MTBE plume is not migrating off of the Navy's property.

The Navy proposes additional hydropunch sampling in the 2<sup>nd</sup> WBZ to further delineate MTBE concentrations in the downgradient portion of the plume.

Additional sampling could be conducted in the area around monitoring well IS72MW16D. Data obtained could then be used to develop an effective cleanup approach in the Final PCAP.

### Discussion

Ms. Reynolds asked what the possibility is that the MTBE could migrate off Navy property. Mr. Smits reiterated that the Navy needs to investigate the area next to well IS72MW16D to obtain more data to determine that MTBE plume has been contained at this location. As such, additional CPT/hydropunch sampling needs to be conducted to collect the data from this location. As of now, a definitive determination needs to be made regarding containment of MTBE at this location.

Mr. Harry Takach, RAB attendee, asked if replacing the HiPOx with a GAC unit is officially going to take place. Mr. Smits said the Navy is still in the planning stages, but are looking to replace the current system with GAC technology. He said there will be some preliminary costs associated with replacing the HiPOx, but in the end, on an annual basis it will cost 50 to 75 percent less. He said there is also considerably less O&M costs and effort required if the Navy uses the GAC technology.

Mr. Zweifel asked about conducting an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the HiPOX system. Mr. Newton said the Navy is doing a cost evaluation for this project; however, an "EE/CA" is done for a different program. He said the Navy is not officially switching to the GAC system yet, but stated that the Navy is strongly leaning towards this option and will need full regulatory agency concurrence before they can move forward. Mr. Smits said the PCAP documentation serves as a reference to enable the Navy to move forward.

### General Discussion

Mr. Newton said the next RAB meeting will be held May 17, 2006. He reminded everyone that the MCAS Tustin RAB meets on the third Wednesday in February, May, August, and November.

Ms. Norby said one purpose of the RAB is to review and comment on documents, but the RAB has not done so in the past 6 months. She noted that the documents should be presented to the RAB and her preference was for receiving the executive summary of documents. Mr. Newton said it would cost between \$300 and \$500 per document to copy and distribute to each RAB member. He suggested that distributing an email with the executive summary to all RAB members would be more cost-effective and he would

look into this further. Mr. Zweifel said he receives all documents and anyone interested can borrow them.

Mr. Morton suggested the RAB schedule another RAB tour of the Former MCAS Tustin. Mr. Newton said he would look at available dates and passed around a sign-up sheet for those interested.

### **Meeting Evaluation - Don Zweifel**

Mr. Zweifel asked for feedback on tonight's meeting. He said it was an excellent presentation by Battelle and the graphics showing the MTBE plume were phenomenal.

### **Future Topics and Meetings - Don Zweifel**

Presentation on Navy's Comeback Policy

### **Closing – Don Zweifel**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m. The next meeting will be May 17, 2006 at the Clifton Miller Community Center.

### **List of Handouts Provided at the Meeting**

RAB Meeting Agenda/Public Notice – February 22, 2006 (72<sup>nd</sup>) RAB Meeting.  
Meeting minutes from the October 19, 2005 (71<sup>st</sup>) RAB Meeting.  
Meeting minutes excerpt from the July 20, 2005 (70<sup>th</sup>) RAB Meeting.  
MCAS Tustin Environmental Program Status.  
Environmental Program Summary Table.  
Map – MCAS Tustin Operable Units, Major AOCs, and MTBE Plume.  
Restoration Advisory Board Fact Sheet/Membership Application.  
MCAS Tustin - Where to Get More Information.  
MCAS Tustin Marine Corps/Navy Team Contact Information.  
For More Information: Administrative Record and Information Repository Locations.  
MCAS Tustin Installation Restoration Program - Mailing List Coupon.  
MCAS Tustin Restoration Advisory Board Mission Statement.  
MCAS Tustin Fact Sheet OU-1A and OU-1B and Arsenic AOC Cleanup Activities;  
February 2004.  
MCAS Tustin Fact Sheet OU-1A and OU-1B, Remedial Design/Remedial Action;  
December 2004.  
Department of the Navy, "Policy for Conduction Comprehensive Environmental  
Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Statutory Five-Year Reviews,  
November 2001."  
The Under Secretary of Defense, "Responsibility for Additional Environmental Cleanup  
after Transfer of Real Property."  
Department of Defense, "A Guide to Establishing Institutional Controls at Closing Military  
Installations."  
Department of Defense, "Institutional Controls: What Are They and How Are They Used."  
*Presentation - Update on UST-222 and Cleanup of MTBE in the Groundwater*

---

Copies of the meeting minutes and handouts provided at the October 19, 2005 RAB meeting are available at the MCAS Tustin Information Repository located at the University of California, Irvine, Main Library, 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 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.navybracpmo.org](http://www.navybracpmo.org)