

DRAFT

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Subject: Former Norwalk Tank Farm Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Semiannual Meeting	Meeting Date: <u>02 February 2013</u> Meeting Time: 5:00 p.m. Meeting Place: Norwalk Arts & Sports Complex
RAB, PROJECT TEAM, AND OTHER ATTENDEES	
<u>RAB Community Members</u>	
M. McIntosh (Co-Chair, Meeting Chair) T. Winkler	
<u>Other Members</u>	
P. Cho (RWQCB) S. Defibaugh (KMED) (Co-Chair) A. Figueroa (City of Norwalk)	
<u>Other Attendees</u>	
L. Oppenheimer (DLA Energy) S. Strom (DLA Energy) P. Ly (WRD) E. Ferguson (WRD) A. Mancillas (Rep. Linda Sanchez) R. Hassan (Parsons) M. Lucas (Parsons) D. Mehaffey (Parsons) M. Wuttig (CH2M Hill) D. Jablonski (CH2M Hill)	
<u>Absentees</u>	
B. Hoskins E. Garcia Lt Col Gaffney (DLA Energy, Co-Chair) C. Emig (City of Cerritos)	
<u>Acronyms:</u>	
CHHSLs.....	California Human Health Screening Levels
CSM.....	conceptual site model
DLA Energy...	Defense Logistics Agency Energy (formerly DESC)
DTSC.....	Department of Toxic Substances Control
GSA.....	General Services Administration
HHRA.....	Human Health Risk Assessment
KMED.....	Kinder Morgan Energy Partners
LNAPL.....	light non-aqueous phase liquids
MTBE.....	methyl tertiary-butyl ether
NPDES.....	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OCCS.....	Offsite Chemicals Cleanup Subcommittee
OEHHA.....	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
1,2-DCA.....	1,2-dichloroethane
RAB.....	Restoration Advisory Board
RBCA.....	Risk-Based Corrective Action
RWQCB.....	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SVE.....	soil vapor extraction
TBA.....	tertiary-butyl alcohol
TPH.....	total petroleum hydrocarbons
URS.....	URS Corporation
VOCs.....	volatile organic compounds
WRD.....	Water Replenishment District of Southern California
<u>BACKGROUND</u>	
DLA-AMW and KMED are conducting environmental cleanup activities at the area in and surrounding the former Defense Fuel Support Point Norwalk, formerly known as the Tank Farm, located at 15306 Norwalk Boulevard, Norwalk, CA. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) is an advisory committee of local citizens and project members that review and comment on documents relating to the environmental cleanup. All RAB meetings are open to the public and are scheduled semiannually on the second Thursday at 5:00 p.m. in the months of February and August unless otherwise voted on by the RAB community membership.	

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

1. **Introduction** Mary Jane McIntosh, RAB Co-Chair, Meeting Chair

Mary Jane McIntosh called the meeting to order at 5:17 p.m. Redwan Hassan introduced Dennis Mehaffey as part of the Parsons team assisting with the presentation and also stated that Parsons has replaced URS as the public relations contractor for DLA. Ms. McIntosh asked for comments on the draft minutes from the August 9, 2012 RAB meeting. L. Oppenheimer made a motion for the minutes to be approved as written. S. Defibaugh seconded the motion. The minutes were approved without opposition.

Ms. McIntosh said to make sure to send all hard copies of packets to Gene and others that did not attend from the RAB. She also stated that the website and library contain all the documents that get uploaded and distributed.

2. **KMEP Update** Mark Wuttig, CH2M HILL

Remediation Operations Update

[Slide 3] Mark Wuttig reviewed KMEP's remediation objectives of hydraulic containment of the plumes and removal of the hydrocarbon mass. Mr. Wuttig also reviewed KMEP's soil vapor extraction (SVE) system, groundwater extraction (GWE) system, and total fluids extraction (TFE) system in the south-central and southeast areas. Mr. Wuttig discussed the westside barrier which discontinued extraction in 2008 due to low concentrations of methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) and 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA). They continue to monitor groundwater in that area to make sure the levels continue to stay low and decline.

[Slide 4] In the south central area there are 18 TFE wells, 24 onsite and 6 offsite SVE wells; and two GWE wells. In the southeastern area there are three TFE wells, three SVE wells and two GWE wells. The SVE vapors are treated onsite with a thermal catalytic oxidizer discharged to the atmosphere under permit. The liquids are treated through an oil/water separator and any free-product is recycled offsite. The groundwater gets treated with granulated activated carbon, fluidized bed bioreactors and then discharged to Coyote Creek under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

[Slides 5 through 8] Mr. Wuttig discusses the operations and maintenance activities and says that 736 gallons (approximately 5,000 pounds) were extracted from the SVE system in the third quarter of 2012; 956 gallons (approximately 6,000 pounds) in the fourth quarter. Since 1995 approximately 460,000 gallons (about 3 million pounds) have been extracted. The SVE system continues to extract vapors. Mr. Wuttig refers to the SVE System Operations Summary chart showing a steep slope (indicating a high mass removal) from 1995 to September 2005 where it levels off and stays fairly level through September 2012. The TFE system extracted about 2 million gallons in the third quarter. Approximately 2 million gallons was extracted by the system in the fourth quarter. The Westside Barrier was shut down through both the third and fourth quarters. About 54 million gallons have been extracted since 1995 in the south central and southeast areas; approximately 27 million gallons have been extracted from the Westside Barrier.

[Slide 9] Mr. Wuttig discusses total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) removal. Thirteen gallons (84 pounds) were removed in the third quarter and thirteen gallons (87 pounds) in the fourth quarter. That makes 290 gallons (about 2,000 pounds) removed since the Second Addendum was implemented.

[Slide 10] Free product, which used to be more than ten feet on the water table has mostly dissipated to just a sheen or a few tenths of a foot in one particular well. Free product is no longer measurable in the oil/water separator. Almost 9,000 gallons of free product have been removed since 1995.

[Slide 11] Mr. Wuttig explains a graph of the cumulative free product removed. Although quite a bit was removed in the early 1990's, over time thickness has decreased and the cumulative volume extracted has flattened out. Although groundwater continues to be extracted, the volume of free product being extracted has gone to not being measurable.

[Slide 12] Mr. Wuttig discusses Remediation Systems Operations. The SVE system operated 48% of the time

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

in the third quarter. Excluding plan shutdowns, it operated 63% of the time. There was an improvement in the fourth quarter with the system operating 85% of the time (92% excluding plan shutdowns). The TFE system operated 89% during the third quarter and in the fourth quarter operated 86% of the time (94% excluding plan shutdowns). Steve Defibaugh asks Mr. Wuttig to expand on why the SVE system was shutdown during the third quarter and suggests that one of the controllers had to be replaced. Mr. Wuttig concurs and adds that there is a slide forth-coming explaining the reasons for various system shutdowns.

[Slide 13] Mr. Wuttig goes on to explain that there were planned shutdowns so that there would be static conditions for groundwater monitoring activities. There were also routine maintenance activities due to the fact that the system is old, having been constructed in the mid-1990's, and need quite a bit of maintenance, some of which includes problems with the wiring and the motor controller. Mr. Wuttig discusses the shutdown of the TFE system for groundwater monitoring activities, routine carbon changeouts, a blown fuse issue, high-level alarms, etc. He explains that they continue to work aggressively on the filters for the particulates in the groundwater that feed into the groundwater treatment system. The water contains some turbidity and "dark and slimy" organic-like material which tends to clog up the pre-filters pretty quickly. Mr. Jablonski is working to identify new and better filtering technology to reduce system shutdowns in the future. Steve Defibaugh explains that they are trying to increase the flow rate, which results in an increase in the number of filters used. Lee Oppenheimer asks about whether the material getting caught in the filters is organic or silt? Mr. Jablonski answers that the material seems to be both organic and silt. Explains about vines, roots, and biofouling on pumps. They have performed cleanouts of some of the wells to reduce clogging material. It is explained that there are fines and bioslime built up in the wells. This is not always visible when looking at the water. There is speculation that this is biofouling of the wells. Mr. Defibaugh mentions that they are just about to begin cleanup of five or six of the offsite wells.

[Slide 14] Mr. Wuttig returns to the slide presentation with a discussion of upgrades to the SVE and TFE systems. For the SVE system, the temperature controllers, motor starter, SVE sight glass and modular motor were replaced. Lights were installed around the control panel. They recently made video recordings of two horizontal SVE lines that run from the treatment pad area south underneath the offsite residences (which were installed in the late 1990's) to monitor their condition and determine whether they were still intact. These extend several hundred feet south under the community and are fairly deep – approximately 25 feet below ground. The video did not show any obstructions. The result is that these horizontal underground lines appear to be an opportunity for future use as cleanup alternatives. A number of operations have been performed on the TFE system, including raising the height of the containment pad equipment, relocating a transfer tank, re-routing a conveyance line, installing backwash equipment, installing acid addition to allow better operation of the equipment, installing some emergency features, installing a six-bag filter housing in parallel with the bag filters (to address the filter clogging issue).

[Slides 15 and 16] Mr. Wuttig refers to a slide outlining a number of preventative maintenance activities for the systems, including a monthly pump operation check; ongoing pump inspection, cleaning and maintenance; bag filter replacements, etc.

[Slide 17] Mr. Wuttig discusses planned remediation activities, with a focus on the main plumes located in the south-central and southeast areas. They will continue operating the previously discussed treatment systems, continue maintenance inspections and data collection on a weekly basis, continue pumping a well in the Holifield Park area where they recently started extracting to hydraulically-contained tertiary-butyl alcohol (TBA). They will continue to monitor concentrations in the Westside Barrier and perform mechanical well redevelopment and rehabilitation for some select offsite extraction wells and investigate use of sand filters or cartridge filters to better remove particulates and increase treatment system uptime.

Additional Assessments Update

[Slide 18] Mr. Wuttig goes on to discuss additional assessments and comments that four have been planned. The first two are complete and have been discussed in prior RAB meetings. These are the southeastern 24-inch Block Valve Area investigation in Holifield Park; the vertical assessment of light non-aqueous phase

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

liquids (LNAPL), which focused on the smear zone. The third is the South-Central Residential Area Vapor Study, the results of which were presented in the last RAB meeting. New to this meeting is the Soil Boring Investigation. The field investigation was completed in October 2012. The report containing the results from that investigation has recently been submitted.

[Slides 19 and 20] Mr. Wuttig recaps the Soil Vapor Monitoring Investigation. Permanent soil vapor monitoring probes were installed at locations in the offsite residential area and in the southeast area as indicated on a map shown on one of the slides titled “Soil Vapor Monitoring Investigation”. These probes were installed to 5- and 15-foot depths. An initial sample was taken and those results were reviewed against the prior risk assessment that had been done. Several years ago there had been a similar effort conducted and a risk assessment performed. When recent concentrations were compared to the risk assessment results it was determined that there are no health risks from soil vapors or soil vapor intrusion. Samples taken by a mobile lab indicated non-detect for constituents of potential concern (COPCs). Samples sent to a fixed lab for confirmation of the field lab results showed concentrations below the screening levels that are protective of residential and commercial use. Although they had originally planned on sampling semi-annually, given the low concentrations they proposed decreasing the sampling frequency from semi-annual to annual, which has now been approved by the RWQCB. The next sampling event is scheduled for July 2013.

[Slide 21] Mr. Wuttig moves on to discuss the soil boring investigation. The objectives were to confirm the vertical extent of impacted soil in the vadose zone (the zone above the water table) and in the smear zone (around the water table). The secondary effect was to provide an additional groundwater monitoring well in Holifield Park in the downgradient area of the southeastern plume. They also collected data for evaluation of a risk-based soil cleanup goal for TPH, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene (BTEX) and other volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

[Slides 22 and 23] The scope of work was to push soil borings at ten locations – seven in the south-central area and three in the southeast area. Those were pushed to the top of the water table and into the water table, which nominally occurs at approximately 25-27 feet. In selecting the locations, they looked at logical places for potential former releases or any indication that the area could be contaminated and would require a boring. The soils were logged in the field and screened with a PID for soil vapor. Soil samples were analyzed for VOCs and TPH. One of those was advanced to the top of the Bellflower Aquatard, which is encountered across the tank farm at about 50 feet below ground, in the southeastern area. One boring was converted to a monitoring well. The objective of the well is to bound the northern extent of the southeastern area plume.

[Slide 24] Mr. Wuttig displays the Soil Analytical Results table showing that results above the water table in the vadose zone are mostly non-detect, with only a few isolated detections. Results at or below the water table show extremely high concentrations. These results are consistent with the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) which showed that the former releases occurred from pipeline block valves which are many feet below ground surface. The former release material would have gone straight downward and pan-caked at the water table, creating the free product that has been extracted since the mid-1990’s. We are now seeing high concentrations with residual LNAPL smear zone which is not really a “soil” problem as much as a groundwater issue.

[Slide 25] Results are shown for the southeastern area, with non-detect readings for the vadose zone and high concentrations in the smear zone. The one boring out of all these that is different is GMW-O-24 in Holifield Park. Results from this well are non-detect for the vadose zone and also for the groundwater zone, indicating that this was a good location for this well to step out bound the southeastern area plume. Mary Jane McIntosh comments that the text in the tables as printed for the presentation handouts are too small to read and requested that in the future they be enlarged to a full page for easier reading. Tracy Winkler questions the relationship between kilograms and liters. Mr. Wuttig explains that a kilogram is a unit of weight whereas a liter is a unit of volume. Steve Defibaugh explains that soil results will be expressed in kilograms but results for groundwater will be show in liters.

[Slides 26 and 27] Mr. Wuttig continues discussion of the Soil Boring Investigation saying that hydrocarbon

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

impacts are generally related to the smear zone (below 25 feet below ground surface), which is consistent with the CPT/LIF data from the vertical LNAPL assessment. CPT is defined as Cone Penetrometer Test, which measures lithology or soil type; LIF stands for Laser-Induced Fluorescence, which provides information on where the free product or residual product is. Most of the diesel fuel release area was non-detect in the vadose zone. Similar results were found in the southeastern area, with the main difference being that the smear zone is a little shallower. Soil impacts at GMW-O-24 in Holifield Park were non-detect except for MTBE which was present at the reporting limit of 1 part-per-billion (1 microgram per liter), which is extremely low. That was due to the fact that the plume was there before hydraulic containment began and the levels were naturally attenuating and decreasing over time. Mr. Wuttig speculates that the next sample would probably result in a non-detect. They will continue to monitor groundwater concentrations in that area.

[Slide 28] Mr. Wuttig makes a brief comparison to the LNAPL report with a figure that shows two cross sections – one east-west cross-section in the south-central area and one east-west cross-section in the southeast area. These show a zone which is the residual product identified by the CPT/LIF, which is the same interval where there were higher concentrations in soil. We see a similar pattern in both the south-central and southeastern areas. E. Ferguson asks as to whether the charts have the same vertical and horizontal scales. Mr. Wuttig answers that they are.

Soil Cleanup Goals

[Slide 29] Mr. Wuttig discusses soil cleanup goals. Since the intention is to reuse the site, Paul Cho requested that they look at calculating soil cleanup goals. DLA Energy calculated soil cleanup goals outlined in the RWQCB's May 1996 "Interim Site Assessment & Cleanup Guidebook". The cleanup goals were calculated for petroleum fuel hydrocarbon compounds and other VOCs. The calculated cleanup goals were submitted to the regional board. He mentions that it was Parsons that did the work on behalf of DLA Energy. The regional board reviewed and concurred with those soil cleanup goals in a July 12, 2012 letter. Paul Cho then asked SFPP to take a look at that work, review the calculations and soil cleanup goals and provide comments. KMEP reviewed the cleanup goals and agreed with the work that DLA Energy and Parsons performed. There are some specifics that are unique to the cleanup goals depending on the lithology, depth of groundwater, etc. SFPP is concurring with those cleanup goals with some caveats and conditions. They are defining cleanup goals down to 15 feet above the smear zone because they view the smear zone right at the water table as a groundwater issue rather than a soil issue where it would be a risk to human health. There were a number of VOC cleanup goals calculated and some of the VOCs have never been detected in the south-central and southeastern areas, therefore cleanup goals for those constituents would not necessarily be applicable to the SFPP plumes. The TPH quantification or the carbon chain range over which the TPH, diesel and jet fuel is calculated were slightly different for what DLA Energy is using versus what SFPP is using. However, substantively, KMEP is in agreement with the TPH calculations. These cleanup goals represent very conservative assumptions if there is ever a reason to warrant additional, more detailed calculations SFPP reserves the right to perform additional, more detailed risk assessments. Tracy Winkler asks for clarification as to whether JP-5 is jet fuel, which Mr. Wuttig answers in the affirmative. Ms. Winkler then asks if that no longer goes through the pipe. Mr. Wuttig answers that JP-5 is a historical contaminant, but is not making any assessment as to whether it goes through the pipe. Steve Defibaugh remarks that they do not see the jet fuel in KMEP area. Ms. Winkler then asks about the meaning of THP-d. Mark confirms that it is diesel.

Conceptual Site Model

[Slide 30] Mr. Wuttig goes on to discuss the conceptual site model, the purpose of which is to look at the details of the site and use that to advance into an effective cleanup strategy. The model shows the surface of the site, identify areas of contamination, show the movement of the contamination within the site and address potential exposure to human health. SFPP is preparing an innovative CSM in which they diagram all hydrocarbons in the soil above the smear zone, in the water table within the smear zone and above the exposition aquifer within the result phase of the groundwater. The CSM will be graphical or pictorial, consisting of some block diagrams showing all of the above-ground infrastructure of the former tanks, the residences, the pipes, free product, groundwater movement, vapor movement, etc. That will be the basis of

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

description of how things are behaving in the subsurface. This will eventually lead to more effective cleanup. After we go through the CSM process, it will be provided to Paul Cho, the community and the RAB, which will allow them to more effectively update the Remedial Action Plan. Ms. McIntosh asks when the site model will be ready. Mr. Wuttig explains that they are working on it now and they anticipate having it ready in the first or second quarter – probably in the next couple of months – maybe early Second Quarter 2013. Ms. McIntosh asks whether the CSM will be completed and available for discussion at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Wuttig answers “definitely”.

Five-Year Action Plan Progress Report

[Slides 31 and 32] Mr. Wuttig discusses the Five-Year Action Plan Progress Report, which was submitted in the Second Addendum to Remedial Action Plan, which was approved in 2007. As a result of that, a number of improvements to the remediation system were implemented, such as installing additional remediation wells. This also included a five-year schedule to submit a closure request, with the projected or anticipated cleanup date of August 2012. Mr. Wuttig comments that this goal was not achieved. As a result, SFPP provided an update letter to the RAB in 2010 with a revised schedule for getting to closure in 2013. However, Mr. Wuttig acknowledges that, as it is now 2013, he is doubtful that we will meet that goal. A Remediation System Effectiveness Evaluation was provided in 2010 which determines whether or not the right remediation systems are in place.

Planned Activities

[Slide 33] Mr. Wuttig goes over the milestone contained in the Second RAP Addendum and discusses planned activities for 2013, including preparation of the CSM and conducting the soil vapor sampling event in July 2013. They are evaluating other technologies that are not currently being done, such as air sparging; biosparging with vertical or horizontal wells; in-situ soil vapor stripping; injecting of chemicals or oxygenated water into the subsurface, which would react with hydrocarbons and destroy them; and monitored natural attenuation (MNA). They are actively evaluating these items and reaching out to technical experts within CH2M Hill and KMEP, both of which have similar sites from which to draw experience. Mr. Wuttig expects to be able to report on those results in the next meeting. Mr. Wuttig says that they are planning to initiate construction and testing and pilot scale remediation systems in the fourth quarter of 2013 and expects to have some new systems in the ground and operating by the end of the year. Mary Jane McIntosh asks if the report from the soil vapor sampling in July will be available in time for the August meeting. Steve Defibaugh answers that he believes they will have the data by then, although the report may not be submitted at that time. He believes that they should know whether or not it's any different from what they've seen before. Ms. McIntosh asks, since the RAB is only meeting twice a year, will they be able to discuss those results at the next meeting. Mr. Wuttig answers that, at a minimum, a data table and site location map should be available. Tracy Winkler asks for a clarification of the term “in-situ stripping”. Mr. Wuttig explains that it means treating the soil in place without first moving it to another location and explains the “stripping” process. Tracy Winkler asks about injection of chemical or oxygenated water; is that something we're not doing yet at this site? Mr. Wuttig answers that she is correct and goes on to explain the in-situ chemical oxidation process in contrast to the use of oxygen as an oxidant.

3. DLA Energy Update Redwan Hassan, Parsons

General Site Activities

[Slide 3] Mr. Hassan begins discussion of the General Site Activities and listed that Parsons submitted Quarterly Discharge Monitoring Reports for the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2012; submitted Remediation Monthly Status Summary Reports; conducted Groundwater Monitoring (GWM) for the 3rd quarter 2012 event in July, the 2nd semiannual event in October and the 1st quarter 2013 event in January; conducted a site-wide weed abatement in September; and performed free product removal at GMW-62 in August, September and January.

Remediation Operations Update

[Slide 4] Mr. Hassan discussed the Remediation Systems and Objectives and described the remediation

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

systems as follows: a groundwater extraction (GWE) system for contaminant mass containment; soil vapor extraction (SVE) for contaminant mass removal and containment; and biosparging for contaminant mass removal.

[Slide 5] Mr. Hassan discussed the Remediation Systems Monitoring and Sampling and reported that there have been daily and weekly system inspections for the GWE and SVE systems; SVE system performance and compliance sampling for the 3rd quarter of 2012 (July, August and September) and the 4th quarter of 2012 (October, November and December); and GWE system performance and compliance sampling for the 3rd and 4th quarters of 2012. However, more frequent sampling was done in December due to an arsenic presence.

[Slide 6] Mr. Hassan discussed the GWE System Operations Summary. GWE operates from two areas of the site – mainly the northwest and the northeast, as those are the areas of concern for offsite migration. In the northwest two extraction wells operate – one 6-inch diameter well (GW-13) and one 4-inch diameter well (GW-2). The two northeastern wells are GW-15 and GW-16. Both are 6-inch diameter wells. The system was on July 1 through December 31, 2012, with the following exceptions: July 2 – 12 for 3rd quarter 2012 GWM event; August 17 – 20 during local power failure; October 8 – 12 for 4th quarter 2012 GWM event; October 24 – November 21 for arsenic exceedance, evaluating changes in influent characterization and remedial options, change out arsenic ion exchange resin and activated carbon; November 21 – 26 for secondary sump pump system repair; and January 7 – 17, 2013 for 1st quarter 2013 GWM event. GWE system operation time: 3rd quarter 2012 - 86.2% of time (97.2% of time excluding planned shutdowns for O&M and GWM event) and 4th quarter 2012 - 49.1% of time (84.8% of time excluding planned shutdowns for permit compliance and GWM event).

[Slides 7 and 8] Mr. Hassan discussed the SVE System Operations Summary and stated that Parsons used to operate the SVE system from multiple wells. However now, because of the demolition and concrete removal, most of the wells in the truck fueling station area are not operational as a result of the demolition activities. In the area in the northern part of the site, four horizontal wells are operating which basically covers the bulk of the tank farm area from where the tanks used to be located. There are six vertical SVE wells operating in the northeastern portion of the site. Those areas were not impacted by the demolition activities and SVE continued. The system was on through July 1st through December 31, 2012, with the exception of: July 2 – 12 for 3rd quarter 2012 GWM event; August 17 – 20 during local power failure; September 14 – 17 and September 20 – 27 for repairs to SVE system carbon vessel ducting; October 1st for high temperature shut down; October 8 – 22 for SVE system vacuum line repair; and January 7 – 17, 2013 for 1st quarter 2013 GWM event. SVE system operation time resulted in the following performance: 3rd quarter 2012 was 74.5% up time (94.2% of time excluding planned shutdowns) and 4th quarter 2012 was 82.9% up time (99.1% of time excluding planned shutdowns).

[Slide 9] Mr. Hassan explains a graph of the SVE System Operations Summary, which shows the various hydrocarbon removals. The blue line (bottom) which has been leveled out for a number of years shows the free product recovery. At the start, it stepped up quite rapidly because a lot was removed but it gradually leveled off. Currently no free product is being removed from any of the wells since most of the free product that is measured onsite, that is connected to the remediation system, is either sheen or less than ½ foot. Mary Jane McIntosh asks about the lack of a bubble (mark) between August 2008 and April 2011. Ms. Lucas explains that during that period the system was down due to permitting and waiting for rebound testing. Ms McIntosh asks if that was for three years. Mr. Hassan explains that the remediation system was evaluated and upgraded; the blower was replaced with a larger one; and additional wells were brought in and put on line, followed by the permitting process. Mr. Hassan goes on to explain that the second (red) line on the graph represents combined free product and hydrocarbon extracted through the SVE system. The top line (green) is a combination of all the hydrocarbon removal. Mr. Hassan points out that the blue line (free product) remained at the same level for a number of years because what is left in the wells (little or nothing measurable) is indicating that mechanical removal is not practical at this time. However, the SVE line (red) shows a slight uptick because when the tank demolition and concrete removal was done, sampling was done showing that the continuation of the soil impact is limited. There is not much soil contamination in the

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

eastern area and very small amounts of hydrocarbons are being extract, therefore is has been proposed that the SVE system in that area be shut down. However, when we consider the truck fueling station and other areas that have not been previously treated, we see an uptick of the line showing SVE.

[Slide 10] For the Overall Operations Summary, Mr. Hassan goes over the volume of groundwater extracted as follows: GWE for 3rd quarter 2012 was 1,710,053 gallons; for 4th quarter 2012 GWE was 1,085,836 gallons which is about 64.5 million gallons since April 1996. For SVE system equivalent fuel removed it was 235 gallons (1,648 pound) in the 3rd quarter 2012 and in the 4th quarter 2012 was 369 gallons (2,585 pounds) for a total of 216,544 gallons (1.5 million pounds) since April 1996.

[Slide 11] Mr. Hassan discusses Free Product Monitoring and states that the measurement of free product and active recovery in GMW-62 (located in Holifield Park) has been ongoing since January 2011. When the product thickness in that well gets to a foot a vacuum truck is used to extract the free product. GMW-62 quarterly gauging results were as follows: 3rd quarter July 2012 it was measured to be 0.45 feet of product; 4th quarter October 2012 was 0.49 feet of product; and 1st quarter January 2013 measured to be 0.24 feet of product. Free product recovery was conducted at GMW-62 and resulted in 5 gallons of total fluids extracted for 2 gallons of LNAPL on August 27th; 5 gallons of total fluids extracted for 4 gallons of LNAPL on September 24th; and 9 gallons of total fluids extracted for 3 gallons of LNAPL on January 8, 2013.

[Slide 12] Mr. Hassan discusses a slide showing GMW-62 Groundwater Elevation and Product Thickness and explains that when a peak in the product thickness of the well is measured, the product is removed which results in a drop in thickness. The groundwater elevation on the graph shows that groundwater across the site has been decreasing over time. This will be covered in the Groundwater Semiannual Report. Groundwater across the site has significantly dropped from year to year, which makes the product appear to be more than it has been in the past.

Concrete Demolition & ACM Abatement Update

[Slides 13 through 15] Mr. Hassan discusses concrete demolition and asbestos-containing material (ACM) abatement and states that essentially all these related activities have been completed. There are no more demolition or abatement activities going on, no more asbestos removal. Everything that could be removed has been removed. Activities conducted during the second half of 2012 include the following: demolished Navy and El Toro pump house foundations and below-grade infrastructure (excluding a portion of the Navy pump house left in place to ensure integrity of active KMEP line); abated and removed storm drain and fire water suppression vaults containing ACM; removed piping in the pump house and truck fueling areas; valve west of Navy pump house (in the KMEP area) was cut and capped; lift stations 1 and 2 were drained and demolished; large excavations in the pump house, lift stations, vault south of 55003 were backfilled with clean import soil; sample shed was demolished and foundation removed; concrete roadway in the truck fueling area was removed; sound wall was dismantled; impacted soil, ACM, concrete, asphalt and piping were disposed as appropriate; and transformer was re-located and substation at pump houses removed. Mr. Hassan refers to a slide containing a photograph of the transformer in its previous location as well as a photograph of the same area with the transformer removed.

Five-Year Action Plan Progress Report

[Slide 16] Mr. Hassan discusses the Five-Year Action Plan Progress Report and states that free product recovery will continue as necessary at specific wells. Measurement of the fuel thickness and extent of product in the wells throughout the site in the last couple of years has shown a decrease. However, groundwater level has also decreased, and therefore, in some wells we're seeing an increase in the product – especially at GMW-62. In October, free product was detected in seven wells across the site – in relation to the semiannual sampling (in two wells in the truck fueling station area and one north of it and one west) – where in the past not much product was measured but now there is an increase. Overall, groundwater decreased and the smear zone is exposed and any trapped LNAPL percolates on the groundwater. GMW-62 in Holifield Park has measurable product. That well is gauged weekly and a vacuum truck is used to remove the product when it reaches 1 foot in thickness. Mary Jane McIntosh asks if the decrease in groundwater level is occurring across

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

the entire tank farm site, or is it only in certain areas. Mr. Hassan answers that there are some areas that we're getting a sink hole – basically a drop in the water table. Some of that is occurring in new areas that were not impacted in the past. Ms. McIntosh asks if that is from activities going on onsite or is it something that is naturally occurring. Mr. Hassan answers that this is, in part, a result of pumping wells. Mr. Defibaugh comments that originally there were three being pumped and now there are five. Mr. Hassan adds that, in the past, we did recapture the pumping rates. That way, the net influence would be minimum. Since then the number of wells being pumped have increased which may have some impact of groundwater levels and flow. Parsons will continue to look at the levels over the next two quarters to see if there are any changes. At some point Parsons will get the total flow rates being pumped and adjust the system so there will be no net probable impact. Mary Jane McIntosh asks whether it becomes more difficult to treat an area where the groundwater level is decreasing and the level of contamination is increasing. Mr. Hassan answers that currently the focus is on the vadose zone for SVE and for the groundwater pumping to control offsite migration. If Parsons were to focus the groundwater extraction in hot spot areas it would be in some ways better because the water table is suppressed which opens up that smear zone for treatment. If that smear zone is porous enough, then either SVE or oxygenation can be implemented. That has not been the focus but it may be an option during the next phase.

[Slide 17] The SVE operation is still continuing since January 2011 from the north and northeastern areas. Those areas were not impacted by the demolition. During the second semiannual period in 2012, approximately 4,200 pounds of contaminant mass has been destroyed by SVE.

[Slide 18] Essentially, the groundwater extraction effectively decreases the plumes over time but these decreases are recent and limited. In looking at the trend over the last ten years, the overall product at the site has decreased. That is true to date. Extraction of contaminant from the northwest corner and the northeastern area has been effective. Offsite wells continue to show non-detect or decreasing trends in TPH and BTEX concentrations. Although TPH concentrations in most wells are lower and/or are declining, GWE is used for plume containment.

[Slide 19] Mr. Hassan discusses the Remedial Action Plan Update and states that in July 2012 the RWQCB approved the proposed soil cleanup goals for all chemicals of concern including TPH, BTEX, MTBE and TBA. The soil remediation schedule is discussed. SVE and/or bioventing operation will be conducted from January 2012 through May 2014. Since this schedule was put in place before tank demolition, concrete tank bottom removal or asbestos removal, this date will be shifted back because there were two years of demolition work that was not anticipate. Additional soil investigation will be conducted to delineate impacted areas and confirm clean areas from February 2013 through May 2013. Respiration test, soil confirmation sampling and reporting will be conducted from May 2014 through December 2014. A draft CSM was submitted to the Regional Board. Additional soil investigation will be conducted and the CSM will be updated. The final CSM, will be used to determine areas needing remediation to reach cleanup goals. Areas that are viewed to be non-impacted will not be remediated. Mary Jane McIntosh asks when the soil remediation will be scheduled. Mr. Hassan answers that we are tasked by DLA Energy to complete the soil investigation and update site CSM. Once that is completed, a recommendation will be made to DLA Energy as to what remediation should be considered. Upon DLA Energy's approval, Parsons hopes to proceed. The timing is to finish the CSM around May/June 2013. DLA Energy will have the opportunity to review prior to Regional Board submittal. By the time of the August RAB meeting, Mr. Hassan states that he should be in a better position to report the dates.

[Slide 20] Mr. Hassan continues discussion of the Groundwater Remediation Schedule and states that GWE for containment will continue. Groundwater remediation technologies will be evaluated and remedial action will be proposed and implemented. This is projected for the second half of 2013 through the end of 2014. Assuming that all sampling and final CSM completed and approved. Any required pilot testing will also be conducted. Mary Jane McIntosh asks for clarification of Mr. Hassan's statements regarding concentrating remediation efforts on those areas that are impacted and not touching other areas. Is he specifically talking about not remediating areas that are non-detect? Are we going to be leaving areas without systems that do

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

have contaminants? Mr. Hassan answers that the CSM is based on all existing site data going back 10 to 15 years. The areas that have been impacted versus areas that have shown concentrations below the cleanup goals approved in July 2012 are considered. If there are areas that are below those concentration levels, then there is no action required to clean up because those areas already meet the requirement. But areas that are in exceedance of approved cleanup levels are where remedial action will be proposed.

Planned Activities

[Slide 21] Mr. Hassan goes on to discuss Planned Activities. Continue operation, weekly system inspections, required sampling, evaluation and optimization of GWE and SVE systems. Conduct 1st quarter 2013 GWM sentry event (this was done in January 2013); 1st semiannual 2013 event (April); and 3rd quarter 2013 GWM sentry event (July). Prepare and submit NPDES discharge monitoring report for 4th quarter 2012 and 1st and 2nd quarter 2013.

[Slide 22] Mr. Hassan states that this is the end of the presentation before he goes into the groundwater report if there are any questions. Tracy Winkler states that she was at Holifield Park recently and heard a humming noise. She would like to know what is causing that humming noise and if it is equipment. She noticed a little building – like a little outhouse – near the southeast corner of the tank farm. Steve Defibaugh answers that there is an air compressor inside the equipment shed. Ms. Winkler asks if that is something new. Steve Defibaugh answers that it is not new. Ms. Winkler asks if that runs 24 hours a day. Steve Defibaugh answers that it does. Ms. Winkler asks if the neighbors can hear it. Steve Defibaugh states that he has walked by and hasn't noticed it before. Steve Defibaugh states that it will be checked to make sure it is not making more noise than usual. It has been there for years. Ms. Winkler states that she has never noticed it before.

4. Second Semiannual 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Event Redwan Hassan, Parsons

[Slide 23] Mr. Hassan begins by stating that everyone should have a copy of the report. 3rd Quarter Sentry event was conducted by DLA Energy and SFPP in July 2012. The 2nd Semiannual Event was also conducted by DLA and SFPP in October 2012. Monthly Events in the southeastern area wells was conducted by SFPP in August, September, November and December 2012.

[Slide 24] Mr. Hassan discusses well gauging and sampling and states that low-flow purging were used. 192 wells were gauged and 101 wells were sampled. SVE/TFE/GWE systems were turned off prior to gauging and sampling of the wells.

[Slide 25] In the past groundwater monitoring reports the previous semiannual data was used for comparison but instead, annual comparisons were made to the previous year and same monitoring event, specifically to the October 2011 semiannual GWM event. This was discussed during the August RAB meeting. Groundwater levels during October 2012 were generally similar to those encountered a year ago in October 2011. In the uppermost aquifer, groundwater elevations were on average 1.97 feet lower since October 2011. The horizontal hydraulic gradient was approximately 0.003 ft/ft toward the north; which is a slight shift in direction whereas before it was toward the north-northwest. In the Exposition Aquifer, groundwater elevations in three wells increased by 0.12 to 1.8 feet and decreased at two wells by 0.06 to 0.75 feet since October 2011. Horizontal hydraulic gradient was approximately 0.0003 ft/ft toward the east-southeastward.

[Slide 26] Free product was measured in 12 of the 192 wells gauged from four areas of concern: northern tank farm area at PZ-3, TF-17, TF-8, TF-20, TF-22 and TF-23; north-eastern area at GMW-62; truck fueling area at MW-15 and GMW-4 and at GMW-10 northwest of the truck fueling area and west of the small slop tank; and south-central area at GMW-O-12 and GMW-O-20. Note that free product was not observed in any wells in the southeastern 24-inch block valve area.

[Slides 27 and 28] Mr. Hassan discusses a slide of the Groundwater Elevation and Free Product Plumes for October 2012 and states that the flow direction is mostly to the north. In the past it used to be more northwest. However, compared to a year ago in October 2011, it is not a huge bend or difference. Five years ago it was more like northwest, but lately it's been trending to the north. The Free Product map shows that by

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

and large it has stayed consistent. Mr. Hassan points out the locations of the plume and free product.

[Slide 29] Mr. Hassan shows a slide of the Groundwater Elevation in the Exposition Wells and states it is pretty much trending the same direction as it has been before, showing basically no change.

[Slide 30] Exposition Wells EXP-1, -2 and -3 were sampled by both DLA and SFPP and EXP-5 was only sampled by SFPP. All analytical results were non-detect except for the following: 1,2-DCA was detected at EXP-3 at an estimated concentration of 0.45 J micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) which is just below the laboratory reporting limit. This type of low-level detection occasionally occurs in the EXP wells but is generally not repeated. The EXP wells will continue to be monitored quarterly.

[Slide 31] In discussing the Uppermost Aquifer Wells, in most areas, the lateral extents of TPH, benzene, MTBE, TBA and 1,2-DCA in groundwater remain similar to those interpreted during recent previous monitoring events and from a year ago in October 2011. Concentrations are influenced by water level fluctuations.

[Slides 32 through 36] Mr. Hassan discusses a series of slides showing changes in plumes for TPH, benzene, 1,2-DCA, MTBE and TBA spanning years 2006 through 2012 showing the data from October every year.

[Slide 34] Ms. McIntosh comments that the 1,2-DCA plume has stayed consistent which is good in the sense that it hasn't increased or expanded, but it is bad in the sense that it's just sitting there and not coming back onsite, which was our original idea of what would happen with that plume. She asks if there would be any benefit in starting back up the Westside barrier and if that would pull plume back onsite. She mentions that the Westside barrier was to keep the plume from migrating any further and asks if there is anything now that can be put in place to try to draw it back onsite. Mr. Defibaugh stated that in 2010 it was receding and the outlines of the plume were about the same. The concentrations are still so low that it didn't seem worth the effort to turn the system back on, especially since it is still below the drinking water standards. Mr. Jablonski stated that this year the highest concentrations were 7 or 9 parts per billion. Mr. Wuttig comments that when you look at the concentrations within the outline, they show that they are decreasing – although the total footprint is consistent but with time it should start to shrink. Ms. McIntosh asked if this is due to natural attenuation. Mr. Wuttig says yes, dilution and decay.

Mr. Cho asks about human health risk assessment and vapor delineation and if any were done in the northwest site area. Mr. Hassan states there are 7 vapor probes along the NW, north, and NE property boundaries. There was a health risk assessment from this onsite data and results were below risk levels and there were no risks. When you look at the graph it shows a big area. But when you look closely at the concentration levels, they are very small. If you look at the concentrations on the northwest for TPH and BTEX, especially benzene, they are really low compared to what we see somewhere in the main tank farm area or other parts of the site. So yes, we have one probe in the NW corner that has shown no vapor concentrations or risk. There was a vapor monitoring program where the probes were sampled four consecutive quarters and all results were below human health risk levels.

[Open Discussion] Ms. McIntosh asks if we took the most recent snapshot of MTBE, TBA, BTEX, and TPH and laid them on top of each other to see where all of those plumes line up, could we treat those areas as quickly as possible. Could we concentrate on those areas. Would we be a little bit farther ahead. Is this something that we could do? Mr. Hassan answers that this is pretty much the essence of the model – basically taking all of the contaminants and laying them out together. The CSM combines soil and groundwater data. If you put them all together, you know the areas of impact you need to concentrate on to remediate, versus the areas that we do not think are impacted and therefore we would not do anything. Mr. Defibaugh interjects that the majority of MTBE and TBA contamination is in the southeastern area, which is where they have increased pumping, added monitoring wells. Ms. McIntosh says she did see some change in that area. Mr. Defibaugh says that there is no measurable product now, which shows that they are going in the right direction. Hopefully once all the product source has been removed, it will make the dissolved phase disappear

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

faster.

Ms. Winkler states that some of the most recent numbers look pretty big and asks if the units were changed. Mr. Hassan answers that they stayed the same and are consistent with the year before in terms of concentrations. There was not a magnitude change.

Ms. Winkler refers to the MTBE map with the plume on the west side and asks if the circle is based on a well that is tested offsite. Mr. Hassan answers that the circle is based on the wells that were sampled and measured. If nothing is shown, than that well was not detected. Ms. Winkler asks if, by causing that to go over to Norwalk Blvd., is there a well in somebody's yard being tested. Mr. Hassan responds that some of these wells have shown concentrations, although there were some non-detect wells – referring to the slide. Ms. Winkler asks if you go south on Norwalk from your leftmost part of the circle, are there wells down there being tested? Mr. Hassan explains that they sample over 100 wells, some of which are offsite and in that area. Ms. Lucas interjects that a solid line indicates that the plume is closed and bounded and therefore, a well on the other side had to have shown no contamination which is why we were able to close the plume. Ms. Winkler asks if that is just a guess. Ms. Lucas responds that it is a guess between that well and the non detect well as to where it is clean; but we know it's clean before it gets to the next one – so it is bound.

5. Regulatory Agency Update Paul Cho, Regional Water Quality Control Board

Mr. Cho says he does not want to restate all the technical components; but actually, they need some components of their own for the closure because this program, as Mary Jane has said, is 18 years along, some may wonder where they are going. They want the site to be developed after remediation, which is the top priority. The site is surrounded by residential areas there is no pressure going on, so we want the cleanup to be completed and the site to be developed. The city and the public are giving them pressure to complete the cleanup.

Mr. Cho discusses the plan for the next six months. They do need a conceptual site model which is the main component for closure. The CSM is kind of the doctor's statement saying that they've examined the body and here's the problem, so now we have to get all these pictures, x-rays, MRI's and CT's, then we have to talk about what the treatment should be. So we did the treatment and then we can get the patient discharged. That is the big concept. It's very complicated. Maybe it seems as if it's taking too long. But we don't have a very good sample case in which this kind of tank case is closed and cleanup done in five years. We don't have that kind of sample case. Technically we are on top of the technical matters in terms of the free product removal and cleanup. Kinder Morgan and DLA did a very good job. Management is very happy about it. Mr. Cho does update management on progress in a timely manner and they are very curious about the progress but are, at the moment, pretty happy about it. As long as there is development in the future. You will see more components that are spelled out in their letter addressed to DLA. You will see more components that are needed for the path forward to closure. They are confident that they can meet expectation. Mr. Cho asks for questions.

Ms. Winkler asks if he is concerned that the elevation of the water has gone down. Mr. Cho responds that he is not very concerned because it may change over time and they are extracting a lot of groundwater. It may be that the water district doesn't like the idea that they are extracting a lot of groundwater from the basin because it's our reserve system. So the (politics?) are saying, "Hey, we don't really need to extract that much groundwater and dump it into the ocean, because we do have a resource. You can see that CH2M Hill mentioned a pilot project the same as DLA. After the conceptual site model, they are going to look at what is the appropriate cleanup remedy. They are going to talk about that toward the end of the year. That is a new area to be talked about. Mr. Defibaugh comments that, to go back to the groundwater issue, there was a big spike in 2005 due to heavy rainfall that year, so some of that recovery was from the water table rising in 2005 then slowly coming back down again. Ms. Winkler asks if the groundwater level is lower at the site than it is a mile away. Are they causing it to go down? Mr. Defibaugh responds that there may be a small amount – a foot or so here or there – but it's doubtful that there would be much of a regional influence. In the scheme of things, they are not pulling that much water out. Mr. Ferguson comments that groundwater is being extracted

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

from water that's above the Bellflower Aquatard. Basically it is perched water. It's not the water that WRD monitors for their agency's purposes. They're actually monitor deeper aquifers. They see on a regional basis all the main aquifers have been decreasing. They had a small blip year before last. There was a little bit of rain. Because of the good rainfall, they saw the levels rise. But last year rainfall was below average. It's a seasonal fluctuation. On a 30-year basis you can see a change in the groundwater levels across the entire basin. They are seeing a slight decrease in groundwater levels in the rest of the basin and you will see it in this perched zone as well. It's not unusual. The small blips that you see beneath the site in small areas where it drops down is due to the groundwater extraction. That is normal. When you take water out it has to come from somewhere. Mainly the perched zone is reliant on infiltration from rainwater and irrigation. Sometimes it has the biggest fluctuation you might see on a month-to-month basis or a year-to-year basis because it's perched, but it is nothing that they are very concerned with.

Mr. Hassan comments that WRD requested both parties to come up with conceptive use of groundwater, so instead of discharging into the ocean, we need to find a way to reuse that water or not use an extraction method but an alternative method. We are in the process of doing that and it will come together once we do the various pilot tests to determine which is the best process, and at that point with approval we will be able to address that. Mr. Ferguson states that the main role of WRD is to replenish the groundwater basin and also the west coast basin and the central basin. Both DLAE and KMEP had a non-consumptive water use permit and an RA, which is a Replenishment Assessment exemption that expired in February 2009 and was never renewed. Since all the water rights to the basin have been adjudicated, if you don't have a water right, you cannot extract water. So basically, both entities have been extracting water without water rights. That could become a problem if any of the other entities who do have water rights get their feathers ruffled over it. We've discussed this issue with both entities and they have submitted applications for a non-competitive use permit and an RA exemption. DLAE has also submitted with that the water rights agreement that they have with the City of Norwalk and Kinder Morgan is also working on that. This is in legal review right now. The way it works is that the entities that have these water rights just don't give them over without some kind of assurance that they are going to get the water use permit. So they draft the form with all the parts filled out but not signed or authorized. They wait for their agency to issue the resolution that says that they will grant permit and once they get their paperwork done, they give it to their board, then it goes back to the entities – in this case the City of Norwalk – and then they'll sign it and they will issue the full non-competitive use permit. They are waiting to see how the holders of the water rights handles the situation. They are looking to put forth DLA's permit request application to their quality committee at the end of this month and then it will go on to their board the first part of March. If they can get that part of the finished documentation from Kinder Morgan in the same cycle, otherwise it will get pushed off to another month. They would like to get both of those things done as soon as possible.

[Open Discussion] Ms. McIntosh comments on names to be removed from the mailing list: Sergio Contreras, Office of Assemblyman Tony Mendoza. He is no longer an assemblyman. Adding Ian Calderon's office and Assemblywoman Christine Garcia's office. She covered a small portion of Norwalk in the Cerritos College area. Ms. Lucas will email Adriana for contact info. Also adding Angelina Mancillas, Office of Congresswoman Linda Sanchez. Keep Congresswoman Napolitano on the list. Even though she no longer represents the area, she is still very involved. Ms. McIntosh says there are no other changes to the mailing list. She comments that she is really pleased with the communication over the past six months. Regular emails and regular email reports are going out. Questions are being asked and answered and everyone is being copied. The high level of communication makes it easier for them since they only meet twice a year.

Ms. McIntosh also says she is very pleased with the reports. She has seen some real progress made within the last six months – not only in the remediation itself as far as what the numbers are showing but she also sees an emphasis on the part of both parties that they want to try to reinvent their systems and do whatever is necessary to pushing remediation. She thanks Paul for keeping that in the forefront. She does not have a

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

07 February 2013

single complaint and is very thankful that everyone is on the same page and moving forward.

Ms. Winkler asks a question about putting something up on the Geotracker website. Mr. Cho explains that all she has to do is go to Google and key in “Geotracker”, follow the link and go to “Public Access” and download all the reports. Mr. Defibaugh says it’s really easy to navigate because you can use the map of Norwalk and click on the area you want and it will say it’s the military site or it’s the Kinder Morgan site and you click on that little spot on the map and then it opens up all the documents and everything else.

Ms. Winkler asks if we are still using “that other website”. Ms. McIntosh says yes, we have our tank farm website. It had been URS but now Parsons is running it. Ms. Lucas says it is up and running, although there are a couple of links that need to be fixed and it still shows URS as the owner. We will update the contacts list as well. It is still up and running and all the documents are still accessible. Ms. Winkler asks what she should Google. Ms. Lucas responds “NorwalkRAB.com”.

Ms. McIntosh asks a question about the newsletter. Mr. Hassan asks if URS did that. He says our task was to do what URS was doing. Ms. McIntosh says the newsletter was done more from the military side, but it covered the tank farm. It discussed everything that is going on in the tank farm site, covered the demolition, covered the cleanup, and gave information about the site. That was sent out quarterly. Mr. Hassan asks if that was something DLA was doing or was URS doing it on DLA’s behalf? Ms. McIntosh says she believes it was something URS was doing on DLA’s behalf. Tim White would contact her prior to it going out to let her know what was going to be in it, if there was any particular information that she needed to have in it. She will send Mr. Hassan a copy. Mr. Hassan says he does recall, but asks if that was done in the interest of the demolition or if it was something that was being done prior. Ms. McIntosh says it was being done for several years. Mr. Strom says the reason he’ll have to get back to her is some contractual issues between them and Parsons. Parsons does not have this contracted and DLA will take care of it directly. Ms. McIntosh says she is asking because it’s been helpful for the residents, so if it’s not something that is going to be done, let her know. Ms. Winkler asks who it was sent to. Ms. McIntosh says it was sent to all of the residents within 1,000 feet. There were people on both sides of Norwalk Blvd. that got it and on both sides of Bloomfield, both sides of Excelsior. It was a substantial area. RAB members got one in the mail also. Mr. Hassan asks if it was printed in both English and Spanish. Ms. McIntosh answers that it was.

Distribution of the reports is discussed. Mr. Cho will get a hard copy of everything as will Mr. Garcia and Mr. Hoskins. Everyone but Mr. Ferguson will get a hard copy of the semiannual GWM report. The rest of the reports will only be emailed.

6. Set Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next semiannual RAB meeting will be held on Thursday, August 8, 2013, at 5:00 p.m. in the Norwalk Arts & Sports Complex. The agenda is to include remediation system updates, semiannual monitoring report, and five-year plan updates.

7. Public Comment Period

Ms. McIntosh made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Defibaugh adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

DRAFT

ACTION ITEMS		
Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Conceptual Site Model	KMEP	08/08/13
Find out about continuing with the Quarterly Tank Farm Newsletter	DLAE, Stuart Strom	08/08/13
Update Distribution List	Parsons	08/08/13
Next RAB meeting	All	08/08/13