

**MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO
PROPOSED PLAN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION
NO FURTHER ACTION SITES
INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM**

ORIGINAL

PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

Thursday, July 31, 1997

4:30 p.m.

**Irvine City Hall
One Civic Center Plaza
Conference and Training Center
Irvine, California**

Reported By: Jeanine Burgner, CSR No. 6653

HAHN
BOWERSOCK
C O R P O R A T I O N
Certified Court and Deposition Reporters
3187 Redhill Avenue · Suite 115 · Costa Mesa, CA 92626
800-660-3187 · Fax 714-662-1398

COSTA MESA · SAN BERNARDINO · LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

<u>COMMENTS BY:</u>	Page
DONALD H. REZ Affiliation: Polar Marine, Inc. 850-A Ronda Mendosa Laguna Hills, California 92653 (714) 588-9010	3
GAIL REAVIS Affiliation: Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Restoration Advisory Board Community Member 21281 Astoria Mission Viejo, California 92692	5 & 6
ANDREW BAIN, U.S. EPA	5
DON ZWEIFEL Affiliation: MCAS El Toro RAB, MCAS Tustin RAB, Consultant to ETLRA (El Toro Local Redevelopment Authority) 2110 West Larkspur Drive Orange, California 92868 (714) 937-1032	6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Thursday, July 31, 1997

(The following comments were made on the record):

DONALD REZ: I'm a resident at Leisure World. I'm very unpopular at Leisure World, because I am voluble in my objection to the fact that our Board of Directors saw fit to produce a half a million dollars-plus into the --

Proposition A, was it?

Don't have an airport at El Toro.

And they didn't ask me or anybody else. They lost the thing. But my treasury and funds that I have in there that maintain my house are gone. And they've raised -- twice since they've raised our monthly dues. And I feel like the Board of Directors that took that money should pay it back to our treasury. So I am very unpopular with the Board of Directors.

I am an inventor. I have a process -- two processes for producing structural concrete out of polluted soil or sand. I've done it a number of times. And I can do everything that is necessary except pass an EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) test, which requires you to reduce the material to -- so fine, it's just a little more coarse than face powder. It has to pass

1 through a 300-mesh screen, which it doesn't matter how you
2 have encapsulated this oil or pollutant, they're going to
3 grind it up so that it is now bare again and reduced in
4 size so much that it spreads so easily that it -- you can't
5 pass their EPA test.

6 The Federal Government has seen fit a few
7 years back, along with Exxon, to try to get oil out of
8 oil-bearing shale in Colorado. I think it was twenty-some
9 years ago.

10 And they have never been successful enough
11 to get enough oil to even supply the process expenditure of
12 energy. So there's no value realized from getting the oil
13 out of the oil-bearing shale.

14 The thing that put me on to this process is I
15 make oil-bearing shale out of this other material. And so,
16 it is necessary that I find something that I can produce
17 out of this polluted soil or sand that has the same
18 characteristics of oil-bearing shale and acceptance by the
19 EPA; that if they were to grind up that oil-bearing shale,
20 they'd get oil out of it. And they would have a
21 pollutant.

22 So I feel like their rules are too
23 restrictive. And I sure would like to find some way of
24 nudging them a little.

25 ///

1 GAIL REAVIS: My first comment is I'd like an
2 answer to my comment. I'd also like an answer to last
3 time's comment.

4 Okay. I brought up one of the concerns. And
5 that was about the manganese.

6 The fact sheet refers to the use of manganese
7 being within background range in the vicinity. I think
8 that's very vague.

9 I realize this is a summary report. But I
10 don't believe that that information is held up in the
11 individual documents. So it's misleading to the general
12 public, who is not even likely to read all of this.

13 I disagree with no cleanup action proposed at
14 eleven sites. I believe if there were private parties in
15 possession of these properties, and that they were being
16 sold to another private property outside of the Government,
17 they would probably need more than no cleanup action
18 proposed.

19 Well, I can't think of what I was going to
20 say. That'll do for the time being.

21

22 ANDREW BAIN: My name is Andrew Bain, with the U.S.
23 EPA, asking Gail if she wanted a written letter in response
24 to her comments.

25 ///

1 GAIL REAVIS: For both meetings.

2 Oh, I'd also like to go on record that I
3 don't consider these to be meetings. They are and have
4 been termed as "open houses." I'd appreciate it if they
5 were called such on the public information that they put
6 out. There's no forum for the people who do come to the
7 meeting to be able to convey their interests, their
8 concerns or their questions to other people. And I think
9 that process of thinking is necessary, because some people
10 don't know what their questions are. So we need to be able
11 to hear other people's thoughts, to work off of that.
12 While this satisfies the Government's requirements of going
13 through the process and making the information available to
14 the public, I think that it's less than the public needs to
15 become informed.

16 I also never saw anything published in the
17 paper on this. If it was in the paper, it wasn't very
18 well-handled. And that is nothing against Matthew. I know
19 he's in charge of this. He's a nice guy.

20 But beyond fulfilling the legal requirements
21 of what the Government wants, I just don't think that it's
22 what the public needs.

23 Thank you.

24

25 DON ZWEIFEL: I enjoyed talking with

1 Lynn Hornecker. She's with the Engineering Command. And I
2 found it marvelous. She gave a wonderful explanation about
3 that program, and the IRP (Installation Restoration
4 Program).

5 I also talked to Dante Tedaldi. He's with
6 Bechtel. And I found he was very helpful in regards to
7 risk assessment.

8 And I also talked with Andrea Temeshy. She's
9 the toxicologist for Bechtel. And I found that her
10 conversation with me was terribly valuable.

11 And Andy Piszkin, I think I enjoyed
12 Andy Piszkin's comments.

13 And Joseph Joyce, I'd also like to add, he
14 was very helpful, too.

15 And I feel this was a wonderful opportunity
16 to see the overall -- the big picture. It really showed
17 the big picture. And I think it's absolutely necessary to
18 have this type of forum.

19 However, there was one -- I did have, at one
20 time, some very major misgivings regarding this type of
21 forum. And now, I think I was mistaken.

22 And -- But I do believe that this is just one
23 mode of making a presentation on this particular subject.
24 But there's -- There are other modes, but this is
25 definitely needed. I found it extremely illuminating and

1 very insightful. And it helped me to understand the big
2 picture, as I said earlier.

3 I think what I'm concerned about right now is
4 MTBE (methyl tertiary butyl ether, a gasoline additive)
5 concentrations. And I'm also concerned about leachability
6 of the -- I'm talking about the leachate emissions. That's
7 a worrisome thing to me. I'm still not, maybe, totally
8 convinced that the -- that the human -- The risk to human
9 health -- I haven't really made -- I don't have enough
10 information to determine whether the risk to human health
11 is a factor here in this presentation that I've seen this
12 evening or not.

13 I'm inclined to think that -- As I said,
14 Andrea Temeshy's presentations indicate to me that pica
15 factor (appetite or craving for unnatural foods, as chalk
16 or clay) is -- has been considered in the risk assessment,
17 and that they felt that it was not a risk.

18 So I would -- I would say that we need to
19 have more of these. And I think that I approve of it
20 wholeheartedly. However, a public forum with a dog and
21 pony show where we can participate and where we can have a
22 microphone, each individual can come up and maybe make a
23 presentation as to how they feel about -- rather than just
24 doing it, you know, through a Court Reporter. This is
25 fine. This is one mode. But I think it's necessary --

1 Other people want to know how other people feel. And in
2 this particular instance, this isn't reflected. This
3 particular forum or presentation or exhibition can't
4 reflect that, because it's not set up that way.

5 But all in all, it's imperative that you have
6 this exhibition, this public demonstration, you might say,
7 a dog and pony show, on a finite level, mind you. So --
8 It's great as far as it goes, but you must consider that
9 there is another forum where people actually -- the
10 participatory factor needs to be considered. Once you have
11 that, then people feel that they've been -- that they've
12 had their day in court, you might say. And as Andy Piszkin
13 was saying, everybody likes to get up on their soapbox, or
14 maybe Joseph Joyce said that. And I think it's important
15 to, for people to have that forum, too.

16 Thank you.

17
18 (The Public Meeting concluded at 9:00 p.m.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE UNDERSIGNED SHORTHAND REPORTER DOES HEREBY
DECLARE:

THAT THE FOREGOING WAS TAKEN BEFORE ME AT THE
TIME AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH AND WAS RECORDED
STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND WAS THEREAFTER TRANSCRIBED,
SAID TRANSCRIPT BEING A TRUE COPY OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES
THEREOF.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SUBSCRIBED MY NAME
SEP 10 1997
THIS DATE: _____.

Jeanine Burque