

**LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
FINAL MINUTES FROM 15 SEPTEMBER 1998 MEETING**

The Long Beach Naval Complex held a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting on 15 September 1998, at the Navy Caretaker Site Office, off Navy Way and Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, California.

**RAB ATTENDANCE:**

Alan Lee - Present  
Ron Johnson - Present  
Martin Hausladen- Present  
Alvaro Gutierrez - Present  
Henry Brice - Present  
Mary Butler - Present  
Carol A. Churchill - Absent  
P. James Drake - Absent  
Harold Ellis - Absent  
John Essington - Present  
Betsy Foley - Present  
Howard Hargrove - Present  
Bob Kanter - Present  
Joseph Petway - Present  
Darwin Thorpe - Present  
Karl A. Tiedemann - Alternate  
Anna Ulaszewski - Present  
Maria Vargas - Present

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle L. Gallice, CDM Technical Support  
John Hill, SWDIV  
Thomas Macchiarella, SWDIV  
Aaron Yue, Cal-EPA DTSC  
John Pickering, AMC  
Abram Eloskof, Foster Wheeler  
Aklile Gessesse, Bechtel  
Terry Ulaszewski  
Greysen Edward Cooley  
Ann Cantrell, Audubon Society  
Ann Denison, Audubon Society  
Anthony Caldwell, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Shirley Oglesky, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Ann Gerringe, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Don Marsh, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Mary Steel, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Nancy Thomson, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Stan Klock, Roosevelt Base Foundation  
Douglas Thomson, Roosevelt Base Foundation

**MEETING BEGAN AT 7 PM** – Alan Lee, Navy Co-Chair, presiding as Chair.

The Chair welcomed the RAB members, and members of the audience, and reminded everyone to please sign in (PRINT LEGIBLY) - *"The sign-in sheet is the official record of attendance for each RAB meeting. It is the responsibility of each and every RAB member to sign into the official record. If you do not sign in, you did not attend the meeting"*.

Mr. Lee reminded the RAB members that the meeting was being tape recorded. No objections were voiced from the floor.

Mr. Lee stated that the Roosevelt Base Foundation would like to video tape the RAB meeting and asked whether this would be acceptable to the RAB members. A member of the Roosevelt Base Foundation stated that the video taping of the meeting is for fact finding purposes only. The Roosevelt Base Foundation is interested in gathering more information concerning the financial

and environmental issues that surround LBNC. Ms. Ulaszewski asked who would be handling the tapes. The President of the Roosevelt Base Foundation will be handling the tapes. Ms. Tiedemann asked if the tapes would be used for commercial or propaganda purposes. The tapes will not be used for these purposes. A copy of the tapes can be obtained from the Roosevelt Base Foundation upon request by a RAB member. The RAB stated that it would be okay for the meeting to be video taped based on the reasons for the taping provided by the Roosevelt Base Foundation.

Ms. Vargas asked if the RAB should salute the American Flag before beginning meetings. The RAB decided they would not salute the flag before meetings.

### **Administrative Issues**

Mr. Lee asked for comments on the 21 July 1998 meeting minutes. The minutes were approved with no corrections. Mr. Lee stated that a copy of the meeting minutes are maintained at the LBNC Information Repository located in the Government Documents section of the Long Beach Public Library.

Ms. Ulaszewski requested that the RAB members introduce themselves to the several new faces in attendance at this meeting. The RAB members, Navy representatives, and regulatory agency representatives introduced themselves. Mr. Lee introduced Mr. Johnson and stated that he is the local LBNC point of contact and he can be reached at 619-843-0206 (cellular phone). Mr. Johnson stated that the Caretaker Site Office will be moving into the Reserve Center within the next few months.

Mr. Lee stated that Ms. Gallice has researched the recommendations on where to hold future RAB meetings presented at the previous RAB meeting. The LBNC Caretaker Site Office will be unavailable after they move this office to the Reserve Center. Ms. Gallice presented information on the Long Beach Water Department Conference Room which is located off Lakewood Blvd/Redondo Avenue in Long Beach and the City of Long Beach Conference Room which is located off Pine Avenue in downtown Long Beach. Mr. Essington suggested that the RAB try the Long Beach Water Department. Dr. Kanter suggested that the RAB stay at the Caretaker Site Office until they move. Ms. Vargas stated that the Long Beach Water Department would be better because the RAB meetings are for the community and the Long Beach Water Department facility would be more community friendly. The RAB voted to try the Long Beach Water Department for the 17 November 1998 RAB meeting. [Subsequent to the meeting Ms. Gallice was notified by the Long Beach Water Department that they have changed their procedures and they will not be able to accommodate the RAB. Therefore, the 17 November 1998 RAB meeting will be held at the LBNC Caretaker Site Office.]

Ms. Vargas recognized some of the members in the audience that she had invited to attend the RAB meeting and she thanked them for attending.

## **Presentation of the Disposal and Reuse Update at LBNC**

Prior to the presentation, Mr. Lee reminded everyone that the forum of the RAB is not disposal and reuse, it is environmental cleanup. It is important that the environmental cleanup of the base be consistent with the local redevelopment plan and therefore an update is being provided to the RAB.

Mr. Hill the Deputy Base Closure Manager, SWDIV, presented an update of the disposal and reuse of LBNC. Mr. Hill stated that he works on closure issues for SWDIV. He provided an overview of the recent actions at LBNC.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed in May 1998. Upon finalization of the EIS/EIR the NEPA/ROD was executed. The Navy recommended in the NEPA/ROD the disposal of LBNC in accordance with the approved Reuse Plan from the City of Long Beach. The Reuse Plan outlines the development of a container terminal facility on LBNC as well as some other port ancillary uses.

Prior to ultimate conveyance, a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (LIFOC) has been executed between the Navy and the City of Long Beach. This includes the Long Beach part of IR Site 6A, the entire NAVSTA main base, the Mole (except for the San Pedro Facility fuel pier), and entire LBNSY excluding Pier E. The LIFOC is good for 50 years or until such time as the conveyance deed can occur. The City of Long Beach can construct their container terminal facility, though they must comply with all environmental and deed restrictions.

Pier E and the Long Beach Harbor West Basin were not included in the lease. The Long Beach Harbor West Basin excludes approximately 100 feet of submerged land that is referred to as the annulus. This area is legally described as part of the upland property. In 1963 when the federal government acquired this land there was a reversionary clause that stated that once 50% of the upland property was no longer being used for federal purposes the harbor would revert back to the City of Long Beach, excluding the 100 feet annulus. The 100 feet annulus has been retained by the Navy and is included in the LIFOC. Pier E and the Long Beach Harbor West Basin have the same reversionary clause. Pier E and the Long Beach Harbor West Basin reverted back to the City of Long Beach on 11 August 1998, the same day the LIFOC was signed.

Under the terms of the LIFOC the Port of Long Beach has assumed complete responsibility for all environmental cleanup of the Long Beach Harbor West Basin. That includes the submerged lands and the land under the piers. The Navy has retained their responsibility for the environmental cleanup of all sites on the upland property, including those sites on Pier E.

The final disposal of the property will be in two parcels, which was agreed upon by all parties under the LIFOC. Parcel 1 will be the first disposal action and is described as approximately 200 acres of upland property and the non-reversionary property in the Long Beach Harbor West Basin. The exact boundary of the 200 acres of upland property are currently under negotiation between the Navy and the Port of Long Beach. However, preliminary indications describe it as the entire NAVSTA main base with the exception of IR Site 14, the Navy Mole with the

exception of the San Pedro Facility Fuel Depot and IR Sites 1 and 2, a portion of the LBNSY, and the Long Beach portion of IR Site 6A.

Parcel 2 will be conveyed at a later date and will contain all the remaining property not covered under Parcel 1. These two parcels are proposed to be conveyed under the CERCLA 334 deferral authority. This allows property which is still dirty to be conveyed even though all environmental cleanup remediation has not yet occurred. This process will be discussed by Mr. Yue during his presentation.

Parcel 1 is scheduled to be conveyed at the end of 1999 and Parcel 2 will be conveyed sometime during the year 2000.

Mr. Hill provided his phone number, 619-532-4746, where he can be reached if there are any questions after the meeting.

### *Questions*

Mr. Hargrove asked if the pumping oil wells that are across Ocean Boulevard are included in the base property. Mr. Hill stated that is not Navy property and is not part of LBNC. Dr. Kanter stated that the wells are owned by the City of Long Beach and are operated by a private contractor.

Mr. Cooley asked about the current activities of the Sea Launch Facility, located on the Mole. Mr. Hill stated that the City of Long Beach leased this property to the Sea Launch facility. Therefore, Mr. Cooley would have to contact the City of Long Beach to get an update.

### **Presentation of Early Transfer Authority**

Mr. Aaron Yue, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), presented the Early Transfer process. Mr. Yue began by presenting a brief history of the evolution of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLA was enacted in 1980 to provide for the cleanup of contaminated sites. CERCLA was amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 that added Section 120 which directed Federal Entities to comply with CERCLA and imposed requirements prior to transfer of real property owned by Federal Entities. A covenant must be made by the Federal Entity as part of the 120(h)(3) requirements prior to transfer of real property to a non-Federal Entity:

- All necessary remedial actions have been taken
- Any further action found to be necessary will be conducted by the United States

In September 1996 an Amendment to CERCLA, Section 120(h)(3) allowed transfer of real properties by deferring the necessary covenant. Section 120(h)(3)(c) allows transfer even if:

- Remediation is not complete
- Remedy has not been demonstrated to be operating properly and successfully

The “covenant deferral transfer” or “Early Transfer” still requires the completion of all remedies with the oversight of regulatory agencies. There are several key requirements for the deferral.

- Property is suitable to be transferred for the intended use by the transferee
- Transfer of real property to non-Federal Entity
- Transfer will not pose a risk to human health and the environment
- Transfer will not interfere with remedial response actions
- Federal agency responsible for the property is to provide public notice and provide a minimum of 30-days for written public comments on the suitability of the proposed Early Transfer.

The statute also requires documentation of the following to support the transfer:

- Necessary land use restrictions
- Assurance that all response actions will be taken
- Schedules for the investigation and completion of all response actions
- A provision that the Federal Entity submits a budget request to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that adequately addresses schedules of the response actions

Mr. Yue discussed the State’s interests. California wants to promote economic recovery impacted by base closures. California does not want Superfund liabilities associated with improper transfer of contaminated federal facilities. Most importantly, California wants to protect human health and the environment. California’s protocol for this process is as follows:

- The Governor’s approval is needed for all deferral requests; coordinated by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
- Secretary of Cal-EPA (6 State Departments & Regional Boards), may designate one agency to evaluate the environmental suitability of the Early Transfer, and make recommendation to the Governor

Mr. Yue proceeded with a discussion of the application process, which is a three track approach for expedience.

- Application Track - where the Covenant Deferral Request is prepared
- Consent Agreement Track
- Land Use Covenant Track

The application track involves the transferring entity and reuse entity agreeing on the viability of Early Transfer. In addition, the transferring entity submits a “Letter of Intent” to the Governor’s office. A Covenant Deferral Request is also prepared and involves the following.

- A cover letter with basis for covenant deferral
- An analysis of the intended use and remediation needed
- Funding arrangement and schedule for cleanup
- Financial assurance from transferee (if they perform the response actions)
- Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET)
  - Modified FOST
    - Includes current stage of investigation/remediation
    - Statement of Early Transfer request
    - Projected impact on planned reuse
- Supplemental or Site Specific EBS
  - Includes BCT Screening Evaluation letter
- Environmental Response Obligations Addendum (EROA)
  - A transfer document, part of the contract for sale
  - Identifies conditions/clauses and provisions regarding hazardous substances and response actions to be included in the deed

The Consent Agreement involves the following.

- Provides an enforceable agreement to assure the State authority for oversight of response actions
- An agreement between Federal Entity, State, and Transferee
- Details the responsibility of each party
- Must be completed before Cal-EPA makes recommendation to the Governor

The purpose of the Land Use Covenant is to preserve the remedial action and minimize intrusion of the property. It also protects occupants during remediation and after its completion. It restricts the reuse to address hazards and is an enforceable document against future transferees, successors and assigns. The Land Use Covenant is as follows.

- Legal instrument that runs with the land
- Prepared by Federal Entity, reviewed and modified by State and transferee
- Negotiation must be complete before Cal-EPA makes recommendation to Governor
- Signed before the close of escrow and recorded with county recorder’s office

Once all three tracks are completed the Cal-EPA will provide an environmental evaluation to the Governor. The Governor has sole discretion to approve or deny Early Transfer requests. Upon receipt of the Governor’s approval, the property can be transferred.

When the cleanup of the property is complete the State will issue a certification of completion. The Federal Entity requests CERCLA 120(h)(3) concurrence from the US EPA. The Federal

Entity working with the State and US EPA will revise the deed restrictions if necessary, and the Federal Entity issues a warranty to the transferee.

### *Questions*

Ms. Steel asked if the paperwork still has to be done since the LIFOC was executed in August. Mr. Yue stated yes, the paperwork still has to be done. This is a way of granting the Port of Long Beach title prior to remediation.

Mr. Essington asked who will support the RAB if there is an Early Transfer; will the RAB still exist. Mr. Yue stated that the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) will have to discuss this because there will still be requirements for public notices and public involvement. Mr. Essington asked if this means the BRAC process is ending for LBNC. Mr. Lee stated that the focus of the RAB is the environmental cleanup process. Until cleanup decisions are reached, the RAB will be involved. If the Port of Long Beach takes over the cleanup then there may not be a RAB. There will always be public involvement. Mr. Hausladen added that the BCT is not sure because this is only the second base that has had an Early Transfer.

Ms. Gerringier asked what has been done with the asbestos cleanup in the buildings on base. Mr. Hill stated that the Port of Long Beach has the authority to do the asbestos abatement but he is not sure when they will begin. Dr. Kanter stated that the requests for proposal are out but he did not have a time table. CH2M Hill is the contractor supervising the work. If anyone has any questions they can contact Dr. Kanter and he will forward the questions to the appropriate people.

Mr. Thorpe asked how the transferee determines the pieces when the Early Transfer takes place. Mr. Hill stated that the two parcels were negotiated and agreed upon by all parties which is documented in the LIFOC.

Ms. Foley asked if they were supposed to have the remedial process in place prior to Early Transfer. What if the property is transferred and the remedy does not work. Mr. Yue and Ms. Foley agree to discuss this by teleconference after the meeting.

Mr. Cooley stated that it sounds like this will take between one and two years. Is it two years from today? Mr. Yue stated that realistically it will take about six months after approval by the Governor. Mr. Cooley asked how long it will be from today. Mr. Yue stated that they hope it will occur with one year.

### **Presentation of the Draft Supplemental Groundwater Investigation at Sites 9, 12, and 13**

Mr. Gessesse, Bechtel National Inc., presented the Draft Supplemental Groundwater Investigation (SGI) for IR Sites 9, 12, and 13. The SGI Report present the findings, conclusions, and recommendation for the SGI conducted at IR Sites 9, 12, and 13. The objectives of this report were outlined in a Work Plan approved by the Navy and regulatory agencies. The Work

Plan provided guidelines for addressing data gaps identified in the Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report. The findings of the RI and the SGI will be used in the Feasibility Study (FS) process.

During the RI, additional chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) were identified in the groundwater beneath IR Sites 9, 12, and 13 that were not addressed in the RI/FS Work Plan. At the completion of the Final RI Report, the sources and extents of several volatile organic compounds (VOCs) detected in the groundwater at IR Site 9 were not completely defined, and the source of some of these VOCs remained unknown. In addition, select metals detected in groundwater at levels above their background concentrations at IR Sites 12 and 13. The sources of these metals was not identified in the RI. Four groundwater areas of potential concern (GWAOPCs) were identified in the RI at IR Site 9 and two GWAOPCs were identified at IR Sites 12 and 13. The GWAOPCs at IR Site 9 are as follows:

- GWAOPC 1 is defined as the dissolved chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval;
- GWAOPC 2 is defined as the dissolved chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval to the south of IR Site 9;
- GWAOPC 3 is defined as the dissolved benzene plume (and to a lesser extent, ethylbenzene and xylenes [total] collectively called the “benzene plume”) in the lower interval to the north of IR Site 9; and
- GWAOPC 4 is defined by a single groundwater sample with a reportable concentration of dissolved 1,1-dichloroethane which was collected from the lower interval to the south of Building 129.

The GWAOPCs in the groundwater of the upper interval at IR Sites 12 and 13 are as follows:

- GWAOPC 1 is defined as the dissolved arsenic plume detected in the western portion of IR Site 12 and in the Parking Lot E area to the west of IR Site 12; and
- GWAOPC 2 is defined as the dissolved Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt plume located in the southwest corner of IR Site 12 and on the western edge of IR Site 13.

The SGI field activities included collecting 162 soil gas samples from 156 soil gas locations; collecting 208 soil samples; sounding 19 CPTs at 14 locations; collecting 103 HydroPunch-like groundwater samples from 70 locations; advancing 3 continuous-cored deep soil borings; drilling 15 soil borings and 65 hand-auger locations; sampling 21 groundwater monitoring wells; and performing multiple rounds of groundwater monitoring. Samples were collected and analyzed as outlined in the approved Work Plan and in the technical memoranda.

Based on the water quality data collected during the RI and the SGI, the groundwater of both the upper and the lower intervals is primarily saline (total dissolved solids concentrations of 10,000 to 100,000 milligrams per liter).

Based on the results of the SGI the recommended future action at each of the GWAOPCs and the rationale for these recommendations is as follows:

GWAOPC	Plume	Proposed Action	Rationale
Vicinity of IR Site 9			
1	Chlorinated volatile organic compound (VOC) plume in the upper interval on north edge of Building 128.	No further action recommended.	Limited extent, low concentrations, and lack of discernible vadose zone source.
1	Chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval on southwest side of Building 128.	Further action recommended.	Chlorinated VOCs were detected at several locations at concentrations exceeding the screening criteria.
1	Chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval on northwest corner of Building 128.	Further action recommended.	Plume appears to be associated with underground storage tanks removed northwest of Building 128. Area is subject of another investigation.
1	Chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval on north side of Building 129.	Further action recommended.	Chlorinated VOCs were detected at multiple locations during previous investigations at concentrations exceeding the screening criteria.
1	Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) plume detected in the upper interval on west side of study boundary.	Further action recommended.	Significant levels of MTBE were detected along the western boundary of GWAOPC 1 which do not appear to correlate with any of the chlorinated VOC plumes.
2	Chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval on the north end of Building 131.	Further action recommended.	Chlorinated VOCs were detected at several locations at concentrations exceeding the screening criteria.
2	Chlorinated VOC plume in the upper interval on the south end of Building 131.	No further action recommended.	Vinyl chloride was detected at a single location at concentrations slightly above the screening criteria and a vadose zone source was not identified.
3	Benzene plume in the lower interval in the vicinity of IR Site 9	No further action recommended.	Local groundwater flow conditions onto LBNSY, site stratigraphy, isoconcentration gradients for benzene, and aromatic VOCs ratios suggest off-site source to the north of LBNC.

GWAOPC	Plume	Proposed Action	Rationale
4	1,1-Dichloroethane (DCA) and other chlorinated VOCs in the lower interval in the vicinity of IR Site 9.	No further action recommended.	Source of 1,1-DCA does not appear to be LBNSY based on, lateral continuity of the fine-grained interval, and upward vertical groundwater gradient between the lower and the upper intervals; distribution of 1,1-DCA (GWAOPC 4) appears related to the aromatic VOC plume of GWAOPC 3. GWAOPC 4 should not be considered as a separate GWAOPC but the same as GWAOPC 3. Contaminant concentrations do not exceed screening criteria.
Vicinity of IR Sites 12 and 13			
1	Arsenic detects in the upper interval.	Further action recommended.	Multiple isolated elevated concentrations of arsenic that exceed screening criteria were detected along with the source of the arsenic in groundwater.
2	Manganese-nickel-cobalt detects in the upper interval.	No further action recommended.	Detected concentrations of manganese and cobalt were below screening criteria developed for the protection of human health and the environment. Nickel was detected at approximately 3.3 times the screening concentration, however, the elevated nickel detects were few in number and sporadic in nature.

*Questions about IR Site 9*

Ms. Ulaszewski asked if the IR Site 9 plume has reached the drydock. Mr. Macchiarella stated that the pumps at the northern end have been closed. The Navy is developing a monitoring program. They do not know the source yet, but they are working with adjacent properties. Ms. Ulaszewski stated that “no further action” is not an appropriate action at IR Site 9 and she is voicing this for the record because the Navy does not know enough about the plume or its source.

Mr. Essington asked if there is any historical use of vinyl chloride. Mr. Gessesse stated that they assume it is a breakdown product.

Mr. Cooley asked if the benzene has been considered to be coming from the Gas Station. Mr. Gessesse stated that the Gas Station is under different review and is not the same as in the plume.

*Questions about IR Sites 12 and 13*

Ms. Steel asked why the City of Long Beach wants everyone to think they will demolish LBNC and build a terminal container facility if the environmental cleanup is not complete. Mr. Hill said that the LIFOC states the Port of Long Beach activities cannot impede environmental cleanup

activities. These provisions are in the LIFOC. If there are any further questions about the LIFOC, call Mr. Hill.

Mr. Marsh asked about the purpose of the wells in the drydock. Mr. Gessesse stated that they are used to pump groundwater from the deeper zone to the shallow zone. This keeps the drydock from collapsing. Mr. Marsh asked if there is any salinity from the ocean water. Mr. Gessesse stated that the groundwater is brackish and saline. The flow of water is to the south. Mr. Marsh asked if they believe that Edison is affecting this. Mr. Gessesse said that they may be affecting the shallow water zone.

### **Open Forum for RAB Members and Members of the Audience**

Ms. Cantrell asked if the Port of Long Beach will assume cleanup responsibility of the Long Beach Harbor West Basin before or after the Early Transfer. Mr. Lee stated that they will assume cleanup responsibility both before and after the Early Transfer. As agreed in the LIFOC, the Navy will be responsible for the cleanup of the upland properties and the POLB be responsible for the cleanup of the Long Beach Harbor West Basin. Ms. Cantrell asked who will perform oversight for this work. The US EPA and the State regulatory agencies will perform oversight. Mr. Macchiarella added that the FS for IR Site 7 is expected in early 1999. Dr. Kanter added that the dredging of the Long Beach Harbor West Basin will begin after the first of the year. He will probably brief the RAB again in January.

Ms. Steel stated that she was confused about who were the members of the RAB. Mr. Essington said that the RAB is made up of community members interested in the environment and health of the community. The RAB reviews technical documents and their purpose is to provide community input to the environmental process being conducted at LBNC.

Mr. Marsh asked who determines how much it will cost. Mr. Lee stated that the FS will evaluate different remedial alternatives. The Navy and regulatory agencies review and determine the best remedial alternative. Mr. Hausladen stated that the scope of the regulatory agencies and RAB is not reuse, but environmental issues. Mr. Hausladen explained the difference between the two and stated that the priority is to protect human health and the environment.

Mr. Thorpe commented that the RAB would like to be involved even after the Early Transfer process takes place.

Ms. Vargas requested that an agenda item be added for the next meeting to discuss the time and date of the RAB meetings because the Long Beach City Council also meets on Tuesday evenings.

Mr. Essington provided the RAB with information about the RAB Caucus. The next meeting is in November in Washington D.C. and there is one in January in San Francisco. The Caucus has a national scope. If anyone is interested there are scholarships available to go.

Having no additional comments, the RAB meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

The next LBNC RAB meeting is scheduled for **17 November 1998** at the Long Beach Water Department.

*These minutes were recorded by Michelle L. Gallice of CDM Federal Programs Corporation acting as the RAB Technical Support at 619-268-3383, and reviewed and approved by all members of the Long Beach Naval Complex Restoration Advisory Board.*

*Approved meeting minutes for the Long Beach Naval Complex (LBNC) RAB can be found at:*

- (1) The LBNC Information Repository located at the Long Beach Public Library, Government Publications Department; and*
- (2) The Internet at the Southwest Division Naval Facilities Command Web page at <http://www.efdswest.navfac.navy.mil/DEP/ENV/default.htm> - SWDIV Point of Contact: Mr. Lee Saunders (619) 532-3100.*