M60050.002206
MCAS EL TORO
SSIC # 5090.3

Opportunity Ahead
MCAS EL TORO LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY • *Janice M. Mittermeier, Executive Director*
MCAS EL TORO MASTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM • *Courtney C. Wieratook, Manager*

April 14, 1998

Colonel E. J. Ritchie, USMC
Assistant Chief of Staff
Base Realignment and Closure
MCAS El Toro
P.O. Box 95001
Santa Ana, CA 92709-5001

Dear Colonel Ritchie:

Staff and consultants from the El Toro Master Development Program look forward to meeting with your staff on April 22, 1998 to discuss issues related to the Proposed Plan for closing the inactive landfill sites at MCAS El Toro.

As you know, the County continues to have concerns regarding the compatibility of the remedy for sites 3 and 5 proposed by the Department of Navy/United States Marine Corps with the anticipated future uses identified in the Community Reuse Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors. We look forward to working with you and relevant environmental agencies to ensure that these sites, following closure, can be used in a productive and beneficial manner.

In connection with our efforts to facilitate the appropriate remediation of the landfill sites, we have been working with our consultants to understand in detail the remedy in the Proposed Plan. As Jan Mittermeier discussed with you, in order to ensure that we fully and accurately understand the proposed remedy, we have enclosed a list of questions regarding the landfill sites.

These questions are intended to clarify key concerns that have been identified regarding the Proposed Plan, and to facilitate our subsequent discussions on this matter. This information will assist me in making appropriate recommendations to the CEO and to the Board of Supervisors regarding these sites.

My staff looks forward to meeting with representatives of DON/USMC on April 22 to discuss these and any subsequent questions concerning the Proposed Plan for closing the inactive landfills on the base.

10 Civic Center Plaza, Second Floor • Santa Ana, CA 92701 • Telephone: (714) 834-3000 • http://www.eltoromdp.org

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Courtney C Wiercioch

Courtney C. Wiercioch, Manager
El Toro Master Development Program

Enclosure

cc: Jan Mittermeier, CEO
Candy Haggard, Master Development Program

MCAS EL TORO
INITIAL QUESTIONS REGARDING DON/USMC PROPOSED PLAN FOR REMEDIATION
LANDFILL SITES 2, 3, 5 AND 17

1. Available data indicates that Sites 2 and 3 have impacted surface water. (There does not appear to be data regarding surface water impact, if any, at Sites 5 and 17.) Site 2 Remedial Investigation[1], p. 4-148; Site 3 Remedial Investigation[2], p. 4-153. What is the rationale for not monitoring surface water quality as a part of the final remedy?

2. Lysimeters have been installed in inclined boreholes, on the perimeter of the landfill sites. How effective will they be in monitoring leachate? What corrective action (besides additional sampling) would DON/USMC propose to undertake if leachate is detected at any of the landfill sites following implementation of the final remedy?

3. Is landfill settlement data available for each of the landfill sites? Was it used in the remedy evaluation and selection process?

4. Alternative 3[3] in the Draft Final Proposed Plan[4] involves onsite waste consolidation. Does DON/USMC contemplate that any waste will be disposed of offsite in connection with the its proposed implementation of Alternative 3?

5. Alternative 3 involves the use of onsite soils to create the monolithic soil cover. The proposed onsite borrow location for these soils is a hill located between Sites 2 and 17. Site 3 Feasibility Study[5], p. 4-8.

   a) The County understands that one sample was collected and tested from this borrow site. Site 3 Feasibility Study, p. 4-8. Has DON/USMC collected and tested other samples from the proposed borrow location?

   b) The area in which the proposed borrow site is located provides habitat for a protected species (the gnatcatcher). Site 2 Remedial Investigation, p. 1-14; Site 17

---

[1] Bechtel National, Inc., "Draft Final Phase II Remedial Investigation - Site 2, Magazine Road Landfill, MCAS El Toro," April 1997 [hereinafter "Site 2 Remedial Investigation"].

[2] Bechtel National, Inc., "Draft Final Phase II Remedial Investigation - Site 3, Original Landfill, MCAS El Toro," April 1997 [hereinafter "Site 3 Remedial Investigation"].

[3] For all four landfill sites, Alternative 3 generally involves the following components: (1) installation of a monolithic soil cover; (2) implementation of institutional controls to prohibit use of the site and surrounding property, and to prohibit disturbances to the soil cover; and (3) long-term site monitoring.

[4] "Draft Final Proposed Plan for Closure of Inactive Landfills at Marine Corps Air Station El Toro," March 1998 [hereinafter "Draft Final Proposed Plan"].

[5] Bechtel National, Inc., "Draft Final Phase II Feasibility Study - Site 3, Original Landfill, MCAS El Toro," September 1997 [hereinafter "Site 3 Feasibility Study"].

Remedial Investigation[6], p. 1-14. Does the existing use of the area impact the proposed excavation and transfer of soils to the landfill sites?

6. Alternative 3 includes planting of vegetation (grass) on the landfill cap. Will the vegetation remain green during the summertime on the landfill? Does DON/USMC contemplate that irrigation will be needed to establish the vegetation? If yes, what amount of irrigation does DON/USMC contemplate will be needed?

7. Alternative 3 does not include the installation of a gas extraction system, or a provision to install a gas extraction system. This proposal apparently is supported by at least two sampling events. Site 3 Remedial Investigation, p. 4-20. Is there other gas sampling data available for the landfill sites? Was gas monitoring conducted in the vadose zone? Was gas sampling conducted on top of the existing cover?

8. Alternative 3 does not include monitoring of gas emissions through the proposed cover of the landfill. What is the rationale for this proposal?

9. What EPA or DTSC guidance documents or policies did DON/USMC use to develop its estimate of costs associated with Alternative 3? How are indirect costs calculated in the cost estimate for Alternative 3? What monitoring frequency was used to develop cost estimates for post-closure monitoring associated with Alternative 3?

10. In the Feasibility Studies for Site 3 and Site 5[7], DON/USMC states that "[a] preferred alternative is not presented because that selection will be based on risk-management decisions, which will occur following review of this document by regulatory agencies and the public." Site 3 Feasibility Study, p. 7-1; Site 5 Feasibility Study, p. 7-1.

    a) What does DON/USMC mean by "risk management decisions"?

    b) Who does DON/USMC expect to make such risk management decisions?

    c) What risk management decisions, if any, have been made by DON/USMC for Sites 2, 3, 5 and 17?

11. Portions of Site 3 presently are capped with asphalt and/or concrete. Site 3 Feasibility Study, p. 4-7. What does DON/USMC contemplate doing with these capped areas?

    a) Does DON/USMC propose to remove the asphalt and/or concrete? If so, how would the materials be managed following removal? If so, does DON/USMC intend to install the monolithic soil cover over the previously capped portions of Site 3? If so, does the cost estimate for Alternative 3 include the removal and management of the asphalt and/or concrete?

---

[6] Bechtel National, Inc., "Draft Final Phase II Remedial Investigation - Site 17, Communication Station Landfill, MCAS El Toro," April 1997 [hereinafter "Site 17 Remedial Investigation"].

[7] Bechtel National, Inc., "Draft Final Phase II Feasibility Study - Site 5, Perimeter Road Landfill, MCAS El Toro," September 1997 [hereinafter "Site 5 Feasibility Study"].

b) If DON/USMC does not propose to remove the asphalt and/or concrete, will the existing cap be retained as part of the final cover for Site 3? If so, are design specifications available for the existing capped areas? If so, does DON/USMC contemplate that such areas could be used for parking, light load storage or other uses?

12. What is the design rationale for the 2% grade of the monolithic soil cover proposed as part of Alternative 3? Site 3 Feasibility Study, p. 4-7.

13. DON/USMC indicates that the Agua Chinon wash will not be lined. Site 3 Feasibility Study, p. 4-11. Does DON/USMC believe that infiltration of water from the Aqua Chinon wash to the landfilled waste will occur? If so, what impacts, if any, does DON/USMC anticipate from such infiltration?

14. DON/USMC indicates in the Feasibility Study for Site 5 that "[s]everal alternatives will accommodate heavy irrigation associated with irrigated portions of a typical golf course and still allow minimal infiltration into landfill materials." Site 5 Feasibility Study, p. ES-10.

a) Is Alternative 3 one which would allow for heavy irrigation of Site 5 in the future?

b) Is Alternative 4D one which would allow for heavy irrigation of Site 5 in the future?

c) Would the analysis of the impact of irrigation on remedial alternatives be similar for Site 3?

15. DON/USMC indicates that:

A key consideration in identifying and evaluating potential institutional controls of a remedial action is planned or anticipated future use of the property. According to the Community Reuse Plan for MCAS El Toro ["CRP"], the preferred redevelopment option for the Station is a major commercial airport. This option includes potential future uses for various zones of Station Property. Sites 2 and 17 are located in an area designated as a habitat reserve. Site 3 is located in a zone designated for commercial and light industrial uses. Site 5 is located in a zone designated for recreation (golf).

Draft Final Proposed Plan, p. 13.

a) What types of uses does DON/USMC contemplate can occur at each of Sites 3 and 5 if Alternative 3 (including proposed institutional controls) is implemented?

b) What types of uses does DON/USMC contemplate can occur in the immediate vicinity of each of Sites 3 and 5 if Alternative 3 (including proposed institutional controls) is implemented?

c) Does DON/USMC believe that Alternative 3 would need to be modified in order to accommodate any of these contemplated uses? If so, which uses would require modification of proposed Alternative 3? At whose expense would such modifications be undertaken?

16. DON/USMC indicates that

Future landowners or users of Sites 2, 3, 5 and 17 shall be prohibited from conducting the following activities without the prior approval of DON and the Federal Facility Agreement signatories. . .

- *performing any activity (such as excavation or construction) on the landfills or on adjacent parcels or properties that will adversely impact the cap and monitoring systems or affect the drainage and erosion controls developed for the cap;*

Draft Final Proposed Plan, p. 13.

a) What "adjacent parcels" does DON/USMC intend to encumber with this and any other proposed institutional control(s)? Can DON/USMC identify the aerial scope of the contemplated institutional control(s) on plot plans of each of Sites 3 and 5? How will the imposition of such prohibitions affect the ability of the County or other person/entity from developing property adjacent to Sites 3 and 5?

b) What is the practical impact of not allowing disturbances of monitoring systems on land uses around the landfills? Can wells or probe heads be modified to accommodate various land uses around the landfill?

17. What is the precise language of the proposed institutional controls that have been or are being contemplated by DON/USMC? If such language has not been prepared by DON/USMC for Sites 2, 3, 5 and 17, can DON/USMC provide to the County an example(s) of specific language used for landfill sites at other closing military installations?

18. DON/USMC indicates in the Draft Final Proposed Plan that institutional controls similar to Alternative 3 would be imposed if other remedial options (e.g., Alternatives 4, 5, or 6) were selected for Sites 2, 3, 5, and/or 17. Draft Final Proposed Plan, pp. 8-9. Does DON/USMC contemplate any specific change in institutional controls should a remedial option other than Alternative 3 be selected for any of the landfill sites?

19. Under what conditions, if any, would DON/USMC contemplate allowing activities to occur at Sites 3 and 5 that would otherwise be prohibited by the proposed institutional controls?

a) What administrative procedures, if any, does DON/USMC believe would be necessary to document the review and approval of such activities by DON/USMC and other signatories to the relevant Federal Facilities Agreement?

b) What information, if any, does DON/USMC contemplate would be required in order to obtain permission to conduct such activities?

20. If DON/USMC approved an activity otherwise prohibited by one or more of the institutional controls, would it continue to conduct remediation activities at the sites (e.g., ongoing operations and maintenance; monitoring activities; etc.)? Would it continue to ensure the adequacy of the implemented remedy to address the identified adverse environmental conditions at the sites?

21. Can DON/USMC provide to the County any examples of landfill sites at closing military installations at which (a) institutional controls have been developed and implemented, and (b) subsequent owners, operators or other users have been given permission to conduct activities otherwise prohibited by such institutional controls?

22. DON/USMC indicates that State of California representatives on the MCAS El Toro Base Realignment and Closure Team concur with the Marine Corps's preferred remedy. Final Draft Proposed Plan at 11. Does this remain DON/USMC's position? If not, how would DON/USMC modify its comparative assessment of remedial alternatives set forth in the Final Draft Proposed Plan?

23. Prior to publication, does DON/USMC intend to assign values to the "community acceptance" component of the comparative analysis of remedial alternatives presented in the Final Draft Proposed Plan? If yes, what values does DON/USMC intend to assign to the various remedial alternatives?