



Pete Wilson
Governor

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Jesse R. Huff, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

July 16, 1998

N68311.001059
NAVSTA LONG BEACH
SSIC #5090.3



Peter M. Rooney
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Mr. Duane Rollefson
Southwest Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1220 Pacific Highway, Room 18
San Diego, California 92132-5181

Dear Mr. Rollefson:

DRAFT COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN (CRP) FOR LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has completed our review of the *Draft Community Relations Plan (CRP) for Long Beach Naval Complex*, dated May 29, 1998. The *Draft CRP* was prepared by CDM Federal Programs Corporation.

The *Draft CRP* was prepared to identify these concerns and interests in the Long Beach Naval Complex Installation Restoration Program (IRP) as expressed in interviews with community members, local business, elected officials, and agency representatives. DTSC is satisfied with the community outreach efforts that the Navy has made.

DTSC comments are as follows:

- 1. Page 2-4, Section 2.4, Paragraph 2, Line 6:** In the sentence beginning with "The RAB Works", please define the regulatory agencies with whom the Navy works in a partnership to assist the public in understanding which specific agencies are involved in the process.
- 2. Page 2-9, Figure 2-1:** This figure does not show the Record of Decision step of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. Please add a box to this figure showing the Record of Decision/ Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP) step in the process.
- 3. Page 3-4, Sections 3.2.1 - 3.2.15:** In these sections, DTSC requests that the Navy add more detailed description (history, background, environmental investigations) and more information regarding the status of the environmental activities at each of the sites presented in the *Draft CRP*. Perhaps a Gantt chart might be helpful to add to this section, to show the past, present and future milestones of the IRP activities at Long Beach Naval Complex.

Mr. Duane Rollefson
July 16, 1998
Page 2

4. **Page 3-13, Figure 3-3:** On this figure, the legend is not clear because the non-optional steps and the optional actions have the same shaped figure. The reader will not be able to differentiate which steps are optional and which are non-optional. Please correct this figure so the reader can easily follow and understand the flow chart.

DTSC has also enclosed additional comments from our Public Participation Unit. If you have any questions, please contact me at (714) 484-5417.

Sincerely,



Alvaro Gutierrez
Base Closure Unit
Office of Military

Enclosure

cc: Mr. J. E. Ross
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Los Angeles Region
101 Centre Plaza Drive
Monterey Park, California 91754-2156

Mr. Alan Lee
Base Environmental Coordinator
Southwest Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, California 92132-5181

Mr. Martin Hausladen
Remedial Project Manager
Hazardous Waste Management Division (H-9-2)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, California 94105



Department of Toxic Substances Control



Pete Wilson
Governor

Jesse R. Huff, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Peter M. Rooney
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
Remedial Project Manager

From: Ms. Marsha Mingay
Public Participation Specialist *mmg*

Date: July 15, 1998

Subject: **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMENT ON DRAFT COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN (CRP) FOR LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX**

On behalf of Public Participation & Education, Office of Military Facilities, I have received the above referenced document. The following comments are divided into two types, General and Specific. The General Comments provide statements about the CRP in general, versus the Specific Comments which address a particular section or page.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me directly. Additionally, if the contractor or base representative has any questions or concerns about the following information, please let them know that I am more than willing to discuss the issues with them. I can be reached at (714) 484-5416.

GENERAL COMMENT:

- 1 When making conclusions based upon interview results, it is best to state the number of interviewees who said "X" out of the total population providing responses to that inquiry. For instance, "The majority of those interviewed have confidence in the Navy's intent and ability to cleanup contamination (12/19)."
2. The following issue is also addressed in several specific comments, but is listed here in more detail. LBNC is a state-lead site and as such must comply with the California Health and Safety Code (CH&S) requirements. Throughout this document the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act process is discussed, however the key requirements of the CH&S code are missing. For example, under CH&S Code, section 25356.1, there are several public participation requirements that must be met for a draft Remedial Action Plan, one of which is the requirement to

hold a public meeting. Please state in the CRP, where appropriate, that LBNC must comply with the requirements of the CH&S code and explain why. Also, include those specific public participation activities (i.e., public meetings, direct mailings) that will take place during the IR process.

3. When describing the interview results, it would be more accurate to state what the interviewees expressed about their community versus wording that leads a reader to believe we concluded the community has a certain believe or feeling about the environmental cleanup. For example, "Information gathered during the interviews indicates that the public has confidence in the Navy's intent and ability to cleanup contamination at LBNC. In addition, the public has confidence in the ability of the federal ..." (page ES-1). This wording is misleading since we do not know how the public feels. We can say however, "Mostly interviewees stated that they believe the public has confidence . . ." Please review the document for these types of errors and correct as appropriate.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

Executive Summary:

1. Paragraph 2, Third sentence: Based upon the interview notes, it would be more appropriate to state that the majority of those interviewed have confidence in the Navy's intent and ability to cleanup contamination.
2. Paragraph 2, Last sentence: This information is misleading and needs to state how many interviewees expressed these concerns. Without this information, it leads the reader to believe that the concern was shared by everyone, which is not correct.
3. Paragraph 3, First sentence: Please change the wording to read, "There is a low to moderate level of interest in the Environmental cleanup." As indicated in many interview notes, and stated in the Executive Summary, those interviewed believe the majority of community concerns are focused on reuse and not on the environmental cleanup.
4. Last paragraph: It is assumed that the Executive Summary is written with generic information first and then proceeds into details. If this is correct, then some of the generic wording in this paragraph could be deleted. If this is done, the paragraph could read, "Based on interviews, the CRP program includes the following components":
5. Page ES-1 to -2, Bullets: It is suggested that the bullets be placed in an order that

provides the most direct access first (e.g., “providing site tours, public workshops, and presentations to local community organizations on an as-needed basis, or as requested by community groups”). This allows the reader to see your most proactive outreach activity first.

Section 1.1: Overview and Organization

1. This section seems to provide an overview of the regulatory structure and the CRP’s organization. If correct, please amend the title to read as follows so as to assist the reader in understanding the contents of this section. “Regulatory Overview and CRP Organization.”
2. Page 1-1, Second to the last paragraph on the page: Since this is a state-lead site, please include wording that informs the reader of the state’s requirements (including CEQA).
3. Page 1-1, Last paragraph on the page: The last two sentences do not connect to the preceding sentences in this paragraph. It is believed that the last two sentences are misplaced in that they do not address nor expand upon the roles of the DoD or DTSC. Please correct.
4. Page 1-2, First paragraph: This paragraph is misplaced as it does not address regulatory issues which the two paragraphs surrounding it discuss. Therefore, it is suggested that the paragraph be deleted.
5. Page 1-2, Second paragraph: Amend the paragraph in the following two ways: 1) rewrite the sentence to read, “The following federal and state environmental statutes and amendments ...”; 2) add as a bullet, “California Health and Safety Code, Title 22” since this is a state lead site and must follow certain state laws and regulations (such as a public meeting for a Remedial Action Plan).
6. Page 1-2, Third paragraph: The wording omits the role of the public in developing this CRP. Please incorporate wording which clarifies that the regulations provide an outline of mandated activities; how these activities are carried out, as well as additional outreach activities requested by the community, is dictated by the community through interviews and then recorded in the CRP.

Section 1.2: Purpose of the Community Relations Plan

1. Page 1-3, First paragraph: Similar to the previous comment, the role of the public is omitted in stating the purpose of the CRP. It is believed that the second paragraph

contains appropriate language to describe the full purpose of the CRP. Therefore, please combine these two paragraphs. The following is suggested:

The purpose of this CRP, and the community relations program it describes, is to encourage two-way communication ... to any hazardous substances' investigation and remediation program.

In addition to meeting the needs of the community, the CRP must also satisfy state and federal laws (see Section 1.1) and associated guidelines. The guidelines are set forth in the "United States Environmental Protection Agency ... Guidelines (DoD 1994)."

2. Page 1-3: Please note that DTSC's Public Participation Manual was updated. The new revision date should read, "February 1997".

Figure 1-2: Site Map

1. As discussed in the latest fact sheet, clarify the boundaries of LBNC. Specifically, show that the LB Harbor, West Basin, is not part of the LBNC. It would further clarify the boundaries if lines were drawn completely around the bases, versus one line separating them. Those unfamiliar with the LBNC will also have difficulty understanding the boundaries of the Navy Mole. Perhaps color coding the three separate areas would assist in defining these areas.

Section 2

1. Since LBNC is a State lead site, include a section on State requirements.
2. Page 2-1, First paragraph: The term "frequently" is subjective. Public Participation normally requests that subjective terms be omitted in public documents since different people will have a widely different interpretation of these types of words. Please delete the word "frequently."

Section 2.3: Installation Restoration Program

1. The administrative record is not currently defined nor included in this Section. Please add a definition and insert the information into the appropriate area.
2. Page 2-1, First paragraph of section: Amend the end of the first sentence to read, "... waste disposal methods **at military installations.**"

3. Page 2-1, partial paragraph at end of page: This paragraph does not seem to add any more information than the first paragraph, therefore it is suggested that it be deleted with the exception of the last line. This sentence "Discussed below are the steps of the CERCLA process for the cleanup at LBNC" should be a stand alone sentence, or added to the end of the first paragraph in this section.

Section 2.3.1: Remedial Action Process

1. Page 2-2, First bullet: To clarify and expand the information, reword to read, "A PA is conducted to determine whether current or past waste management practices have resulted in the release of hazardous substances which may pose a threat to public health or the environment. This is done through record searches and/or visual inspections of the area. This stage results in a list of potential areas of concern that warrant further site investigation."
2. Page 2-2, Second bullet: To clarify and expand the information, reword to read, "The SI usually requires sampling and analysis of soil, surface water and/or groundwater. Based upon the data, the site will be either 1) dropped for no further action, 2) recommended for removal action, or 3) will be further investigated in the next stage. (See Section ____, for information regarding public participation activities associated to removal actions). If the area will be further investigated, an information repository is established. The information repository contains the documents generated during the life of the project. Because the number of documents produced is voluminous, it is not all inclusive. The repository is established in a location where the interested public can review and copy the material.
3. Page 2-2, Third bullet: The following wording modifies the draft wording to increase clarity and expand the information. Reword to read, "The RI involves conducting a comprehensive site study to determine the lateral and horizontal extent of contamination. All field work is performed according to a sampling and analysis plan that is approved by the regulatory agencies. During this time, an assessment of risks to human health and the environment is also conducted and reviewed by the agencies. Based upon the risk posed, the site could be 1) recommended for a removal action, 2) recommended for no further action, or 3) entered into the next stage. If a removal action is proposed, public participation activities are required (see Section ____).
4. Page 2-3, Fourth bullet: Add the following information to the existing draft text, "The FS uses the data, collected during the RI, to evaluate and develop a **wide range** of effective cleanup alternatives ... A preferred cleanup alternative is identified from those presented

in the FS **and is distributed to the public in the form of a Proposed Plan (see next bullet).**

5. Page 2-3, First bullet: The current wording indicates that “all” cleanup alternatives are presented in the Proposed Plan. Our experience with other installations show that the FS usually has a larger universe of cleanup alternatives, out of which a select four to six alternatives, are discussed in the PP. Please research and correct the wording if appropriate. It is suggested that this paragraph also include a statement that states, “The DoD will consider all comments received on the PP prior to making a final decision.” A last sentence needs to be added that states “all significant comments will be responded to in a Responsiveness Summary. This summary will be placed in the information repository.”
6. Page 2-3, Second bullet: Please add the following, “The availability of the ROD is publicized **through a display ad in a local newspaper of general circulation.**”
7. Page 2-3, Third bullet: Please add the following, “The design for the cleanup solution is prepared **and a fact sheet is distributed to the project mailing list prior to beginning remedial action (or cleanup). The need for updating the Community Relations Plan will also be assessed at this time.**”
8. Page 2-3, Fourth bullet: Add the following to the existing sentence, “The cleanup solution is conducted **and the public is kept informed as dictated by them. At a minimum, the community will have a Point of Contact who they can contact to ask specific questions or state their concerns.**”
9. Page 2-3: Add a fifth bullet under Remedial Action. This bullet should state, “Operations and Maintenance (O&M) - In certain cases, a selected remedy (e.g., landfill cap or “dig and haul”) may require only construction and no active, ongoing cleanup in order to achieve cleanup goals. However, some remedies may require long-term monitoring to ensure effectiveness of the cleanup technology. Similar to the RA stage, the public will be kept informed at the level indicated by them. At a minimum, they will have a telephone number and name to whom they can direct questions and comments.”

2.3.2 Removal Action Process

1. Page 2-3, First bullet: -- The current wording leads the reader to believe all removal actions include an EE/CA. Since this is not correct, please change the information accordingly. Additionally, to clarify the information, please reword the last sentence to read, “The EE/CA is circulated to the public for their review and comment. In addition,

the state regulators will review and approve the document. A written response to significant comments is written and placed in the information repository.”

2. Page 2-3, Second bullet: Add the following to increase clarity, “The final decision regarding cleanup technology is documented in the AM. For removal actions with a planning period of less than six months, a display ad announcing the availability of the AM is published in a local newspaper of general circulation. If the planning period is greater than six months, the AM is normally public noticed with the EE/CA.”
3. Page 2-4, First paragraph: Since the paragraph is providing generic information, please substitute the word “Navy” with the word “military.” This wording allows the reader to understand that all military bases have the opportunity to form a Restoration Advisory Board.
4. Table 2-1: Please amend the “Implementation” column within this table as follows:

Fact Sheets: “Prepared at **mandated technical milestones (e.g., Remedial Design stage), or at points when there are significant findings or ...**”

Public Notice: Please note that a public notice is not required for the Remedial Investigation Work Plan or at the completion of the Remedial Investigation. They are required for: Draft Proposed Plans, RAB meetings, Community meetings, CEQA draft documents, final RODs, draft EE/CAs and AMs.

Provide 30-day Public Comment Period: Same comment as Public Notice with exception of RAB meetings.

Responsiveness Summary: The current wording limits the timing of these to RODs. This is incorrect. Responsiveness Summaries are also required for CEQA documents, EE/CAs and any other 30 day comment periods. Please reword. As a suggestion, the sentence could read, “Required after all 30-day comment periods.”

Figure 2-1

1. The Figure is missing several key milestones which are listed below:

Removal Action -- Add “Issue Responsiveness Summary,”

Remedy Selection -- Add “Issue public notice announcing Final ROD availability,” and

Remedial Design/Remedial Action -- Add, "Issue Fact Sheet for Remedial Design."

Section 4: Community Background

1. Please add a new section that describes community organizations, such as the West End Community Association. This information will assist in understanding the resources available to the project team when faced with distributing notices, fact sheets, etc.

Section 4.1.2: Population

1. State the reference for the median household income.

Section 4.2: Previous Community Relations Activities

1. Page 4-4, Last paragraph on the page: Please add a transition sentence between the third and fourth sentences which talk about the TRC and the RAB.
2. Page 4-6, Last paragraph for section 4.2: To remain with the writing style of providing generic information first and then more specific information, please delete this paragraph since it does not provide specific information.

Section 4.3: Community Interviews

1. Page 4-7, First paragraph: Please add transition words to the last two sentences to increase the flow of information being presented.

Section 4-4: Interview Topics and Results

1. There seems to be an over usage of the word "suggested." In some instances it is used incorrectly, such as "It was suggested that those in the community ..." versus "It was **stated** that those in the community ...". Please use words that clearly indicate what was stated in the interviews. This will increase the reader's ability to understand what people's statements were and what suggestions they had to offer.

Section 4.4.1: Familiarity with Navy Installation Restoration Program

1. Page 4-8, First paragraph in section: The second sentence reads, "... possible harbor (water and sediment) contamination, possible contamination of the mole, possible

- petroleum-related contamination ...” The interview notes reflect that people knew these areas to be contaminated therefore the use of “possible” is incorrect. Please reword.
2. Page 4-8, last paragraph on the page -- The second sentence lists ways that the public learned of the hazardous waste sites. In this listing “general knowledge” is included. Since this is a vague description and is left to the reader’s own perception as to its meaning, reword or delete the term. If this term came up during the interviews, then it could be included if it is placed in quotation marks.
 3. Page 4-9, First partial paragraph on the page: To indicate that “always aware” is a quote from the interviewees, please place it in quotations.

Section 4.4.2: Contamination-Related Concerns

1. Page 4-9, First paragraph: The first sentence states that the majority of interviewees have concerns regarding the IR program. Please add information which states what concerns they have about the IR program.

Section 4.4.4: Knowledge of Community Involvement in the Environmental Program at LBNC

1. Page 4-9, First paragraph in the section: Please change as indicated, “Interviewees **stated** that the **community-at-large** is not familiar with the environmental investigation at LBNC. Interviewees also **stated** that the community has not been involved with the cleanup activities. It was **further stated** that those in the community, who have been involved, are interested in reuse plans.
2. Page 4-10, Second paragraph, First sentence and bullets: Substitute “through the following mechanisms” with “about” since the following information lists issues versus a mechanism used to communicate. In addition, the bullets could be abbreviated and strengthened by beginning each of them with the subject of discussion (e.g., “contact for reasons other than environmental concerns” versus merely stating “non-environmental concerns”). This direct wording tends to strengthen and clarify the information.
3. Page 4-10, Last paragraph in section: If possible, please elaborate on the statements (e.g., “response depends on the nature of the contact” and “Negative experiences included responses concerning the ...”). By including additional information, the reader could understand more fully, the comments expressed by the interviewees.

Section 4.4.6: Confidence in Regulatory Oversight of the IRP

1. Page 4-11: Since the first paragraph states why interviewees are confident and the second paragraph states why some are not, add a transitional phrase at the beginning of the second paragraph.

Section 4.4.7: Topics of Interest and Methods for Providing this Information

1. Page 4-11, First paragraph: The sentence begins with "This interview question ..." Since the reader will not know which question is being referred to, please either change the wording or add the question number. Additionally, to clarify what the interviewee stated, please make the following changes in the second and fourth sentences, "... interviewees feel ~~as if~~ **that** they are adequately ... Two individuals **stated that they** are not well-informed ~~because~~ **out** of a personal choice."
2. Page 4-11, Second paragraph in the section: The second sentence reads, "A general interest was expressed ..." Please reword to clarify the meaning. Does "general interest" mean that the majority of interviewees expressed a desire for status information on reuse and cleanup?
3. Page 4-11, Last paragraph on the page: The last sentence on this page provides information on a different subject than the preceding sentences. Please create a new paragraph that begins with, "Interviewees were open to a number of sources the Navy currently uses to community information to them. These include fact sheets, ..."

Section 4.4.9: Public/Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Logistics

1. Page 4-12, First paragraph, Second sentence: Please reword to read, "Those who have seen the public notices remember seeing them in ..."

Section 4.4.10: Location for Information Repository

1. Page 4-13, Last sentence: The comma in "... library, and ..." is incorrect. Please edit.

Section 4.4.11: Language Translation Needs in the Community

1. Page 4-13: This Section needs to record the interviewees comments about the Cambodian community having a low interest level in the environmental program. As included in the interviewer's notes, the Cambodian community is primarily a very low-income population whose interest is mostly focused with maintaining an income that supports their family and their community.

It is also suggested that the specific outreach avenues for each population group be identified (i.e., list the Hispanic avenues and then the Cambodian).

Section 5

1. It is suggested that this section utilize an active voice which strengthens the statements made (e.g., "Community members have expressed interest ..." versus "Community members expressed interest"). This can usually be done by eliminating the "to be" verbs.
2. Page 5-1: In the introduction, restructure the existing wording to show DoDs responsiveness. "In response to the information received during the interviews (as discussed in Section 4) this section presents ..."
3. The last sentence in the introduction reads, "and as it relates to the City of Long Beach." Please clarify.

Section 5.2: Community Relations Program's Objectives and Strategies

1. Page 5-1, Objective 1: Section 4 did not state that interviewees requested information to be in "non-technical terms." Since this section states that the objectives were created from the interviewees, it is extremely important that there is a direct correlation between the objectives and the information reported in Section 4.
2. Page 5-1, Bullets: Add information to each bullet that describes how these activities satisfy the objective. Certainly they provide information, but how do they satisfy the objective of supplying information in "understandable, non-technical terms?"
3. Page 5-2, Objective 2: By listing these three organizations, we've unintentionally excluded other population centers. Please reword.
4. Page 5-2, Objective 3, Second bullet: Reword to read, "continue to offer **and hold** open discussion **sessions for** the public, RAB, and regulator comments on project documents and **the** Navy's responses ..."
5. Page 5-3, Objective 5, Second bullet: State the CRP revision dates, or the frequency or revisions.

Section 5.3.3: Mailing List

1. Page 5-4, Second paragraph, First sentence: Please include public comment periods.

Section 5.3.4: Public Comment Periods

2. Page 5-5, First paragraph, Second sentence: Clarify if this is a required public comment period announced through newspaper ads and direct mail, or if the RAB process includes a 30-day review period for RAB members.
3. Page 5-5, Second paragraph: Include in the listing of documents requiring 30 day public comment periods, Action Memos, proposed CEQA decisions and Remedial Action Plans. Delete the sentence, "Public comment periods will be held accordingly" as it is redundant.
4. Page 5-5, Third paragraph: The sentences preceding the sentence quoted below, leads the reader to believe all Responsiveness Summaries are part of the ROD (i.e., "The summary is prepared as an attachment to the ROD document"). Please correct.
5. Page 5-6, Sentence at top of page: Add the following, "Fact sheet topics will be **identified and** discussed at RAB meetings, ..."

Section 5.3.6: Media

1. Page 5-6, Second paragraph, Last sentence: Delete the phrase "in the past" to eliminate redundancy.

Section 5.3.7: Restoration Advisory Board/Public Meetings

1. Page 5-7, Last sentence to the partial paragraph at top of page: Define or substantiate "significant."

Section 5.3.8: Language Interpretation Needs

1. Page 5-7, First sentence: Add the following, "... language interpretation **and translation** ..."

Additionally, as stated earlier, some interviewees stated that the Cambodian population had a very low interest level in the environmental program. This information needs to be incorporated into this Section. Based upon the interviews (and especially in light of the interview with the Cambodian affiliated with this population group) it should be assessed if it's appropriate to translate and interpret the information for the Cambodian population.

Also, please clarify if the fact sheets presented to these groups, are written in their language. The draft language in the CRP seems to lead to a conclusion that translation will be done for both population groups.

Section 5.3.9: Optional Community Relations Activities

1. Page 5-7: The paragraph states that open houses were considered positive, but less beneficial. This information is not discussed in Section 4. Please include it in Section 4. (Also see comment above about the importance of correlating activities in Section 5 with information in Section 4).
2. Page 5-7: The last three sentences do not provide specific information, but rather seem to summarize a conclusion. To provide the reader with specific information and an increased understanding of the activities, please state what services will be continued and what alternative forms of communication will be used. Additionally, state who will determine when alternative forms of communication would be most beneficial to the public.

Appendix A: Community Interview Questionnaire and Responses

1. This section should reflect the information in the interviewer's notes (through bullet statements) versus a general description of the comments received. This allows a more accurate record of the comments received and lessens the chance of an interviewee claiming that we editorialize and/or censored the questions and concerns expressed during the interviews. Included in this memorandum is a copy of bullets created from the interview notes. (Due to their volume, I've included them as the last comment in this memorandum). Please note that these are in addition to the comments included in the draft CRP.
2. Page A-1, Second paragraph, Last three sentences: To increase the flow of information, the following is suggested, "It should be noted ...by each interviewee. ~~This survey was not a scientific study, nor was it intended to be.~~ **Therefore**, the numbers associated with comments in this appendix ~~may~~ **will** not **always** correlate with the **total** number of respondents **interviewed.**" (I have deleted the middle sentence because I believe it does not add substantive information. In addition, this information has already been included in the main body of the document).

Appendix B: Location for Public and Restoration Advisory Board Meetings

1. Please substantiate the meaning of "high" ("Attendance at the RAB meetings has been high").

Appendix E: Mailing List of Key Contacts

1. Page E-1: To clarify the last sentence, please reword to read, "If you are interested in receiving information on the LBNC environmental cleanup program, please contact the person listed below and ask to be placed on the mailing list."
2. Page E-3, Long Beach Naval Complex Key Contacts: To provide greater accessibility to these key contacts, please include their telephone numbers.
3. Page E-5 and E-6, DTSC Mailing List: Please delete the address for the Department of Fish and Game, Attention: Jonathan Clark.

Additionally, include the appropriate punctuation for David Nunenkamp at DTSC.

4. Page E-9, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors: Please include Chuck Bookhammer as Supervisor Burkes' point of contact.

Appendix G: Local Media Resources

1. Since my notes of the interviewees include additional media stations that the draft CRP does not mention, please verify that all sources are listed in this Appendix (Please refer to this Memorandum's attachment). Be sure to include the local cable station.

Appendix H: Clubs and Organizations

1. See comment for Appendix G. Additionally, the third sentence states, "Interviewees suggested membership to a variety of organizations ..." Please clarify this. Who are they suggesting to join these organizations?

Appendix K: References

1. Please correct the reference for DTSC's Public Participation manual. It was updated in February 1997.

Appendix A (continued from page 13)

Please include this information in the Appendix.

Interview Question #2

Cambodian Community
Asian advisory to the Police Chief
City of Long Beach
BRAC Cleanup Team
National Groundwater Association
Long Beach Managers Association
United Parents
Friends of the Los Angeles River
Save our Shipyard
North Long Beach Community Action Group

Interview Question #3

Information:

- Not much. I am getting information through RAB meetings, but I've only been attending since August 1997.
- I know there has been a sediment contaminant task force because of the contaminated sediments. Some contamination around the Navy Mole and also around the piers.
- Aware of contamination but in general terms (nothing specific)
Aware of dredging
Very little - just of asbestos in buildings
It's an industrial site therefore there is a good possibility of groundwater contamination
In the late 50's early 60's staffed dumped lead, asbestos onto soil.
Seems like the contamination is localized and not severe. Sediment contamination I---
despread in some areas. (To complete comment, check wording in questionnaire for Tom Johnson)

Source:

- Stationed there as a Captain .
- Folklore.

Interview Question #4

- Still in learning process. I'm getting information through RAB meetings. Information is often too technical for basic community member to understand.
- Learned from last year through RAB meetings. Very technical and often difficult to follow. Talk about general knowledge of community.
- 2 -- Nothing.
- Heard about it.
- I am not aware of investigation occurring on land. My interest is in the bay sediments.
- Knowledgeable about the leaching of fuels from USTs and the VOC removal. Also am aware of the small inactive landfill.
- Knowledge is not specific. Mostly familiar with reuse of the housing area.
- Navy rectifies past mistakes and makes sure it doesn't occur again.
- Wish they would have followed BRAC.

Sources:

- Naval Complex meeting.

Interview Question #5

- Last year through the Press Telegram's articles on reuse.
- I wasn't aware of process until I received a letter recently.
- California Coastal Water Report
- In 1989, I was running on the Mole Pier and talked to some guys there.
- I am not aware, just assumed due to activities that there would be contamination.
- I worked there from late 1959.
- When designated as an alternate for the RAB in 1993/94.
- **(Verify that the statement accurately reflects D. Mays comment).** Became aware when the Slender Salamander was almost wiped out; but were still on base.
- Got on the RAB because I was concerned with basin sediments.

Interview Question #6

- **(Please summarize D. May's comments. It seems that he had much to say. My notes are sketchy and I would have a hard time trying to make all the information flow together since I was not present. Since you were in the interview, and Jennifer Rich, of our staff, is still on maternity leave, it would be helpful if you would take a stab at the summary. Feel free to FAX a draft to me.)**
- Everything. I want it cleaned and transferred as quickly as possible.

- Solvents along gate; mole area is terrible; water is a concern. Should take core samples at bottom of bay and alongside pilings (especially Pier 9, 15 and 16). Go at least 5 to 8 feet.
- Hard to keep track of work.
- At site 7, they tested soil a few centimeters down; but they will dredge 35 feet. They should test all the way down before dredging. Other sites are okay.
- **(Verify statements made by E. Cooley).** Very concerned regarding Site 7. No real feedback from whoever is performing cleanup. State only minimal contamination (Petroleum and lead).
- Concerned that it is cleanup according to planned reuse. Also very concerned about Site 7.
- Military is not always subject to the same regulations as the private sector.
- Increased traffic.
- "Can't kill the fish"
- Hope they clean up the base with no impact on the public for future development.
- Cleanup should be done not at marginal acceptance levels, but for level of future use.
- Nature of contamination is fairly benign (although the cleanup needs to be done). I don't believe there is a hazard to human health or the critters.
- How does this affect residential communities close by?
- Concerns depend upon use of site. If going to be used for industrial purposes then okay, but wouldn't be okay for recreational activities.
- Navy needs to proceed di --- gently. Move along and get it over with or delegate to someone else. I personally do not have too much concern. **(To complete sentence, see Tom Johnson's questionnaire. My copy was not readable.)**
- I have no concerns because I know the cleanup is occurring. Reuse, currently designated as container storage area, will be okay because its an industrial usage.

Interview Question #7

- **(Verify statement from E. Cooley).** I've heard from Mayor O'Neil, asphaltting the entire area. I don't agree with this. People are not awake, so not a big concern expressed.
- Priority and land use, not as concerned about environmental cleanup.
- They are not aware. So no concerned have been voiced because they don't know. Their concerns are focused on redevelopment.
- So far away from residential areas there is very little concern.
- 3 -- Haven't heard of any concerns.
- Community is concerned about the odors from the refineries - AQMD concerns.
- RAB and community think Navy and other agencies are doing good. Concern over compliance side.
- Seniors involved because they have the time to be. Majority of the community finds is boring. They don't really care. LBNC is not is a residential area.

- The community has the same type of concerns as myself. Some maybe more extreme. The Navy shouldn't leave the site until the full cleanup is done and follow-up completed.
- Little interest in contamination, more special interest (LRA, RAB, Historical groups).
- Reuse. Cleanup to a certain level for reuse.

Interview Question #8

- **(Verify statement from E. Cooley).** Very little knowledge and high amount of apathy regarding environmental cleanup. Navy is not getting outreach out, especially ethnically.
- Community has been involved because of air quality. Concerns about cleanup have been generally from Don May.
- RAB is the main involvement.
- Only involvement has been on reuse and historical issues.
- RAB has functioned very well. There's a good effort at trying to bring people into the group.
- 2 -- None.
- Community and city doesn't really want to get involved.
- I'm not aware of anything.

Interview Question #9

- Wilmor city heritage Association, Carol Goddard, President (? About spelling of names)
- Sierra Club
- Audubon Society, El Dorado, Ann Cantrell
- Gertrude Schwab, Wilmington North Homeowners Association
- Jan Chaplan Brown, attorney for Long Beach Heritage

Interview Question #10

- They represent some but not all. Concerned about having a balance between economic development and cleanup.

Interview Question #11

- Alternate member of the California Coastal Commission for this region. Head up committee to clean up the trash in the LA River and Vice Chair of the city's tidelands and harbor committee.

Interview Question #12.A

- **(Verify that I have recorded D. May's comment correctly by checking the wording with your notes/memory of the interview.)** I've had contact with the Navy, local, state and other officials concerning LBNC regarding their lack of following RAB procedures.
- I participate, either now or in the past, in the RAB, LRA, CDFMA, CMEC (attended a couple of meetings) on panel for local community.
- Though work I inspect USTs and TSD facility.

Interview Question #12.B

- They have listened, but have taken no action. Disappointed with Fish and Game too.
- Good response from EPA especially.
- Good response, except with Site 7
- Positive as long as a contact name is available.
- I feel there is a good relationship.
- Both easy and hard to work with. Different phases and issues are dealt with differently. Overall okay. It is costly and time consuming. Major problem is timing; schedule for reuse with schedule for cleanup.
- Good, they trust Port of Long Beach.

Interview Question #13

- 2 -- Unknown
- Moderate

Yes:

- (Incorporate A. Lowenthal's comments - I can't read my copy)
- Confidence in their expertise. But I question their willingness to really cleanup. Must be cost effective so may not be able to cleanup enough.
- Got the message that is a military priority.
- The cleanup activities have involved companies with good reputation and who get the job done. They have the money and the best interest of the Navy.
- They will throw bucks at it.
- They have the expertise and money to do it.
- As long as they can spend money, they are able to cleanup up the sites. I have no problems with the quality of the work.
- Reasonably comfortable that it will be done in accordance with regulations, but is this enough?
- Have to trust them, no reason no to.

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
July 15, 1998
Page 20

- Desire to work together. They have the experience and work hard at streamlining the process.
- Always have qualified personnel to handle remediation.
- Always consult with AQMD when necessary.
- Experience with the Corp. Of Engineers has been very positive. So I expect similar situation here.
- In ability.

No:

- (Incorporate A. Lowenthal's comments. I can't read my copy.)
- They don't have a good grasp of the magnitude of effort required to clean it up. Obtaining the necessary budget won't be easy if you don't know the magnitude.
- Navy doesn't have any interest in cleanup.
- Concern is not enough. Must have the resources to adequate clean up the site (personnel and funding). It is not a technical problem.

Unknown:

- I'm totally ignorant, no experience working with the Navy.
- Depending upon final use, maybe I have confidence. I don't believe the site is appropriate for recreational activities.

Interview Question #13.A

- (Incorporate A. Lowenthal's comments. I can't read my copy.)
- Disclose information concerning contamination to all interested parties.
- We made a mess, we'll clean it up. Need some reality.
- If EPA or someone directing process would have been better. Withdraw flawed studies and show interest in finding out how bad things really are. Do something about it.

Interview Question #14

- 1 Yes/no

Yes:

- Dealt with them so know they will enforce.
- I've seen a lot of people comment and noticed how strict they are. See that they do enforce the law.

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
July 15, 1998
Page 21

- (Incorporate A. Lowenthal's comments. I can't read my copy.)
- Both federal and state agencies have knowledge.
- They will make sure it gets done.
- In dealing with Cal/EPA, they are committed to do the best job they can.
- The issue is receiving considerable attention. So many people interested and concerned.
- Concerned about limited resources to devote to the project. It is not a technical problem.
- There will be a lot of monitoring by Congressional administration, especially because of current legislature.
- State is usually more stringent than Federal government.

No:

- They are an information gathering agency. They have no money for enforcement. No power, time or funding.
- In the past, they've displayed hesitancy about their willingness to aggressively clean-up the sites.
- Both activities are horrendously over staffed. Can't expect to have people that know everything about all issues. Volume of work and resources spreading too thin. Undermanned and under funded and won't be able to responsive to communities.

Unsure:

- I don't know, haven't see leadership role regarding bay sediments. Less doubt about land based cleanups.
- Could be a problem because not enough staff and money.
- Not a lot of confidence in DTSC because of downsizing.

Interview Question #14.A

- I have a good working relations with EPA and the State; but they have no power and no money.
- If DTSC assigned enough staff, they would be competent. Need enough funds.
- Be more active in driving Navy harder for more definitive risk levels and remedial actions. Publicize information regarding actions taken.
- Provide direct and consistent information. Complete research on toxicological properties of chemicals. Use these as standards/criteria (NOAH).
- Rules of the game have got to change. Community thinks cleanup is timely and complete. Agency's can't do it. And DoD has problem with manpower and bucks. Once facility is closed not as much of a hurry to clean up due to political situation. It's a bad deal for communities.

Interview Question #15

- 1 - No, not in regard to reuse
- 1 - no response

Yes:

- My information is from RAB meetings; not much information prior to joining the RAB.
- Have received good information through mailings.
- Informed through RAB meetings
- I've been informed adequately, with exception of sediments cause not much going on yet.
- I'm not sure that I need to be too informed; but I like to be kept abreast of the activities.
- Informed from Port of LB; not directly from the Navy.

No:

- (Incorporate A. Lowenthal's comments. I can't read my copy.)
- No general public forum. But, even if we did make more effort, people are not interested.
- No on-going information source with the closure of the base.

Sometimes:

- **(Verify this statement from M. Vargus).** I didn't know where information was located; I have enough information now that I'm on the RAB.

No Response:

- They've generated a lot of paper, but just going through the motions and covering up. Garbage in; garbage out.

Interview Question #16

- Not a convenient location for N. Long Beach residents.
- Suggest libraries in the No. Long Beach area.

Interview Question #17

Yes:

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
July 15, 1998
Page 23

- I have property here.
- I get adequate information through the mailing list.

Interview Question #18

- Health risks.
- For RABs, provide them with schedule updates at every meeting (with corresponding map showing IR sites and POI).
- Need more information about reuse process (lease information, compliance issues, map out IR sites and related compliance issues).
- Does the groundwater plume go under my site?
- Information on birds.
- Information concerning the nature of contamination (chemicals of concern, type of testing)
- Timeline for gay sediment investigation & cleanup
- Compliance with SCAQMD regulations (e.g., emissions, current activities).
- Public meeting dates and times.
- I want a general status of cleanup at LBNC.
- Additional information regarding Site 7.

Interview Question #18.A

- As it becomes available.
- Update every 6 months.

Interview Question #19

Fact Sheets

- 1 -- Yes, if short and simple
- 2 -- Yes and quarterly
- 1 -- Don't know how effective any would be.

Newspaper Articles

- 1 -- in editorial section

Community Meetings

- 1 -- Yes, very good

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
July 15, 1998
Page 24

- 2 -- Probably not a lot of interest. Its an industrial area.
- 1 -- not much good so far.

Advisory Committee

- 1 -- doesn't work. Spend the money on litigation.

Open House

- 1 -- Hard to get people to come to these.

Other

- Big issues by phone (elected officials should be contacted personally)
- Congressional briefings
- Cable TV (Channel 3)
- Speakers Bureau
- Wrigley Association

Interview Question #20

- **(Complete the name of the park provide by M. Vargus).** H--- Park, N. Long Beach
- Covenant Presbyterian Church
- Long Beach Plaza Hall holds 40-50 people
- New Westside Police Station (on Santa Fe and PCH)
- Neighborhood Resource Center (Pine and 5th)

Interview Question #22

- No Tuesdays
- Suggest that research be done to ascertain when other meetings are being held and then avoid those times and dates.
- No weekends.

Interview Question #23

- I don't believe there is interest from other communities (e.g., Hispanic).
- Hispanic, especially in west end of the community.
- A lot of monolingual Cambodians east and north.

- I think the Cambodian community has a low interest level regarding the cleanup at LBNC.
- The Cambodian community has a low interest level regarding the cleanup. Most of their focus is on their community.
- The Cambodians are not concerned about clean up, rather with getting food on the table.

Interview Question #23.A

- Cambodian Association (on file with the City of Long Beach)
- Personal contact through groups.
- Mail boxes at the resource center (approximately 100 boxes are located here).
- Send flyers home from school (in Spanish and English).
- Speakers at school meetings, regional parent centers (Washington) and district bilingual committee.
- Monthly newsletters (to the schools). Principle of Middle School is willing to pass out fact sheets to students.

Interview Question #24

- The media is accurate, but almost non-existent for this environmental issue.

Interview Question #26

- KFMB
- KLAC in the morning
- Don't listen to the radio

Interview Question #27

- Don't watch television
- Cable TV

Interview Question #28

- Earth Island Journal, 300 Broadway, Suite 28, San Francisco 94133-2217
- Internet, web site

Interview Question #31

- Past RAB members (Richard Landgraff)

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
July 15, 1998
Page 26

- Brian Phillips
- Bob Lamond (? About spelling)
- United Cambodian Community (on Anaheim Street)
- Betsy Foley

Interview Question #32

- Concern about economy due to loss of jobs as a result from the base closure.
- RAB process works. Community is fortunate to have a RAB.
- RAB is not listened to; they are lied to.