LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
FINAL MINUTES FROM 20 JANUARY 1999 MEETING

The Long Beach Naval Complex held a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting on 20 January 1999, at the City of Long Beach Community Room, 200 Pine Street, Long Beach, California.

RAB ATTENDANCE:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michelle L. Gallice, CDM Technical Support
Duane Rollefson, SWDIV
Thomas Macchiarella, SWDIV
Jennifer Rich, Cal-EPA DTSC
Del Davis, City of Long Beach
Dave Bjostad, CDM Federal
Rick Sauerwein, Battelle
J. A. Pickering, AMC
Jim Sturm, Naval Base Committee
Stan Klock, Naval Complex Restoration Alliance
Greysen Edward Cooley
Ken Larkey
Doug Carstens
Anthony Caldwell, 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. Caldwell requested to videotape the meeting. Mr. Lee asked him to explain the purpose of videotaping the meeting, and Mr. Caldwell stated that he was interested in the Pier T activities. Mr. Lee stated that Pier T is not one of the agenda items. Mr. Lee asked Mr. Essington and the RAB if there were any objections to the meeting being videotaped. Mr. Essington responded that he had no objections as long as the meeting was not shown on the news. There were no objections from the RAB members.

Mr. Lee welcomed audience members attending the RAB meeting for the first time and stated that the RAB has been meeting since April 1994. Mr. Lee stated that the purpose of the RAB is to provide a forum for the exchange of information between the Navy, the community, and the regulators regarding the environmental cleanup at the Long Beach Naval Complex (LBNC). Mr. Lee added that the RAB meetings are open to the general public and the RAB meets every other month with the next meeting to be held in March. Mr. Lee introduced himself and Mr. John Essington, the elected RAB community co-chair. Mr. Lee stated that the RAB currently has 14 active members and the Navy is planning to solicit additional members, which will be discussed as an agenda item during the meeting.

Administrative Issues

Mr. Lee asked for comments on the 17 November 1998 meeting minutes. A member of the RAB requested that a change be made to Page 4, second paragraph. Mr. Thorpe asked for a clarification of whether the Navy is still responsible for the cleanup at LBNC after the transfer of land. The meeting minutes were approved with this one minor change. Mr. Lee stated that the meeting minutes would be mailed to the RAB members and 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.

Mr. Lee mentioned that some people were locked out since the doors to the building closed at 7 p.m. Mr. Lee suggested that the meeting start at 6:30 p.m. or have someone downstairs at the door after 7 p.m. The RAB agreed to start the meetings at 6:30 p.m. beginning with the March RAB meeting.

Mr. Lee noted that Mr. Essington's term as community co-chair is up and that the March meeting will include the community co-chair elections and changes to the Rules of Operation including the date and time change for the meeting.

Discussion of New RAB Member Solicitation Process

Mr. Lee stated that the RAB members decided at the November 1999 meeting to select new members for the RAB. The RAB Rule of Operations calls for a maximum of 20 members, so there is currently vacancy for 6 new members (14 current RAB members). Mr. Lee said that Ms. Gallice has contacted several of the current RAB members who have not been attending meetings regularly to determine their status on the RAB. Additional RAB members may need to be solicited if current RAB members choose to resign.

Ms. Vargas asked Mr. Lee if this is a new solicitation process from the one for RAB members selected in the past year. Mr. Lee said that this is a new process that began with a public notice sent out on 13 January 1999 with applications for RAB membership due on 15 February 1999. Mr. Lee said that the RAB Membership Selection Committee plans to meet after the applications have been submitted. The committee is composed of Mr. Essington, Ms. Vargas, Mr. Petway, Mr. Brice, Ms. Rich from DTSC, and Mr. Lee. The committee agreed to meet on 24 February

1999 at 5:30 p.m. at the City of Long Beach Community Room. Ms. Gallice will contact Mr. Mr. Brice, who was absent from the meeting, to confirm that he can make this date and time.

Mr. Lee stated that the new members would be introduced at the 17 March 1999 RAB meeting and that an orientation and education workshop would be conducted in April or May. Mr. Essington suggested that those who had applied during the last RAB member solicitation should be contacted. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Lee suggested that anyone who knows of someone who would be interested in being on the RAB should pick up an application.

Receive Comments on Draft Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Cleanup Plan (BCP)

Mr. Lee stated that the BCP is a planning document for the LBNC and review of the document is optional (not an environmental study or record of decision). Mr. Lee reminded the RAB members and the public that the Draft BCP is at the Information Repository located at the Long Beach library. Comments are not due until the end of January so RAB members still have time to comment on the document.

Mr. Thorpe stated that the executive summary was very informative but he asked if the target threshold for cleanup (i.e., industrial not residential) should be discussed in the executive summary. This information would be beneficial to the public in identifying that the cleanup goals at LBNC are for exposure to an industrial worker and not for residential use.

There were no other comments on the BCP during the meeting.

Presentation of the Status of the Areas of Concern (AOCs) Project at LBNC

Mr. Lee introduced Mr. Dave Bjostad from CDM Federal who was present to give an update on the ongoing Areas of Concern (AOCs) Project at LBNC. Mr. Bjostad distributed handouts to the RAB members and other attendees for the slide presentation.

Mr. Bjostad stated that the AOCs project at LBNC began in 1996 with a total of 304 AOCs identified by the Navy in the Environmental Baseline Survey. A subset of 122 AOCs (previously identified as Points of Interest [POIs]) were designated as Group A AOCs and investigated in 1997. These AOCs were 'closed-out' in 1997 with no further action required after approval from the regulatory agencies. The remaining 182 sites were designated as Group B AOCs and are the basis for the presentation.

Mr. Bjostad explained that 25 of the 182 AOCs were expedited because they are located generally on the western portion of LBNSY (near Long Beach Naval Station property), and investigating these areas would facilitate property reuse. In February 1998, the Draft Preliminary Assessment (PA) for the 25 expedited AOCs was issued and a presentation (by Mr. Bjostad) was given to the RAB in March 1998 to present the results of the PA. The Final PA for the expedited sites was issued in June 1998. The report recommended no further action for 16 of the AOCs, and the nine remaining AOCs were recommended for further action.

Mr. Bjostad presented the process for conducting a PA, the first step in determining whether a site might have an environmental problem. Mr. Bjostad stated that a field team conducted a site reconnaissance, reviewed old documents, reviewed aerial photographs and maps, and interviewed personnel for each of the AOCs. The purpose of the PA is to assess whether any hazardous materials may have been released to the soil, groundwater, or sediment and whether any further action is required.

Mr. Bjostad stated that the field work for the nine AOCs recommended for further action was conducted in June 1998, which included soil and groundwater sampling at most sites and sediment sampling at the drydocks and storm drain catch basins. The samples were then sent to a laboratory to perform chemical analysis. Mr. Bjostad showed slides for (1) the Direct Push Technology (DPT)/hydropunch rig used to collect soil and groundwater samples and (2) sediment sampling at Drydock Number 1 with a "sandcatcher" tool.

Mr. Bjostad presented the sampling program for the nine AOCs for soil, groundwater, and sediment. Sanitary sewer lines and storm water drain lines had the most samples collected since the lines traverse a large portion of LBNSY. Mr. Bjostad informed attendees that he had a copy of the Final Sampling Report for the Nine AOCs if anyone required more information and that there was also a copy of this report in the Information Repository. Mr. Bjostad pointed out a map identifying the locations of AOCs and described four AOCs where further action is recommended based on the results of the sampling program.

Sanitary Sewer System Lines

Mr. Bjostad showed a map of the sanitary sewer lines and associated buildings at LBNSY. Soil and groundwater samples were collected from 15 locations along the sewer line. Ten sample locations were at forced main lines where the sewer lines are under pressure leading to the sewage treatment plant. The remaining five locations were sampled because there was a break in the pipe or a section missing from the pipeline. It is possible that industrial wastes entered the sewer lines back in the 1950s and 1960s based on past disposal methods. Three locations were identified to be problem areas from the sample results.

Storm Water System Drain Lines

Mr. Bjostad identified the storm water system drain lines and sampling locations on the map. As with the sanitary sewer lines, it is possible that some industrial wastes were disposed of in the storm drain system during the 1950s and 1960s. A video survey was conducted in 1992 of the storm drain lines. Based on information gathered from the video survey, five sampling locations were identified where cracks and breaks in the pipes were documented where wastes could leak from the pipe. Mr. Bjostad pointed out that the storm drains also had water entering pipelines since some pipelines were installed below the groundwater level. Mr. Bjostad also pointed out the catch basins where storm water is accumulated and then pumped out to the West Basin. Mercury was detected in the groundwater sample collected near Building 132 at a level slightly above the screening criteria. Sediment from four of the seven catch basins was collected, and the analysis identified oily constituents and metals.

Drydock 3

Mr. Bjostad explained that Drydock 3 continually has seepage of water into the drydock and therefore requires pumps within the drydock walls to pump the water to the West Basin Harbor to allow the drydock to remain free of water. General practice for the drydocks was to sweep up and dispose of any waste on the drydock floor, but it was not possible to remove all of the waste. The remaining waste entered the drainage basins located inside the walls of the drydock. A sediment sample was collected from Drydock 3 at the low point of the drainage basins located on the far end of the drydock. The sample was similar to the catch basin sediment samples with oily constituents and arsenic above screening criteria.

Drydock 2

Mr. Bjostad stated that a sediment sample was also taken from Drydock 2 at the low point of the drainage basin with similar results to Drydock 3 with arsenic again above the screening criteria.

Mr. Bjostad spoke of sampling attempts for sediment at Drydock 1, which could not be completed since there was little to no sediment in the drainage basin. The tunnels at Drydock 1 had been cleaned of sediments in 1997 after LBNSY activities had ceased so it appears that most of the sediment was removed at that time.

Recommendations

Mr. Bjostad reiterated that sampling for these nine AOCs was conducted in June 1998. CDM Federal issued the Final Report in November 1998 which recommended no further action for five of the AOCs and further action for the remaining four AOCs. The five AOCs recommended for no further action included:

- Drydock 1 - No sediment was found in the drainage basin, so no sample could be collected. Standard procedure at the drydock was to periodically clean out the drainage basin at the drydock.

- Hazardous Waste Facility (HWF) at Building 98 - Operated in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s as a fiberglass shop that used various solvents. Three soil and groundwater samples were collected, and none of the results exceeded screening criteria.

- Acetylene Generating Plant and Sludge Pit, Building 162A - Operated from 1943 to 1960 for the production of acetylene for welding torches. Groundwater was sampled in the area of the previous sludge pit for pH. The pH for the sample was within the normal range for groundwater at the site.

- Gun Mount Storage, Cleaning, and Repair Yard – Operated from the 1950s to the 1970s and the yard was used to dismantle and clean large guns mounted on Navy ships. Solvents, oil, and grease were used during the operations, and the area for

these activities appears to have been unpaved during this time period. Five soil and groundwater samples were collected from the yard, and none of the results were above screening criteria.

- Public Works Facility Yard Associated with Building 5 - Used for parking of government vehicles, paint booth operations, steam cleaning operations, and pesticide storage. Five soil and groundwater samples were collected, and none of the results were above screening criteria.

Mr. Bjostad continued his discussion of the four AOCs recommended for further action based on results from the sampling. Recommendations for these four AOCs are:

- Sanitary Sewer Lines - One location north of building 128 had elevated levels of total petroleum hydrocarbons. Therefore, additional sampling will be conducted to delineate the problem and source. Other two locations where there were detections will be addressed under other LBNC environmental programs.

- Storm Drain Lines - One location had a detection of mercury in the groundwater and will be further delineated by collecting additional soil and groundwater samples. Catch basins with oily sediment are recommended for cleaning to prevent contaminated sediment from entering the West Basin Harbor.

- Drydock 3/Drydock 2 - Because of oily sediment and arsenic detections, sediment in the two drydocks should be removed or the drainage basins should be sealed to prevent sediment from entering West Basin Harbor.

Mr. Bjostad presented a summary slide on the sampling program conducted for the nine AOCs associated with the expedited 25 AOCs.

Mr. Hargrove asked if the systems presently in the drydock will be part of the system that will be used in the future under the reuse plan. Mr. Kanter stated that the new operator will be responsible for maintaining and running the system. Mr. Kanter is working under the assumption that (1) the drydock systems are functional and (2) the operation and maintenance of the drydock will be guided by special provisions in the operator's lease. The operator will also be responsible for maintaining any permits for releases to the waters from the State Water Board. Mr. Kanter stated that there will be greater restrictions than when the drydock was operated by the Navy, including some restrictions imposed by the Port of Long Beach to prevent any further contamination from being discharged. Mr. Hargrove stated that Drydocks 2 and 3 are planned to be retired, for the benefit of the attendees.

Mr. Bjostad spoke on the storm drain system and clarified that the majority of the storm drain lines are in good condition based on the video survey with only a few cracks. Mr. Kanter pointed out that the reuse plan includes plans to replace the storm drain system.

Current Status of AOCs Project

Mr. Bjostad continued with the a summary of the current status of the non-expedited AOCs. Mr. Bjostad stated that there were originally 157 non-expedited AOCs. Based on discussions with the Navy and regulatory agencies, nine additional AOCs have been added to this list. In 1998, CDM Federal conducted the site reconnaissance, documentation search, and personnel interviews for these AOCs. Sampling was conducted at 33 of the AOCs, and no further action was recommended for the remaining 133 AOCs.

One-hundred of the 133 AOCs recommended for no further action were satellite accumulation points (SAPs), which were found to have a very low potential for contaminating soil and groundwater. Draft and final reports for the remaining AOCs are expected in the summer and fall, respectively. Mr. Bjostad described the types of AOCs to be addressed in the report including SAPs, sanitary system pits, hazardous waste storage, historical sites, industrial wastewater systems, PCB contaminated sites, process tanks, and underground storage tanks.

Question and Answers

Mr. Cooley mentioned that Site 7 was addressed in Fact Sheet Number 3 but that Site 7 was not mentioned in the presentation. Mr. Bjostad stated that Site 7 is not part of the AOCs project and is addressed in separate investigations ongoing at LBNC. Mr. Lee said that he plans to have a presentation in March or May to update the progress of the investigation. Mr. Cooley stated that he heard a radio program about an EPA directive in 1979 regarding the Santa Monica Bay. The program indicated that Santa Monica Bay was not addressed as it should have been back in 1979 and that it will take 13 years to address runoff for Santa Monica Bay. Mr. Cooley asked if Site 7 will be put off as Santa Monica Bay was and stressed his concern for Site 7. Mr. Lee stated that this topic is not related to the presentation and that the discussion could come back to this issue after the questions for Mr. Bjostad were completed.

Ms. Vargas asked for a clarification on whether the sanitary sewer line sample with elevated total petroleum hydrocarbons was located near an oil well. Mr. Bjostad said that the sample location is approximately 50 to 100 feet from a well and that it will be investigated further. Mr. Bjostad explained that Installation Restoration (IR) sites are different from AOCs in that IR sites are generally investigated earlier at a facility and focus on the worst sites. The AOCs are sites that have a lower potential for having environmental impacts but still are necessary to investigate to rule out any possible impacts.

Mr. Caldwell asked if Drydocks 2 and 3 are going to be retired and what is the process (cleaning and filling in, dismantling). Mr. Kanter said that he did not know the definitive plan but that materials and any contaminants will be removed prior to demolition of the drydocks.
Mr. Sturm asked if there was any effect on the AOCs investigation from building demolition being conducted on the Naval Station portion of LBNC. Mr. Bjostad said that the AOCs investigation will lead to demolition of buildings at LBNSY once the areas have been determined to be clean. Mr. Sturm asked how he can receive information on a particular building to verify that the area has been cleaned up. Mr. Essington explained that LBNC is comprised of Naval Station and LBNSY and studies were conducted specifically for Naval Station, separate from

LBNSY. Mr. Essington stated that the Information Repository has reports from all environmental studies conducted at the Naval Station prior to demolition of the buildings.

Mr. Sturm stressed that he wants to be sure that LBNC is being cleaned up the right way, and he would like to know who can provide answers to his questions on past activities. Mr. Lee stated that before the Navy can lease or transfer the property, they must determine whether the property is suitable for that purpose-meaning that the environmental studies and/or cleanup must be conducted before even considering lease or transfer. Mr. Lee stated that the RAB acts as a forum for review of documentation and to provide input for the environmental cleanup decisions. Mr. Gutierrez added that state and federal regulators have been overseeing the cleanup process from the beginning and that the Navy is not acting alone in environmental cleanup decisions.

Mr. Sturm asked for clarification on who is responsible for oversight and ensuring that the cleanup is done properly. Mr. Hausladen responded that the RAB gives suggestions to the Navy and the regulators that are part of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) which decide on the most appropriate cleanup approach at these sites. The regulators have reviewed all documents related to environmental cleanup and decided that certain areas at Naval Station were suitable for transfer or lease by the Navy. No evidence of contaminants have been found at the areas designated for transfer or lease. Mr. Gutierrez added that the RAB meetings are to address environmental cleanup issues only and are not intended to cover any demolition or reuse issues.

Mr. Sturm asked for clarification on who can tell the Navy that they are clear to lease the property. Mr. Hausladen stated that the regulators are the only authority that can allow the Navy to lease or transfer the property.

Mr. Petway recommended that the discussion remain on the topics that are on the agenda and that there is an appropriate time to address questions from the audience. Mr. Lee asked if there were any additional questions on the AOCs project. There were none.

Open Forum for RAB Members and Members of the Audience

Mr. Lee requested that new members of the audience introduce themselves. Mr. Klock asked for a clarification on the function of RAB members. Mr. Thorpe suggested that reading the Executive Summary of the BCP will clarify the environmental status at LBNC. Mr. Thorpe clarified that RAB members make recommendations on the investigational cleanup and not on reuse and are aware of areas still requiring cleanup. Mr. Thorpe also stated that the local newspaper had made errors in an article on the base that stated that LBNC had been transferred to the Port of Long Beach in May 1998, which is not true.

Mr. Essington added that a function of the RAB is to answer specific questions by providing the question to a RAB member in writing so that the question can be addressed by the appropriate person. Another purpose of the RAB is to convey information to the community. In the past, RAB members have been vocal about the work at Site 7 and influenced the work conducted at the site.

Mr. Kanter stated that the RAB focuses on environmental cleanup and not on reuse. Aspects of an environmental investigation such as planning, field work, and conclusions are part of process which includes Navy and regulator interaction and RAB member input. RAB members can then provide information to the community based on their involvement in the process.

Mr. Lee recommended looking at the fact sheets prepared for LBNC to familiarize the public with the current status of the environmental programs. Mr. Lee stated that Fact Sheet Number 1 is especially good for getting an overview of IR sites at LBNC.

Mr. Carstens asked about the status of the early transfer authority. Mr. Lee stated that the early transfer process had not been initiated. He stated that the RAB will be notified when the process is started and will be involved throughout the early transfer process.

Ms. Foley stated that none of the property has been transferred but has been leased to the Port of Long Beach.

Mr. Hargrove added that there were several reuse committee meetings where there was information presented on potential reuse of LBNC property. The RAB has been established for discussion of environmental cleanup at the base, especially the 14 IR sites, prior to the property being conveyed to the Port of Long Beach.

Mr. Macchiarella clarified the dredging work that is being conducted at Site 7. Mr. Macchiarella stated that certain portions of sediments in the West Basin Harbor have been determined to not have contamination problems, so the POLB has been cleared to work in these areas. Mr. Cooley had asked earlier about progress on the IR Program for Site 7, which is currently at the Feasibility Study stage. Mr. Macchiarella said that the March RAB meeting would be an appropriate time to have a presentation on the Site 7 progress. Mr. Hausladen added that if there is not information on a particular site for several months does not mean that the work at that site has stopped. There are many parts of an environmental investigation that take time, such as planning documents, sampling activities, and report preparation.

Ms. Rich suggested that Mr. Lee could provide names of the local reuse authority (LRA) and Navy reuse specialist since there are questions from the audience on reuse issues. Mr. Davis added that any questions on reuse could be addressed by the City of Long Beach office. Mr. Davis added that the reuse plan is also in the library.

Mr. Cooley went fishing out at Site 7 and would like to know the status of the cleanup. Mr. Gutierrez stated that there should be signs on the Navy mole for no fishing. Mr. Cooley said that they fished out by the Sea Launch facility. Mr. Cooley asked why the park at the end of the mole is inaccessible. Mr. Gutierrez stated that the park was fenced for public safety and to prevent exposure to any chemicals of concern. Mr. Hausladen added that the park area is an active waste site.

Ms. Vargas introduced herself as a representative of the people of Long Beach. Ms. Vargas stated that the RAB meetings can be used as an educational tool. Ms. Vargas said that accessing

the community is a challenge; to let them know that they can be part of the process for cleanup at LBNC.

Mr. Gutierrez asked Mr. Lee and Mr. Macchiarella to provide a brief summary on Site 7. Mr. Lee offered to meet with Mr. Cooley after the meeting to discuss Site 7.

Mr. Klock asked if there is any possibility that the POLB could dredge the sediment earlier than expected. Mr. Lee stated that under the IR Program the Navy determined whether the sediment was contaminated. The next step was to address what to do with contaminated sediment, which is currently underway in the Feasibility Study. The POLB project deals with dredging and disposal of contaminated sediments. They will have to work with the Corps of Engineers and let them know how they plan to dispose of the sediments. This is a different legal mechanism than the IR Program.

Mr. Kanter stated that the POLB did additional sampling at Site 7 to aid in delineating the clean and dirty areas in the sediment. The POLB has written a disposal plan for both clean and dirty sediment. The plan was approved by the Corps of Engineers, EPA, and Regional Water Quality Control Board and included a permit being issued for the dredging activities. The plan for contaminated sediment is to transport the sediment to a Class I landfill or to the Port of Long Beach landfill. Clean sediment will be placed in a borrow pit or at an off-shore disposal site. Dredging cannot begin until the POLB receives the permit.

Mr. Sturm asked if it was a conflict of interest to have the POLB do the sampling for dredging and also the dredging activities. Mr. Kanter stated that there is a process that occurred prior to sampling that required the EPA's input in determining where and how the samples were to be collected. The plan for sampling required approval from the regulatory agencies prior to conducting the field work. The field work was conducted by an independent contractor and the work was monitored by regulatory agencies.

Mr. Gutierrez asked when dredging activities will be conducted. Mr. Kanter stated that dredging is planned to begin in March. Mr. Macchiarella stated that the area for dredging is only a subset of Site 7 and that a large portion of Site 7 is currently under the CERCLA process. Remediation of the remaining area of Site 7 will be decided in the Feasibility Study. Mr. Gutierrez stated that confirmation samples will be collected after the dredging to ensure that the remaining sediment is clean to regulatory standards.

Ms. Rich mentioned the RAB caucus in San Francisco, which John Essington and Mary Butler will attend. Mr. Essington stated that the caucus is made up of RAB members from military installations across the country. The purpose of the caucus is to discuss issues on a national level and provide recommendations for legislation on the BRAC process. The caucus will be held from 30 January to 3 February; Mr. Essington has more information. Mr. Essington stressed that you must be a member of a RAB to attend.

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

The next LBNC RAB meeting is scheduled for **17 March 1999** at the City of Long Beach Community Room at 200 Pine Street.

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.***