

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
SITE TOUR  
8 July 2003

Participants:

Bradley, John / United States Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bromund, Paul / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Carmody, Jack  
Chauvel, Tim / Department of Toxic Substances Control  
Clarke, Dean / Orange County Health Care Agency  
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL  
Hohenadl, Eike  
Jordan, Jack  
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair  
Schallman, Robert / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Spinelli, Erica / SWDIV  
Sturm, Jason / SWDIV  
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and Navy Co-chair  
Torrey, Peter /CH2M HILL  
Wallerstein, Margaret / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Detachment Concord  
Whittenberg, Lee / City of Seal Beach

WELCOME

At 6:15 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair and Base Installation Restoration (IR) Program Coordinator, began the 2003 IR Program Site Tour by welcoming the participants. P. Tamashiro introduced S. Le, the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for the IR Program from SWDIV and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). In addition, P. Tamashiro introduced R. Schallman, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Conservation Project Manager and M. Wallerstein, IR Program Manager for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, Detachment Concord.

Participants were encouraged to direct any questions regarding the IR Program sites to P. Tamashiro. General questions regarding the NAVWPNSTA could be directed to G. Smith and questions specific to biological resources or the environment could be directed to R. Schallman.

P. Tamashiro then introduced P. Torrey, CH2M HILL Project Manager who would be leading the 2003 IR Program Site Tour. Two handouts were provided to the participants of the site tour: (1) a map illustrating the general locations of IR Sites 7, 14, 22, 40, 70, 73, and 74 with NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach boundaries, and (2) individual site maps with focused views of each of the seven sites. P. Torrey stated that the tour would provide a discussion of the

past, current, and proposed activities for each site and he encouraged participants to ask questions during the site tour. P. Torrey indicated Site 7 – Station Landfill would be the first site visited.

The order of the sites visited are as listed below. Questions and answers discussed during the site tour are summarized below.

## SITE TOUR

### Site 7 – Station Landfill

Question: Will the “hot spots” along Perimeter Road be excavated?

Answer: Yes. Lead hot spots within and adjacent to Area 2 of Site 7 will be excavated. The source of the lead hot spots is believed to be from the historic use of waste oil containing lead for dust and vegetation control. Buried and partially exposed debris within Site 7 Area 5 will also be excavated as they are a potential source of contamination to the aquatic wildlife in Perimeter Pond. The existing landfill cover in Area 1 of Site 7 will be supplemented to provide a minimum of two feet of cover thickness.

Question: What is the upper concentration of lead contamination at Site 7?

Answer: The highest concentration of lead ranges from 2,000 to 2,500 parts per million (ppm).

Question: Are there any restrictions on the future land use of this site as a result of past disposal practices? You couldn't have a playground?

Answer: No, use of the site as a playground would be restricted. There are no plans for land uses of that type, however.

Question: With rail tracks so close by, I would assume that disposal costs at Site 7 would be low?

Answer: Use of rail for disposal is dependent on whether the disposal facility is served by rail. It is possible that trucks will be used for disposal of excavated material for this removal action.

Question: I would think that disposal by rail would be cheaper than by truck, something like \$35/ton?

Answer: True, but there are other associated costs to consider. For example, the railroad track would need to be re-certified to transport the weight of the disposal material.

The September 2003 RAB meeting will include a presentation on the Removal Action proposed for Site 7.

### Site 74 – Old Skeet Range

Question: Did you say that soil samples were collected at depths of 3 inches below ground surface (bgs)?

Answer: Yes. Soil samples were 6-inches in diameter and 3 inches bgs.

Question: With respect to the agricultural fields located on the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, is the use of pesticides and herbicides controlled?

Answer: Yes, each month the farmers are required to report the actual amount of pesticide usage. Farmers must only use approved pesticides contained on an authorized list.

Question: Has the harvested product ever been tested for pesticide levels?

Answer: Not to my knowledge. However, there are Department of Food and Agricultural requirements for pesticide levels that are enforced by the State of California.

Comment by

J. Bradley: As a result of concerns voiced in previous RABs, since the early to mid-1990s the policy has been to slowly reduce the amount of pesticide use at the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. As an example, along the north side of the NAVWPNSTA an organic farming area has been established to gauge success.

#### Site 22 – Oil Island

Question: Are there any plans for future abandonment of Oil Island? Who is responsible for the costs of cleanup?

Answer: The following response was obtained from Breitburn Energy after the site tour in response to the above question:

Breitburn Energy projects operations at Oil Island should last 20 to 30 years based on present economics. When the time comes to abandon the operation, Breitburn will work closely with the Navy and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to restore the island at Breitburn's expense without harming the environment.

Question: Would the Navy be responsible for site investigations to determine the level of contamination present at Oil Island?

Answer: No, Breitburn Energy would be responsible for conducting investigations to determine the levels and types of contamination present. The Navy would conduct verification sampling to make sure the cleanup is successful and meets appropriate standards.

Question: Does Oil Island have a site closure fund?

Answer: No, Oil Island is not a Superfund site nor is it listed on a national priority cleanup list. If Breitburn refused or was unable to pay for required site investigations and cleanup at Oil Island, the Navy would conduct the activities and IR Program funds would be used. However, a legal claim would be filed to recover costs.

Question: A normal industrial site would be required to have a site closure plan. What about Oil Island?

Answer: There may be a closure plan for drilling activities and activities are subject to permit requirements (i.e., permits for flare usage and spill prevention, control, and countermeasures).

Question: What is the purpose of the large nests located in the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)?

Answer: These are nest platforms constructed by the USFWS for the endangered California clapper rail. Approximately 100 nest platforms are provided for use by the clapper rail at high tide. A count for the species conducted in December 2002 identified 62 clapper rails within the NWR. We have counted as many as 150 this year, and in 1995 as few as 20 were counted. Their numbers fluctuate from year to year.

Question: What other wildlife species are present within the NWR?

Answer: A number of special status species inhabit the NWR. Species include the California least tern (that nests on NASA Island), the brown pelican (that uses the deep waters of the estuary), the peregrine falcon (federally delisted in February 2003, but still state listed as endangered), and Belding's savannah sparrow (that are only found in pickleweed vegetation within the marsh).

Question: Is the lease here at Oil Island open ended or is there a contract limit in place?

Answer: I believe there is some type of lease with the Navy.

The following response was obtained from Breitburn Energy after the site tour in response to the above question:

The lease has no termination date and will continue until the operation ceases.

#### Site 14 – Abandoned Underground Storage Tank (UST)

Question: When was methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) first used?

Answer: In the early 1980s.

#### Site 40 – Concrete Pit/Gravel Area

Question: How large is the extent of contamination at Site 40?

Answer: 650 feet long by 450 feet wide and approximately 66 feet deep.

Question: There is a difference in cleanup standards between commercial and residential cleanup goals. What is the goal for cleanup here at Site 40?

Answer: The groundwater cleanup standard is the maximum contaminant level (MCL) allowed for trichloroethene (TCE) in drinking water, which is 5 parts per billion (ppb).

Question: For soil contamination different standards are used. What is the cleanup goal for soil contamination at Site 40?

Answer: No soil cleanup was required at Site 40. Evaluations of perchloroethene (PCE) and trichloroethene (TCE) contamination relate to groundwater only.

Question: What is the purpose of the rubble and soil piled to the north of Site 40?

Answer: This is part of the NAVWPNSTA's water pipe replacement project intended to replace a circa 1940s water main. The rubble pile has no association with the Site 40 remediation.

#### Site 73 – Water Tower Area

Question: How much soil was removed during the Site 73 Removal Action?

Answer: Approximately 26 to 27 truckloads removed about 500 cubic yards of material.

Question: Was the sod placed after completion of the Removal Action at Site 73 irrigated?

Answer: No, Site 73 was not irrigated before or after the Removal Action. The dying sod will be reported to the NAVWPNSTA landscape maintenance department.

#### Site 70 – Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area

Question: Does Rockwell pay for the cleanup at Site 70?

Answer: Not yet. A background informational package is being prepared to send to Washington, D.C., for the Navy's lawyers to review.

#### COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro thanked the participants for attending the 2003 IR Program Site Tour. It was announced that the next RAB meeting would be held on Tuesday, September 9, 2003. A presentation on the Site 7 – Station Landfill Removal Action and a status update for the Site 40 Phase 2 Pilot Study will be presented.

P. Tamashiro reminded those attendees that wished to join the RAB to submit their RAB member applications as soon as possible for consideration.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Attendees were told to have a safe trip home. The 2003 IR Program Site Tour ended at 8:00 p.m.

Note: This is a meeting summary, not an actual transcript.