

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
March 8, 2005

Participants:

Blake, Geoffrey
Carmody, Jack
Chauvel, Tim / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Coerper, Gil / City of Huntington Beach
Dudakis, Jason / Orange County Water District
Hohenadl, Eike
Jordan, Jack / Ecology Control Industries
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Pilichi, Carmine
Reeve, Rod / MARRS Environmental Services
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stillman, Glenn
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:00 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced J.P. Peoples, RAB Community Co-chair and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO).

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing IR Program.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

The RAB meeting continued with a status update on the ongoing IR Program presented by S. Le, the SWDIV Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program.

The following sites were discussed:

- Site 42 - Auto Shop Sump/Waste Oil Tank; Sites 44/45 - Former Waste Otto Fuel Drum Storage / Building 88 Floor Drain Outlet; and Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 57 - Paint Locker Area; Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA)
- Site 14 - Abandoned Leaking Gasoline Underground Storage Tank (UST), Groundwater Investigation
- Site 40 - Concrete/Pit Gravel Area and Site 70 - Research, Testing, and Evaluation (RT&E) Area; Groundwater Monitoring Program

- Site 70 Revised Feasibility Study (RFS), Proposed Plan (PP), and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 40 Remedial Design and Remedial Action
- Site 74 – Old Skeet Range, Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment
- Site 4 – Perimeter Road; Site 5 – Clean Fill Disposal Area; Site 6 – Explosives Burning Ground; and Site 7 – Station Landfill, Long-term Groundwater Monitoring Program

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The following questions were posed after the Project Highlights presentation:

Question: What does “DCA” stand for?

Answer: “DCA” stands for dichloroethane.

Question: Is the groundwater at Site 7 being tested for perchlorate?

Answer: No, there are no prior indications of explosives, rocket propellant, or other sources of perchlorate ever reported or documented at Site 7. The Navy has no reason to suspect its presence; therefore, perchlorate is not a chemical of potential concern at Site 7 and is not being tested for at Site 7. At Site 6 and Site 70, perchlorate was tested in the groundwater samples because these sites were an explosives burning area and a research, testing, and evaluation (RT&E) area, respectively. Test results did not find perchlorate at these sites.

Comment by Jack Jordan: A new bill is coming out of Sacramento but it has to be re-written because the non-technical authors of the bill confused perchlorate with perchloroethylene.

Question: Is pump-and-treat ineffective at most sites?

Answer: Pump-and-treat is effective for sites under certain favorable conditions, such as sites with permeable soils. At Seal Beach, the soils are predominantly silty-sand. Furthermore, based on groundwater modeling, it is estimated it could take more than 50 years to cleanup the groundwater plume at Site 70 using pump-and-treat.

Question: Are we doing pump-and-treat anywhere at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

Answer: No, we were about to begin a pump-and-treat at Site 70 but we are now changing the treatment strategy. This was the subject of the RAB presentation a few months ago.

Question: Does DHE (*Dehalococcoides ethenogen*) work on vinyl chloride?

Answer: Yes, the KB-1™ strain can biodegrade trichloroethene past vinyl chloride to its elemental components.

Question: Did the recent rains cause any problems with our sites at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

Answer: Some sites were temporarily flooded by the heavy rains. There were probably some temporary effects to the shallow groundwater, but there is no concrete data to show any major impact. The next round of groundwater sampling will tell what kind of effect, if any, and we will report to the RAB if any significant effects were observed.

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by indicating that a presentation would be given by R. Reeve of MARRS Environmental Services on the Project Update of Site 42, Site 44/45, and SWMU 57.

PRESENTATION - PROJECT UPDATE: ENGINEERING EVALUATION/COST ANALYSIS (EE/CA) NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION FOR SITE 42, 44/45, AND SWMU 57

R. Reeve proceeded with his presentation on the Site 42, Site 44/45, and SWMU 57.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The following questions were posed after the presentation:

Question: What is the source of arsenic at SWMU 57?

Answer: Some paints contain arsenic. Historically, military bases have used rodenticides that contained arsenic. Also, arsenic is a metal that naturally occurs throughout the state of California.

Question: Did you get stakeholders buy-off on the EE/CA?

Answer: The next step is to send out the draft EE/CA to the regulatory agencies and the RAB for comments.

Question: How much soil will be removed at SWMU 57?

Answer: This information was not available at the RAB meeting. After the RAB meeting, it was determined that about 175 cubic yards of soil will be excavated from SWMU 57.

Question: Why are nickel and zinc a problem at Site 44/45?

Answer: Based on the screening ecological risk assessment, the concentrations of nickel and zinc found in the ditch sediments could pose a danger to sensitive ecological receptors. The American kestrel and least tern were used as representative receptors that might be exposed to the ditch sediments. The concern also includes contaminants buildup in the food-chain.

Question: Are nickel and zinc damaging to humans?

- Answer:** Nickel and zinc can be dangerous to humans depending on the concentrations, but not in the concentrations found in the ditch sediments. Although it is unlikely that humans will be exposed to the ditch sediments, the Navy decided that rather than conduct additional studies, the impacted area is small enough to expend the monies to remove.
- Question:** When trash and debris wash down the Orange County Flood Control Channel, are they polluting the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge?
- Answer:** Only Site 42 lies directly in the tidal salt marsh that may be impacted by the waters from the flood control channel. The impact is somewhat mitigated by the tidal flow out to the Pacific Ocean.
- Question:** Has anyone analyzed the water quality of the storm water washing down from the flood control channel?
- Answer:** The County of Orange would be responsible for this because they have jurisdiction over the flood control channel.
- Comment by G. Smith:** On March 26, 2005, there will be a public volunteer cleanup effort taking place at the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. Let me know you are interested in helping. This will be especially important after all the debris that has been washed up after all the recent storms.
- Question:** What is the SWMU 57 removal action timeline?
- Answer:** After the regulatory agencies and RAB comments are received and addressed, the Navy expects to fund this removal action by August 2005, and the removal action field activities may be able to begin as early as September 2005. It is expected that the total removal action field work will take between 3 to 4 weeks.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB community co-chair election was scheduled for that evening, but there are not enough RAB members present to form an election quorum. She excused all attendees who were not RAB members. She announced that after a 10-minute break, the RAB members would reconvene to decide what to do about the election.

P. Tamashiro also reminded the RAB members that the new federal RAB regulations were available for review and comment. The Federal Government is soliciting comments no later than March 29, 2005.

BREAK

RAB COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR ELECTION

P. Tamashiro reiterated that despite contacting every RAB member in advance of the meeting to encourage attendance for the election, there were not enough RAB members

present to form an election quorum. Some could not attend because of medical or family obligations.

P. Tamashiro asked if any of the RAB members present wished to volunteer to be the RAB community co-chair. There were no volunteers. She then asked if there were any objections to J.P. Peoples serving as the RAB community co-chair for another year. No objections were raised. P. Tamashiro asked for a motion. G. Blake motioned that J.P. Peoples serve as the RAB community co-chair for another year. J. Carmody seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB by-laws would be revised to extend the RAB community co-chair term to three years.

A comment was made that the new Federal RAB regulations read as if the Federal Government wanted to disband RABs. P. Tamashiro encouraged the RAB member to submit this observation as a comment and cite the paragraph(s) that gave this impression.

One RAB member asked if RAB meetings would be resumed at the base. Another comment was that it would be nice to have coffee or juice and cookies again.

J.P. Peoples offered to bring her 1997 RAB application. She suggested that the applications received by the Navy in 1997 could be revisited to see if these applicants are still interested in the RAB.

One RAB member suggested that the RAB meetings start at 6:00 or 6:30 p.m. G. Blake motioned that the RAB meetings start at 6:00 p.m. J. Carmody seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Another comment was made that all RAB meeting attendees should be introduced. It was announced that this practice would be implemented at future RAB meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

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