MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
October 10, 2012

Participants:

Antos, Charles/Community Member
Antos, Marie/Community Member
Buck, Slader/United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Cummings, Esther/National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer
Fitch, John/USFWS Volunteer
Gandara, Jose/RAB Community Member
Gilligan, Kirk/ USFWS
Grinyer, Walt/Geosyntec Consultants
Hamparsanian, Hamlet/Parsons
Jordan, Jack/RAB Community Co-Chair
Lee, Larry/RAB Community Member
Levine, Laura/KCH JV
Lieberman, Tara/Richard Brady and Associates (Brady)
Roy Marroquin/Community Member
McConathy, Brenda/KCH JV
Monroe, Bruce/RAB Community Member
Niou, Stephen/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Olivera, Jerry/City of Seal Beach
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Command Southwest
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Vesely, R. Gene/RAB Community Member
Wong, Bryant/KCH JV
Zerman, Katie/USFWS

WELCOME

Pei-Fen Tamashiro commenced the meeting at 6:10 pm at the City of Seal Beach Council Chambers by welcoming all participants. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves and to sign-in and collect handouts at the front table.

P. Tamashiro introduced Gregg Smith, the Public Affairs Officer for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and Jack Jordan, the RAB Community Co-Chair.

P. Tamashiro announced that two presentations will be given tonight: A brief overview of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) Project

Highlights by Brenda Reese; and a Feasibility Study (FS) for IRP Site 74, Old Skeet Range, by Brenda McConathy of KCH JV.

B. Reese began the presentation by acknowledging the Navy team members, regulatory agencies, and contractors. She provided background on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), reviewed IRP and MRP Site Status at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, and identified sites on a base map. She briefly reviewed background and current status of open IR Sites, including: Site 7, Station Landfill; Site 40, Concrete Pit/Gravel Area; Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area; Site 74, Skeet Range; Site 75, KAYO SB Agricultural Well; UST 7 (Bldg. 229)-Former UST Site; and UST 8 (Bldg. 500) – Former UST Site. She concluded by briefly discussing the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection and Site Inspection status.

Questions and answers discussed during the Project Highlights Presentation are summarized below.

Question: *You referred to closing Site 75, how can the Navy close the site without remediation?*

Answer: *Closure is just one possibility. The source of contamination is off Navy property, so the first course of action will be for the Regulatory Agencies to identify the Potential Responsible Party (PRP). This approach will involve working with the regulators to determine the best course of action, and to make sure the identified PRP completes the cleanup.*

Question: *Whoever is the source of contamination is responsible for stopping the release and cleaning up the contamination. The Navy has a fiduciary responsibility to prevent the contaminant plume from coming onto Navy property.*

Answer: *There is a financial liability associated with any open site on Navy property. Site Closure must be negotiated with the regulatory agencies, and the Navy has not requested a closure letter. The Navy is not planning on conducting additional sampling or cleanup at the site, but it will focus on helping the regulators find the PRP. The site will most likely remain open until a PRP or PRPs can be identified, and the contamination is cleaned up or under control.*

P. Tamashiro introduced Brenda McConathy, of KCH JV to deliver the technical presentation on the Feasibility Study for IRP Site 74, Old Skeet Range, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, CA.

B. McConathy began the presentation by briefly describing Site 74. This site is approximately 23 acres, a portion of which is located within the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge, adjacent to the Station's Small Arms Range. The eastern side, or upland area, of the site is referred to as the soil portion; and western side, the tidal marsh within the wetland, is referred to as the sediment portion. B. McConathy identified several special species present on site. Next she provided a brief site history, explained a visual of the skeet range area showing the site layout

and shooting pads, and reviewed a timeline of previous investigations leading up to the 2012 Feasibility Study Report. She identified the contaminants of concern and passed around lead shot examples. She reviewed the CERCLA Process and discussed the feasibility study (FS) process evaluation criteria: threshold criteria, balancing criteria and modifying criteria. Next, she reviewed the key FS report elements and the human health risk assessment results including the cancer and non-cancer risks. In addition, she also discussed the ecological risk assessment results. She stated that based on the risk assessment results, remedial action objectives were identified. After the areas of contamination were identified, remediation goals were developed for the site. B. McConathy reviewed the technology screening evaluation including the general response action, remedial technology type, and process options associated with each type of technology. She concluded with a detailed discussion of the development of Alternatives 1- 4 and explained the comparative analysis and the eventual selection of Alternative 4.

Questions and answers discussed during the Feasibility Study Presentation are summarized below.

Question: *Are the buildings shown on the figure still there?*

Answer: *No, the buildings have been removed. The berm and portions of the concrete pad still remain.*

Question: *Do the calculated levels of risk account for lead shot?*

Answer: *Yes, the level of risk from lead shot was calculated when calculating post-remediation levels of risk; however, we are focusing the remediation on lead because it has the greatest risk. The areas with lead shot correspond to the areas with the highest lead concentrations. Therefore, by focusing on removing lead, lead shot will be removed simultaneously.*

Question: *Was an analysis of birds ingesting insects, including tiger beetles, conducted for the ecological risk assessment?*

Answer: *Yes, as part of the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment, modeling of invertebrates to birds, to higher level birds was conducted. This analysis was included in the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment Report that was concurred by all regulatory agencies. The Belding's Savannah Sparrow was identified as the species with the highest level of risk. Cleaning up/remediating the site for this species will ensure that risk is at acceptable levels for all species. The Tiger Beetle was not specifically looked at because invertebrates were not evaluated on a species specific level.*

Question: *Recently 19 geese died at Site 74, at what level would lead not be a hazard to geese?*

Answer: *Just to clarify that the geese were found dead last winter due to lead poisoning at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, about 0.5 mile from Site 74. Although it was suspected that the geese ingested lead from Site 74, the direct link was never established. With that said, the ecological risk assessment did consider the ingestion of lead shot by birds as part of calculation of acceptable levels of risk for the site.*

Question: *What is the difference between soil and sediment?*

Answer: *The western side of Case Road is referred to as the sediment side, the slew opens up to a tidal flow, and it is inundated periodically by water. The eastern side of Case Road is referred to as the soil side. Different remediation technologies have been selected for each side.*

Question*: Are both the east and west side of the site within the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge?*

Answer: *Case Road is the boundary of the Wildlife Refuge.*

Question: *In Alternatives 2 and 4, you must dewater prior to implementing remediation, how do you accomplish this?*

Answer: *Sheet piling will be installed by specialized contractors to divert the flow of water away from the area requiring remediation. The dewatering plan will be developed after the completion of the FS. However, general assumptions, and cost estimates for dewatering were incorporated into the FS process, and the subsequent design process will incorporate specifics. Alternative 2 ranked lower because implementation would be more destructive of the wetland.*

Question*: In the analysis of the alternatives, did you consider NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach base use (such as the loading and unloading of ammunition), flooding, sea-level rise, soil acidification, or the possibility of an earthquake in terms of how these events might delay the project?*

Answer: *Alternative 3, Capping is less effective because an event like an earthquake could impact the long-term effectiveness of the remediation strategy. The site is not included in the munitions loading and unloading area of the base. The other events mentioned (sea –level rise, acidification, etc.) would impact all the alternatives equally, so those factors would be cancelled out.*

Question: *How was it determined to remove 1-foot of soil?*

Answer: *Removing soil to a depth of 1 foot was determined based on previous sampling results, the Conceptual Site Model, and an evaluation of how lead is accumulated on site. There is no indication that lead is buried below a depth of 1 foot. Confirmation sampling will occur after remediation is complete to determine if additional excavation is necessary. Lead shot, and lead will both be removed through excavation.*

Question: *Alternative 4 will scrape the site until it is clean? Once the surface soil has been removed, will vegetation be replanted? At the Site 7 landfill, the re-vegetation efforts have not been as effective as anticipated, are you expecting the vegetation at this site to be easy to grow? It seems like vacuuming would have less of an impact on the wetland. How many different pieces of remediation equipment did you evaluate? There are alternative vacuuming trucks that are easier to manipulate and move around.*

Answer: *The plan is to excavate to a depth of 1 foot, replace the excavated soil with clean fill, then re-vegetate the site with native species. The re-vegetation plan will be laid out during the remedial design stage of the project. Our aim is to use equipment that will have the least impact to the wetland. Traditional excavation equipment would impact the adjacent areas of the wetland more than the selected Alternative 4 strategy. For the Feasibility Study we consulted with vendors specializing in remediation equipment in order to determine the best-suited equipment. Vacuum hoses only extend 150 feet, and the distance from the road to the outer extent of contamination is 400 feet. In order to get the vacuuming equipment out into the wetland, the dense vegetation in the salt marsh would have to be removed. If you are aware of additional vendors specializing in remediation equipment please provide their information so we can get additional quotes.*

Question: *The Canadian Geese died without action, after spending 12.7 Million what is the effect going to be?*

Answer: *The goal of remediation is to reduce residual risk to below 1. The Savannah sparrow is a more sensitive species than the Canada goose. Residual risk numbers were generated based on remediating the site for the Savannah sparrow.*

Question*:* *How was acceptable wetland residual risk determined to be 149mg/kg?*

Answer*:* *Overall the site wide average after remediation will be 97 mg/kg. This average is protective for the Savannah sparrow.*

Question*:* *What would you need to do to remove all the lead, and clean-up to background levels?*

Answer*:* *Background is 37 mg/kg, but we don't have an unacceptable level of risk at 149 mg/kg. Our remedial action goal is to reduce risk to an acceptable level. In addition, there residual risk numbers are conservative.*

Question*:* *Is there a 10% difference between b and c?*

Answer*:* *Yes.*

Question*:* *Does the remedial design include capturing and caring for wildlife, and then releasing them again? Are there any Native American artifacts on site?*

***Answer**: There is a biological monitoring component that has been factored into the remedial design and cost estimate for the Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study does not contain specific details; there will be an assessment to determine what species will need to be cared for, and appropriate action will be incorporated into the remedial design. Monitoring will occur before and during the remedial action. There are no known Native American artifacts on site.*

***Question**: What factors make the Savannah sparrow the most sensitive species?*

***Answer**: The sparrow ingests a lot of vertebrates, lives on the ground, has a small home range, and may be affected by incidental ingestion. The concentration of lead at the site could impact a species, like the sparrow, which spends a lot of time on site. Plants were collected from the site, analyzed, and modeled to determine what levels of lead animals on site would be ingesting.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following documents are available for review and comment:

The Site 70 Performance Monitoring Report, and the 5-Year Review for Site 40 and Site 70

P. Tamashiro announced that two separate incidents have occurred on NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

Incident 1: MRP AOC2- Drop Test Tower.

In mid-August, P.Tamashrio received a phone call from installation personnel that the drop test tower at MRP AOC2 had been altered. The USFWS confirmed that they were responsible for removing the cat walk platform around the top of the drop test tower. The Navy expressed concern to the USFWS that the Navy were not notified prior to start of work. The site is an active MRP site with unresolved safety issues. The USFWS assured the Navy that the site was not disturbed during the alteration because a long-arm mechanical method was employed to alter the tower. Any additional discussion regarding this issue will be documented.

Incident 2: Spent bullets on Case Road reported on September 10, 2012.

The USFWS reported observing spent bullets along Case Road inside Site 74, and down range of the Station's Small Arms Range. The Navy collected GPS points for all bullets observed along Case Road and created a lead shot distribution map. The highest density of bullet shot was located down range from the Small Arms Range. Ricochet from the Small Arms Range is believed to be the source of the observed spent bullets. The majority of the bullets were flattened by vehicle traffic and stuck in the road surface, few loose items were observed. On September 19, 2012, the Navy removed all bullets off of Case Road. The impacted portion of the road has been closed to all vehicle traffic, and the Navy will continue to monitor the area for two months

to determine if any new ricochet from the Small Arms Range is impacting the area. Monitoring will be purely observational, no samples will be collected. In addition, a NAVFAC SW Range Engineer has been consulted to determine if there are improvements that can be made to the design of the Small Arms Range to reduce the potential for ricochet.

Questions and answers discussed during the Incident Discussion are summarized below.

***Question**: Given that rounds were found in the vicinity of the dirt road, is the extent of lead shot ricochet greater than the potential footprint for Site 74? How will you address that?*

***Answer**: The lead shot along the road may have been dispersed by vehicle traffic. We do not know the total extent to the lead shot. We will incorporate confirmation sampling into the Remedial Design for Site 74 to account for the ricochet.*

***Question**: Sediment can be soft; could rounds potentially be buried deeper than 1 foot?*

***Answer**: We will conduct confirmation sampling after the removal to determine if we need to excavate additional soil/sediment. We will also be replacing the excavated soil/sediment with clean back-fill to prevent contact with ecological receptors.*

***Question**: Can I assume from the map there will be no excavation East of Case Road?*

***Answer**: The figure shows an outline of the area that will be excavated in the upland portion (East side of Case Road) of the site. The area outlined on the wetland portion (West side of Case Road) will be excavated using amphibious equipment.*

***Question**: Is there any possibility that the Small Arms Range activity will cease so that this will not be an issue in the future?*

***Answer**: It is an essential mission of the Navy to provide a training area for Navy military personnel and law enforcement personnel. Base security, the Environmental Office, the Public Works Department, and NAVFAC Range Engineers are working together to determine what can be done to minimize or eliminate the ricochet issue.*

***Question**: What is the long term plan for the Small Arms Range?*

***Answer**: At this point in time, there are no plans to relocate or replace the range. There is a project in place to renovate and improve the range. The Navy is mindful of the sensitive habitat surrounding the range, but there are no plans proposed to enclose the range.*

***Question**: Is the Feasibility Study and Remedial Action plan contingent on renovating the range?*

***Answer**:* *I would say so; it does not make sense to remediate Site 74 if the Small Arms Range is a continuous source of lead contamination. The ricochet issue will need to be addressed first.*

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:55 p.m.

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