
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
July 11, 2001

Participants:

Bettencourt, Philip
Bradley, John/United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Clarke, Dean/Orange County Health Care Agency
Coquia, Marielle/CH2M HILL
Garrison, Kirsten/CH2M HILL
Hamparsumian, Hamlet/Foster Wheeler
Lamond, Robert
Le, Si/Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Monroe, Bruce
Smith, Gregg/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Vesely, Gene
Willhite, Lindi/RAB Community Co-chair
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:05 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair and Base Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Coordinator, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the meeting and introduced L. Willhite, the Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro also introduced S. Le, the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV and G. Smith the PAO for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

P. Tamashiro also noted the recent drop in RAB meeting attendance. Attending RAB members were thanked for their participation and encouraged to attend regularly. In addition, it was announced that several positions were open for new members and interested parties should contact P. Tamashiro or L. Willhite.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

S. Le, provided the RAB with an overview of NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach's IRP projects status. The following projects were highlighted:

- Sites 4, 5, and 6 Removal Site Evaluation
- Site 5 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memo/RAP (Removal Action Plan)
- Site 7 EE/CA and Action Memo/RAP
- Site 5 Removal Action

-
- Focused Site Inspection (FSI) Phase II (15 sites total)
 - Site 14 Baseline Survey Investigation
 - Groundwater Monitoring Program for Sites 40 and 70
 - Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision (ROD) for Sites 40 and 70
 - Pilot/Treatability Test for Sites 40 and 70
 - Community Relations Plan (CRP) Update

Copies of the Project Highlights slide presentation were made available as handouts at the meeting. Questions and answers made immediately following the presentation are summarized below:

Question: While this question was posed during the June 2001 RAB tour and the meeting minutes reflect this, the RAB has not been given a complete answer (i.e., cannot comment) with respect to Site 70 and why the Navy has not taken legal action against NASA and its contractors for the contamination left behind when they shut down their facilities. NASA was using a Navy facility and authorizing contractors to conduct activities resulted in environmental problems. It is unfair that IR Program funds and tax payers' money are being used to pay for studies and cleanup required because of NASA and its contractors activities. Funds allocated to the Site 70 IR Program could be spent on other programs ongoing at NAVWPNSTA.

Answer: The possibility and type of legal action are still being evaluated by the Navy with respect to NASA and its contractors' historic activities at the RT&E area. This comment will be presented to the legal team that is evaluating the Navy's legal options.

Question: Please reflect a continued concern with respect to NASA and its contractors association with contamination at Site 70. Private contractors were operating under federal contracts and using a federal facility. Taxpayers are now paying for remediation which could have been avoided had activities been appropriately managed by NASA and its contractors. Contamination, which occurred, has the potential to put areas outside the NAVWPNSTA facility at risk. Taxpayers money is now being used to investigate and cleanup a problem at Site 70 that was caused by a private company who made profits from the work.

Answer: Your concerns will be documented in the meeting minutes. A copy of the RAB meeting minutes will be forwarded to the Navy's legal team to convey the community's concern.

(The comment has been provided to Mr. Perry Sobel, the SWDIV counsel, on 12 July 2001. Mr. Sobel stated that the community member's opinion would be taken into consideration during the Navy's evaluation of the potential legal actions at Site 70. However, it is not appropriate for the

Navy to comment on this matter at this time , since any comment may potentially jeopardize Navy's future legal position on this mater. The community will be informed when a decision is formed on this mater.)

Question: With respect to Site 4, Perimeter Road, DTSC found high levels of lead in two areas; where were these areas?

Answer: Areas of Concern 1A and 2A of Site 4 are located on the south side of the base along Perimeter Road, near the Site 7 Landfill.

PRESENTATION – SITE 7 EE/CA (STATION LANDFILL)

P. Tamashiro introduced M. Coquia, CH2M HILL, who gave a presentation of the Draft EE/CA conducted for Site 7, the Station Landfill.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The questions and answers made immediately following the presentation are summarized below:

Question: Is Site 7 a candidate site for the Port of Long Beach to perform wetland mitigation?

Answer: The Navy, City, and County are considering a project which would widen the Orange County Flood Control Channel to increase the channel's capacity for conveying runoff. Channel widening would require moving the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach fence line back, cutting into the area of Site 7. The project is still in the "talking stage" and Navy has been requested to participate in the conceptual definition. The project won't begin for at least 5 years.

Question: With respect to alternative land uses for Site 7, is creation of wetland habitat a potential?

Answer: All three removal action alternatives discussed in the EE/CA propose to return Site 7 to current land uses that would be compatible with the existing habitat. The evaluation of alternatives in the EE/CA considers these factors. For example, Alternative 2 has been ranked lower than the other alternatives in this area because the proposed capping would reduce the existing wetland area. Alternative 3 has a higher ranking, in part, because it minimizes impacts to habitats and allows for long-term monitoring.

Comment by J. Bradley: With respect to the previous question regarding potential wetland mitigation by the Port of Long Beach at Site 7, I would like to add that Site 7 would be a great place for the Port to conduct mitigation if and when they want to. If a remediation action was conducted and funded by the Port or another entity, then IR Program funds could be directed to other clean up actions on the Station.

Comment by G. Smith: Widening the Orange County flood channel would require excavation of a portion of Site 7. The County is aware that the IR site exists, however the

G. Smith: project is still in a conceptual phase and it is too early to determine if they would move forward with the project and affect remediation activities at Site 7.

Portions of Site 7 that would be affected by flood control channel widening would most likely be Areas 2 and 6 of the site. Remediation activities within these two areas would not escalate beyond groundwater monitoring (Area 2) and surface debris removal (Area 6). Sites to the north of Site 7 would not be affected.

In addition, if it becomes apparent that this potential project may affect remediation efforts at Site 7, the County or Navy may choose to conduct additional groundwater monitoring (feasibility study is projected to be conducted in September 2001 for the flood control channel widening project). The RAB will continue to receive updates with respect to this proposed project and its potential affect on the IR Program.

Comment by J. Bradley: The USFWS would be interested in expanding compatible habitat at Site 7 and would be interested in delaying proposed removal actions if concurrent proposals would remediate Site 7.

The USFWS believes that the activities proposed for Areas 3, 4, 5, and 6 within Site 7 are consistent with Refuge objectives relating to the expansion of fresh and saltwater marsh habitats and the 1991 ROD for the Environmental Impact Statement for the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. The activities proposed for Areas 1 and 2 could also be consistent with Refuge objectives, but would require more time.

Question: Did the 1991 ROD recognize that there was a landfill at Site 7?

Answer: No, the goal to expand freshwater and saltwater marsh areas at the Station was included in the ROD was not directed to any particular site or areas of the Station.

Question: If Site 7 became a wetland area used by wildlife for foraging and habitat, would it be reclaimed by the Navy as part of the military mission?

Answer: Site 7 is located within the explosives safety arc surrounding weapons storage magazines and serves as a buffer between these areas and the communities which surround NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. Therefore, this area is not suitable for buildings or other structures.

Question: Alternative 3 includes repair of existing soil cover, what does this mean?

Answer: An examination of Area 1 revealed the thickness of soil cover over landfill debris was less than 2 feet in some places. It was determined that soil cover should be supplemented in these areas to increase the separation between debris and ecological receptors to at least 2 feet of soil cover.

The repair of soil cover in Area 1 under Alternative 3 can be contrasted with capping recommended in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 proposes a complete

capping of Area 1, resulting in destruction of existing wetlands.

Question: Groundwater monitoring is recommended in association with Alternatives 2 and 4. But no methane monitoring is recommended?

Answer: Earlier investigations sampled for landfill gas and found that the levels detected was much less than for a typical landfill. These findings are consistent with our understanding of the site; for a landfill that is at least 25 years old to as much as 50 years old, much of the biodegradable refuse is probably degraded and the low potential for methane generation does not warrant monitoring.

Question: What are the costs for the common removal actions for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.

Answer: These costs can be provided in the meeting minutes.

(The costs of the common removal actions for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are estimated to range between \$691,000 and \$1,055,000. These are considered preliminary costs and have not been reviewed by the Navy.)

Question: Alternative 4 proposes excavation of waste areas and offsite disposal, costing between \$16.9 and \$40 million. Please provide the portion of this cost range attributed to backfill of soils.

Answer: These costs can be provided in the meeting minutes.

The costs of the imported clean soil backfill are estimated to range between \$2,290,000 and \$5,970,000. These are considered preliminary costs and have not been reviewed by the Navy.

Question: Are detailed costs provided in the EE/CA?

Answer: A table is provided that summarizes the major cost categories for each alternative. The estimated cost of a particular item must take into account the contingency costs.

At the close of the Site 7 EE/CA presentation, P. Tamashiro announced that the Pre-Draft EE/CA was submitted to the Navy for review in May 2001 and comments are requested by July 25, 2001. The Draft Site 7 EE/CA is scheduled to be submitted to the RAB in late August. The RAB will be given 60 days to review and provide comments. Although there will not be an August RAB meeting, time will be set aside at the September 12, 2001 RAB meeting to discuss any questions the RAB may have. RAB members are encouraged to bring their comments and questions with respect to the Draft EE/CA to the September 2001 RAB meeting.

PRESENTATION - "NO FURTHER ACTION" INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITES 1 AND 19

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Hamparsumian, who gave a presentation of the “No Further Action” Recommendations for IR Sites 1 (Former Wastewater Settling Pond) and 19 (Building 241 Disposal Pit and Sandblast Grit Area).

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The questions and answers made immediately following the presentation are summarized below:

Question: What is the approximate soil volume removed from Site 1?

Answer: Approximately 21,900 cubic yards of soil was removed.

Question: What was the density of the soil removed from Site 1?

Answer: About 1 ton per cubic yard.

Question: Are these sites located within the explosives safety arc?

Answer: Site 19 is not located within the explosives safety arc. It is located in the base administration area. Site 1 is within the explosives safety arc, near the northern tip of the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge.

Question: The sites were backfilled and planted with native vegetation. Is there a noticeable difference in vegetation establishment and aesthetics of the site?

Answer: Yes. The sites look beautiful. Site 1 is especially well covered and very green. The USFWS helped with the selection of vegetation at Site 1.

Question: In terms of the cleanup standards for Sites 1 and 19, are there any limitations to future uses of the sites? Could vegetables be grown?

Answer: There are no land use limitations. Active farmland is located just northeast of Site 1 across the railroad tracks and could be expanded to Site 1.

Question: If I were a Seal Beach resident, how would I feel about Sites 1 and 19 and the “No Further Action” recommendation?

Answer: The “No Further Action” recommendation is in accordance with RCRA and CERCLA. This is the final chapter for Sites 1 and 19. Residents will most likely recognize that the IR Program has achieved everything it set forth to do with respect to these sites and the threat remains to humans and the environment have been removed.

Question: Are there any specific plans for Sites 1 and 19?

Answer: Site 19 will remain an open area and allow vehicle travel through designated routes. As discussed before, the farming lease currently held for an area northeast of Site 1 could be expanded to include portions of Site 1.

Question: Did Foster Wheeler make the arrangements for waste material to be transported to Utah?

Answer: Yes.

-
- Question:** How much did transportation and disposal of waste material to Utah cost?
- Answer:** Approximately \$74 per ton.
- Question:** Does this cost include manifesting?
- Answer:** No, the costs associated with preparing the manifests and signing them are separate. There were a total of about 220 manifests involved – one for each rail car load.
- Question:** Is the disposal facility a military facility?
- Answer:** No, it is a permitted, commercial facility.
- Question:** In terms of lessons learned, have we learned anything from the processes gone through to remediate Sites 1 and 19?
- Answer:** Planning and getting all concerned parties involved in the process from the very beginning is key to the success of a project in terms of scheduling, accurate costs, etc.
- Question:** Are we applying these lessons at Site 70?
- Answer:** Yes, but each site is different with different contaminants, site constraints, and geology. So planning occurs with available information and current knowledge.
- Question:** It is also nice to wrap up Sites 1 and 19 remedial activities. When we began the process only studies were being conducted and little action took place.
- Answer:** Yes, however, all studies conducted were necessary to satisfy all concerns and options and to determine the best solution/conclusion to the issue.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro reiterated the drop in recent RAB membership and attendance, noting only 16 RAB members. L. Willhite reminded RAB members that regular attendance is expected. If a RAB member has two or more absences, the Co-chair has the authority to request a resignation. RAB members can notify P. Tamashiro, L. Willhite or G. Smith if unable to attend.

A position description for RAB members was requested. It was identified that no formal description exists beyond the requirements that RAB members live or work near NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and meet the definitions of a community stakeholder.

It was suggested that recruitment announcements for additional RAB members be placed in public locations, however it was pointed out that referrals from current RAB members and other individuals associated with the IR Program are preferred.

RAB members asked if any particular interest or community group should be targeted for RAB representation. P. Tamashiro responded that all community members are encouraged

and welcome to participate in the RAB, especially educators and Leisure World residents and that no specific groups are being targeted for membership.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.