MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
January 13, 2004

Participants:

Carmody, Jack
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL
Haynes, Michal / South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC
Mirick, R.A. /Captain, Commanding Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stevens, Charles
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Willhite, Lindi

WELCOME

At 7:02 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced Captain R.A. Mirick, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Commanding Officer and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). P. Tamashiro announced that Captain R.A. Mirick would be speaking to the RAB members at the beginning of the meeting.

Captain R.A. Mirick wished the RAB a good evening and Happy New Year and indicated that this would be his last opportunity to meet with the RAB as he received orders for an assignment at the Pentagon at the end of February 2004. He acknowledged the important role the RAB plays in the health of the base and the Navy's environmental cleanup mission. He commended the RAB for helping the Navy find ways to economically and appropriately steward the limited available funds for installation restoration at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and thanked the RAB members for their participation.

Captain R.A. Mirick then thanked L. Willhite for her service to the RAB and presented her with a plaque in recognition of her outstanding service as RAB Community Co-chair from 2000 to 2003.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing Installation Restoration (IR) Program followed by an IR Program schedule and budget update presented by S. Le, the SWDIV Remedial Project Manager (RPM). She indicated that the presentations would be followed by a short discussion of internal RAB matters. P. Tamashiro acknowledged that RAB member attendance at the meeting was low, but indicated that she had been intending to have the RAB matters discussion for several months and, rather than delay the discussion, she would present the information for RAB consideration and discussion. She stated that the materials discussed during the session would be mailed to RAB members who were unable to attend and additional actions could be taken in future meetings.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

The RAB meeting continued with a status update on the ongoing IR Program presented by S. Le, the SWDIV RPM for the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program. The following sites were discussed:

- Site 7 - Station Landfill, Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memorandum (AM) and Removal Action
- Site 73 - Water Tower Area, Removal Action
- Site 14 - Abandoned Leaking Gasoline Underground Storage Tank (UST), Baseline Groundwater Investigation
- Site 40 - Concrete/Pit Gravel Area and Site 70 - Research, Testing, and Evaluation (RT&E) Area, Groundwater Monitoring Program
- Site 40 and Site 70 Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan (PP), and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 40 Pilot Testing
- 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, Groundwater Monitoring Program

Copies of the Project Highlights slide presentation were made available as handouts at the meeting.

Questions and answers posed during and after the Project Highlights presentation are summarized below:

Slide 8

Question: Was the bio-augmentation pilot testing at the Concrete/Pit Gravel Area (Site 40) successful?

Answer: Yes, while the experts are still evaluating the data, interim data show reduction to a concentration of approximately 5 parts per billion (ppb). As a result, it has been determined that enhanced lactate bioremediation will be implemented at Site 40.

PRESENTATION – IR PROGRAM SCHEDULE AND BUDGET PRESENTATION

S. Le proceeded with a presentation on the IR Program schedule and budget.

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

Slide 3

Question: What IR Program site is assigned a prioritization level of medium risk?

Answer: The Paint Locker Area (Solid Waste Management Unit [SWMU] 57), which is scheduled for an EE/CA in fiscal year (FY) 2004 and removal action in FY 2006.

Slide 10

Question: Is the effort required for development of an EE/CA counted as cleanup dollars or studies and investigation dollars?

Answer: Because an EE/CA is a study that evaluates removal action alternatives, it is considered part of the documentation required for a removal action and is counted toward cleanup dollars.

Slide 11

Question: There is a tremendous jump in the estimate of costs required for the IR Program in FY 2012. Why does this occur?

Answer: This estimate is only a computer software projection and probably represents a shift of the costs for long-term groundwater monitoring to later years to balance the overall budget in the near term. The Navy is comfortable with the estimated cost to completion from FY 2004 to FY 2006, but the costs for later years will likely change as we draw closer to that time frame.

Question: What happens to the IR Program budget if the monies are not spent during the FY for which they are awarded?

Answer: The budget updates conducted in the spring and fall of each FY are designed to accurately account for the available budget. Adjustments to the estimated cost-to-complete can be conducted at this time to redistribute funds appropriately within each FY. The SWDIV Headquarters manages the IR Program budget at a program level for a number of installations. IR Program Managers are responsible for managing funds at their respective installation given the available budgetary dollars and time frame. Funds are typically not lost given this management approach.

Question: Is the estimated IR Program cost-to-complete factored for current dollars or inflation?

Answer: Costs are reported in 2003 dollars with escalation factored in for each subsequent year.

Question: Are we currently preparing the budget for FY 2005 now to identify anticipated costs?

Answer: The budget will be adjusted in Spring 2004 to reallocate funds for 2004 and future years as necessary. Fund reallocation is conducted with consideration of activities that are required to be conducted but may not have been anticipated at the last budget update, as well as those activities that were anticipated at the last budget update but may not be

required immediately.

General

Question: Does the Department of Defense (DoD) provide the funding for the IR Program?

Answer: Yes, and the Navy's portion of that funding is managed by the Environmental Restoration, Navy (ER,N) Account.

Question: Does the IR Program include demolition of existing buildings on NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

Answer: ERN funding can be used for building demolition if structure removal is required as part of the removal action at the site. The Station Demilitarization Furnace (SMWU 24) removal action involved building demolition. However, a normal building demolition project at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach would not be funded by the ER,N Account.

Question: Is there an existing list of buildings that are proposed for demolition as part of the IR Program?

Answer: Each installation maintains a list of IR Program sites, which would identify whether existing structures are being considered as part of the IR Program site.

SITE 42 (AUTO SHOP SUMP/WASTE OIL TANK) DISCUSSION

P. Tamashiro announced that prior to moving forward with the discussion of RAB matters, she would like to draw the attendees' attention to the map of Site 42 (Auto Shop Sump/Waste Oil Tank), made available as a handout at the meeting. P. Tamashiro explained that Site 42 was one of the sites discussed earlier in the IR Program schedule and budget presentation, reminding the attendees that the site is scheduled for an EE/CA in FY 2004 and subsequent removal action in FY 2005 or 2006 to clean up heavy metal-contaminated sediments along the discharge outfall area in proximity to the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). The EE/CA and removal action will address contamination at the discharge outfall for the site located across Kitts Highway to the south. Currently, a portion of Site 42 (northwest of Kitts Highway) is the subject of a proposed construction project where the current car wash onsite would be expanded and onsite wastewater facilities would be improved. The proposed construction project would be located in an area of Site 42 where "no further action" was recommended by the Navy and approved by the regulators.

The proposed construction project is currently in the design phase and scheduled for completion in FY 2004. However, DTSC has requested that further soil analysis be conducted in the vicinity of the proposed construction project prior to approval. The Navy is currently fulfilling this request. If soil contamination is not detected, the project will move forward quickly.

Discussion of the proposed construction project at Site 42 has been reported to the RAB and documented in these meeting minutes to appropriately notify the RAB and enlist their questions or concerns regarding the project prior to commencement. The following questions were posed in relation to the proposed construction project at Site 42:

Question: Does the proposed construction project at Site 42 involve increasing the size of the oil/water separating tank?

Answer: No detail on the water treatment system is not available at this time as it is still being worked out. However, the site does not involve production or handling of hazardous waste. We do know that the Navy is pursuing design of a treatment system that would be more environmentally friendly.

Question: Is the car wash used for military or civilian vehicles?

Answer: The car wash would be used solely for military vehicles and small vessels (i.e., boats). Civilians are not allowed to wash their vehicles on base. The car wash would service military vehicles present on base including cars and sport utility vehicles. Large armored vehicles including tanks would not be serviced at the car wash.

Question: Where does the discharge from the Site 42 discharge outfall go?

Answer: Wastewater from the oil/water separator at Site 42 is discharged into an industrial sewer system in compliance with the local sanitation district regulations. Only the storm water runoff is discharged into the outfall on the other side of Kitts Highway.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting would be held on the third Tuesday of March (16 March 2004) to conduct training on the IR Program process. She indicated that the training was open to both RAB members and interested community members. She highly encouraged attendance, indicating that valuable information and background on the IR Program would be provided and she identified that it would be a good opportunity for new members to learn the IR Program process. S. Le indicated that the NAVWPNSTA was also planning to invite the PAO from SWDIV to speak to the RAB about the duties and responsibilities RAB members have under applicable federal guidelines. P. Tamashiro requested that any questions regarding the upcoming training be directed to her.

P. Tamashiro also announced that additional training sessions would be offered in future RAB meetings. She requested suggestions for future training topics and encouraged attendees to contact her via e-mail or telephone with training topics that interested them.

RAB MATTERS

P. Tamashiro indicated that if attendees had no other questions or comments concerning the topics discussed so far, all non-RAB members were excused so that a discussion of RAB matters could be held.

[All non-RAB members departed the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.]

P. Tamashiro proceeded with the discussion of RAB matters, acknowledging that RAB member attendance at the meeting was low. She indicated she would mail the materials discussed during the session for consideration and comment by RAB members who were unable to attend.

P. Tamashiro made available as a handout the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach RAB Rules of Operation (adopted 8 May 1997). She encouraged RAB members to read through the Rules of Operation at their leisure, but noted that, since the document was adopted in 1997, no updates have been performed and some of the content is outdated. She identified the following sections in particular for RAB member discussion and consideration:

Section III Membership

d. Members are expected to attend all RAB meetings. If a member has two or more unexcused absences, the RAB Community Co-chair may ask the member to resign. Resignation requests will be by letter. Members who decide they are unable to continue to participate will submit their resignations in writing to the Community Co-chair. There is no limit on the number of excused absences.

P. Tamashiro reminded the RAB members of the importance of attendance. She indicated that while the RAB has not exercised the right to request a resignation after two or more unexcused absences, the Rules of Operation are still in effect. She requested that members call or e-mail her if they know they will not be able to attend a RAB meeting. This will serve to officially excuse members for their absence and also let the group know that the member is still interested in participating.

Section III Membership

e. Application for RAB membership will be accepted at any time a community member wishes to submit one. RAB community member replacement will be as openings occur. Replacement members will be selected from submitted applications by an independent selection panel. The Community Co-chair and the Navy Co-chair will develop panel membership.

P. Tamashiro indicated to RAB members that while a panel has existed in the past, none has been in existence to address membership issues lately. P. Tamashiro suggested that a panel be re-established to help increase RAB involvement and participation and requested volunteers for formation of the panel. She indicated approximately 3 to 5 volunteers would be appropriate. The following RAB members volunteered to participate on the panel:

J.P. Peoples
C. Stevens

Jack Carmody
Lindi Willhite

P. Tamashiro requested that additional RAB members contact her if interested. A schedule for periodic panel meetings will be established once panel membership has been completed.

Section IV RAB Structure

e. Topics for each meeting agenda will be submitted to the Navy Co-chair not later than two weeks prior to a meeting. The Community Co-chair and the Navy Co-chair will select agenda items.

P. Tamashiro indicated that topics for meetings are currently announced at least one month before the RAB meetings. Therefore, a motion was made to change the time frame for submittal of meeting topics from two weeks to one month. No objections were made.

The following text change has been approved for the Rules of Operation:

Section IV RAB Structure

e. Topics for each meeting agenda will be submitted to the Navy Co-chair not later than one month prior to a meeting. The Community Co-chair and the Navy Co-chair will select agenda items.

The above text change will also affect the date of acceptance of the Rules of Operation:

Section VII Accepted by the RAB Community Members

Accepted on the 13th day of January 2004.

These text changes have been officially accepted and are documented in these meeting minutes.

P. Tamashiro concluded the RAB matters discussion by soliciting additional questions and comments from the attendees. The following summarizes the discussion that followed:

Question by L. Willhite: In order to encourage attendance at future RAB meetings could announcements be posted on community bulletin boards or other public gathering places such as local merchant's store/restaurant windows?

Response by G. Smith: Most cities have strict regulations where public postings can be placed. It might be more effective to announce meetings in the community news sections of local newspapers (Seal Beach Sun or Orange County Register) or prepare a short public information announcement for the public access television station (SBTV Channel 3).

Comment by L. Willhite: Huntington Beach also has a community bulletin board on KOCE and there are several community bulletins in circulation where we could announce RAB meetings, including the Fountain Valley View and the Huntington Beach Independent. The City of Westminster is also trying to re-establish a community bulletin, although it's not distributed citywide yet.

Response by G. Smith:	I wasn't aware that Westminster was re-establishing their community bulletin. These are all ideas worth pursuing.
Comment by J.P. Peoples:	It would also be good to initiate more interest from the Leisure World community. Possibly hold an informational seminar about the IR Program and RAB membership.
Comment by J. Carmody:	What about the possibility of holding the next meeting at a Leisure World facility?
Response by G. Smith:	I believe there are restrictions on the use of Leisure World facilities by non-residents. The Council Chambers is still a good meeting location. Though tonight is an exception, parking is typically readily available.

P. Tamashiro announced that while the March 2004 RAB meeting would be held in the Seal Beach Council Chambers, the May 2004 RAB meeting would likely be moved back to Building 110 at the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. She also reminded the attendees that the annual NAVWPNSTA IR Program Site Tour would be held in July.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking the participants for attending and wishing them a safe trip home. She requested that attendees return their name badges before departing. The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

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