

FINAL MINUTES
WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH (WPNSUPFACSB)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
JANUARY 14, 1998

Participants:

Abbasi, Rafat/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Albright, Dean
Baillie, David/ WPNSUPFACSB (Navy Co-Chairman)
Castillon, Rick
Dick, Andrew/SWDIV
Embree, Melody/CH2M HILL
Garg, Anjali/Orange County Environmental Health
Hammond, Andy, Captain/WPNSUPFACSB
Johnson, Danny/WPNSUPFACSB
Mitchell, Mike/U.S.Fish and Wildlife Service
Monroe, Corrine
Moore, Richard
Peoples, "JP"
Robinson, Rob/WPNSUPFACSB
Reynolds, Ken/SWDIV
Rosenman, David, M.D.
Sebring, Fred
Spencer, Jim/Community Co-chairman
Torrey, Peter/CH2M HILL
Vessely, Gene
Voce, Mario
Washburn, Jackson (for Randy Breitenbach)
Welz, Ed
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:00 p.m., D. Baillie welcomed the participants to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and presented an overview of the meeting's agenda. He announced two changes to the meeting's agenda: 1) there will be no Site 1 Treatability Study presentation by Foster Wheeler; and 2) an added discussion related to a change in the RAB co-chairmanship.

D. Baillie introduced Captain Andy Hammond, Commanding Officer for WPNSUPFACSB. Captain A. Hammond thanked the RAB for their involvement and stated that he intends to continue to participate in RAB meetings to the extent possible. He

also mentioned that in April 1998 he will be transferred and that there will be a new Commanding Officer for WPNSUPFACSB.

J. Spencer announced that he is resigning his Community Co-chairmanship due to a new career opportunity out of the state and stated that a new Community Co-chair will need to be elected. J. Spencer's last meeting is tonight. He also asked that M. Voce take the lead on conducting the election at the end of tonight's meeting.

HIGHLIGHTS

D. Baillie introduced K. Reynolds, who provided the RAB with highlights of the WPNSUPFACSB's Installation Restoration Program (IRP) project status. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 3 - Site 1 Wastewater Settling Pond - Removal Action:

The treatability study is having trouble stabilizing copper in certain Site 1 soil samples to below Soluble Threshold Limit Concentrations. This is one reason why tonight's scheduled presentation on the Site 1 Treatability Study is postponed to another date.

Slide 4 - Site 7, Station Landfill - Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memo/Remedial Action Plan (RAP):

J. Spencer brought to the attention of the RAB an e-mail message regarding cleanup of military landfills. Copies of the message were made available as a handout at the meeting. He explained that the e-mail message, written by William Smith, a planning commissioner in Alameda County, states that capping, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) presumptive remedy for landfills, may not be the most appropriate measure for landfills which are subject to strong tidal fluctuations. Mr. Smith felt that because the landfill contents are already in contact with groundwater, a cap will do little to prevent leaching of contaminants and that other alternatives need to be considered. The message went on to suggest that excavation or leaving it in-place with long-term monitoring may be better methods for the closure of landfills. J. Spencer recommended this point of view should be considered in the development of alternatives for Site 7. J. Spencer added that the State Regional Water

Quality Control Board's position is that Site 7 does not require capping. R. Abbasi stated that the ecological risks at Site 7 needs to be better understood before a decision is made. K. Reynolds added that the Navy is planning to do additional field work at Site 7 (e.g., Ecological Phase II Validation Study, additional field work for the "excavation" alternative, and additional groundwater monitoring). Once that data is available later this spring, the Navy will re-evaluate what alternatives should be evaluated in the Site 7 EE/CA and may add a "leave it in-place with long-term monitoring" alternative.

Q. Is any data available from other sites that addresses the issue of landfills near water? Has it been proven that capping a disposal site which is influenced by tidal action does not work?

A. To the best of our knowledge, current data is not available which addresses this situation.

Q. Do EPA regulations require disposal sites to be capped?

A. No.

Q. What does monitoring the landfill accomplish?

A. Monitoring will detect the presence and migration of contamination in the groundwater.

Q. Does "removal action" mean that the waste will be "removed"?

A. Not necessarily. "Removal action" is a general term that can mean a variety of actions including complete excavation of the waste, partial removal, treatment of the waste, constructing a fence around the site, or monitoring of the site.

Slide 7 - Ecological Risk Assessment - Phase II Validation Study:

Q. Does this slide refer to Site 7?

A. This slide refers to both Sites 1 and 7.

Slide 9 - Sites 1 and 7 Groundwater Study:

Q. Has the Workplan been completed?

A. The Navy plans to award the contract for this effort by the end of January 1998.

Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area:

In response to a question about the status of the groundwater investigation at Site 70, K. Reynolds reported that groundwater samples were collected to a depth of 80 feet below ground surface (bgs) and contamination was detected. Field work to collect deeper groundwater samples (at 150 feet bgs and 180 feet bgs) was commenced just before Christmas. These field activities are projected to continue through April 1998.

K. Reynolds introduced Andrew Dick as a Navy Remedial Project Manager joining the WPNSUPFACSB team.

Q. Is there a problem at this site that the Navy was not originally aware of?

A. No. The scope of the original contract was based on the assumption that we would only drill to only 80 feet bgs for sampling. This was done principally to establish a definitive budget for the project. However, based on the recent sampling results, deeper sampling will be needed.

Q. What keeps the contamination from following the path that is being drilled?

A. There are several established drilling methods to prevent cross-contamination between groundwater aquifers. These methods are being used as part of the Site 70 investigation.

OPERABLE UNITS 1,2, AND 3 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT
ADDENDUM

D. Baillie introduced Peter Torrey, CH2M HILL Assistant Project Manager, who provided the RAB with an overview of the Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report Addendum. Handouts of the presentation were made available at the meeting. Questions and answers made during the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 17 - DDT in Sediment:

Q. Compared on a regional basis, does this refer to a comparison with White's Point?

A. There were four areas that were compared, Los Angeles Harbor, Marina del Rey, Bolsa Bay, and Upper Newport Bay. White's Point was not one of them.

Q. Has DDT been detected elsewhere at WPNSUPFACSB?

A. Site 7 is the only area where sediment samples were taken during the RI. (In the 1992-1993 National Wildlife Refuge Study, 29 sediment samples were collected and analyzed for DDT. The DDT levels detected were in the range found in the California regional coastal areas).

Q. How do the levels of DDT at Site 7 compare to the levels at the National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) as reported in the NWR Study?

A. There is a discussion of the results of the NWR Study in the RI Report. Low levels of DDT were detected, but specific concentrations were not available at the RAB meeting. (Refer to the Section 7.1.2, page 7-2 in the RI Report for additional information.)

Q. Because DDT is so prevalent, how can it ultimately be cleaned up?

A. It would be futile to clean up DDT if it is due to regional contamination because DDT concentrations would continue to return to the site.

Q. Is DDT coming from the flood control channel?

A. Yes, DDT appears to be coming from the flood control channel because the highest DDT concentrations in sediment are closest to the entry way to the channel.

Q. From which flood control channel is DDT coming from?

A. DDT is probably coming from the Orange County (formerly Bolsa Chica) Flood Control Channel.

COMMUNITY FORUM

M. Mitchell gave a brief status on Site 22 - Oil Island and the meeting held on December 4, 1997, with Breitburn, regulatory agencies, USFWS, and the Navy. Because birds and other wildlife are attracted to this site, the site will be made less attractive to wildlife as a way to discourage wildlife from entering the area. (This is in accordance with the recommendations for Site 22 in the OU 1, 2, & 3 RI Report.)

Captain Hammond presented a 1966 aerial photograph of WPNSUPFACSB and a letter of recognition and appreciation to J. Spencer for his participation and involvement in the WPNSUPFACSB RAB.

J. Spencer expressed his opinion on how well the Project Managers' meetings have progressed with a RAB representative attending. He said that attending these types of meetings has been valuable, helpful, and successful. It has made a difference on a number of issues including those involving Sites 7 and 22. He hopes that, after his departure, that RAB representatives will continue to attend Project Managers' meetings. K. Reynolds concurred with his assessment of the RAB participation.

As part of the RAB membership drive, D. Johnson issued a news release as a campaign to attract new RAB members. Later in the meeting, it was suggested by a RAB member that a copy of the news release be posted at the Huntington Beach library. D. Johnson will do this.

J. Spencer explained to the RAB what he did as the Community Co-chair and what to expect of the new community Co-chair:

1. Review and comment on draft technical reports.
2. Attend Project Managers' meetings (it was noted that any RAB member could be the representative for the RAB at these types of meetings).
3. Ask questions.
4. Review meeting agendas and meeting minutes.
5. Receive all correspondence between regulatory agencies and the Navy.
6. Receive project pertinent e-mail, mail, etc., from the Navy.

It was noted by D. Baillie and R. Robinson that any RAB member interested in becoming the new community co-chair does not need to serve at the same level of effort as J. Spencer has. The position does not require vast technical knowledge or background but the individual should be available to review meeting minutes and agendas, and to attend other project-specific meetings.

M. Voce requested RAB members to vote on whether to nominate a new Community Co-chair during this meeting and have an election at the next RAB meeting, or to have the election tonight. It was noted that because not all RAB members were in attendance, that the election should take place at the next RAB meeting. D. Baillie suggested a letter explaining the nomination and election process be mailed out with the meeting minutes.

It was unanimously decided to open nominations during this meeting and have the election at the next RAB meeting in February.

It was suggested by D. Baillie that as a help to the new community Co-chair, other Navy installations that have RABs, could be contacted to assist with any questions the new community Co-chair may have.

D. Rosenman, on behalf of the RAB, bade farewell and good luck to J. Spencer and thanked him for his participation and dedication to the RAB as Community Co-chairman.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

The following future RAB meeting agenda topics were suggested or proposed:

- Presentation on Site 1 - Treatability Study by Foster Wheeler at the February RAB meeting.
- Removal Site Evaluation Workplan for Sites 4, 5, and 6 by Bechtel National Inc., (Ed Morelan).
- Nominations/election of a new community Co-chair.

NEXT MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 11, 1998, at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

D. Baillie adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.