

WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY (WPNSUPPFAC), SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
July 8, 1998

Participants:

Abbasi, Rafat/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Bernitt, Captain Thomas (Commanding Officer WPNSUPPFAC, Seal
Beach)

Coffey, Michael

Crone, Walter

Dick, Andrew/SWDIV

Embree, Melody/CH2M HILL

Garg, Anjali/Orange County Environmental Health

Hertfelder, Dana/Foster Wheeler

Menzel, Barry

Mingay, Marsha/DTSC

Mitchell, Michael/ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Monroe, Bruce

Peoples, J.P.

Pilichi, Carmine

Rennis, Denise

Robinson, Rob/WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach

Sears, Terry/Golden Rain Foundation

Sebring, Fred

Smith, Gregg/WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer

Vance, Carolyn

Voce, Mario

Washburn, Jackson

Welz, Ed

Whittenberg, Lee

Willhite, Lindi

Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:00 p.m., R. Robinson welcomed the participants to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and introduced M. Voce, the Community Co-chair. R. Robinson served as the Navy Co-chair in place of David Baillie who could not attend the meeting.

HIGHLIGHTS

M. Voce introduced A. Dick who provided the RAB with highlights of the WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach's Installation

Restoration (IR) Program 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 7 - Sites 4, 5, & 6 Removal Site Evaluation (RSE):

Question: Is the dioxins issue the only thing holding up progress at Site 4?

Answer: Yes. The dioxin detection limits for the samples collected were not low enough, so there may be a need to re-sample some areas. The reason the Navy is deciding to proceed with the RSE at Sites 5 and 6 is because these two sites are ready to go. Site 4 is complicated by the data gaps from the previous investigation, the very expensive dioxin analyses, and the long length of Site 4 (being over 10 miles long).

Question: Were the samples collected at Site 4 analyzed under acceptable standards?

Answer: Yes, the Navy is required to use State-certified laboratories and approved sampling and analytical plans. The reason the incorrect limits were used is because the Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) had been lowered since the previous investigation to reflect more protective limits on dioxins. Unfortunately, the lower PRGs are below the detection limits obtained during the previous investigation.

Question: What is an environmentally safe oil?

Answer: This environmentally safe oil is a petroleum-based product that does not contain metal contaminants.

ACTION: As requested, R. Robinson will provide the Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) on this petroleum product to E. Welz and D. Rennis.

Question: Is the Work Plan for Sites 4, 5, and 6, RSE being distributed to the RAB for review?

Answer: Yes, the Work Plan has already been distributed to the RAB and regulatory agencies for review.

Question: Can non-RAB members obtain access to these documents?

Answer: Yes, the Work Plan as well as other recent environmental documents relating to WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach IR Program are maintained at the Information Repository located at the Seal Beach Public Library, Mary Wilson Branch, at the WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach, and at Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Command in San Diego.

Slide 8 - Site 19 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memo/Remedial Action Work Plan (RAW):

Comment: L. Whittenberg from the City of Seal Beach expressed the City's appreciation for the Navy's diligence and willingness to move forward with the removal action at Site 19 before McGaugh Elementary School summer break ends.

Slide - 5 Sites 1 & 7 Groundwater Monitoring Study:

Question: Will there be separate three-week intervals of continuous water level monitoring?

Answer: Yes, the Navy is trying to evaluate seasonal effects on local groundwater gradients.

Question: Has there been a big change in the groundwater levels from when sampling was first conducted?

Answer: Yes, the groundwater levels appear to have significantly risen although they have receded by now. This is not too surprising because the water levels were measured in February-March 1998, in the middle of an unusually heavy wet-season. This was purposely done to observe the wet weather effects on water levels and gradients.

Question: Is there also a change in the gradient flow direction?

Answer: Yes, there appears to be seasonal changes in the groundwater gradient flow direction. Because of these seasonal changes, the gradient is planning to be checked on a quarterly basis.

Question: When will the additional groundwater sampling be conducted?

Answer: Depending on funding, additional sampling could begin at the beginning of the next fiscal year (October 1, 1998).

SITE 19 REMOVAL ACTION

R. Robinson introduced M. Mingay from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) as the public participation specialist. He also announced that M. Mingay provided copies of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation for Site 19 as handouts at the meeting.

R. Robinson introduced D. Hertfelder from Foster Wheeler who provided the RAB with a presentation on the Site 19 Removal Action. Handouts of the presentation were made available at the meeting. Questions and answers made during the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 7 - Removal Action:

Question: What is the depth to groundwater?

Answer: The depth to groundwater at Site 19 is approximately 12 feet.

Slide 8 - Disposal Pit - Pre Excavation Sample Locations:

Question: How do you determine how many samples to collect?

Answer: The sampling plan was developed following U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) data quality objectives guidance. The number and location of samples were determined based on cost, size of excavation, and what is practical to do during an excavation.

Question: Are the metals you are referring to, extracted metals or total metals?

Answer: The metals being referred to are total metals.

Slide 12 - Disposal and Transportation:

Question: Are there plans to monitor the wind velocity and direction during the removal action?

Answer: Yes, there are several Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) which must be followed. One of which is the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1150, which requires upwind and downwind monitoring during excavation. If the wind increases substantially (i.e., over 15 miles per hour for 15 minutes

or longer), then the removal action would be stopped. Also, dust control measures will be implemented during the removal action.

Slide 14 - Summary:

Question: Because you are excavating to 12 feet (which is the depth to groundwater), will you have to collect and dispose of the water you encounter?

Answer: The excavation depth of 12 feet is only estimated; only debris and soil that show evidence of contamination will be excavated. We do not anticipate there to be much wet soil or debris removed. If we are wrong and there is enough wet material collected that runoff is produced, the water will be collected, stored in containers, and disposed of properly.

Question: Will this water be tested?

Answer: Yes, if the amount of runoff water is significant then the collected water would then be tested to determine the proper disposal method. Groundwater quality data to date indicate that groundwater has not been impacted.

Question: Why are the cleanup levels for arsenic based on the *upper* limit background value? Wouldn't the average background value be more conservative?

Answer: The cleanup level established for arsenic is based on the concentration found in uncontaminated "background" soils at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach. Upper limit background values are those considered to be representative yet conservative (i.e., protective). In the development of these background limits with the regulatory agencies, unusually high background data was removed to further ensure adequate protection.

SITE 7 SUPPLEMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION

D. Hertfelder from Foster Wheeler provided the RAB with a presentation on the Site 7 Supplemental Characterization study. 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 9 - Location of Subsurface Anomalies:

Question: Has the Navy identified and contacted individuals with knowledge of past disposal practices?

Answer: Yes. In 1984 and 1985, as part of the Navy's "initial assessment study" that first identified this and 24 other past disposal sites at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach, "old-timers" or former employees, were interviewed about what they knew of past disposal practices at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach. Also, as part of that study, historical aerial photographs, available maps, and old reports were reviewed for useful information on past disposal locations and practices.

Slide 10 - Boring and Hand Auger Locations:

Question: Why hand augers versus borings?

Answer: At the request of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the hand auger method was used at some locations because it was the least disruptive to the mating and nesting marsh inhabitants observed in that area. Belding's savannah sparrows, a sensitive species, were observed at that location.

Slide 14 - Supplemental Characterization (Photo):

Question: When you collect samples do you follow Quality Control (QC) procedures, such as temperature control?

Answer: Yes, there is a QC person on the sampling team who ensures that the approved Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) are followed. In particular, soil samples are stored and shipped on ice after collection in accordance with the SAP and QAPP.

Slide 15 - Supplemental Characterization:

Question: Does the nature of the debris coincide with what the Navy thought would be in the landfill?

Answer: Yes, in general, the debris appears to be mostly construction materials and typical household waste. The sampling team did not observe any obvious hazardous or

industrial waste. But that does not mean that they were not buried in the landfill.

Question: For the Area 1 Trenches, did you collect samples east of the site boundaries to determine if the trenches extends further than expected?

Answer: Yes. The eastern-most trenches lie within the existing site boundaries.

Question: Will the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) be based on the assumption that hazardous materials are buried onsite?

Answer: This determination has not yet been made; the soil samples that were collected are currently being analyzed. However, if there are hazardous materials, then the EE/CA will be based on hazardous materials. The EE/CA is also being tied to the ecological risk assessment validation study results to assess the impact to plants and animals.

Question: Can you determine if the landfill was used for both demolition debris as well as household wastes?

Answer: The site (Area 5 especially) is predominantly demolition debris. However, in some of the areas of Site 7, other debris such as diapers, plastics, and glass have also been found.

Question: Have paint cans been found at Site 7?

Answer: No paint cans were observed during sampling. But that does not mean paint cans or other chemical containers are not buried at Site 7.

Comment: B. Wong mentioned that in January 1996, as part of the Site 7 landfill closure planning, a backhoe was used to excavate portions of the existing cover to determine the soil cover thickness over the trenches. He indicated that no evidence of chemical or industrial wastes were observed. However, the trenches were only probed to the top of the buried debris, so there may be other buried debris (such as chemical containers) that were not observed at the surface of the excavation.

M. Mitchell of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service commented that he noticed one spray paint can during the excavation event, and indicated that during the "old timers" interviews that an estimated 75,000 spray cans had been disposed of there.

Slide 16 - Supplemental Characterization Results:

Question: You have not mentioned Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs), are they not included?

Answer: PAHs are included as part of the study.

Question: Is there any evidence of asbestos?

Answer: Asbestos was not included in this supplemental characterization.

B. Wong added that asbestos was tested for as part of the Remedial Investigation of the site, and no significant amount of asbestos was found.

Question: When you discussed subsurface anomalies (Slide 9) were you referring to electromagnetics or ground penetrating radar or both?

Answer: Both.

Question: What were the dates of the landfill's use?

Answer: The landfill at Site 7 was used from 1957 until 1973.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (TAPP)

R. Robinson provided the RAB with updated information regarding TAPP funding. The funding for TAPP would come directly from the activity level, so it could take away funding from RAB meetings or planned investigations and cleanups.

COMMUNITY FORUM

M. Voce and R. Robinson announced the topics for the upcoming RAB training being held in lieu of the August regular RAB meeting. The meeting will be held on August 12, 1998, at 6:00 p.m. to allow enough time for the training presentations. The training topics for August are:

- 1) Risk Assessment
- 2) The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Process
- 3) How the WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach fits into the CERCLA process

4) M. Voce will provide tips on how to review technical documents

M. Voce requested RAB members to suggest topics for the training. RAB members can contact either M. Voce or R. Robinson with suggestions.

Questions: Will this RAB training be in lieu of TAPP training?

Answer: The upcoming RAB training is completely different and separate from TAPP training.

R. Abbasi offered his assistance with the training on how to review a technical document.

Question: There is a pilot program for a TAPP at North Island. After reviewing the report, on the Internet, it seems that the third-party TAPP review was completely contradictory. Did anyone else review this report and find it was contradictory?

Answer: Yes, you are right, the TAPP contractor's report was contradictory to the conclusions of the Navy's contractors.

M. Mingay indicated that the TAPP reviewer was inadvertently not given all the available documentation to review. This was not discovered until after the TAPP comments were received. Also, the TAPP reviewer was able to make comments with the benefit of hindsight due to the availability of newer and improved technology.

M. Mingay also announced an EPA-funded assistance program called Technical Outreach Services to Communities (TOSC) Program. This program would not impact RAB funding like the TAPP would.

Question: Is there a web site for this program?

Answer: The TOSC website is currently under construction. However, the TOSC point of contact, Christopher Blakeman, welcomes questions. Please direct questions via email to christoper.blakeman@orst.edu (please identify yourself as a WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach RAB member when corresponding with C. Blakeman).

A RAB member commented that the environmental investigation process has been going on for years, and warned about the

dangers of "analysis paralysis." He suggested that instead of re-analyzing studies already completed, we need to get on with the business of cleaning up these sites. We need to expedite the cleanup process, not slow it down. The more money spent on re-analyzing studies, the more delays and less monies are available for cleanups.

R. Abbasi agreed and stated that if you base decisions on sound data, there is no benefit to re-evaluate and re-analyze the data.

M. Mingay indicated that there may be community concern about the studies completed and that those concerns need to be addressed. Some community members may want additional studies and evaluations to give them a comfort level that they are being protected. TOSC may be a service available to the RAB to assist with these concerns.

A RAB member stated that, as a RAB member, he wants to feel comfortable with the decisions being made; but he does not want to prolong the cleanup process.

Question: What is the future land use for Site 7?

Answer: There are no plans to close WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach. The future land use of Site 7 is still a military base. But, typically, you do not want to develop on a landfill site. Land use restrictions would be necessary if the base was ever to close. Because of the years of disposal operation and studies that have occurred at Site 7, it is unlikely that it will ever be forgotten that a landfill exists there.

M. Mitchell indicated that the Biological Research Contaminants Division (BRCD) of the U.S. Geological Survey is being contracted by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help review technical documents prepared for sites that may impact the Wildlife Refuge. The reviewer has a doctorate in toxicology.

ADJOURNMENT

M. Voce thanked the participants of the RAB for their time and adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.