NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
January 9, 2002

Participants:

Beresky, Nancy/Waterstone Environmental
Bradley, John / U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Clarke, Dean / Orange County Health Care Agency
Embree, Melody/CH2M HILL
Foreman, Kim / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Gorski, Pat/BreitBurn Energy Corporation
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC
Mirick, R.A. /Captain, Commanding Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Schilling, Bob / Bechtel National, Inc.
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Voce, Mario
Welz, Ed
Willhite, Lindi /RAB Community Co-chair
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:10 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair opened the meeting by apologizing for the inconvenience at the front gate and door due to the current security procedures. She identified that for future RAB meetings, measures would be taken to ensure that the gate guards are aware of attendees and that doors would be open.

She welcomed the participants and introduced L. Willhite, the Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro also introduced S. Le, the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV, G. Smith, the PAO for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, and Captain R. A. Mirick, the Commanding Office for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

S. Le, provided the RAB with an overview of NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach's Installation Restoration Program (IRP) budget status.

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

Slide 13

Question: How do you estimate the budget?

Answer: The budget is estimated based on a Navy "Cost-to-Complete" model that takes into consideration the major factors involved in cleaning up a site. These factors include the number, types, and concentrations of contaminants, the depth to groundwater, and other relevant site-specific information. The cost model has been refined, updated, and improved based on past experience learned as the IRP progresses. This cost model tends to estimate on the conservatively high side.

Comment by G. Smith The *authorized* FY 02 budget does not assume the funds have been appropriated. The appropriation bill has to be signed by the President before the funds are actually made available for use. The bill should be signed in the next couple of weeks.

PRESENTATION – SWMU 24 ENGINEERING EVALUATION/COST ANALYSIS (EE/CA) – NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION

P. Tamashiro introduced B. Schilling, from Bechtel National, Inc., who provided the RAB with an update on Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 24 EE/CA.

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

Slide 14

Question: Did you determine what form the lead is in?

Answer: No.

Question: Why don't you speciate the lead?

Answer: The areas of contamination are so small that the cost of re-sampling to speciate would probably exceed the cost of proceeding with the removal action.

Question: Will the lead move in soil or groundwater readily?

Answer: The depth of contamination is only about 1 to 2 feet deep, so it does not appear that the lead is moving readily in the soil to the groundwater.

Slide 18

Question: What is the depth to the water table?

Answer: The water table is 21 feet below ground surface.

Slide 24

Question: Does the $118,000 include everything, including sampling and removal?

Answer: Yes, that is correct. The cost was estimated using the "RACER" program which is a common feasibility study cost estimating program.

BREAK

P. Tamashiro announced that there would be a 10 minute break. She also reminded the attendees to please sign-in before leaving.

PRESENTATION – SITE 22 OIL ISLAND WORK PLAN

P. Tamashiro introduced N. Beresky from Waterstone Environmental, who provided the RAB with an overview of Site 22 – Oil Island Work Plan.

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 10

Question: What is gross alpha and gross beta?

Answer: Gross alpha and gross beta are indicators of radioactivity. Part of the work plan is to determine the types of radionuclides that are present in the groundwater.

Comment by B. Wong: Gross alpha and gross beta occur naturally in the environment. We originally analyzed for gross alpha and gross beta in the Remedial Investigation, not because we expected to find radioactive wastes or because of alleged nuclear activities on the base, but because we anticipated the need for groundwater treatment. A common groundwater treatment process is to use granular activated carbon to adsorb the contaminants in the groundwater. We wanted to know ahead of installing groundwater treatment systems whether enough naturally-occurring radionuclides exist in the water that granular activated carbon systems would concentrate them to the degree that radioactive precautions may need to be taken. This has been the case at other non-Department of Defense granular activated carbon systems in Southern California.

Slide 4

Question: How much oil is produced at Oil Island a day?

Answer: Oil Island produces about 175 barrels a day. The oil is trucked off and the natural gas is piped off of the island.

Question: What is done with the runoff that goes into the ponds?

Answer: The water from the ponds is pumped back into the water injection system.

Question: What will be done with Oil Island after the life of the oil production, in 20 to 30 years?

Answer: The wells would be abandoned in accordance with the California Department of Oil and Gas regulations, plugged correctly, and much of the piping and soil would be removed during the abandonment process.

Comment by BreitBurn currently leases the land from the Navy and the lease specifies

B. Wong	that BreitBurn is responsible for the ultimate "disposal" of the island. However, what exactly the ultimate disposal may entail is to be determined and will likely involve the USFWS because of the island's presence in the middle of the National Wildlife Refuge.
Comment by P. Tamashiro:	Each summer the Navy provides a tour of the IRP sites and Oil Island is on the tour. We extend an invitation to all of you to join us this summer if you have not already seen the island.
Question:	Why do you need Oil Island when you can do directional drilling?
Answer:	When the oil production began in the 1950's, directional drilling technology was not available.

Slide 5

Question:	What is the areal extent of the mineral rights?
Answer:	We are not sure. Mineral rights are granted in blocks or tracts that are not necessarily related to surface features.
Question:	Do you feel confident that the extraction of oil from under the marsh does not allow for seepage or leakage of oil into the marsh?
Answer:	Yes, because the oil wells are so deep, the chance if seepage is low. Depending on the geology, seeps have occurred naturally near the surface in some parts of Southern California.
Question:	I heard that the marsh is sinking. Could some of the land subsidence of the island be from the Newport-Inglewood fault?
Answer:	Some severe land subsidence in the past (including parts of Long Beach) have been caused by over-extraction of oil formations deep below the surface. Also, the Newport-Inglewood fault passes through the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge and may contribute to some subsidence.
Question:	Is Landing Hill caused by the fault?
Answer:	Yes, that is correct.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro opened the Community Forum and announced that no RAB meeting would be held in February. G. Smith asked the participants of the meeting if the use of a web site for meeting minutes, agendas, notices, and other information, would be helpful to the members, regulatory agencies, and the public. The general consensus was that a web site with that type of information would be helpful. It was suggested that on a voluntary basis that some RAB members would prefer all correspondence via the web to help cut down on paper usage. A comment was made that not everyone has access to a computer or the Internet, and that web site usage would be used only for people with access and a

preference for receiving information that way. The web site would not eliminate the option to receive paper copies of information.

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting would be held on March 13, 2002.

P. Tamashiro mentioned that the RAB has lost two more members, and that the current list of active members is 13, but attendance has been low. The Navy has stepped up its solicitation for new RAB members. She asked that if anyone knows of someone interested in attending meetings or becoming a RAB member to please contact her or L. Willhite.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.