

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
March 12, 2003

Participants:

Clarke, Dean / Orange County Health Care Agency  
Foreman, Kim / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL  
Hamparsumian, Hamlet / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.  
Haynes, Michal / South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)  
Hohenadl, Eike / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC  
Monroe, Bruce / RAB Member  
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Member  
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)  
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair  
Voce, Mario / RAB Member  
Welz, Ed / RAB Member  
Willhite, Lindi / RAB Community Co-chair  
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL  
Wordes, Kelly

WELCOME

At 7:03 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair, began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced L. Willhite, RAB Community Co-chair; G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO); and K. Foreman, DTSC Public Participation Specialist. First-time visitor M. Haynes, from the SCAQMD, was also introduced.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would begin with a status update on the ongoing Installation Restoration (IR) Program presented by S. Le, the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for the IR Program from SWDIV Engineering. She indicated that the Project Highlights presentation would be followed by a technical presentation by Tetra Tech FW, Inc. and the election for the RAB Community Co-chair position.

P. Tamashiro notified attendees that no nominations had been submitted for the RAB Community Co-chair position thus far. She indicated that nominations should be submitted during the RAB presentations prior to the meeting break so that the election could be conducted during the second half of the RAB meeting. In addition, P. Tamashiro stated that it had been some time since RAB member attendance was greater than 50 percent and that a review of RAB meeting procedures would be conducted to facilitate the election process.

## PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

S. Le provided the RAB with an overview of the progress at the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach's IR Program sites. The following sites were discussed:

- Site 5- Fill Disposal Area, Removal Action
- Site 7 - Station Landfill, Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memorandum (AM)
- Site 73 - Water Tower Area, Removal Action
- SWMU 24 – Station Demilitarization Furnace Facility, 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, and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 40 and Site 70 Pilot Testing
- Site 74 – 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 after the Project Highlights presentation are summarized below:

### **Slide 4**

**Question:** What were the results of the archeological data recovery at Site 73 (Water Tower Area)?

**Answer:** Bits and pieces of broken shells and a few small broken animal bones were found. Nothing of out of ordinary archeological significance was recovered.

### **General**

**Question:** Approximately 2,000 tons of lead-impacted soils were removed from Site 73 and SWMU 24 (Station Demilitarization Furnace Facility). What kind of fill was used to re-grade the excavated areas at these sites?

**Answer:** No imported soil was required after soil excavation at Site 5 (Fill Disposal Area) because it was returned to tidal wetlands. Very little was required at Site 73 or SWMU 24 because we were able to just re-grade by moving the remaining soil. Approximately 150 tons of topsoil was imported for

Site 73.

**Question:** What was the source of the imported topsoil?

**Response:** The imported fill was obtained from West Coast Sand and Gravel. The imported fill was certified clean topsoil and samples were obtained beforehand and analyzed for metals, VOCs, SVOCs, TPH-purgeable and TPH-extractable. The results indicated that the imported soil was clean.

**Question:** Where did the topsoil originate?

**Answer:** A quarry off State Highway 91 and Coal Canyon.

PRESENTATION – NON-TIME CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION SWMU 24 (FORMER DEMILITARIZATION FURNACE FACILITY SITE)

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Hamparsumian, Tetra Tech FW, Inc.

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

**Question:** Has SWMU 24 been revegetated?

**Answer:** No, the Navy discussed revegetation with John Bradley, United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Refuge Manager, and he suggested the site be left to revegetate naturally.

**Question:** What type of vegetation species would the site naturally revegetate with?

**Answer:** J. Bradley indicated that the site would revegetate with the same ruderal species that surround the site.

**Comment by M. Voce:** I believe we should be actively revegetating the site with native plants.

**Response:** The decision to let the site naturally revegetate with ruderal species was based upon the fact that the site is rather small and surrounded by sites with ruderal, weedy species. To restore only the small parcel was not considered to significantly increase the quality of overall habitat in the area.

In addition, now that contamination at SWMU 24 has been removed, the site will likely be incorporated into the agricultural lease program and will be cultivated. Therefore, restoration of the site would not be beneficial.

**Question:** What did the water applied for dust control consist of? Regular water or surfactant?

**Answer:** It was regular water from the fire hydrant.

**Question:** Were the trucks hauling contaminated soil tarped before they left the site?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question:** How was disposal of the contaminated soil at Kettleman Hill Landfill handled?

**Answer:** The soil excavated from SWMU 24 was classified as California hazardous waste. It was not classified as RCRA hazardous waste. Therefore, the soil was buried with no additional action necessary.

**Question:** Was the average lead concentration of 10 mg/kg determined during verification sampling as an arithmetic average or as a weighted average?

**Answer:** It is an arithmetic average. Lead concentrations ranged from 2.4 mg/kg to 315 mg/kg. The average was determined by adding the concentrations of each of the samples taken and dividing by the total number of samples (197). The majority of the concentrations found were towards the lower end.

**Question:** So statistically, you feel this is an accurate average?

**Answer:** It would more accurately be described as a mean.

BREAK

P. Tamashiro announced that there would be a 10-minute break. She notified the RAB meeting attendees that while the election for the Community Co-chair position was planned, it could not be held because only 6 of the 14 official RAB members were present, and at least 50 percent representation is required. Attendees who were not RAB members were excused and it was announced that a discussion of RAB matters and election issues would be held following the break.

COMMUNITY FORUM

### **RAB Meeting Attendance**

P. Tamashiro began the Community Forum by addressing the recent RAB mailer that strongly encouraged increased RAB participation and fulfillment of the RAB member responsibilities. She assured the attendees that the RAB was tolerant of family and personal schedule conflicts that may arise, as long as RAB members provide a valid excuse and notify either the Navy Co-Chair or Community Co-Chair of their absence ahead of time. However, several RAB members have been inactive for some time and have not provided notice of their absences or interest in participation. P. Tamashiro indicated that these RAB members would be notified that their position has been terminated due to their lack of participation and response, and in an effort to allow new, interested members to join. She thanked all the RAB members present for their continued interest and attendance.

The following question was posed in response to the RAB member attendance discussion:

**Question:** Is it possible to change the RAB meeting from Wednesday to Tuesday to facilitate attendance? Some City of Seal Beach representatives have an interest in the RAB, but the Wednesday night meetings conflict with City meetings and prevent them from attending.

In response to the question, P. Tamashiro suggested that a vote be held regarding any objections to holding future RAB meetings on Tuesday nights. No objections were raised. P. Tamashiro announced that future RAB meetings, beginning with the next scheduled RAB meeting in May 2003, would be held on Tuesday.

### **RAB Meeting Schedule**

P. Tamashiro raised a second issue before the RAB members and requested a vote. The maturation of the IR Program at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach has resulted in the completion of many of the smaller, simpler sites. The remaining sites tend to be larger and longer to implement in duration. Therefore, the number of sites that need to be discussed have declined. She proposed that the frequency of RAB meetings be changed to every other month. P. Tamashiro indicated that in the event of an IR project deadline or urgent issue, additional meetings could be scheduled and held accordingly. No objections were raised. It was announced that the next RAB meeting would be held in two months, May 2003.

### **E-mail Reminder of RAB Meeting Occurrences**

P. Tamashiro asked the RAB members if an e-mail reminder of RAB meeting occurrences would be helpful. She requested that those members interested in receiving an e-mail reminder prior to each meeting provide their e-mail addresses on the RAB meeting sign-in sheet.

**Question:** Will e-mail addresses be kept confidential and used only for RAB-related business?

**Response by P. Tamashiro:** Yes, I can assure that all e-mail addresses will be kept confidential and used only for RAB-related business.

### **RAB Community Co-Chair Election**

P. Tamashiro indicated that the RAB Community Co-chair election would be held at the May 2003 RAB meeting unless anyone was interested in volunteering for the position, which would not require a formal vote with 50 percent RAB member representation.

J. Peoples indicated that she would be interested in volunteering for the position. P. Tamashiro asked the RAB members if they would accept the volunteer in place of a formal vote during the May 2003 RAB meeting. E. Welz, L. Willhite, B. Monroe, and M. Voce all responded positively. J. Peoples was accepted as the new RAB Community Co-chair.

### **RAB Meeting Location**

M. Voce indicated that attendance at RAB meetings might be low due to the fact that they are held on the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and that the high security requirements for access to the NAVWPNSTA may deter attendance. E. Welz offered that the City Council Chambers would be a good location if there were no conflicts on the second Tuesday of each month. P.

Tamashiro responded that use of alternate location was a good idea. She indicated that the Navy would look into holding the next meeting at a location outside of the base in the City of Seal Beach. Specifics will be included in the next RAB mailer to be distributed prior to the May 2003 RAB meeting.

#### ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

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