

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
May 13, 2003

Participants:

Beresky, Nancy / Waterstone Environmental, Inc.
Carmody, Jack / RAB Member
Chatters, James / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.
Chauvel, Tim / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Clarke, Dean / Orange County Health Care Agency
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL
Gorski, Pat / Breitburn Energy
Hamparsumian, Hamlet / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.
Hohenadl, Eike / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Hutchinson, Adam / Orange County Water District
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC
Monroe, Bruce / RAB Member
Mumper, Alison / SWDIV
Pilichi, Carmine / RAB Member
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Rivera, Eleanor / SWDIV
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Welz, Ed / RAB Member
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:04 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO), and T. Chauvel, DTSC Public Participation Specialist. J.P. Peoples, the newly elected RAB Community Co-chair, was also introduced. P. Tamashiro indicated that this was J.P. Peoples first time serving as Community Co-chair and thanked her for taking on the duties and responsibilities associated with the position.

P. Tamashiro announced that Lee Whittenberg from the City of Seal Beach (who had arranged for the RAB meeting to be held in the City Council Chambers) would be unable to attend the RAB meeting as his father had passed away earlier in the day. While there had not been time to prepare a condolence card for RAB members to sign, attendees were encouraged to send personal condolences.

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.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

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

- 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 8

Question: Are intermediate tests being conducted between the pilot tests at Site 40?

Answer: Yes, weekly and monthly groundwater sampling and testing are being done to track progress. One week after the injection of 40 liters of KB-1 dechlorinating microbes, the first round of groundwater monitoring began. Results from the testing have been promising because vinyl chloride was detected in the samples. We must caution it is too early to draw any conclusions, however the presence of vinyl chloride is promising because it is a by-product of successful dechlorination of dichloroethene. Bechtel will begin another round of sampling next week.

Question: Will you continue to keep the RAB apprised of these activities?

Answer: Yes, another status update will be provided at the next RAB meeting (September 2003).

Slide 3

Question: Can you provide additional information about the archaeological data collected from Site 73 (Water Tower Area)?

Answer: Yes, the archaeological discoveries at Site 73 will be discussed in detail during one of tonight's presentations to the RAB.

General

Question: What is the purpose of the drainage work being conducted along Seal Beach Boulevard, across the parking lot from Building 110?

Answer: This is a waterline project involving replacement of an aged waterline.

Question: Have any dirt samples been taken in this location to determine the presence and type of contamination in the soil?

Answer: The excavation activities for removal of the old waterline and replacement with the new waterline have been restricted to the upper 4 feet of soil. As activities are limited to only surface excavation, no preventative action would be required to protect workers from potential soil contamination.

PRESENTATION – OIL ISLAND UPDATE – IR PROGRAM SITE 22

P. Tamashiro introduced N. Beresky, Principal Hydrogeologist, Waterstone Environmental, Inc., and P. Gorski, Environmental Health and Safety Director, Breitburn Energy.

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:

General

Question: Why did the chemical analysis of groundwater samples not analyze organics?

Answer: The earlier NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Remedial Investigation (RI) eliminated organic constituents as chemicals of concern for contamination.

Question: You indicated that the results of groundwater sampling for total metals identified three additional metals (copper, lead, and zinc) with more study remaining to be conducted (specifically, a health criteria risk assessment). What is proposed for further study of these three metals?

Answer: This update to the RAB is being given in the middle of our data analysis and we have not yet completed our evaluation. We are currently working with the Navy to ensure our data analysis is consistent with health risk assessments that have been conducted at other NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program sites.

This additional study will be conducted to determine health risks associated with the concentration of the three metals present at the site. A draft report will be submitted to the Navy in a few weeks.

Question: In the hydrograph (slide titled, "Tidal Influence Study"), can you explain the differing responses of the three monitoring wells to the tides?

Answer: It is strange that wells that are only 200 feet apart would have such a marked difference in groundwater elevation. The lithology of the island may be a factor in the water level responses to the tides. Because the island is man-made, the way it was constructed in the 1950s and the amount of compaction used in its construction may explain this behavior. I would assume that the tidal flows would take the path of least resistance, meaning it would choose to move around the island instead of traveling up through 8 to 10 feet of sediment.

Question: Is the lack of movement through island fill due to the homogenous nature of the material used to create the island?

Answer: Possibly, however the exact components of the fill material is unknown. Records for the construction of the island back in the 1950s are not available. It is also possible that water movement through island fill is restricted as a result of compaction of the material. There were likely concerns about tidal erosion of the island, so perhaps higher standards of compaction were applied.

Question: Can you provide an explanation of the drop in gross alpha and gross beta concentrations between the 1994 sampling and 2002 sampling?

Answer: It is possible that the 1994 sampling was an anomaly. As only one sample was taken, there aren't additional samples to analyze to make a determination.

Comment by K. Leibel: If this is the case, by comparing only these two sets of samples, the results don't really tell us much.

Response by L. Beresky: That is a fair statement.

Question: Based on your previous response, would you say that additional data should be collected for this analysis?

Answer: You can always use more data. It would be interesting to see what additional data, if collected, would show.

Question: Can you explain the relationship of the groundwater wells on Oil Island?

Answer: The groundwater underlying the island appears to be moving in a northeast direction.

Question: Do roads connecting Oil Island to the mainland cut off tidal flows?

Answer: Yes, to some extent the road from the north restricts water movement and water must flow around it. But the access road from Pacific Coast Highway to Oil Island is actually a bridge, which restricts tidal movement in the immediate vicinity of the roadway to a much lesser extent.

Comment by P. Tamashiro: If you are interested in visiting Site 22 - Oil Island, this site will be included on the RAB IR Program Site Tour scheduled for July 2003.

BREAK

P. Tamashiro announced that there would be a 10-minute break.

PRESENTATION – NON-TIME CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION – IR PROGRAM SITE 73 (FORMER WATER TOWER AREA)

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Hamparsumian and Dr. J. Chatters, Ph.D., both from Tetra Tech FW, Inc.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. No questions were posed after the presentation, however one comment was received. The RAB member comment is summarized below:

Comment by B. Monroe: I would like to congratulate the professionalism and skill applied to the IR Program Removal Action at Site 73. In contrast, the housing development project across from the base is still on-hold due to their lack of understanding of the requirements needed for this type of job.

Response by P. Tamashiro: Thank you. The Navy coordinated a great deal with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) prior to conducting the Removal Action at Site 73. The Navy also signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SHPO to specifically address what actions would be taken if archaeological discoveries were made.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro requested input from the RAB members on the use of the Seal Beach City Council Chambers as the RAB meeting location.

J. Carmody indicated that he thought the location was good due to its accessibility.

No other comments were made.

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting would be the annual RAB IR Program Site Tour, beginning at 6 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 2003. She indicated that since the IR Program Site Tour would be held at the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, RSVPs would be required. Information on the meeting location and additional IR Program Site Tour details will be mailed to the RAB at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

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