

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
March 16, 2004

Participants:

Carmody, Jack
Chauvel, Tim / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Maylone, Ken
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Saunders, Lee / SWDIV
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stevens, Charles
Stillman, Glenn
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Vesely, Gene
Whittenberg, Lee / City of Seal Beach
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:03 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced J. Peoples, the RAB Community Co-chair and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). P. Tamashiro then introduced L. Saunders, a guest from Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest Division (SWDIV). She indicated that L. Saunders serves as the PAO for S. Le's office and was a regular attendee at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach RAB meetings years ago. P. Tamashiro then thanked L. Whittenberg from the City of Seal Beach for providing the cookies and coffee at the meeting.

P. Tamashiro announced that the new Commanding Officer (CO) for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, Captain Fowler, would not be able to attend the RAB meeting this evening but would attend a future meeting as soon as possible.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing Installation Restoration (IR) Program.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

The RAB meeting continued with a status update on the ongoing IR Program presented by S. Le, the SWDIV Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program. The following sites were discussed:

- Site 7 - Station Landfill, Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memorandum (AM)
- Site 7 - Station Landfill, and Site 4 - Perimeter Road, Removal Action

- Site 14 - Abandoned Leaking Gasoline Underground Storage Tank (UST), 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 (PP), and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 40 Pilot Testing
- Site 74 – Old 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 during and after the Project Highlights presentation are summarized below:

Slide 3

Question: Are the lead “hot spots” within Site 4 (Perimeter Road) located near Site 7 (Station Landfill)?

Answer: Yes, the lead “hot spots” are located to the south of the landfill between the Orange County Flood Control Channel and the Station Landfill, along Perimeter Road.

Question: When soil was removed from Site 4, did it drop the elevation of the road?

Answer: Yes, to some extent. The excavations required for both Site 4 and Site 7 were backfilled by reusing clean soil from the wharf area and former Site 5.

Slide 4

Question: Is the ecological risk screening assessment prepared for Site 14 (Abandoned Leaking Gasoline UST) out for RAB member review currently?

Answer: Yes, the draft report is currently out for review.

Slide 5

Question: Does the annual groundwater sampling being conducted at Sites 40 (Concrete/Pit and Gravel Area) and 70 (RT&E Area) include one sample per well per year?

Answer: Semi-annual groundwater sampling is actually being conducted at both sites, which means each well is sampled two times per year (i.e., every six months). Over time, the frequency of groundwater sampling and sampling parameters at these sites has been reduced based on the stability

and trend of the groundwater contamination plume.

Slide 6

Question: As the Navy considers changing the remedial alternative for Site 70, are they holding discussions with DTSC and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for general concurrence?

Answer: The Site 70 remedial alternative is currently undergoing internal Navy review. If the preferred remedial alternative changes, then DTSC and the RWQCB will be brought into these discussions.

Slide 8

Question: Can you please define the terms bioaccumulation and bioassay?

Answer: Tests to determine bioaccumulation are designed to measure the uptake and accumulation of contaminants through the food chain and specifically how ecological receptors at varying trophic levels are affected by the contamination that is being studied.

A bioassay measures the impact of soil and sediment and its contaminants on invertebrates that inhabit that medium. The process includes taking samples of the subject soil and sediment and observing the impact to specific invertebrates living in that environment.

In addition to bioaccumulation and bioassay tests, we are also conducting bioaccessibility tests. Bioaccessibility tests are designed to simulate the digestion of soil in the acidic stomach environment of an animal. The degree to which contaminants in soil become accessible to the animal are studied.

These three tests are all helpful at Site 74 (Old Skeet Range) to determine the appropriate remedial action for lead contamination and will help to develop appropriate and ecologically protective cleanup levels. The Phase II Ecological Risk Assessment will be ecologically specific and provide a more realistic assessment of the extent of lead contamination.

Question: Did the physical sampling conducted for Site 74 cover a large area?

Answer: A grid 100 feet by 100 feet was established with a random orientation to avoid bias. Samples were taken at the nodes of this grid and compared to background lead levels. If a sample exceeded the background lead level, then the sampling area was extended another 100 feet from the sampling location, in two different directions.

Question: Was the sampling conducted at low tide?

Answer: Yes, it was conducted at low tide to sample in an extensive tidal saltmarsh.

General

Question: How do the volumes of soil planned to be excavated based on Site 4



investigations compare to the actual soil volumes that were required to be excavated at the site?

Answer: More soil was actually required to be excavated due to the results of the Site 4 confirmation sampling.

Question: How many samples were taken during the site investigation at Site 4?

Answer: Hundreds of samples were taken. The area sampled was some 11 miles long. The lead clean-up goal was 600 mg/kg. A presentation for this removal action will be given in the next RAB meeting.

Question: Can you provide the RAB with an update on Site 22 (Oil Island)?

Answer: The Site 22 investigation has been conducted and financed by Breitburn Energy Corporation since the Navy conducted a Remedial Investigation for the site back in 1997. Breitburn recently submitted an environmental report concerning Site 22; however, DTSC still has outstanding comments regarding investigations that DTSC feels have not been completely carried out by a consultant to Breitburn Energy.

More discussions concerning this issue are anticipated between the Navy, Breitburn Energy, and DTSC.

Question: How does coordination between the agencies work for Site 22? Do the regulatory agencies communicate directly with Breitburn Energy?

Answer: As the landowner of Site 22, the Navy has and will always participate in the discussions associated with Oil Island.

PRESENTATION – IR PROGRAM PROCESS AT NAVWPNSTA SEAL BEACH

B. Wong proceeded with a presentation on the IR Program process.

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 6

Question: Is the site ranking conducted for IR Program sites subjective? What are the relative high-medium-low risks ranked against?

Answer: The ranking of IR Program sites is made relative to other sites. The level of risk associated with a site can be determined by the complexity of the site. A complex (and therefore, higher risk) site would be one that is located within the National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) or is associated with a shallow depth to groundwater. If a site is isolated from a groundwater source or located in an area where a clay layer exists between the contaminated site and the groundwater, the threat to the environment may be considered less and therefore the site would have a lower risk. Exposure of the contamination to the environment (both human and

ecological) is important. Other factors are also considered.

Given the shallow groundwater and presence of the NWR at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, 99 percent of the IR Program sites at the Station are considered high risk. Very few have been ranked medium or low risk.

Slide 9

Question: Is the public meeting required for a Proposed Plan conducted outside a regular RAB meeting?

Answer: The public meeting conducted in association with a Proposed Plan is required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). RAB meetings are conducted outside the CERCLA process and are therefore separate and distinct from the public meetings conducted for a Proposed Plan or any other type of CERCLA action or activity.

CERCLA activities required in association with a Proposed Plan include a public notice followed by a public meeting to discuss the contents of the Proposed Plan.

Slide 10

Question: Has there been a case where a cleanup began directly with the CERCLA Removal Action steps, skipping the Remedial Action steps completely?

Answer: Yes, when there is an eminent threat to human health or the environment. This situation has not occurred at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. In addition, if an IR Program site is a simple site and easy removal makes the most sense, the more complex Remedial Action process is often skipped.

Slide 11

Question: Does the term "Removal Action" mean the removal of a threat?

Answer: Yes, in some cases it can mean that, but a Removal Action does not necessarily always involve a physical removal action such as soil excavation.

Question: Who makes the decision to move to the Removal Action process?

Answer: This decision is usually a joint decision between the Navy and the regulatory agencies involved. The Navy typically takes the lead.

Question: Is the Removal Action process considered timelier? Is it a quicker process?

Answer: Yes, the Removal Action process is faster than the Remedial Action process because it requires fewer steps. It is simpler, easier, and more flexible for the appropriate sites and conditions.

Slide 15

Question: When the term “agency” was used earlier tonight, was this term being used to refer to DTSC?

Answer: Yes, typically when we say “agency” we are referring to DTSC, but really we should be more precise and say “agencies”, as there is usually more than one agency involved at an IR Program site. However, DTSC usually serves as the lead state regulatory agency.

Question: Do the State of California agencies involved in IR Program sites have input on the Remedial/Removal Action Plan proposed for a site?

Answer: Yes, these agencies review and approve the plan and depending upon the IR Program site, some have special roles to ensure that the remediation/removal is proceeding appropriately and no applicable, relevant, and appropriate requirements (ARARs) are being violated.

Slide 17

Question: The State of California DTSC is the lead enforcer of remediation/removal at IR Program sites at the Station, but isn't the IR Program subject to the Navy's budget?

Answer: Yes, that is one of the constraints of the IR Program. Risk management factors include budget concerns. If no funding is available, there is only so much that can be done. This is why available funding is prioritized and spent on the highest risk sites first.

Slide 18

Question: Are the \$1 million limits shown in this slide in 1991 dollars?

Answer: Yes, but the dollar amount has not been updated since. However, the important point to take away from this slide is that the EE/CA and Action Memo are considered by the State of California to comply with the Removal Action Workplan (RAW) and Remedial Action Plan (RAP).

Slide 20

Question: If the definitions from Slide 18 for a RAW and RAP determine that a site is classified as a RAW due to the fact that the cost of cleanup is initially anticipated to be less than \$1 million, but it is later determined that the cleanup costs exceed \$1 million and a RAP needs to be prepared, is the Navy required to go back and start at the beginning of the Remedial Action process to comply with the RAP even though the Removal Action Process has already been started to comply with the RAW?

Answer: The terms RAW and RAP are simply DTSC terminology, whether the site is classified as one or the other, the cleanup activity at the site is still referred to as a removal action. The Navy would seek the additional funds required for the removal at the site but would not be required to go back through the paperwork to re-classify the site using the DTSC RAP terminology.

It should be noted that most removal actions recently conducted at IR Program sites at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach (with the exception of Site 73 and SWMU 24) have exceeded the \$1 million dollar threshold and have been classified appropriately from the outset.

Slide 24

Question: When a site cleanup requires continuous monitoring is that considered part of cleanup costs or study costs?

Answer: Continuous monitoring would be considered part of the cleanup costs because this is usually an activity required as a follow-on task to a cleanup action.

General

Question: I recently read a paper that addresses the current State of California concern over perchlorate. Is this a problem at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

Answer: Only two sites at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach were determined to have the potential for perchlorate occurrence due to past activities (perchlorate was the oxidizer used in rocket propellants for a period of time). Site 6 (Explosives Burning Ground) and Site 70 (RT&E Area) have both been tested for the presence of perchlorate. Groundwater sampling results at both of these sites resulted in nondetection of perchlorate.

Question: Can you estimate the time it will take to complete the recommended remediation at Site 70 (RT&E Area)?

Answer: The Navy would like to complete the remediation sooner than the current plan. The current pump and treat option is estimated to take 42 years, and the Navy would like to optimize efficiency with a more aggressive technology. However, the groundwater plume is large at about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile wide by $\frac{1}{2}$ mile long.

The groundwater plume is considered pretty stable, but does migrate at a slow rate based upon groundwater monitoring results. The "growth" of the plume is thought to be the outcome of more data and additional well locations rather than actual migration.

Question: Can you estimate the time it will take to complete the recommended remediation at Site 40 (Concrete/Pit Gravel Area)?

Answer: The Remedial Action is planned for 2005. It is estimated that approximately 2 to 3 years will be required, which includes closeout of the site, resulting in a clean site.

Question: How does the Site 70 groundwater plume compare in size to the groundwater plume at the now closed El Toro Marine Base?

Answer: The groundwater plume at Site 70 is about 10 percent of the plume size at El Toro.

In addition, the groundwater aquifer beneath NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach is not currently used for drinking water.

Question: With respect to costs to completion, a large amount of funds seem to be allocated for cleanup of the medium risk site in later years of the IR Program?

Answer: Funds included in the costs for completion in later years include funds not only for the medium risk site but also funds intended for high risk site activities, spread out over a number of years. Take for example Site 74 (Old Skeet Range), this 26 acre site is currently in the Normalized Budgeting System (NORM). The site is currently allocated \$20 million for cleanup but the site will not receive all \$20 million for cleanup in one year and therefore NORM distributes the money over the remaining number of years. In addition, the site-specific ecological risk evaluation may determine that not all of the \$20 million allocated for that cleanup is required for the cleanup. The funds can then be redistributed in other years for long-term monitoring activities and pump-and-treat at Site 70.

RAB MEMBER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES PRESENTATION

P. Tamashiro announced that L. Saunders from NAVFAC SW DIV would be presenting information to the RAB members about their roles and responsibilities in the RAB.

Several handouts were made available to RAB meeting attendees. The questions and answers posed during and after the presentation are summarized below:

Question: RAB members are considered to be community members, as well as city and state officials? RAB members are not just limited to community members?

Answer: Government officials and agency representatives can be considered members of the RAB, however only one representative from each agency is recommended to participate on the RAB. The Navy is primarily concerned with the community members on the RAB. We are here to support the RAB members on their mission to advise the Navy.

Question: So should a representative of DTSC be a RAB member?

Answer: The Rules of Operation for the RAB should define who the members will be. Some RABs designate specific positions on the RAB for agencies and organizations, while others do not. Each individual RAB can make a judgment on the level of agency representation they would like to have. The 1994 RAB Implementation Guidelines recommend that representatives from various groups be members of the RAB.

Question: Is there a potential conflict of interest present if a RAB member was a NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach employee and wanted to serve as the RAB Community Co-chair?

Answer: As an employee of NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, that person would be working indirectly for the CO of the Station. The CO could have influence over the employee's performance evaluation. If that person were to serve as Community Co-chair while employed at the Station, there could be a perceived conflict because of this relationship.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro thanked L. Saunders for his RAB Membership presentation and announced that this was the completion of the first training session in a series of training workshops being held to educate new RAB members and refresh older RAB members on the IR Process. P. Tamashiro announced that additional training sessions would be held later in the year. L. Saunders encouraged RAB members to attend RAB meetings held at other local installations to get a different perspective for RAB operations.

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting would be held on the second Tuesday of May (11 May 2004). She indicated that the meeting would include presentations on Site 40 (Concrete Pit/Gravel Area), and a review of the removal action for Site 7 (Station Landfill), which would be completed by the next RAB meeting.

P. Tamashiro also requested input from the RAB on how they felt about moving the RAB meetings back to Building 110 at the Station. L. Whittenberg indicated that the City Chambers would be unavailable the second Tuesday of May due to a special City Council meeting. Given the unavailability of the Council Chambers, it was announced that the May RAB meeting would be held at the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, Building 110.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking the participants for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

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