

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
May 11, 2004

Participants:

Blake, Geoffrey  
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL  
Hamparsumian, Hamlet / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.  
Hannon, Patricia / Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Hohenadl, Eike / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Jordan, Jack  
Leibel, Katherine / Department of Toxic Substances Control  
Maylone, Ken  
Monroe, Bruce  
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair  
Schallman, Robert / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Schilling, Bob / Bechtel National, Inc.  
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. P. Tamashiro stated that she hoped the meeting notice provided to RAB members was a helpful reminder of the scheduled RAB meeting.

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by introducing J. Peoples, the RAB Community Co-chair and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). RAB members were encouraged to direct any questions regarding environmental issues or the Installation Restoration (IR) Program to P. Tamashiro or G. Smith.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing 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, 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, Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan (PP), and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 40 Pilot Testing
- Site 40 and Site 70 Groundwater Monitoring Program
- 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
- Site 42 – Auto Shop Sump/Waste Oil Tank; Sites 44/45 – Former Waste Otto Fuel Drum Storage / Building 88 Floor Drain Outlet; and Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 57 – Paint Locker Area; Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA)

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:

### **General**

**RAB Member Comment:** I would like to make a general comment about an article printed in the Orange County Register regarding currently operating skeet ranges. It is interesting that we are spending so much money to remove contaminants from the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Skeet Range, while other commercial ranges continue to operate.

**Response:** The concern for contamination at Site 74 is primarily due to its presence next to the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and the potential impact that lead contamination from the site could have on endangered species that live and forage at the NWR.

It should also be noted that while lead shot was historically used at commercial and military skeet ranges including the Old Skeet Range at the Station, currently operating skeet ranges use stainless steel shot.

**Question:** Is there any concern for perchlorate contamination at NWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program sites?

**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:** I understand the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is requiring testing of “emergent chemicals” all over the state of California. Isn’t perchlorate considered one of these “emergent chemicals?”

**Answer:** Yes, perchlorate is one of the six “emergent chemicals.”

*Note: In California, “emergent chemicals” include N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA), Perchlorate, 1,4-Dioxane, Hexavalent chromium, 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (TCP), and Polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE).*

**Question:** Why is the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach exempt from testing for the presence of “emergent chemicals?”

**Answer:** The Station is not exempt from this requirement. The RWQCB requested information regarding potential “emergent chemical” contamination at IR Program sites. Navy and the RWQCB determined that only two IR Program sites (Site 70 [Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area]) and Site 6 [Explosives Burning Ground]) were potentially associated with past propellant use, including munitions, rockets, etc. Based on the request of the RWQCB, the Navy proceeded with perchlorate testing at Site 70 and Site 6. Perchlorate has not been detected at either site.

The general rationale that has been applied for “emergent chemical” testing is that if known historical activities at a site indicate that it is reasonable to suspect the possible presence of an “emergent chemical”, the Navy will test for it.

**Comment:** Some inspectors are requiring “emergent chemical” testing even in situations where evidence of past use does not support possible presence; for example, dry cleaning facilities. This is true for several sites in the Burbank area that are not associated with historical use of explosives, munitions, rockets, etc. However, these sites overlie a groundwater contamination plume associated with Lockheed Martin activities.

**Response by P. Tamashiro:** In the case of the Burbank area dry cleaner sites, the groundwater contamination plume was likely the reason for required testing, even though historic use doesn’t support possible presence of “emergent chemicals.” The required testing may be due to the fact that the RWQCB is screening for ambient contaminant levels, if no existing site data is available.

At the NWPNSTA Seal Beach, IR Program sites were screened based on knowledge of past activities associated with past explosives or rocket manufacturing activities.

**Question:** What is the anticipated schedule for release of the Site 70 Proposed Plan for RAB review?

**Answer:** The optimization phase is anticipated to take less than two months, followed by a 30-day review by Navy headquarters. If Navy headquarters review results in any changes to the proposed remedy, the Proposed Plan

will require revisions prior to release to the public.

In total, we anticipate a four to six month time frame before release of the Site 70 Proposed Plan to the RAB.

## PRESENTATION – SITE 40 PHASE II PILOT TEST RESULTS

B. Schilling of Bechtel National, Inc. proceeded with a presentation on the Site 40 Phase II pilot test results.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. An additional double-sided graphic was provided that illustrated Site 40. One side of the graphic showed the Phase II pilot test area well locations at Site 40 and the other side illustrated the extent of the PCE plume at Site 40. The questions and answers posed during and after the presentation are summarized below:

### **Slide 11**

**Question:** Is there any evidence of stratification?

**Answer:** The zones we are dealing with are fairly uniform in terms of their geology.

### **General**

**Question:** Is the groundwater flow causing the bacteria to migrate downgradient?

**Answer:** Some movement is due to hydraulic pressure, but bacteria movement primarily meanders with the groundwater flow.

## WEED ABATEMENT PROJECT ANNOUNCEMENT

P. Tamashiro introduced B. Schallman, Natural Resources Manager for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, who made a brief project announcement regarding proposed weed abatement activities.

B. Schallman proceeded to describe the proposed weed abatement project at the Station, which would take place in various areas adjacent to the NWR. He indicated that the Navy felt it was important to inform the RAB of the proposed activities because of the project's proximity to the NWR and some IRP sites. B. Schallman identified that the majority of weeds would be removed mechanically, however some weed abatement, including removal of iceplant, would require use of an herbicide known as AquaMaster, which is approved for use adjacent to water areas. B. Schallman identified that the weed abatement project would be conducted from May 2004 through September 2004. No questions were posed by the RAB following the weed abatement project announcement.

## BREAK

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

PRESENTATION – NON-TIME CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION SITE 7 (STATION LANDFILL) AND SITE 4 (PERIMETER ROAD) AREAS OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (AOPCs) 1A AND 2A

H. Hamparsumian from Tetra Tech FW, Inc., proceeded with a presentation on the non-time critical removal action at Site 7 and Site 4, AOPCs 1A and 2A.

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 35**

**Question:** What is the equipment pictured on slide 35?

**Answer:** The equipment is an electro-magnetic detection device. It detects metals up to five or six feet below ground surface (bgs). The equipment also has a data logger, which is connected to a geographic positioning system (GPS). The GPS determines the spatial coordinates of the metal anomalies detected by the electro-magnetic detection device.

**Slide 48**

**Question:** What is the source of the lead contamination along Perimeter Road?

**Answer:** The source of the lead “hot spots” along Perimeter Road is believed to be from the historic use of waste oil for dust and vegetation control. The waste oil contained lead.

**General**

**Question:** How many acres does the non-time critical removal action for Site 7 encompass?

**Answer:** Site 7 spans a total of 33 acres . Six areas of past landfill operations were identified for remediation and designated as Areas 1 through 6.

Area 1 covers approximately 8 acres. Area 2 is a single continuous trench, approximately 600 feet long by 40 feet wide. Areas 3 and 4 are irregularly shaped and cover approximately 3 acres. Area 5, consisting of two north-south oriented trenches, is approximately 0.7 acres in size. Area 6 is an irregularly shaped area approximately 0.1 acre in size.

**Question:** Who determines what vegetation is considered weeds and if these weeds are native or non-native?

**Answer:** The determination for non-native, noxious vegetation removal at Site 7 was made with input from John Bradley, United States Fish and Wildlife Service NWR Manger; the biologist for Tetra Tech FW, Inc.; and Bob Schallman, Natural Resources Manager for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

**Question:** Was Site 7, Area 1 excavated?

**Answer:** No, one of the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) for Site 7 was to reduce the potential for exposure of ecological receptors to landfill waste and potentially contaminated soil by increasing separation and/or eliminating exposure pathways (for example, water seeps) of wastes to human and ecological receptors. To achieve this RAO, where the thickness of soil cover over landfill debris in Site 7, Area 1, was less than 2 feet, it would be supplemented with additional clean soil to increase the separation between the landfill debris and ecological receptors to provide at least 2 feet of soil cover.

**Question:** Aren't some of the debris within Site 7, Area 1 located below the high water level?

**Answer:** Yes, much of the buried waste is inundated because of the high groundwater table, so it didn't make sense to excavate.

**Question:** So the remedial action at Site 7, Area 1 included re-sealing the top of the landfill?

**Answer:** Yes, supplemental soil was added to maintain a cover thickness of at least 2 feet.

**Question:** Were any studies conducted on the solubility of the lead within the lead-contaminated soil and debris collected from Site 7 and Site 4, AOPCs 1A and 2A prior to disposal?

**Answer:** Yes, the lead-contaminated soil was tested for lead contaminant levels with consideration of Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) and Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC). The waste was not found to contain lead at concentrations exceeding its STLC or TTLC and therefore was not defined as Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste. Because the soils are not classified as RCRA hazardous waste, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) land disposal restrictions (LDRs) do not apply.

## COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro thanked the RAB members for their attendance and announced that the next RAB meeting would be the annual RAB IR Program Site Tour, beginning at 6 p.m. on Tuesday, July 13, 2004.

G. Smith asked where the RAB should meet to begin the Site Tour and P. Tamashiro indicated that details regarding the IR Program Site Tour, including information on the meeting location, would be mailed to the RAB prior to Tuesday, July 13, 2004.

P. Tamashiro reminded the participants that reports for the Site 40 Phase II Pilot Test and Sites 4 and 7 Removal Action would be distributed to the RAB for review within the next month. She indicated that the Navy would provide responses to all comments received on the reports.

G. Vesely requested that the meeting minutes reflect that everyone in attendance chose to attend the RAB meeting instead of watching the Los Angeles Lakers basketball game.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

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

