

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
September 21, 2004

Participants:

Blake, Geoffrey
Bradley, John / United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Jordan, Jack
Leadon, Chris / SWDIV
Leibel, Katherine / Department of Toxic Substances Control
Monroe, Bruce
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Sample, Brad / CH2M HILL
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stevens, Charles
Stillman, Glenn
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
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 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 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)
- 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 40 Remedial Design and Remedial Action
- 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: Could you comment on the firm that was awarded the Site 42, 44/45, and SWMU 57 EE/CA?

Answer: MARRS Environmental Services is a minority and woman-owned small business.

Question: Are they based in the local area?

Answer: They have offices in Santa Fe Springs and Escondido, California.

Slide 4

Question: When did MTBE come into use?

Answer: The Air Resources Board required the use of MTBE in the late 1980's and early 1990's as an oxygenate for fuel. CH2M HILL researched the use of MTBE and found that it was sometimes used in the early 1980's for this same purpose, and therefore was likely used at Site 14.

Question: What type of facility was Site 14, a fueling dock?

Answer: It was a gas station.

Slide 6

Question: Is the technology proposed for Site 70 bioremediation?

Answer: The biobarrier remediation technology proposed for Site 70 is similar to Site 40, but it is more like a permeable reactive barrier. Contaminated groundwater passes through the barrier at a slow pace and is dechlorinated by bacteria using the TCE as the food source as it passes through the biobarrier.

Question: Is the process like osmosis? Are you putting a membrane in?

Answer: No, the technology involves the injection of an electron donor spaced to allow the contaminated groundwater to pass through but allow the

dechlorinating bacteria to break down the chlorinated compounds.

Question: Will you need to re-do the Feasibility Study (FS)?

Answer: Yes, we will be re-doing the FS.

General

Question: Have any decisions been made about lead removal at Site 74 (the Old Skeet Range)?

Answer: The Navy is still evaluating the ecological risks for Site 74. We are considering conducting a net ecological benefit analysis to gauge the lead impacts against damage that may result from the implementation of the removal action, itself.

Comment by RAB member: Remediation at Site 74 is difficult because the lead shot is disintegrating, but to remove the contamination may cause damage to the sensitive wetland habitat.

Question: When you used the term “removal action” by 2007, were you using this terminology in a general sense?

Answer: Yes. The term “removal action” could indicate a number of actions, even actions not involving excavation.

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by indicating that B. Sample from CH2M HILL would proceed with two presentations to the RAB. She indicated that the first presentation would be a RAB training session to provide an overview of Ecological Risk Assessments and the second presentation would summarize findings on the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment conducted at Site 74.

P. Tamashiro indicated that the Site 74 presentation was very technical in nature and she encouraged the RAB to request clarification whenever needed. She provided the RAB with an acronym list for its reference during the presentations.

PRESENTATION – PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS OF ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENTS

B. Sample, Ph.D., Principal Ecological Risk Assessor, CH2M HILL proceeded with a presentation on Principles and Applications of Ecological Risk Assessments.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. No questions were posed in regard to the presentation.

BREAK

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

PRESENTATION – TIER II ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT, SITE 74

B. Sample proceeded with a presentation on the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment conducted at Site 74.

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 12

Question: Why didn't the Ecological Risk Assessment consider measured concentrations of lead in the liver tissue of mallards and small mammals?

Answer: Both measured and estimated concentrations of lead in the liver tissue of small mammals were considered. However, only estimated concentrations of lead in the livers of mallards were considered. This was primarily due to the fact that the assessment did not involve collection of mallards. The original plan was to collect willets or black bellied plovers, which are species roughly similar to the California clapper rail, but these species were not available for collection at the site during fieldwork and were substituted by western meadowlarks.

Slide 22

Question: Are the media-based toxicity values provided in Slide 22 given in parts per million (ppm)?

Answer: Yes.

Slide 41

Question: Did you use a graphics software program to develop the remediation footprint boundaries?

Answer: I am not sure of the specific method used to determine the footprint boundaries, as these depictions were developed in our graphics department. I believe these boundaries were interpolated based on the halfway distance between adjacent sampling points.

Following the RAB meeting, CH2M HILL verified that the response given above accurately described the method used to determine the footprint boundaries.

General

Question: At what stage of the review process is the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment?

Answer: CH2M HILL is in the process of incorporating Navy review comments. The draft report should be ready for agency and RAB review by early October 2004.

Question: Which agencies are involved in the review?



Answer: The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Question: What about the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)?

Answer: Yes, CDFG will also review the report, however their review role is tied to DTSC's review.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by indicating that J.P. Peoples, the RAB Community Co-chair would provide the RAB with a report of her recent attendance at a Navy RAB workshop in Salt Lake City, Utah in July 2004.

J.P. began by thanking the RAB for electing her Community Co-chair and giving her the opportunity to attend such an informative conference. She indicated that the workshop was very interesting and provided attendees with tools to ask more intelligent questions about the IR Programs they are advising. She showed the RAB a notebook of different workshop materials she collected during the conference. The following question was posed to J.P. regarding her experience at the conference:

Question: What kind of workshops did you attend at the conference?

Answer: There were a number of topics addressed. Some of the workshops include:

- Remediation technologies
- Navy budgeting for IR Programs
- Risk communications, including how to communicate to a RAB
- Munitions response programs
- Regulatory standards
- Site closeout
- Land use controls
- Installation Restoration Program/Munitions Response Program (IRP/MRP)
- Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup
- Technical assistance to RABs to conduct meetings

J.P. closed her report to the RAB by indicating that she thought the conference was very worthwhile.

P. Tamashiro reminded the participants that the executive summary report for the Fourth Annual Groundwater Monitoring for Site 40 and Site 70, as well as the report addressing the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment at Site 74, would be distributed to the RAB for review soon. She encouraged the RAB to review the reports and submit their comments. Questions regarding the reports should be addressed to P. Tamashiro.

P. Tamashiro thanked the RAB members for their attendance and announced that the next RAB meeting would be held in November 2004 and include presentations on the Site 40 and Site 70 groundwater remediation projects. P. Tamashiro indicated that a mailer would be distributed to the RAB with the meeting specifics.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

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