

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
May 10, 2005

Participants:

Dudakis, Jason / Orange County Water District
Garrison, Kirsten / CH2M HILL
Hamparsumian, Hamlet / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.
Hannon, Patricia / Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
Hohenadl, Eike
Komatsuzaki, Amy / Tetra Tech FW, Inc.
Le, Si / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Leibel, Katherine / DTSC
Monroe, Bruce
Peoples, J.P. / RAB Community Co-chair
Pilichi, Carmine
Schilling, Bob / Bechtel National, Inc.
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Torrey, Peter / CH2M HILL
Whittenberg, Lee / City of Seal Beach
Willhite, Lindi

WELCOME

At 6:07 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced J.P. Peoples, RAB Community Co-chair.

P. Tamashiro announced that two technical presentations would be presented at the RAB meeting, preceded first by 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 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 70 Revised Feasibility Study (RFS), Proposed Plan (PP), and Record of Decision (ROD)
- 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, Long-term Groundwater Monitoring Program

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. No questions were posed during or after the Project Highlights presentation.

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by indicating that a presentation would be given by B. Schilling of Bechtel National, Inc. on the groundwater monitoring at Sites 4, 5, 6, and 7.

PRESENTATION - GROUNDWATER MONITORING AT INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 4 (PERIMETER ROAD), SITE 5 (CLEAN FILL DISPOSAL AREA), SITE 6 (EXPLOSIVES BURNING GROUND), AND SITE 7 (STATION LANDFILL)

B. Schilling proceeded with his presentation on the Sites 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The following question was posed after the presentation:

Question: Regarding the new monitoring wells installed, you indicated during the presentation that they were screened from 10 to 30 feet below ground surface (bgs). Are there any existing wells at Site 7 that occur deeper below ground surface?

Answer: There are no monitoring wells at Site 7 deeper than 30 feet bgs. One of the existing wells is screened from 10 to 20 feet bgs. Most of the other monitoring wells are screened from approximately 10 to 30 feet bgs.

BREAK

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

Prior to the second technical presentation, P. Tamashiro thanked L. Whittenberg for providing the RAB with the City Council chambers facility and coffee. She also noted that in response to a recommendation, meeting attendee introductions would now be conducted at the beginning of each RAB. The meeting attendees proceeded with the introductions by stating their name and affiliation (Note: please see the participant list at the beginning of these meeting minutes for the name and affiliation of each meeting attendee).

PRESENTATION - POST-CLOSURE INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE REPORT,
INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 7 (STATION LANDFILL)

P. Tamashiro opened the second presentation by introducing H. Hamparsumian, Tetra Tech FW, Inc., who proceeded with a presentation of the post-closure inspection and maintenance report for Site 7.

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: You stated during the presentation that the inspection of the surface water management system at Site 7 was conducted on March 17 and March 23?

Answer: Yes.

Question: So the initial pictures of the ponding were taken on March 17, and the follow-up pictures showing the depressional areas dry and cracked were taken just 6 days later? Given the recent rainy season, I'm surprised the depressions were able to dry this quickly.

Answer: The subsequent pictures showing the depressional areas dry and cracked were taken on April 8, during an informal inspection of Site 7. The ponded water at Site 7 actually persisted for quite some time.

Comment by P. Tamashiro: The ponded water remained for a great period of time given the heavy rainfall this year. For example, ponded water at the Westminster Gate of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach remained for three to four months.

Question: Once the recommendations of the Site 7 post-closure inspection and maintenance report are approved, how quickly can they be implemented?

Answer: Once approval is received, procurement of staff and equipment to conduct the recommended activities will occur. This process is anticipated to take approximately one month. We only need 100-200 cubic yards of soil for filling and grading the depressions.

Question: What was the source of soil used for the cover system at Site 7?

Answer: There were four total sources for the soil cover system at Site 7:

- Dredged sediment stockpiled on the Station wharf
- Clean soil excavated during the removal action at Site 5
- Grubbing material from Site 7
- Offsite borrow soil from West Coast Sand and Gravel

As illustrated in the Figure on Slide 5, the majority of soil cover was placed on the eastern portion of Site 7.

Question: What is the percentage of vegetation re-establishment at Site 7?

Answer: I would estimate approximately 60 percent vegetative re-establishment, based on the inspection of the site as subdivided into 100 foot by 100 foot grids.

Note: Subsequent to the meeting, the above response was verified and it was determined that approximately 65 to 75 percent vegetative re-establishment has occurred at Site 7.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro reminded the RAB members that the draft report for IR Sites 4, 5, 6, and 7 is currently out for comment. Concurrence from DTSC was received approximately one month ago and the City of Seal Beach has submitted comments. She reminded RAB members that there are still a few weeks remaining for comments to be submitted on the report. Comments should be submitted to P. Tamashiro.

P. Tamashiro also reminded the RAB members that the draft report for the recommendations from the post-closure maintenance and inspection report for Site 7 would be available for RAB review in approximately two weeks. Comments on the draft report must be submitted within 60-days and can be provided to P. Tamashiro.

P. Tamashiro asked if there were any additional questions. None were posed.

Given the recent changes in RAB meeting format, start time, and meeting location, P. Tamashiro encouraged attendees contact her with any questions or concerns.

Lastly, G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO) announced the forthcoming Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) list, scheduled for release on Friday, 13 May, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) (6:30 a.m. Pacific Daylight Time [PDT]). He explained that based on the initial list, the BRAC Commission will travel to each installation on the list to determine if closure is necessary. Over the summer months, the list may be revised as a result of BRAC Commission Review. In September 2005, the BRAC Commission will submit their final recommendations to the President for his review. The President may take one of two actions: (1) Accept the BRAC list in its entirety or (2) Reject the BRAC list in its entirety. If the President accepts the list, then it is entered into the law within 45 legislative days. If the President rejects the BRAC list, a joint resolution to disregard the list will end the pursuit of the closure of the installations. However, G. Smith indicated the latter scenario was unlikely. The following statement was made by a meeting attendee:

Comment: Historically, 85 percent of the installations listed on the BRAC list were ultimately closed.

With respect to a potential change in the BRAC list (i.e., installations being added or removed from the list), G. Smith explained that the BRAC Commission is composed of nine

members. To add a new installation to the list released on 13 May, 7 of the 9 members would have to be in favor. To remove an installation from the list, a majority of the members in favor would be required. G. Smith stated that historically, 10 to 15 percent of the BRAC list has changed as a result of the BRAC Commission review process. However, he added that the Department of Defense (DoD) has gone to great extents to research the currently proposed installation closures and the list released on 13 May 2005 is not likely to change a great deal during BRAC Commission review.

The RAB was encouraged to address any BRAC-related questions to G. Smith.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

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