

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
January 9, 2007

Participants:

Bettencourt, Philip
Breglio, Bob / MARRS Services, Inc.
Dudakis, Jason / Orange County Water District
Grinyer, Walter / GeoSyntec
Hannon, Patricia / Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
Jordan, Jack
Le, Si / Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest (NFEC SW)
Leibel, Katherine / Department of Toxic Substance Control, Cypress
Qureshi, Farooq / MARRS Services, Inc.
Salazar, Cindy / CH2M HILL
Sargent, Gary / Surfrider Foundation
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stevens, Charles
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Vessly, Gene
Whittenberg, Lee / City of Seal Beach
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 6:01 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced S. Le, NFEC SW, Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM) and G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). She also introduced C. Salazar who will be taking Kirsten Garrison's place in recording the meeting minutes. Each meeting attendee was asked to introduce himself/herself.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing Installation Restoration (IR) Program followed by update on the IR Program schedule and budget by S. Le. P. Tamashiro announced that one technical presentation would be presented by MARRS, Inc., on Site 14, Former UST Site.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

The RAB meeting continued with a status update on the ongoing IR Program presented by S. Le.

The following sites were discussed:

- Site 42 - Auto Shop Sump/Waste Oil Tank; Sites 44/45 - Former Waste Otto Fuel Drum Storage; and Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 57 - Paint Locker Area; Cleanup
- Site 14 - Abandoned Leaking Gasoline Underground Storage Tank (UST), Additional Groundwater Delineation

- Site 70 – Research, Testing, and Evaluation (RT&E) Area, Remedial Design and Construction
- Site 40 - Concrete/Pit Gravel Area, Remedial Action
- Site 74 – Old Skeet Range, Net Environmental Benefit Analysis (NEBA) and Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA)
- 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

Hard copies of the slide presentation were available as a handout at the meeting.

Questions and answers posed after the Project Highlights presentation are summarized below:

General

Question: Did you make a recommendation to the agencies regarding Site 74, Old Skeet Range?

Answer: The Navy performed an EE/CA that evaluates the effectiveness, implementability, and relative costs of various removal alternatives. The Navy also performed a NEBA that weighs the impact to the environment. Both documents rank alternatives based on comparative analysis.

The NEBA and EE/CA were used to present the facts to stakeholders through the use of standard acceptable methods and to help the Navy come to a consensus of a decision that is within the Navy’s scope. This is the first phase of the process and presents what we think is appropriate for the site. The process allows the public to comment and allows the regulators to provide input. The site specific data is used to evaluate and rank in terms of results what is best for the site.

Question: Who ultimately makes the final decision?

Answer: The Navy is the lead Federal agency but works with State agencies in a collaborative fashion. The Navy seeks to gain concurrence with the State before making a decision. In addition, a public meeting will be held to allow the public to provide comments.

Comment by B. Wong: The challenge is that about half of Site 74 lies within the National Wildlife Refuge, which is a sensitive wildlife habitat. Quantifying the biological and ecological value of the wetlands is problematic. Fortunately, there is methodology for quantifying the value of the resources in the National Wildlife Refuge, called the NEBA. The NEBA uses an approach acceptable to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Once you can quantify these values, you can evaluate objectively rather than subjectively and assess the pros and cons of the different alternatives.

Question: If we leave the lead in-place, is the lead oxidizing and a problem?

Answer: The Navy conducted site-specific studies to evaluate the risks from the lead contamination in-place. These results are considered as part of the overall evaluation process that is still taking place.

Question: Is the program still using federal funds?

Answer: Yes, all funding is from the federal government, although Site 70 is under review in Washington, D.C., where Navy Legal is evaluating potential claims action.

PRESENTATION - IR PROGRAM BUDGET

S. Le continued the RAB meeting by presenting an update on the IR Program schedule and budget. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The following questions were posed after the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 10

Question: We are presently operating under a continuing resolution; does this information take this into account?

Answer: This is a planned budget and not an authorized budget. If the federal government re-prioritizes and more money is allocated elsewhere, then the spending schedule would be shifted out to the future.

General

Question: Is Site 70 the only high risk site?

Answer: All sites are considered high risk with the exception of two medium risk sites. There are no low risk sites.

P. Tamashiro announced there would be a 10-minute break followed by the technical presentation on Site 14, Former UST Site.

BREAK

PRESENTATION - RESULTS OF GROUNDWATER MONITORING INSTALLATION RESTORATION (IR) PROGRAM SITE 14 - FORMER UST SITE

This presentation was given by B. Breglio. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The following questions were posed during and after the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 22

Question: Is the southeast gradient consistent on the site?

Answer: Yes, the groundwater gradient is consistently to the southeast. Foster Wheeler did a study and showed that there is some tidal influence on the site, but it did not extend past the dispenser islands.

General

Question: Will you continue to monitor the plume?

Answer: The Navy is in discussion with the RWQCB. The first leak was detected in 1984 and so we have been monitoring the plume for a long time now. We are seeing the rate of migration is very slow, so the plume is not going anywhere. In addition, the chemical concentrations are below the established ecological risk-based screening values. So, there is a justification of no further action.

Question: Why did you discontinue the use of ASTs?

Answer: The Navy discontinued the use of AST because of operational issues, not because of any environmental reasons. It was replaced with transportable tanks that are more mobile, easier to maintain, and are smaller. These tanks are now located outside next to the car wash and has a secondary containment unit and a bermed area around it for fueling. They meet regulatory requirements.

Question: Is there a better explanation for the anomalous data to the north?

Answer: The data seems to be geologically controlled. Temporary wells were installed to find the source, but the data from these wells did not give us an answer. The concentrations are so low that it is not a concern and does not justify continued monitoring.

Comment: Is the MTBE toxic? What about the benzene?

Answer: The screening criteria for MTBE were based on ecological receptors, not human health receptors. Groundwater in the area of Site 14 has no beneficial use due to its high salinity. Therefore, MTBE in groundwater does not represent a human health concern. MTBE is not toxic at the concentration level at Site 14. It is more of a nuisance in regards to odor and taste.

We were able to establish that benzene concentrations are stable or declining and natural attenuation is occurring.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro continued the announcements by indicating that the report for Site 74 is still in internal review and should be available before the next RAB meeting, along with the groundwater monitoring reports for the Site 14 and Sites 5 and 7.

P. Tamashiro indicated that with only a handful of active sites, there will be no March 2007 RAB meeting unless RAB members have a topic they would like to discuss. Members were told to contact P. Tamashiro for suggestions on topics to discuss for a March 2007 RAB meeting. Unless a topic is identified, the next RAB meeting would be held in May 2007.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB Community Co-chair position is open again this year. This position was normally held for 2 years, and J.P. Peoples has served as the co-chair for 3 years. P. Tamashiro and J.P. Peoples can be contacted for additional information about the position.

No additional questions were raised.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:27 p.m.

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