

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
September 11, 2007

Participants:

Arends, Mike / AGVIQ Environmental Services
Carmony, David/ City of Seal Beach
Jordan, Jack / RAB Community Co-chair
Le, Si / Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest (NAVFAC SW)
Lee, Larry
Monroe, Bruce
Olivera, Jerry / City of Seal Beach
Salazar, Cindy/ CH2M HILL
Sands, Linda / CH2M HILL
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Stevens, Charles
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and RAB Navy Co-chair
Willhite, Lindi
Whittenberg, Lee / City of Seal Beach
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL
Vesely, Gene

WELCOME

At 6:00 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair began the meeting by welcoming the participants. She introduced S. Le, NAVFAC SW, Environmental Business Line Team Lead, G. Smith, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO), and J. Jordan, RAB Community Co-chair.

Attendees were asked to introduce themselves.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting would proceed with a status update on the ongoing Installation Restoration (IR) Program, followed by one technical presentation.

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 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 5 - Clean Fill Disposal Area 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:

Slide 8

Question: Is there a certain period of time that the landfill cover for Site 7 needs to be monitored?

Answer: The original work plan stated three to five years. Vegetation needs to be established to prevent erosion of the cover. During the first year of monitoring, there was too much rain and conditions during the second year were very dry. The vegetation is slowly being re-established and is about 50 percent where it should be.

Question: Can you share the Legal comments received on Site 74?

Answer: The main comments were questions from a new Navy attorney who was not familiar with the NEBA, about how NEBA would fit with the EE/CA. He thought that the NEBA needs to be more integrated into the EE/CA. Other comments had to do with the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) evaluation.

Question: What is the amount of lead shots that contaminate Site 74?

Answer: This will be covered in the presentation.

P. Tamashiro continued the RAB meeting by introducing the technical presentation on Site 74.

PRESENTATION - UPDATE ON SITE 74, OLD SKEET RANGE

M. Arends, AGVIQ Environmental Services, presented the EE/CA portion of the presentation and L. Sands, CH2M HILL, presented the draft NEBA results portion of the presentation. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers posed during and after the presentation are summarized below:

Question: How deep will you have to excavate to remove the contamination?

Answer: Excavation in the upland area will be approximately 1 foot below ground surface (bgs) and 2 feet bgs in the wetland area.

Question: Do the dots on the figure represent sampling points? (Referring to Slide 10.) Does the water stay on the west side of Case Road during high tide?

Answer: Yes, the dots represent sampling locations. During high tide, Case Road acts as a barrier and prevents water from flowing onto the east side of Case Road.

Question: How would you remove “hot spots”? Can a “super sucker”, vacuum truck, or air mover be used?

Answer: An excavator with an extension arm could be used along and adjacent to the west side of Case Road. Another method that can be used is to place metal plates in the wetlands to provide excavators with deeper access to the tidal saltmarsh. The excavators would be equipped with a long-arm bucket scoop which would be used to remove contaminated sediments.

Because of the depth of the water, it will be hard to use any sort of equipment that sucks up or vacuums the sediment. It is important to keep as much of the plant roots and the detritus in place to minimize disruption. The Navy is always considering the possibility of new technologies to assist in its remediation projects.

Question: Does the sampling grid provide enough information to identify the location of the hot spots?

Answer: Yes, the sampling grid provides enough information to identify the hot spots.

Question: With Alternative 2, will you backfill the wetland?

Answer: No, the tidal movement will be allowed to naturally re-fill the excavation over time and allow the wetland to re-establish itself.

Question: What is the white powder seen on the lead shot samples? Is the lead shot water soluble?

Answer: The white powder on the lead shot sample is lead oxide as a result of the exposure of the lead to the atmosphere. The lead shot and lead oxide are not water soluble. The anaerobic conditions that prevail in the sediment would favor lead sulfide to form which is also not water soluble.

Response by the Navy: Lead oxide is not very mobile in water. There is some decomposition of the lead particles into the soil through weathering primarily.

Question: Are the light-footed clapper rails or the Belding’s savannah sparrow affected by the lead sulfide?

Response by B. Wong: The Navy did not do a specific study on the light-footed clapper rail or Belding’s savannah sparrow ingesting lead sulfide at the National Wildlife Refuge. The literature does not indicate such a study has been conducted. However, studies have been done on ducks and mallards and conclude that there is some risk to them if they were to consume

lead shots.

Question: Is this risk included in the NEBA?

Answer: The total risk is evaluated in the NEBA. We have not seen any population die-offs or brittle eggs due to the contamination. No documentation has been found on neurological problems from lead on the light-footed clapper rail or the Belding's savannah sparrow. The Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment looked at plants and other sensitive species and various pathways (bioassays, bioaccumulation, bioaccessibility).

Question: What is an "ARAR"? (Referring to slide 16.)

Answer: "ARAR" is the acronym for applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, which are pertinent laws, statutes, and regulations.

Question: Does the NEBA look for funding sources?

Response by the Navy: Funding for implementing investigations and remedial actions under the Navy's Installation Restoration Program comes from Navy environmental restoration account authorized by Congress.

Question: If the discount rate were to change, would that change the conclusion?

Answer: No. The discount rate affects the net present value of the cost of each alternative. The same discount rate is used to compare each alternative. Since each of the alternatives has a similar time to implement, a change in discount rate would affect each alternative's cost to relatively the same degree.

Question: How will the Coastal Conservancy review the wetland mitigation? Will there be Federal consistency or will there be wetland mitigation caps?

Response by the Navy: All negotiations will be between the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the Navy because part of the site is partially located within the National Wildlife Refuge. Permitting will not be needed under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance will be conducted under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC). A mitigation ratio of 1:1 was used to develop cost estimates in the EE/CA, which is the assumption used by FWS to develop the cost analysis. This ratio will be negotiated, as required, at a later date. The EE/CA does not include the cost of the land for the migrating wetland.

Question: Will creating a wetland be worse than doing nothing?

Answer: Doing nothing will leave a much greater risk in place. The NEBA will help to evaluate and quantify the relative residual risk.

Question: Will all the hot spots be removed?

Answer: The EE/CA and NEBA will be evaluating the number of hot spots that need to be taken out in the wetlands to attain an acceptable risk.

Question: What are the ecological receptors and the toxicity levels for each?

Answer: The Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment (completed in 2005) identified representative ecological receptors and the risk that Site 74 poses to them.

For more detailed information, the Tier II Ecological Risk Assessment is available on the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IR Program website at <http://www.cnrc.navy.mil/sealbeach/Programs/Env/IRP/index.htm>.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro indicated that the draft EE/CA will be available for review and comment within six months.

No additional comments were raised.

P. Tamashiro indicated that with only a handful of active sites, there will be no RAB meeting until after the New Year. The next RAB meeting will be held the second Tuesday in January (January 8) 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:20 p.m.

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