MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
April 12, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:
Akkenapally, Sree/Insight EEC, Inc.
Blake, Geoffrey/MFASE-AQMD
Chen, Qihai/Accord Engineering, Inc. (AEI)
Duffy, Marlene/Geosyntec
Ford, Tony/Insight
Grinyer, Walt/Geosyntec
Jordan, Jack/RAB Community Co-Chair
Lee, Larry/RAB Community Member
Li, Li/ Orange County Water District
Lieberman, Tara /Richard Brady and Associates (RBA)
Monroe, Bruce/ Community Member
Niou, Stephen/Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)
Olivera, Jerry/City of Seal Beach
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC SW)
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Schallmann, Bob/NAVWPNSTA Biologist
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Thorpe, Darwin/Community Member
Shields, Timothy/ RBA

WELCOME

P. Tamashiro commenced the meeting at 6:00 pm at the City of Seal Beach Council Chambers by welcoming all participants. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves, sign-in, and collect handouts at the front table.

P. Tamashiro announced that two presentations will be given tonight. The first, an overview of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) Project Highlights by Brenda Reese, RPM NAVFAC SW; and the second, a technical presentation of the Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection for IRP Site 75 by Timothy Shields of RBA.

B. Reese gave an overview of the IRP and the MRP. She began by stating that due to the current budget stalemate, the next five to six months should be aggressive in terms of completing the

execution of contracts. She then quickly acknowledged the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Environmental Team members, reviewed the definitions of Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), and discussed the IRP/MRP Site Status. B. Reese then reviewed each open IR site individually. She concluded with a review of the MRP Sites, briefly mentioning that the regulators have concurred that no further action is required for Area of Concern (AOC) 1 (Building 94 Evaporation Pond) and Site UXO2 (Buildings 101/103 Surrounds and Ponds). AOC 2 (Explosives Drop Test Tower) will be formally entered as a UXO site.

P. Tamashiro announced that a recent incident occurred at Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach. She informed that on February 10, 2011 reports were received of geese behaving strangely in the general vicinity of a pond east of Kitts Highway, and over a subsequent 2 to 3 day period 20 geese were found dead in the area. She stated that thousands of geese congregate at the station annually. This was the first time this type of incident has ever occurred. The location where the geese were found is approximately ¼ mile from Site 74, and the deaths were initially thought to be related to pesticide use in the area. Two of the 20 geese were selected and sent to the National Wildlife Health Center for a toxicity evaluation. Lead shots pellets were found in the gizzards of the two geese. High lead concentrations, at potentially lethal levels, were found in the livers of the two geese. Unfortunately, the pellets samples were not preserved, and a direct comparison to the lead shot at Site 74 could not be conducted. However, because Site 74 is the only location for lead shot exposure in the general area, it is considered to be the probable source. NAVFAC SW headquarters has been informed of the incident, and NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Biologist is available for any questions or concerns. P. Tamashiro listed two potential reasons for the incident: 1) the large amount of rainfall may have changed the local environment and caused the geese to locate in different areas than previous years; and 2) Site 74 is located next to the Small Arms Range, a site which in the past has been very active and loud. The Small Arms Range was closed for renovation this winter, which may have attracted geese to the now quiet area. P. Tamashiro announced that they are in discussion with the biologist to see if there are any hazing activities that can be performed to deter birds from the area, that will not scare other species away from the adjacent Wildlife Refuge. Currently funding is not available for the site until FY 16 or 17 for a removal action, but P. Tamashiro and B. Reese are working to rearrange the funding schedule to expedite work on this site due to the current incident. P. Tamashiro stated that the Navy will keep the RAB informed of any updates related to this incident.

Questions and Answers discussed during the Project Highlight and Site 74 Discussion are summarized below:

Question: How were the birds selected to be used as samples? Did the birds display any distinctive characteristics, or signs of illness? Normally heavy metals will disorient birds, and they will starve to death before lead will accumulate in the liver.

Answer: It was a random selection, the two carcasses that were in the best condition were sent to the National Wildlife Center for analysis. Of

the twenty geese, 19 were Canada geese and one was a Greater White Goose. At first the birds appeared to have died from avian disease. There was some indication that the geese were disoriented, but the biologists were unsuccessful in capturing the geese while there were still alive. In addition, the lead poisoning did not affect any other species of birds including ducks, coots, and shore birds that congregate in that area. This may be due to the foraging activity of the geese.

B. Schallmann stated that he spoke with an animal aircraft hazard group about developing techniques for hazing animals. However, traditional hazing techniques can't be use because it is next to wildlife refuge, where sensitive habitat and species exist.

Question: Canada geese forage more deeply than other birds, so perhaps they came in contact with old lead shot that has been inaccessible to other birds. What other birds were used in the Ecological Risk Assessment?

Answer: Medowlark, killdeer, and other species much smaller than geese were used in the ecological risk assessment.

Question: Is there a danger that children drinking water from the aquifer could be impacted by lead?

Answer: The primary concern is ecological receptors. Surface water and groundwater are not the issue, the sediment is.

Question: The Air Mover technology could potentially be used in that environment to do selective vacuuming. This technology would not be as intrusive in that sensitive area.

Answer: We will have to evaluate that option.

P. Tamashiro introduced Timothy Shields, Project Manager for Underground Storage Tank 229 and IR Site 75, to give the next presentation: Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection Using the Triad Approach at IRP Site 75, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California.

T. Shields began by discussing the Site History of IRP Site 75, the location of a former agricultural well KAYO-SB. He discussed the well decommissioning, previous low-flow sampling by the OCWD, and current uncertainty about the source of VOC contamination and geology. Next he explained the proposed objective of the investigation to determine VOC concentrations and groundwater flow, and detailed the design of Monitoring Wells using the Triad approach and real time technologies. T. Shields concluded with a review of the dynamic work strategies, Proposed Decision Rules and schedule for the project.

Questions and responses discussed during the IR Site 75 presentation are summarized below:

Question: Do you know the volumes of the releases that occurred at the sites near KAYO-SB?

Answer: The volume of the release was not focused on during the initial research. We looked specifically at the types of compounds, well construction details, and the direction of groundwater flow.

Question: Are there many part shops and machinist shops in the manufacturing area surrounding the well?

Answer: I have not personally driven in that area. But based on the aerial photos and electronic data search, there are many known industrial sites with known releases near Site 75.

Question: What is the action level? Is the aquifer used for drinking water?

Answer: The MCL for TCE is 5 parts per billion (ppb), this is a drinking water standard. All groundwater in the State of California is considered beneficial; the groundwater at the site is a beneficial source aquifer, and VOCs could potentially contaminate the drinking water supply for Orange County. The Beta Aquifer is currently tapped and used as a municipal water source.

Question: Where is the Source of the contamination? Is it off-site or on-site?

Answer: That is the question of the investigation.

Question: Was any testing done for selenium ? This is a problem of Backbay and Newport, California.

Answer: We assumed that the whole suite of analytes was collected by the OCWD when they did their initial well-water sampling in 2004. Attempts will be made to see if OCWD have historical analytical data beyond 2004. *(Upon contacting OCWD, the Navy was informed that no data were available for this well prior to 2004.)*

Question: Will multi-completion wells be constructed to allow for sampling from different depths?

Answer: No, due to difficulty of drilling in heaving sands, we are not proposing to do multi-completion wells; it would be too risky. Sonic drilling, which can go up to 100 feet per day, has been selected as the preferred drilling technology. Sonic drilling has a high probability of success.

Question: Is the KAYO-SB constructed of a gravel pack from 30 to the total depth?

Answer: Due to the limited well construction data we have we can only suppose that the annular space was gravel packed. This was the typical construction of other agricultural wells from that time period of construction. As such, the agricultural well may serve as a vertical conduit, and concentrations may blend over the vertical distance.

P. Tamashiro announced the end of the Question and Answer period.

P.Tamashiro announced that several reports will soon be available for public review and comment.

IR Site 75 Work Plan will be available via a website posting at the time of regulatory submittal. P. Tamashiro requests that you inform her if you have any difficulty accessing the website.

The 2010 Annual Report for IR Site 70 will be available in approximately two weeks (by April 26th).

P. Tamashiro announced that no nominations were received for the RAB Community Co-Chair position. Jack Jordan has agreed to continue in the position. P. Tamashiro requests that you contact her if you are interested in perusing the position.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m.