

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers  
October 10, 2011

Participants:

Akkenapally, Sree / Insight ECC, Inc. (Insight)  
Betterncourt, Philip / Community Member  
Blake, Geoff/RAB Community Member  
Fattahipour, Mitra / Insight  
Jordan, Jack / Community Co-Chair, RAB Community Member  
Lee, Larry T. / RAB Community Member  
Li, Li / Orange County Water District  
Lieberman, Tara / Richard Brady and Associates (RBA)  
Oliveria, Jerry / City of Seal Beach Planner  
Reese, Brenda / Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC SW)  
Shields, Timothy / RBA  
Smith, Gregg / Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach  
Thorpe, Darwin / RAB Community Member

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 and to sign in and collect handouts at the front table.

P. Tamashiro introduced Gregg Smith, the Public Affairs Officer for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and announced that three presentations will be given tonight: A brief overview of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) project highlights by B. Reese; a status update presentation for IRP Site 75 by T. Shields, and after a brief break, a presentation on the MRP sites prioritization update by B. Reese.

*B. Reese began with an overview of the IRP and MRP Project Highlights. She first recognized the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Environmental Team members involved, and then defined the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP). Next, she briefly reviewed NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach IRP/MRP Site Status and gave a brief review of the clean-up process and project status for the following open IR Sites in more detail: Site 7 Station Landfill; Site 40, Concrete Pit/Gravel Area; Site 70, Research Testing, and Evaluation Area; Site 74 Skeet Range, Site 75, KAYO-SB Agricultural Well, and Site 229, Former UST Site. She then briefly discussed the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection and Site Inspection status. She concluded with a list of acronyms.*

Questions and answers discussed during the Project Highlights Presentation are summarized below.

**Question:** On Site 74, because of the wetlands impact, is there an opportunity to get other funding to protect/enhance or restore the wetlands?

**Answer:** The Navy's Natural Resources Program does provide some funding for monitoring and enhancing the wetlands. The wetlands at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach are part of the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge and are co-managed by the Navy and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. However, other than IRP, we are not aware of any programs that are providing funding specifically for the work at Site 74. The Navy is working through the CERCLA process to restore the area. The next step for Site 74 is remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS), and the goal is to do less harm than the benefit the cleanup will provide. All IRP documents are considered public documents, and the community will be notified and have an opportunity for providing comments during the FS stage. Status updates will also be presented at the RAB. Additionally, the US Fish and Wildlife Service has been involved in the IRP process at the site. This is a combined effort of different stakeholders, and the Navy wants to ensure that everyone is on the same page.

**Question:** Is site 75 the only one of the IR sites under the PRP review?

**Answer:** IR Site 70 is also a PRP Site. The Navy Litigation Office started to gather information to prepare for the potential litigation. Cost information has been provided to legal counsel. However, please note, this is not detracting from our current remediation effort. The Navy will proceed with remediation regardless of the legal decision regarding costs.

P. Tamashiro announced that T. Shields would next give a Project Status Update Presentation for Site 75, NAVWPN STA Seal Beach.

*T. Shields began the presentation with a brief discussion of the Site location and land-use, and the pre-investigation uncertainty about the geology and VOC migration depth. He followed with an explanation of how the Triad Approach was used to manage uncertainty for the project. The plan for the Triad investigation involved the use of systematic planning, real time technologies, and dynamic work strategy. T. Shields reviewed the proposed decision rules for the project. Next he reviewed the field work (drilling, marking core depths, temperature logging, soil logging and sample collection, and well installation), and explained the real-time screening results near KAYO-SB, as well as the screening results and preliminary groundwater analytical results at all other locations, showing maps of the groundwater contours for the shallow and deep wells, and cross sections of the wells. There is a general east to west direction of groundwater flow in the shallow wells and deep wells, but groundwater flow is more complex in the deeper wells. The concentrations are higher off the base than on the base, indicating per the decision rules that the Navy is not the source. The highest concentrations were found in the shallow well #5. A second*

*round of sampling is scheduled for December 2011, and the results will be evaluated to determine if this trend continues.*

Questions and answers discussed during the Site 75 Status Update Presentation are summarized below.

**Question:** Is all the groundwater flow east to west?

**Answer:** In the shallow wells it is. In the deep wells it is more complex.

**Question:** Do you have any conjecture as to where the contamination is coming from in the deeper wells?

**Answer:** Yes, this will be discussed further in the presentation.

**Question:** Was TCE the primary contaminant, and are the other contaminants the breakdown products?

**Answer:** Not necessarily, there is a mixture.

**Question:** Does this site raise federal clean water act issues? Is this suggestive of a ruptured vessel to the east or some conscious discharge occurring in the area?

**Answer:** An electronic records review was conducted for an approximately 1 mile distance around the site. Known releases in this area were investigated on a preliminary basis for this project. The RWQCB is aware of open and closed cases in the area, these cases involve plating solvents, and degreasers that use the same chemicals found in the groundwater.

**Question:** The deeper contamination is caused from agricultural well draw? It looks like the contaminant has to get through the clay layer to get to the lower layer, is it though the well bore?

**Answer:** The agricultural well was constructed with a gravel pack, likely from very near the surface to 310 feet. The pump was down between 200-300 feet below ground surface (bgs), and it was known that perforations were there at different zones. When wells are pumped, they create a cone of depression in the water table and related downward flow paths.

**Question:** The current investigation did not find numbers as high as what was discovered in 2004?

**Answer:** No, the original Orange County Water District's (OCWD) results were lower than what we found during this investigation. However, the OCWD samples were collected from the outfall from the discharge, and as such, were significantly volatilized. The OCWD's results indicated that there was contamination, but they were not representative of the actual levels of contamination in the groundwater.

**Question:** Will the responsibility be placed on someone else? Put the monkey on someone else's back. You're starting in a good spot to do the follow up, but the question is who is going to pay for the follow up investigation?

**Answer:** The Navy met with regulators regarding the Potential Responsible Parties (PRPs) associated with this contamination. The regulators' position was that they have done due diligence regarding investigating if other parties were responsible for the contamination. The Navy was then put into a position where they needed to do their own investigation. With the results of this investigation, in combination with the litigation work, the Navy can now openly communicate with the regulators so that action can be taken. In addition, the Navy will use the latest data to do additional calculations and forensic work to attempt to narrow down the source of the contamination.

**Question:** What is the role of the OCWD?

**Answer:** They are the stakeholder because they are protecting the quality of the groundwater; the water is used as a regional drinking water source. In 2004 when the OCWD conducted the initial sampling, they informed the Navy immediately of the results so the Navy could shut down the well.

**Comment:** I have been on a similar situation. I had to show that someone else was responsible, and then was absolved and the other party had to pay for it.

**Response:** This is what we are hoping for. The geology is very complex. Hopefully this investigation will shed some light on this issue.

**Question:** Who would pay for additional investigations and actions?

**Answer:** This issue has been turned over to the Navy Litigation Office. We hope that the RQCWB will take on enforcement action with whoever they think is responsible. Foundationally, it's not the Navy's job to be the detective. Ultimately, the most cost-effective solution is for the right RP to be identified and for them to take control of their contamination. The Navy might not be the one to decide who the PRP is, and we don't know if there is a single PRP or multiple PRPs.

**Question:** How long will you continue to monitor? As a concerned citizen, I do not want the problem to be getting worse, or show that contaminant levels are increasing.

**Answer:** One more monitoring event is scheduled for December 2011. However, keep in mind that there do not appear to be complete pathways to receptors. There is not a drinking water well or connection with ecological receptors. Furthermore, the contaminants are above the drinking water aquifer, and the 30 feet of silts and clay above the contaminated groundwater would tend to inhibit vapor intrusion from occurring. In addition, the off-site releases identified have all had source removals completed on site. Right now there does not appear to be an imminent threat to human health or the environment. The current funding level only

allows for two rounds of sampling. However, if the second round shows something unexpected, the Navy will re-evaluate. It is always possible that other as yet unidentified sources may be identified through further investigation.

**Question:** Within a reasonable radius of the KAYO well, is there no way of knowing if everything else is clean? From the electronic records review maps have you found any active sites?

**Answer:** There are still active sites in the vicinity of the well, and not all cases have been closed. When contamination was first discovered at the KAYO-SB well, the previous RWQCB manager's position was that all sites to the east were fully delineated, and not extending outside their localized areas. However, this investigation shows that that this may not be the case. By demonstrating that contamination is migrating through the shallow layer (30-40 feet) from east to west, this investigation provides evidence that not all of the sites to the east are fully delineated.

*P. Tamashiro announced a 10 minute break.*

Upon return, P. Tamashiro announced that B. Reese would deliver the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSP) Presentation.

*B. Reese began with a review of the history and scope of the MRSP. She stated that she will be discussing results for UXO 1 and 6, but not the AOC, because it is not an official site as of yet. She reviewed the protocol structure, and modules and axis evaluated for each site. Finally, she discussed the combined module table and final MRS priority results which were as follows: UXO 01 = 3, UXO 06 = 3. Once a year, the Navy completes this entire process. This year the primary change was that priority for both sites at NAVWPSTA Seal Beach increased, primarily due to increased information on the presence of munitions at the two sites. Prior to the SI, it was only suspected that there were munitions at the site; however, following the SI, the Navy could confirm that there were munitions. Higher priority may accelerate funding to clean up the site.*

Questions and answers discussed during the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol Presentation are summarized below.

**Question:** UXO Site 1 is the settling pond?

**Answer:** UXO 1 is the Mitigation pond and UXO 6 is the deposit area. The two sites are very similar because material from pond digging was deposited at UXO 6.

**Question:** I notice that you only included the two UXO sites. What about the AOC?

**Answer:** The AOC will be added next year and will be officially entered into tracking system making it an official site. There is a separate approval

process to get a site added. Once the site is added it will officially become UXO 7. At the AOC there was enough evidence that the recommendation was to do further investigation, it is approximately 1,000 yards from IRP Site 74.

**Question:** Do the Navy or DOD publicize the results of the MRP?

**Answer:** One of the requirements of the MRP is to get stakeholder feedback. A list of sites may be compiled and published. If you have any comment on how numbers were determined please provide input.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Tamashiro announced that there are no upcoming reports in next few months. Additional sampling is scheduled to occur at Site 70 and 40, and 75, and then there will be a report issued for these sites. In addition, the 5-year review is estimated to come out in the next 6 months.

Finally, please be aware that subsequent RAB meeting times may change due to scheduling conflict with Council chambers.

#### ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:50 p.m.