

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers  
January 9, 2013

*Participants:*

*George, Chris/Richard Brady and Associates (Brady)*  
*Hamparsanian, Hamlet/Parsons*  
*Lee, Larry/RAB Community Member*  
*Lieberman, Tara/Brady*  
*Marroquin, Roy/Community Member*  
*Niou, Stephen/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)*  
*Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Southwest*  
*Shields, Timothy/Brady*  
*Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach*  
*Stillman, Glenn/RAB Community Member*  
*Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach*  
*Vesely, R. Gene/RAB Community Member*  
*Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL Kleinfelder, a Joint Venture*

*WELCOME*

Pei-Fen 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.

P. Tamashiro announced that three presentations will be given tonight: An overview of the Project Highlights for the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP); and an update on the Budget Status by Brenda Reese, RPM; and a presentation on the Work Plan for Site Characterization at Building 500 by Timothy Shields of Richard Brady and Associates (Brady).

*B. Reese announced that her presentation would be two parts. She began the project highlights portion of the presentation by acknowledging the Navy team members, regulatory agencies, and contractors. She provided background on the DERP, reviewed IRP and MRP Sites Status at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, and identified sites on base map. Briefly reviewed background and current status of open IR Sites including: 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 Ag Well; UST 7 (Bldg. 229)- Former UST Site; and UST 8 (Bldg. 500) – Former UST Site. She*

*concluded by briefly discussing the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection and Site Inspection statuses. She began the budget status portion of the presentation by reviewing the IRP/MRP Project costs for Fiscal Year (FY) 12, identifying the projects that received funding. Then presented the budget projection for FY 13, and identified the projects that will receive funding. B. Reese concluded with a chart depicting the budget projection for FY 13-25.*

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

**Question:** *Did you add fertilizer to the soil at the Site 7 landfill?*

**Answer:** *No fertilizer was used at Site 7. The Navy conducted seeding, and planted small plants on site approximately 1.5 years ago. The vegetation across the site is slowly expanding. It is not currently where we want it to be due to difficulties associated with the tidal influence and soil salinity. Monitoring will continue to ensure that there is no erosion and the landfill cap remains in place.*

**Question:** *What are you doing to pin-point the source at Site 75? What regulatory agencies are you working with?*

**Answer:** *The Navy is working with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). They are the lead regulatory agency for the site, and it is their responsibility to monitor and regulate the contamination that is present in the groundwater. Prior to the field investigation the Navy collected information on all previous investigations that were conducted within a 1 mile radius of the site. The Navy cannot disclose the names of the possible Potential Responsible Parties (PRP) at this time; Navy Legal must first authorize the release of this information. The Navy will coordinate with the RWQCB and approach the PRPs to address the issue. There is potentially more than one source, as there are several industrial sites located to the east of the site, and it has been difficult to specifically identify a source due to the presence of drainage ditches and sewer lines. An additional investigation may be performed, but further discussion between the RWQCB, Navy Legal, and PRPs must first occur. Furthermore, the time line for any potential future investigation is dependent on these discussions.*

**Question:** *At Site 75, was contamination only detected in the water? Or was it detected in soil as well?*

**Answer:** *From the site investigation it was clear that contamination is only present in the groundwater and not in the soil above the groundwater.*

**Question:** *Were these results consistent through the multiple rounds of sampling conducted at Site 75?*

**Answer:** *Yes, the results of the various rounds of sampling were consistent.*

**Question:** *Is the area adjacent to Site 75 still being used agriculturally?*

**Answer:** *Yes, the area is being used for agriculture, but the well is not in use.*

**Question:** *At Site 70, will the Navy inject EVO into all of the wells or only into select wells?*

**Answer:** *An optimization study will be conducted to determine which wells are depleted, and to identify the bio-barriers that will require additional injections. Once the studies have been conducted, an injection strategy will be presented at the RAB.*

P. Tamashiro introduced T. Shields of Brady to deliver the technical presentation on the Work Plan for Site Characterization for Petroleum Contamination at the Former Building 500 UST Site, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, CA.

*T. Shields began the presentation by introducing the site, showing the site location on a map, and discussing the environmental setting and site history. He then reviewed the conceptual site model and planned Site Characterization and Analysis Penetrometer System (SCAPS) Investigation. Next he presented a brief overview of the SCAPS history and technology, including the direct push technology, cone penetrometer test, laser-induced fluorescence, data interpretation, and confirmation sampling. T. Shields concluded by reviewing the planned SCAPS investigation and investigation schedule.*

Questions and answers discussed during the Work Plan Presentation are summarized below.

**Question:** *Is parts per million (ppm) the same as mg/kg?*

**Answer:** *Yes.*

**Question:** *Was the percentage of fuel in the sample calculated by weight or volume?*

**Answer:** *I am not certain as this specific sample was collected for a previous investigation. It was reported by weight, as it was reported in mg/kg.*

**Question:** *Is the SCAPS technology usable to detect other contaminants?*

**Answer:** *Yes, it is also used to detect the presence of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in conjunction with an ion-trap mass spectrometer. The SCAPS technology was not utilized at Site 75 due to the particular geology involved.*

**Question:** *Why was the data not validated?*

**Answer:** *Third party validation is not a requirement for all sites, and it was not a requirement for UST closure under the UST program. Third Party validation is a requirement for all sites identified under CERCLA.*

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

*The following documents are available on the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Website:*

*Draft Work Plan for Site Characterization for Petroleum Contamination at the Building 500 Former UST Site.*

G. Smith announced that the Navy is transitioning to a new website system. The new system will be live at the end of January. If you experience any issues with accessing the documents in the reading room, please contact P. Tamashiro or G. Smith.

P. Tamashiro announced an update to the Bullet Shot Incident reported during the October 2012 RAB Meeting.

*Additional monitoring was conducted along Case Road two months after the initial September 2012 investigation. 76 spent bullets were observed on the road surface, but most of the observed bullets were deformed suggesting that they are ricochet from the Small Arms Range. Based on the recommendations of the NAVFAC SW Range Engineer, the range has discontinued the use of spinning targets, and amended the backstop of the berm to reduce the potential for ricochet. The Navy is pushing for additional funding to conduct a long-term renovation to incorporate modern bullet traps into the backside of the Small Arms Range.*

Questions and answers discussed during the Incident Discussion are summarized below.

**Question:** *Where is the shooter and in what directions do the rounds go? Is the road open for use?*

**Answer:** *The shooters shoot at the southwest direction. Case Road is currently closed due to the ricochet issue.*

P. Tamashiro announced that Jack Jordan will be stepping down from his current role as the RAB Co-Chair. If any of the RAB members is interested in the RAB community co-chair position, please contact P. Tamashiro by the end of March. An election will be held at the April 2013 RAB meeting, and all candidates are asked to present a brief presentation detailing why they are interested in serving as the co-chair.

## ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:10 p.m.

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