MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING
AND COMMUNITY SITE TOUR
July 10, 2013

Participants:

Bettencourt, Phillip/Community Member
Blake, Geoff/RAB Community Member
Gandara, Jose/RAB Community Member
Jordan, Jack/RAB Community Member
Lee, Larry/RAB Community Member
Lieberman, Tara/Richard Brady & Associated (Brady)
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Command Southwest
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Thorpe, Darwin/RAB Community Member
Wong, Bryant/KCH JV
Wiley, Jennifer/Boeing

WELCOME

Pei-Fen Tamashiro commenced the meeting at 6:00 pm at the Main Gate parking area of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. She welcomed all participants and handed out a base map. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves and to sign-in.

P. Tamashiro introduced Gregg Smith, the Public Affairs Officer for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

P. Tamashiro announced that the following sites would be visited during the site tour: Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Site 70, the Small Arms Range (SAR), Site 74, Site 7, and Site 75.

SITE TOUR

<u>SITE 70</u>

The facilities near IRP Site 70 were constructed and operated by North American Aviation under contract to National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) between 1962 and 1973. The facilities were used for the design and manufacture of the second stage of the launch vehicle for the Apollo moon rocket program. During that time, chlorinated solvents, primarily trichloroethene (TCE), used in the manufacturing process were released to the environment, resulting in groundwater contamination. The Navy selected in situ enhanced bioremediation, monitored natural attenuation, and land use control as the remedy for groundwater contamination at the site. During the 2008 baseline assessment the plume was approximately 3/4 of a mile long, and 175 -190 feet below ground surface. As of 2011, approximately 90% of the original TCE

contamination had been degraded to its daughter products: TCE has degraded to dichloroethene (DCE), which then degrades to vinyl chloride (VC), and eventually ethene, which has no negative health impacts. The groundwater that is impacted by the plume is not used for drinking water. The Navy is concerned with preventing the plume's migration to the Deep Sand aquifer which is used for drinking water.

The area that was used by NASA's former operations was designated a Historic District, and the Navy has not been allowed to alter any of the structures. The structures have been expensive to maintain and to update to current earthquake code. The Navy applied and received approval to delist this site. The plan is to gradually demolish the buildings that are obsolete and construct new buildings to meet the Navy's need in the future.

Questions and Answers discussed during the Site 70 site visit are summarized below:

Question: *Where are the nearest production wells and are they associated with the Orange County Water District (OCWD)?*

Answer: *(P. Tamashiro pointed out two wells on the base map, one adjacent to UXO 6 and one in the center of the base.) These wells are screened deeper than the contamination at IRP Site 70 and they are a great distance from the site. The OCWD is conducting a groundwater monitoring program. They are proposing to install wells at six additional locations on NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach in the near future in order to conduct a detailed study on sea water intrusion.*

Question: *Are there contaminants other than TCE that are of concern?*

Answer: *Several studies were conducted in the area to evaluate contaminants in the soil and groundwater. The studies looked into metals and other organic compounds. It was concluded that TCE in groundwater was the only concern. However, during the remediation, the daughter products of TCE will also be monitored closely.*

Question: *Are you concerned about asbestos and PCBs?*

Answer: *Asbestos and lead paint debris will be monitored and properly disposed of during the demolition process.*

Question: *Is the Navy pursuing a Potential Responsible Party (PRP) to pay for the cleanup?*

Answer: *Yes, Navy Litigation Office is seeking reimbursement.*

Question: *What other activities are occurring in the buildings?*

Answer: *The other buildings are used for small offices. There are no major operations or industrial activities taking place.*

Question: *Is Building 121 part of the historic district?*

Answer: *Yes, there has been no major construction since the 1960s.*

SMALL ARMS RANGE (SAR)

The SAR is divided into three sections. Railroad ties installed at the base of the berm prevent the slope from eroding. Runoff is collected by the drainage material behind the railroad ties, and funneled into an evaporation pond where the water is evaporated. The dirt accumulated at the bottom of the pond can then be returned back to the berm for reuse. The target retrieval system was broken, and close distance shooting caused railroad ties to degrade and scatter drainage material all over the top of the berm. This material then became a source of ricochet. New funding is in place to clean up the range, replace the railroad ties, sand bags, and install foam blocks in front of the ties to capture the bullets and lead shot. A new target retrieval system will also automatically adjust the target distance and reduce ricochet. Case Road will be cleared, and the Navy will conduct monitoring for ricochet for a two month period after the range is re-opened.

Questions and answers discussed at the SAR are summarized below.

Question: *Have there been any injuries at this site?*

Answer: *A local police department claimed that there was one incident of skin abrasion that occurred. The Navy is taking this very seriously.*

Question: *Are there water runoff issues?*

Answer: *Runoff is contained and handled on site. The drainage ponds have been covered to protect birds, and water infiltration is minimized as much as possible.*

Question: *Are the foam blocks made of recycled materials?*

Answer: *Yes, recycled rubber.*

Question: *How long has the range been closed for?*

Answer: *The range has been closed for several weeks during construction.*

SITE 74 – Skeet Range

Skeet shooting activities took place at Site 74 from the late 1960s to 1990s. Clay pigeons were shot at from different locations across the site. The site is located adjacent to the SAR, the wildlife refuge, and Case Road. The contaminants of concern identified include lead, antimony, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). A Feasibility Study is being worked on to evaluate remedial action alternatives for the site.

Questions and answers discussed at the SAR are summarized below.

Question: *Do the labs you use have a good method of practice?*

Answer: *Yes, the labs have all the required levels of quality assurance and quality control.*

Question: *Were you able to differentiate the ricochet from the SAR from the debris from the skeet range?*

Answer: *Yes, the bullets discovered along Case Road were larger. Some of them were flattened, and some looked like pebbles. The lead shots from the skeet range are much smaller.*

Question: *How was the area sampled, and to what depth?*

Answer: *The area was broken into a grid, and samples were collected above one foot. Collecting samples in a grid allowed us to determine lead shot distribution.*

Question: *Did you consider the use of a vacuum truck?*

Answer: *We talked to several vendors who recommended against the use of a vacuum truck due to the silt content in the sediment in the wetlands. They stated that the vacuum line would most likely get clogged and slow down the removal process.*

DROP TEST TOWER

The catwalk and stairs around the drop test tower were removed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The tower is part of a Munitions Response Program site. A remedial investigation will be conducted at this site once funding is in place in FY 2015/2016.

IR SITE 7

The 33 acre landfill was in operation from the mid 1950s to 1970s. A non-time critical removal action was conducted in 2004. After that, periodic inspections of the landfill cover, vegetation, and maintenance activities have been taking place at this site. Three landfill inspections have been done since January 2013, with a fourth to follow on July 18th. The landfill cover is intact and stable, and vegetation is slowly increasing in the western portion of the landfill. Maintenance of the jute mesh and straw wattles will occur on July 18th.

Questions and answers discussed at IR Site 7 are summarized below.

Question: *What type of wastes was buried at the landfill?*

Answer: *A large variety of wastes generated by NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach were disposed of at the landfill including paints, rags, batteries, construction debris, and domestic waste.*

Question: *Was groundwater monitoring conducted at the site?*

Answer: *Yes, groundwater monitoring was conducted for a long period of time, both before and after the removal action. This is one of the most studied IRP sites.*

Question: *What is the jute mesh made of?*

Answer: *The mesh is a biodegradable material composed of woven natural fibers.*

Question: *What plants were planted? Why didn't they survive?*

Answer: *Native, salt tolerant plants were planted in grids on the western portion of the landfill. These plants did not survive for a variety of reason: the western portion of the landfill is lower in elevation, the area is tidally influenced, and it is very difficult for small plants to survive in a very high salinity environment.*

SITE 75

In September 2004 the groundwater collected from an agricultural well, KAYO-SB, was found to be contaminated with chlorinated hydrocarbons. The access to this well was immediately terminated, and the well was subsequently decommissioned in November 2006. A total of ten groundwater monitoring wells were installed and sampled in 2011. Four of the wells were located along Bolsa Chica Road. Historic photos of the industrial park development to the east were also reviewed. Based on the groundwater testing results from these wells, the source of the contamination is most likely one or multiple commercial industrial sites located east of the station. In July 2012, DTSC and the RWQCB concurred with the PA/SI that summarized the investigation.

Questions and answers discussed at IR Site 75 are summarized below.

Question: *Do the businesses adjacent to the base have parts washers?*

Answer: *Records showed that several industrial operations adjacent to the base had historically used some of the contaminants of concern. The Navy is not in a position to identify a potential responsible party at this time.*

Question: *Was the creek always here (referring to the water way just east of the site)?*

Answer: *It is a flood control channel that was constructed in the 1970s. The storm water from industrial sites have been discharged into the flood control channel.*

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

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