

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
January 8, 2014

Participants:

Basham, Jim/City of Seal Beach

Chen, Will/City of Seal Beach

Cummings, Esther/Friends of Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (SBNWR)

Cutler, Mark/Tetra Tech EC

Faherty, Ryan/Richard Brady and Associates (BRADY)

Gandara, Jose/Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Member

Jordan, Jack/RAB Member

Landarazo, Crystal/City of Seal Beach

Lee, Larry/RAB Member

Li, Li/Orange County Water District

*Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest (NAVFAC SW)*

Shields, Tim/BRADY

Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, Naval Weapons Station (NAVWPNSTA) Seal Beach

Vesely, Gene/RAB Member

Wong, Bryant/CH2M Hill

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 announced that two presentations will be given tonight: An overview of the Project Highlights for the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) by Brenda Reese, RPM; and a technical presentation on the status of the groundwater remedial action at IRP Site 70 by Mark Cutler of Tetra Tech EC.

B. Reese began the project highlights portion of the presentation by acknowledging the Navy team members, regulatory agencies, and contractors. She provided background on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), reviewed IRP and MRP sites status at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, and identified sites on the base map. She briefly reviewed back ground and current status of open IRP sites including: Site 7 Station Landfill; Site 40, Concrete Pit/Gravel Area; Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area; Site 74, Former Skeet Range; Site 75, KAYO SB Ag Well; UST 7 (Bldg. 229) Former UST Site; and UST 8 (Bldg. 500) Former UST Site. She announced that UST 229 has been closed since the last RAB meeting. She concluded by briefly discussing the MRP site statuses.

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

Question: *Is the Site 7 vegetation pickle weed?*

Answer: *Majority of them are, but not all. Many invasive species are present.*

Question: *How many invasive species?*

Answer: *We don't have a count for that.*

Question: *Has a botanist been able to identify the indigenous species?*

Answer: *No, but there are known indigenous species.*

Question: *Is the lack of rain becoming an issue?*

Answer: *Yes, the lack of rain increases the salinity at the site.*

Question: *Is it feasible to selectively extract shot from Site 74?*

Answer: *Residual shot would not be able to be seen easily*

Question: *Are you continuing to monitor metals behind the shooting range?*

Answer: *Yes, we are continuing to monitor the ricochets behind the range. This is a hot topic for the command. Many agencies, including local law enforcement agencies, and state and federal agencies use the range. It is also critical for the Navy to train and certify their personnel at this range. We realize that the ricochet issue is a huge concern. We have tried different approaches to control the ricochets and are continuing to monitor the range. We are looking into doing additional work to control the ricochets. The problem is that we only have very limited funding at this time.*

Question: *How is the volume of material now compared to in past?*

Answer: *We are seeing the percentage of ricochets increased, but the type of ricochet changed. The number of larger slug rounds leaving the range has decreased.*

Question: *Whose responsibility is it to upgrade the range?*

Answer: *The Facilities, or Public Works, Department is responsible for the facility upgrade.*

Question: *Is Case Road currently closed?*

Answer: *Yes, it is closed all the time.*

Question: *What kind of material was being used at the range?*

Answer: *Lead bullet with copper coating.*

Question: *Do we have more dying geese?*

Answer: *No.*

Question: *Is the range still in use?*

Answer: *Yes*

Question: *Is responsibility for the range subcontracted by the Navy?*

Answer: *No, it is operated by Navy personnel. However, some other agencies are allowed to use the range.*

P. Tamashiro introduced M. Cutler of Tetra Tech EC to deliver the technical presentation on the status of IRP Site 70.

Question: *Enhanced In-Situ Bioremediation (EISB): is the microbe naturally occurring?*

Answer: *Yes.*

Question: *EISB Implementation: Were you pumping the water out as part of the injection process?*

Answer: *Yes, the water used for the injection was extracted from adjacent injection wells. This method prevented groundwater mounding. Groundwater mounding could cause contaminated groundwater to move outward, thus spreading the contamination.*

Question: *How would you judge the actual rate of degradation with the anticipated rate of degradation?*

Answer: *The current rate of degradation in TCE concentrations is in line with our expectations. This is reflected by the consumption of emulsified vegetable oil (EVO). It was estimated that the EVO would need to be replenished every 3 to 5 years. The reinjection of EVO in 2013 was in line with this estimate.*

Question: *Last Monday was the end of the injections. Did you mean EVO? And did you mean that was the end of the 16 years of active treatment?*

Answer: *Yes, we completed the re-injection of EVO last Monday, and no, the 16 years of remedial program is not completed. We are now about 5 years into the projected 16-year program.*

Question: *Is this plume one of the biggest plumes?*

Answer: *For this base, yes. It is one of the largest biobarrier type of bioremediation project in the nation.*

Question: *Will the EVO sludge you found in one of the well casings have a long term effect?*

Answer: *It is not expected to have a long term effect. It did not appear to be biofouling of the one well screen, which would have been a problem. It was thought to be old, polymerized EVO that we were able to physically break through.*

Question: *Does EVO stay in pipe after injection?*

Answer: *No, EVO was pushed into the formation after the injection.*

Question: *Why didn't EVO get injected out of well?*

Answer: *Most of the EVO did get injected out of the well, but apparently a small amount of residue remained after the initial injection, and it polymerized over time. Also, some formations areas are less permeable than others. Injection response is dependent on geological formation.*

Question: *In the three wells with clogging, what was the depth of plume?*

Answer: *Screen bottom was around 110-120 feet*

Question: *Are there any stakeholders involved here tonight?*

Answer: *Representatives from Friends of the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge, City of Seal Beach, and Orange County Water District are here tonight.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Tamashiro made a special presentation commemorating the service of Jack Jordan as the former RAB co-chair.

P. Tamashiro announced the next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 16th. (Due to project schedule, the RAB meeting was not held in April 2014.)

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:50 p.m.

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