

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
January 13, 2016

Participants:

Bettencourt, Philip/Community Member

Blake, Geoffrey/RAB Member

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

DeMetropolis, George/CH2M Hill Kleinfelder a Joint Venture (KCH)

Gauthier, Marilyn/KCH

Gomez, Eloy/Community Member

Grinyer, Walt/Geosyntec Consultants

Heimes, Dana/KCH

Landavaro, Crystal/City of Seal Beach Planner

Jordan, Jack/RAB Member

Lee, Larry/RAB Member

Niou, Stephen/California Department of Toxic Substances Control

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

Shields, Tim/Richard Brady and Associates (BRADY)

Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach

Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach

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 then introduced Brenda Reese, RPM, to present an overview of the Project Highlights.

Brenda Reese presented an update on site work on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) which consists of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munition Response Program (MRP). The current status of the sites was discussed in detail by B. Reese:

- *Site 7, Station Landfill – Semiannual Landfill Cover Inspections and Maintenance*
- *Site 40, Concrete Pit/Gravel Area – Annual Long Term Monitoring*
- *Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation – Remedial Action Operating*
- *Site 74, Skeet Range – Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan*
- *Site 75, KAYO-SB Ag Well – Navy Legal Investigation for Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs).*

She concluded by briefly discussing the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection and Site Inspection statuses.

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

Question: *At IRP Site 74, there was a problem before with lead on road behind the range. The range has recently been rebuilt. Are there any updates regarding the lead problem?*

Answer: *The renovations were finished last August. The use of the range and the types of rounds used were examined, and the range is now limited to Navy use with specific types of ammos. A visual inspection was performed along the road about 3-4 months after use of the range resumed. The inspection found one piece of the new bullets that are being used, as opposed to 300 – 400 pieces found before renovation. The range was then inspected and it was suspected that the bullet hit a steel bean that has a very low probability of being hit during training at the range.*

Question: *Is there a plan in the future to expand the number of agencies and type of weapons used?*

Answer: *There is currently no plan at this time to expand the use of the range beyond Navy use.*

Question: *IRP Site 75 is under Navy Legal review. Can the same thing be said for IRP Site 70?*

Answer: *Yes, IRP Site 70 is also under legal review and is further along in the review process.*

Question: *Has the offsite boundary of IRP Site 75 been identified?*

Answer: *No. The Navy has demonstrated that it is not a Navy source, but will not expend Navy resources to do further investigation to delineate the offsite plume. There are several potential sources offsite. The Navy would like to work together with offsite PRPs to do further investigations.*

Question: *There has been a Phase I investigation done – but has the PRP been identified?*

Answer: *Records reviews such as those done in a Phase I investigation were done. There are several PRPs, it is not completely clear which one is the Responsible Party. We are working with the water board to identify the Responsible Party.*

Question: *Did they dig out the hot spot at IRP Site 70?*

Answer: *There was no hot spot, the impact was only to groundwater. There is an inferred source area, but no free product was found. The release probably happened in the 1960s and 1970s, and the source has since gone completely into groundwater.*

Question: *Did the leak come from a degreasing pit?*

Answer: *That is unknown. The release may have been simply due to the practices at the time, which were not regulated as strictly as now. It also may have been due to a leaking pipe, or similar situation.*

P. Tamashiro thanked the community members and said the Navy will continue to report out to the community and keep them posted. P. Tamashiro then introduced B. Reese, RPM, to present an overview of the Budget.

The total environmental restoration costs for fiscal year 2015 were \$230, 000, which were all associated with the IRP program. Budget projections for fiscal year 2016 are \$1.14 million.

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

Question: *Looking ahead to 2019 at IRP Site 74, if it is found that the work at the range has stopped the lead, will the restoration work be accelerated? And where does the money come from?*

Answer: *We go through a budgeting process and submit the budget to the headquarters for review. This is one of the biggest Navy environmental projects in the southwest. We have fought hard to keep it in fiscal year 2019 and not have it get pushed further into the future, and so far we have been successful. It is very difficult to have projects moved earlier, so that is not likely. Also, the Proposed Plan and Record of Decision process takes time, so fiscal year 2019 is a good place in the overall timeline.*

Question: *Also, the best technique has not been identified yet.*

Answer: *Yes, the selection process will continue after the Proposed Plan is released.*

Dana Heimes of KCH presented an update on the planned remedial investigation (RI) for MRP Sites UXO1, UXO6, and AOC2. The presentation covered the history of the sites, the results of previous investigations, the proposed RI activities, safety measures, and project status and schedule. UXO1 is the Primer/Salvage Yard and Port of Long Beach (POLB) Mitigation Pond. UXO6 is the Westminster POLB Fill Area. AOC2 is the Explosives Drop Test Tower. The goal of the RI is to characterize the nature and extent of munitions and munitions constituents.

Questions and answers discussed during the planned RI for MRP Sites UXO1, UXO6, and AOC2 presentation are summarized below.

Question: *These munitions are not expected to be radioactive or to discharge gases?*

Answer: *Correct, they are conventional weapons, with no radiation or gases involved.*

Question: *Could these have come from non-US ships?*

Answer: *That is highly unlikely. There is typically only one non-US ship every 3 to 4 years, and they only come to pick up weapons, not to leave weapons.*

Question: *None of these materials would have come from the SALT II burning ground?*

Answer: *These sites were not burning grounds or related to those kinds of activities.*

Question: *There is a berm along Westminster Avenue. Is that part of the site?*

Answer: *No, the fill is behind the berm, not between the berm and Westminster Avenue. The MRP site soils filled in the low areas.*

Question: *It was mentioned that dragging of geophysical equipment would be part of the process. Dragging could disrupt the eelgrass.*

Answer: *The survey will not involve dragging along the bottom, but rather having a boat drag an instrument behind it. The instrument is suspended above the bottom and towed behind the boat.*

Question: *Is there any chance that the drop test tower could be removed as part of this process?*

Answer: *That will be a separate project, not part of this investigation. This project must be completed first.*

Question: *We would like that tower to come down if at all possible.*

Answer: *Thank you for your input, your comment is noted.*

Question: *The back corner of the pond is round, but was designed to be squared. Be aware that flotsam and jetsam accumulate in this area. You will likely find debris and trash.*

Answer: *Thank you for that information.*

Question: *You mentioned that there will be divers. Will the diving happen when sea turtles are in the area?*

Answer: *No, it will be planned to avoid encountering sea turtles.*

Question: *Why was the soil not screened and cleaned when it was moved to UXO6?*

Answer: *The soil was moved in the 1990s and only visually screened. In the beginning, nothing was seen; but later, munitions were found. Based on the initial screening information at that time, nothing was expected.*

Question: *If munitions did not detonate when they were excavated and moved to UXO6, what are the chances that they would detonate now?*

Answer: *Since it has been moved once, the likelihood of it detonating is low. However, it cannot be 100% ruled out. We still need to put in precautionary safety measures to protect the workers and Navy's property. Any munitions found at UXO6 would most likely be removed from the site during the investigation.*

Question: *One large section at UXO1 is fenced off near the end of the pond. Will the fences be coming down once this area has been deemed cleared?*

Answer: *That will be a decision by NAVWPNSTA Facilities. Historically, this was fenced because it was a salvage yard. The fences were left up to restrict access to the area.*

Question: *Will this area be redeveloped?*

Answer: *Probably not, due to its proximity to the wetland as well as ongoing munitions operations.*

Question: *Why is perchlorate a concern?*

Answer: *Perchlorate is a common component of solid rocket propellant.*

Question: *Does it cause cancer?*

Answer: *No, it affects the thyroid function. It is also naturally occurring. It is a concern only if it exceeds a certain level.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting will likely be in July of 2016. The next site tour will be scheduled in July of 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:25 p.m.

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