

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
January 11, 2017

Participants:

Akkenapally, Sree/ECC-INSIGHT, LLC
Blake, Geoffrey/RAB Member
Caragan, Lynn/CB&I Federal Services (CB&I)
Cummings, Esther/Friends of Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)
Grinyer, Walt/Geosyntec Consultants
Kuebler, Bea/Community Member
Jordan, Jack/RAB Member
Li, Li/Orange County Water District
Masseti, Nick/RAB Member
Nye, Rick/US Fish and Wildlife Service; RAB Member
Pierce, Jim/ACTenviro
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Thorpe, Darwin/Community Member
Vance, Carolyn/Community Member
Walther, Leslie/CB&I Federal Services (CB&I)

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 said that there were three presentations this evening, the Project Highlights, the Budget Status, and a technical presentation on Site 70 by Sree Akkenapally from ECC-INSIGHT, LLC. P. Tamashiro then introduced Brenda Reese, RPM, to make the first two presentations.

B. Reese presented an update on site work on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) which consists of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions 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/Record of Decision*

- *Site 75, KAYO-SB Ag Well – Potential Navy Legal Investigation for Potentially Responsible Parties.*

B. Reese then briefly discussed the MRP sites status:

- *UXO 1 (Primer/Salvage Yard and POLB Mitigation Pond) – RI/FS and Removal Action*
- *UXO 6 (Westminster POLB Fill Area) – RI/FS*
- *AOC 2 (Explosives Drop Test Tower) – RI/FS*

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

Question: *For the drop tower you said at the last RAB meeting the documents would be ready in February, but they aren't ready yet. Why?*

Answer: *This has to do with the other sites and not wanting to piecemeal the investigations. UXO 6 drove the schedule, and the drop tower investigation is in the same contract*

Question: *What is UXO 6?*

Answer: *Site UXO 6 is area along Westminster Blvd. When negotiating with the agencies, DTSC disagreed on the sampling strategy, so we met and reached a consensus before moving forward. We are conscientious about spending taxpayers' money, so we needed to reach an agreement on the sampling strategies at all of the sites. In addition, each property has a different value and a different future land use plan. If it is unlikely to develop the property at a site, we may be able to just fence it off and walk away. Other properties may have commercial values, such as Site UXO 6. The property is flat and near major roads, Westminster and Seal Beach Blvd. From the Navy's position, it makes more sense to clean this site up to allow potential commercial or industrial development; therefore, the investigation needs to be more thorough. In addition, due to the changes in the sampling strategies, the Navy was required to modify the contract.*

Question: *What agency are you working with?*

Answer: *We work with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, with DTSC as the lead agency. We also work with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on protecting wildlife during field work.*

Question: *For IRP Site 74, initially you were going to scrape the land clean, but there has been such a problem at the landfill getting things to grow. Does the skeet range have more tidal influence? Salt infusion?*

Answer: *Site 74 is different than the landfill site at Site 7. At Site 74, one side of Case Rd is wetland, the other upland. The upland portion of Site 74 is not inundated as frequently as Site 7. Although the southern portion of the upland side of Site 74 does have the characteristic of a salt pan with very sparse vegetation.*

Question: *It still may be difficult to grow stuff. If any vegetation is left it is easier to grow than if scraped clean. Don't go deep.*

Answer: *It still might be difficult to replant. At another site we have saved vegetation and replanted it, and the result seemed to be better. For wetland restoration we would look into a seed bank. If lead is in the root system it may not work to replant the removed vegetation.*

Question: *You could use the landfill as a prediction of vegetation recovery at the skeet range. Is a cost estimate part of the EE/CA?*

Answer: *Yes, the cost estimate is in the Feasibility Study.*

Question: *So the idea isn't to scrape and see what happens?*

Answer: *No, a work plan will be developed before we start the remedial action activities.*

Question: *What about super-sucker use? Other vendors?*

Answer: *We have contacted several vendors, including the vendor recommended by the RAB, and none of them recommended the super-sucker for the wetlands environment at Site 74.*

Question: *We had used that at the Port.*

Comment: *At the former IRP Site 5, near Kitts Highway and Bolsa, which is similar to the wetland portion of IRP Site 74, a removal action was done there without re-vegetating the site.*

Answer: *Yes, the removal action at Site 5 was done in 2001. At that time John Bradley was the USFWS Refuge manager. He said to let it take its course. The site came back nicely by itself. At Site 7 the vegetation is needed to reduce erosion.*

Comment: *It has to do with the soils.*

Answer: *Experts said it was salt inundation that limited vegetation growth.*

Question: *Have you tried pickle weed?*

Comment: *They suck up salt water.*

Answer: *The large patches look ok then the next year they died out. It has not worked for us to forcefully plant vegetation at Site 7.*

Comment: *We have had success making islands of vegetation.*

Question: *What is DTSC?*

Answer: *It's the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the lead state agency for IRP work*

B. Reese continued with her next presentation, an overview of the Budget. There were no questions at the end of the briefing. B. Reese asked if anyone wanted a break or would like to go right into the technical meeting. All comments were to continue with the technical meeting.

Sree Akkenapally from ECC-INSIGHT, LLC made a technical presentation on the recent data from the Site 70 2016 Semi-Annual Performance monitoring activities.

Questions and answers discussed during the technical presentation are summarized below.

Question: *Regarding the source location, didn't you dig it clean before?*

Answer: *No, the purpose of the treatment is to remove contaminants in the groundwater. .*

Question: *Is the contamination in soil still leaching into the groundwater plume?*

Answer: *We have sampled at various locations, and unless you drill right at the source location, it is very difficult to find the source. Given the land use at the time no one would be exposed to the soil. So there was no further action required for the soil. Once it reaches groundwater, it becomes a problem. Groundwater remediation is what we are working on right now.*

Comment: *You would just dig it out if it was an underground storage tank (UST). At the airport the client blew through phase 2 to dig it out at 60 feet deep.*

Question: *Are you watching TCE in soil?*

Answer: *No.*

Comment: *It'll continue to leach. You will be in business for a while.*

Answer: *We are conducting additional investigation in an area in the sources area where groundwater flows in the opposite direction than the rest of the site. We used direct push method to well define the extent of the plume in this area. Permanent wells will be installed in this area.*

Question: *Is Site 40 done? Did you calculate the money spent vs cubic yards treated? Did you correlate pump and treat to compare with bioremediation?*

Answer: *The pump and treat option was in the Feasibility Study. Navy policy was to stay away from the pump and treat. The price comparisons were included in the Feasibility Study. The final cost will be calculated at the conclusion of the remedial action.*

Question: *Cost attenuates, the contamination will naturally degrade.*

Question: *Is there an update on the shooting range and what you found?*

Answer: *We did a pickup on Dec 28th and found 67 pieces. Based on the number of rounds fired, about 50,000 rounds, .13% of rounds came out. The majority of the rounds looked like they came from the shot gun range. Based on this, the range has been directed to limit the usage of the shotgun range. In the next few months, the range will switch the shot gun practice to the NRA and Bullseye ranges to see if the rounds leaving the range can be reduced. The facility is contacting the Army Corps to see if they have a solution. This is a common problem, but ours is unique due to the establishment of a refuge behind the range. This is a complicated problem as the range is critical for training sailors. We will continue to monitor and discuss this issue.*

Question: *Additional monitoring and then do you cleanup?*

Answer: *That is part of the discussions. Maybe we can mitigate the problem with a barrier or mitigate that portion of habitat with another – trade off.*

Comment: *Ok, keep us informed.*

Comments from the Navy Co-Chair: *The Community Co-Chair asked me to relay a message. He wished he could be here but had travel planned. He apologized and wished everyone a happy new year.*

Question: *Two buildings in the RT&E are gone. Regarding the building with the giant crane, will that building also come down? Will all the buildings in the area come down? When?*

Answer: *Part of the crane has been removed, and the area just in front of that building is no longer barricaded. That building is on demolition list, but the timeline will depend on the funding and contract. Not all buildings in that area will be demolished.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting will be a site tour in July of 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:30 p.m.

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