

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
July 11, 2018

Participants:

Bettencourt, Philip/Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Community Co-Chair
Cummings, Esther/Friends of Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)
Downs-Heimes, Dana/CH2M-Jacobs (KCH)
Lessin, Mike/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Pierce, Jim/ACTenviro
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest
Shelton, Dennis/CH2M-Jacobs (KCH)
Siegal, Joan/AECOM
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, Naval Weapons Station (NAVWPNSTA) Seal Beach
Tamashiro, Pei- Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Vance, Carolyn/Friends of Seal Beach NWR

Welcome

Pei-Fen Tamashiro commenced the meeting at 6:00 pm at the City of Seal Beach Council Chambers by introducing Gregg Smith, the Public Affairs Officer for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and Phillip Bettencourt, the RAB Community Co-Chair. All other attendees were asked to introduce himself or herself. It was stated that Brenda Reese will give an update on the current Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) sites and Dana Downs-Heimes will give a technical presentation on the MRP sites.

Project Highlights Presentation

B. Reese presented the Project Highlights for the active IRP and MRP sites at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. The current status of the following IRP sites was discussed:

- Site 7, Station Landfill - Semiannual Landfill Cover Inspections and Maintenance.
- Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area – Remedial Action Operation.
- Site 74, Former Skeet Range – Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Record of Decision.
- Site 75, KAYO-SB Agriculture Well – Potential Navy Legal Investigation for Potentially Responsible Parties.

The current status of the following MRP sites was discussed:

- UXO 1 (Primer/Salvage Yard and Port of Long Beach (POLB) Mitigation Pond) – Remedial Investigation

- UXO 6 (Westminster POLB Fill Area) – Remedial Investigation
- AOC 2 (Explosives Drop Test Tower) – Remedial Investigation

Questions and answers discussed during the Project Highlights presentation are summarized below:

Site 75

Question: For the Westminster Site (Site 75), will legal be reviewing? Also for Site 70, will legal review?

Answer: Yes. The Navy has identified a few potential responsible parties. The Navy’s legal team is preparing to contact these companies to discuss the Navy’s findings. We know the government’s legal battles could go on for a long time. We will keep you posted for the outcome of the discussions.

Question: For the well site, are DTSC and the Water Board in the process to detect the responsible parties?

Answer: Three potential responsible parties have been identified by the Navy among multiple industrial sites. This was mainly based on chemicals usage and groundwater flow directions. All three sites have had some sort of investigation and/or remediation, and free product was recently found at one of the sites. These are existing sites that are under the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s oversight.

Site 74

Question: As there are still Feasibility Study comments provided by California Department of Fish and Wildlife that still need to be resolved, did the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also review the Feasibility Study?

Answer: Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did review the Feasibility Study. There are no outstanding issues associated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Project Highlights Presentation concluded.

Technical Presentation

B. Reese introduced D. Downs-Heimes. D. Downs-Heimes presented the preliminary results of Digital Geophysical Mapping, UXO clearance, soil/sediment/water sampling, and Risk Assessment at UXO 1, UXO 6, and AOC 2.

Questions and answers discussed during the presentation are summarized below:

UXO 1

Question: Were batteries or transformers found out there?

Answer: The historical record indicates there may be batteries or transformers at the site, but we didn't find any of these items.

Question: Do you have a protocol if these are found?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How long is each of the munitions items found submerged in the pond?

Answer: About 12 inches.

Question: Were there very few items detected by the Digital Geophysical Mapping in the southern portion of the 7th Street Pond?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Were all items found on the islands removed?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What ponds were sampled to characterize the background condition of 7th Street Pond?

Answer: The ponds used to characterize the background condition for 7th Street Pond are the ponds located along Case Road and Forrestal Road. Both are located north of 7th Street Pond.

Question: Were chemical weapons included as part of the investigation?

Answer: The base has never stored chemical weapons, as the base does not have the facilities to handle them.

Question: What animals did the ecological risk assessment include?

Answer: We used bird species, such as American robin (invertebrate), red tail hawk (carnivore), and mourning dove (herbivore), and mammals, such as grey fox, California mole, and deer mouse.

Question: Why don't you look at birds and mammals specific to the Station? We don't have robins, and we have coyotes.

Answer: These receptors are considered representative of their feeding guild. There is good data on soil ingestion by earthworms, so they are considered a general receptor across the USA. They are standard. We can apply this to things that probe in ground. Their models are considered a more conservative exposure.

AOC 2

Question: When is the tower coming down?

Answer: There is currently no funding for this task.

Question: Will the Navy pay for the demotion of the tower?

Answer: It is low priority on the funding list. I understand the U.S. Fish and Wildlife is also looking for funding to pay for the tower removal.

Question: If I go out to look for carcasses is there a problem? Is there a risk?

Answer: It is not a closed site yet, access to the site is still restricted. Although the surface has been cleared, we still need to formally document the proper land use control to allow for access to the site.

Question: We shouldn't include it on trash pickup?

Answer: Not at this time.

General Questions

Question: Will the fence around the terrestrial portion of Site UXO1 still stay up?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What about the plants north of the fenced area that were ripped up?

Answer: They were just mowed to allow the geophysical surveys. They are coming back. The roots are still there. Revegetation is not allowed in this area due to the presence of buried objects.

Question: Is the eelgrass in 7th Street Pond ok?

Answer: Yes, there are more eelgrass beds now than before the commencement of the investigation in the pond.

Question: For the larger area in Site UXO6; will it likely be an agricultural area or flow into Naval operations?

Answer: Although the surface of Site UXO 6 has been cleared, there are still buried anomalies. It won't be open to agriculture. If the Navy wants to develop any portion of this site, a significant amount of safety measures will be put in place during construction.

Technical Presentation concluded

General Questions/Comments

P. Tamashiro announced that the road going through the Research, Testing, and Evaluation (RT&E), where IRP Site 70 is located, was being repaired. The contractor was required to monitor for methane gas when excavating near the source area of IRP Site 70. So far, methane gas has not been detected. The repair work should be completed around mid-July.

Question: Are the buildings in the RT&E Area going to be removed?

Answer: Yes, the planning is in process. We anticipate the demolition to start in early 2019.

Question: Including the one with the crane on top?

Answer: Yes, including that one. It is a design/build contract, and it will be done safely.

Question: Have you received comments on the MRP sites?

Answer: The Navy has not issued the draft remedial investigation report for the MRP sites yet. When the report is issued, we will ask the community members and regulators for their review and comments of the report.

P. Tamashiro announced that the RAB meeting minutes will be posted on the Station's website after the meeting. It will still be sent out with the notification of next RAB meeting, just like how it has been done currently.

Adjournment

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting will be in January 2019. The July 2019 meeting will include a short meeting and a tour of the IRP/MRP sites. P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at 7:45 pm.

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