

---

MINUTES  
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA), SEAL BEACH RESTORATION  
ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
March 8, 2000

Participants:

Baghdikian, Serge / Bechtel National, Inc.  
Bettencount, Philip  
Clarke, Dean / Orange County Health Care Agency  
Dick, Andrew / Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Eells, Brenda / CH2M HILL  
Hannon, Patricia / Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (RWQCB)  
Jordan, Jack  
Lamond, Robert  
Leibel, Katherine / Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
Monroe, Bruce  
Nguyen, Quang / Orange County Health Care Agency  
Peoples, J.P.  
Reynolds, Ken / SWDIV  
Schilling, Bob/Bechtel National, Inc.  
Schmitt, Mike  
Smith, Gregg / NAVPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer  
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and Navy Co-chair  
Vesely, R. Gene  
Voce, Mario / Community Co-chair  
Willhite, Lindi  
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:05 p.m., M. Voce, Community Co-chair, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the meeting and reminded members that this was his last RAB meeting as Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro also welcomed the participants to the RAB meeting and introduced herself as the Navy Co-chair and base Installation Restoration Program (IRP) coordinator. P. Tamashiro also introduced G. Smith/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO). P. Tamashiro reminded RAB members that they would be electing a new Community Co-chair and asked members to consider whether they would like to volunteer for the position or nominate someone for the position and to let her know during the break.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

P. Tamashiro introduced A. Dick, Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV, who provided the RAB with an overview of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach's IRP projects status. In addition, he included a brief overview of "Where Do We Go From Here?" as a follow-up

---

to his discussion of “Where Are We Going?” from the January 12, 2000 RAB meeting. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made following the presentation are summarized below:

**Question:** Regarding delays at Site 7, is there a protocol for resolving interagency conflicts?

**Answer:** There is not an interagency conflict. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) expressed its comments and concerns as part of the normal review process and DTSC supported those concerns. The Navy has delayed the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memo/RAP until the Navy can address those aquatic ecological concerns in Perimeter Pond next to Site 7.

**Question:** Is there funding to do the additional work at Site 7 to keep on-schedule?

**Answer:** Yes, the Site 7 aquatic ecological risk study is funded. Depending on the findings of this study, the degree of remediation will be better defined. Level of funding for the remediation depends on the degree of remediation required.

**Question:** Regarding the Site 70 plume, there is a proposed well at the northwest corner of the base’s perimeter fence along Seal Beach Boulevard. Is the Navy concerned only about the contaminant plume within Navy property or is the Navy also concerned about contaminants outside the boundaries of the base?

**Answer:** The Navy is concerned about the possibility of offsite migration of contaminants as well as the contamination within the base. The Navy sampled and tested groundwater samples collected just inside the base’s perimeter line, and the results were non-detectable or below levels of concern.

**Question:** How would asphaltting Perimeter Road affect the removal action for Site 4?

**Answer:** Asphaltting the road provides short-term benefits of reducing dust generation from the Perimeter Road and preventing the fragmentation of the existing pavement. It would probably not interfere with whatever ultimate removal action that is ultimately carried out at the site.

**Question:** How long has the Navy been studying the underground storage tank (UST) site (Site 14)?

**Answer:** Studies began at the UST site as early as 1986.

**Question:** Why have studies been going on for so long?

**Answer:** There was an interagency agreement to support research at this site. As part of the agreement, the enforcement agencies agreed that no cleanup and abatement orders would be issued while this research was being conducted. Once research is complete, however; cleanup would resume in earnest.

---

## SITES 4, 5, AND 6 REMOVAL SITE EVALUATION

P. Tamashiro introduced S. Baghdikian, the Sites 4, 5, and 6 Task Manager from Bechtel National, Inc., who provided the RAB with a presentation of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the removal site evaluation (RSE) for IRP Sites 4, 5, and 6. S. Baghdikian discussed the background and previous investigations at the sites, RSE objectives, field investigations, and data evaluations. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during and following the presentation are summarized below:

### Slide 20 – Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (IRP Site 4 – AOPC 1A)

**Question:** Regarding your recommendation for further evaluation to refine the ecological risk assessment, why not simply initiate a removal action if elevated levels of lead were found? Why would you study more?

**Answer:** The elevated levels of lead were found using an initial screening risk assessment, which uses very conservative assumptions. A refined assessment is required to determine if concentrations are high enough to be considered a risk and therefore require removal.

**Question:** Why not do a refined assessment first and avoid having to do two assessments?

**Answer:** If an initial screening risk assessment using conservative evaluation criteria shows the site to be safe, then the Navy saves money by not having to do the more detailed, refined risk assessment.

**Question:** Will the cost of the refined risk assessment be more or less than the RSE?

**Answer:** The refined risk assessment is less expensive because the site is already characterized and no additional field sampling and laboratory analysis are required. The refined risk assessment primarily consists of a review of the literature and re-assessment of the risk based on more realistic assumptions.

### Slide 21 – Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (IRP Site 4 – AOPC 2A)

**Question:** What is Aroclor 1254?

**Answer:** It is a type of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB).

**Question:** Is AOPC 2A 100 feet from Perimeter Road?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question:** Was marine life, such as mussels, sampled at AOPC 2A?

**Answer:** Marine life was not sampled at AOPC 2A, only groundwater.

---

Slide 25 – Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (IRP Site 5)

**Question:** How did you survey for unexploded ordnance (UXO)?

**Answer:** A magnetometer equipped with computer analysis was used to identify potential areas (anomalies) with UXO. These anomalies were then excavated to confirm whether UXO was present.

**Question:** How did UXO get out to Site 5?

**Answer:** Site 5 has been historically used as a dump area. As part of the early stages of Site 5 as an IRP site, the possibility of dumping spent and possibly live shells was identified. The Navy takes the possibility of UXO presence very seriously. Based on all the investigations that have taken place at Site 5, only spent shells and corroded shell casings have been found.

Slide 27 – Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (IRP Site 6 – AOPC 2)

**Question:** What is the source of ammonia at Site 6 – AOPC 2?

**Answer:** The source of ammonia has not been definitely determined. It could come from any number of nitrogen sources, such as degraded explosives or fertilizer, since Site 6 had a historical use as an agricultural field.

**Question:** Regarding Site 4, has there been any attempt to protect farmer's crops from runoff from the road?

**Answer:** At AOPC's 1 and 2, the fields are either at a higher elevation than the road or the same elevation as the road, so it is not likely that there will be runoff from the road into the fields. At the other AOPC's, the farmland extends to the road.

**Question:** Did the ecological risk assessment look at impacts to crops?

**Answer:** The ecological risk assessment did not include crops.

COMMUNITY FORUM

M. Voce announced that the RAB traditionally has a site tour in June and asked if RAB members were interested in scheduling a site tour for June 2000. Most RAB members expressed interest in attending a site tour, so the Navy will schedule a site tour for June 14, 2000 starting at 6 p.m. M. Voce also announced that there will be no RAB meeting in April, so the next RAB meeting will be May 10, 2000.

A RAB member stated that he would like to begin each RAB meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance, if there were no objections from other RAB members. There were no objections.

---

P. Tamashiro announced that J. Peoples had volunteered to become the RAB Community Co-chair and L. Willhite had been nominated by M. Voce to become the RAB Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro asked if there were any other volunteers or nominations. B. Monroe was nominated, but respectfully declined due to schedule conflicts. J. Peoples and L. Willhite both provided personal statements.

P. Tamashiro distributed ballots to RAB members for voting. While members were voting, M. Voce provided a brief description of the time commitment required of the Community Co-chair. He stated that, in addition to the RAB meetings, he typically attends the dry-run presentation and monthly project managers meeting both held on the afternoon preceding the RAB meeting, and attends other community meetings as a representative of the RAB. The Community Co-chair also receives the full text of documents to review, whereas RAB members receive only the executive summaries of documents.

M. Voce and P. Tamashiro counted the ballots and M. Voce announced that L. Willhite was elected as the new Community Co-chair.

G. Smith presented M. Voce with a framed certificate and expressed the Navy's sincere gratitude for his participation on the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach RAB as Community Co-chair.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.