MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
September 9, 2008

Participants:

Caruso, Erin / Malcolm Pirnie
Carmany, David/ City of Seal Beach
Charles Stevens/ Community Member
Dejesus, Monique / Malcolm Pirnie
Fu, Christina / Department of Toxic Substances Control
Graubard, Ellen / Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC SW)
Jordan, Jack / RAB Community Co-chair
Lee, Larry / Community Member
Niou, Stephen / Department of Toxic Substances Control
Olivera, Jerry/ City of Seal Beach
Smith, Gregg / NAVWPSNTA Seal Beach, Public Affairs Officer (PAO)
Sullivan, Jennie / Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC SW)
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen / NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, RAB Navy Co-chair
Wong, Bryant / CH2M HILL & Community Member

WELCOME

P. 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 three presentations will be given tonight: Project Highlights, Munitions Response Program (MRP) Preliminary Site Inspection, and MRP Site Prioritization Protocol.

P. Tamashiro introduced J. Sullivan as the new Remedial Project Manager for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and will deliver the Project Highlights presentation.

J. Sullivan presented the Project Highlights for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

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

<u>In regard to the Potential Site 75 KAYO-SB Agricultural Well:</u>

Question: Was the well ever abandoned?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Was it sealed?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Is it on the base itself?

Answer: Yes, the well was on the Navy's property and owned by the Navy.

P. Tamashiro introduced E. Caruso to deliver the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection presentation.

E. Caruso presented the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection presentation.

Questions and answers discussed during the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection Presentation are summarized below.

<u>In regard to Port of Long Beach (POLB) Mitigation Pond:</u>

Question: So there is water there?

Answer: Yes. (E. Caruso pointed to the location of the mitigation pond and referred to a slide picture.

Question: Is that the only (MRP) site on the refuge?

Answer: No, the drop test tower site is also within the refuge boundary.

<u>In regard to Building 101-102 Evaporation Ponds:</u>

Question: In the Preliminary Site Investigation, high concentrations of Explosive D were found inside the buildings. What will be done about that?

Answer: The buildings themselves are not considered a part of the site. Navy experts from Indian Head, under Public Works' contract, will take care of the materials in the building.

Question: Is ammonium picrate a contact explosive?

Answer: Yes, it is very sensitive and could explode with friction.

<u>General Questions at the conclusion of the presentation:</u>

Question: Is perchlorate an emerging issue at Seal Beach?

Answer: No. Perchlorate is generally associated with solid propellants. The types of munitions involved in the MRP sites identified in Seal Beach should not contain perchlorate.

Question: Who did the sampling at Buildings 101 and 102 in 2003?

Answer: Navy munitions experts from Indian Head, MD, under Public Works' contract, did the sampling for the purpose of planning for demolition.

P. Tamashiro announced a short break.

Upon return, P. Tamashiro announced that demolition project for Buildings 101 and 102 complex would begin in November 2008. Because the buildings are located within the footprint of an IRP/MRP site, it is required that the Navy announce this in the RAB meeting. The project will demolish all infrastructure associated with the buildings,

including auxiliary buildings and drainage ditches. If the community members have any questions, they are encouraged to contact her.

P. Tamashiro introduced E. Caruso to deliver the MRP Site Prioritization presentation. P. Tamashiro announced to attendees that the Site Prioritization presentation is to inform the community of how the Department of the Navy determines site prioritization and allows the community to provide input into how sites are prioritized.

E. Caruso presented the MRP Site Prioritization presentation.

Questions and answers discussed during the MRP Site Prioritization Presentation are summarized below.

Question: When you say MRP eligibility is defined by an operational range, you mean currently operational?

Answer: Let me clarify this. The ranges that are eligible for the MRP are the ones that were closed or became non-operational before 1 October 2000.

Question: How many operational ranges are on the base currently?

Answer: We have 2 of them.

Question: What toxic chemicals are associated with munitions? Zinc and Copper?

Answer: Different munitions will have different toxic chemicals associated with them. Specifically, we will look into metals and explosives chemicals.

Question: Is depleted uranium associated with munitions at Seal Beach?

Answer: It is not associated with the types of munitions potentially associated with the sites.

Question: Do Seal Beach and El Toro have similar situations?

Answer: No, El Toro is not an operating base. Seal Beach is operational.

Question: It seems like you are focusing on the munitions themselves. What about the chemicals in the munitions?

Answer: Both the munitions themselves and the chemicals in the munitions, or so called munitions constituents, are considered part of the MRP.

Question: The term munitions constituent does not seem to include production wastes. Are there areas that are excluded from the Munitions Response Program because they are considered production waste?

Answer: The Navy is not trying to exclude anything. For instance, Buildings 101 and 102, previously considered production buildings, are covered under the contract by the Public Works department. The MRP will focus on munitions contamination or hazard that could cause environmental concerns or hazard.

Question: Will the chemicals at the ponds be sampled later?

Answer: The ponds will be investigated under the scope of the site inspection.

Question: What is the scale of scores in the munitions response site prioritization protocol?

Answer: The scale goes from 0-100.

Question: It sounds like the scale is empirical and not analytical?

Answer: Yes, it's based on the judgment derived from the observation or knowledge of a site. That's why it's an iteration process that requires inputs from the Navy and the stakeholders.

Question: Is this system set up so stakeholders can legally compete with each other?

Answer: In a way it is. The prioritization protocols are set up so that the stakeholders from different communities could score their sites on a somehow even footing. The system is not perfect, because it does involve inputs based on certain level of biased judgment, but it at least provide some standards for the DoD to allocate environmental funding based on the risk level each site posts to the environment. We will provide a link to the web site that hosts the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol Primer in the meeting minutes. (The web site address is http://anga7cvr.us/documents/mmrp_supp_docs/MRSPP_Primer.pdf.)

Question: Is Seal Beach in good shape?

Answer: Yes, because it is an operational base.

Question: When the base is operational is it more secure?

Answer: Yes. When a base is active or operational, there is higher level of control for security and exposure; therefore, it is more secure in terms of limiting the exposure of the waste munitions to the public.

Question: Then El Toro is a different situation?

Answer: Yes.

P. Tamashiro encouraged all attendees to visit the Seal Beach website to view a copy of the MRP Preliminary Site Assessment and the Site Prioritization. P. Tamashiro also informed everyone to contact her via telephone or e-mail with any additional questions.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

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