

MINUTES
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
City of Seal Beach Council Chambers
July 23, 2014

Participants:

Baillie, David/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Beaty, Hal/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Beaty, Shirley/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Blake, Geoffrey/RAB Member
Buck, Slader/United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) -Refuges
Cummings, Esther/Friends of Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)
Cutler, Mark/TetraTech EC, Inc.
Faherty, Ryan/Richard Brady and Associates (BRADY)
Fitch, John/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Hardy, Martin/Captain, U. S. Navy, Commanding Officer (CO), NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Jordan, Jack/RAB Member
Kovakcs, Robert/Community Member
Parsell, Mary/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Rahemtulla, Salim/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Reese, Brenda/Remedial Project Manager, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
Schallmann, Bob/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Shields, Tim/BRADY
Smith, Gregg/Public Affairs Officer, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Smith, Patti/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Stillman, Glenn R/RAB Member
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/RAB Navy Co-Chair, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach
Thorpe, Darwin/RAB Member
Vance, Carolyn/Friends of Seal Beach NWR
Wittenberg, Howard/CKY Inc.

WELCOME

Pei-Fen Tamashiro commenced the meeting at 6:00 pm at the City of Seal Beach Council Chambers by welcoming all participants and thanking them for attending the 100th RAB meeting. The RAB started in 1995 and we are getting close to our 20th anniversary. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves and to sign-in and collect handouts at the front table.

P. Tamashiro announced that the small arms range update will be moved to the top of the agenda tonight to allow enough time to discuss and answer questions. The small arms range update would be followed by three presentations: An overview of the Project Highlights for the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Munitions Response Program (MRP) by Brenda Reese, RPM; a technical presentation on the status of the long term monitoring at IRP Site 40 by

Howard Wittenberg of CYK Inc.; and a technical presentation on the 2013 performance monitoring results for Enhanced In Situ Bioremediation at IRP Site 70 by Mark Cutler. P. Tamashiro then introduced the CO, Capt. Hardy, to say a few words.

Capt. Hardy spoke about the small arms range. In the last few months, this has had his attention in detail. In the past, approximately 50 percent of the range use was to support non-Navy training; now it has been reduced to focus only on Navy mission.

P. Tamashiro discussed the background of the Seal Beach Small Arms Range. She explained that IRP Site 74, where remediation is planned, has an area that overlaps with the range surface danger zone (SDZ). The range is now not being used to full capacity due to the “ricochets” which mostly are metal fragments. The Navy has surveyed Case Road behind the range for spent bullets and fragments. A table of survey statistics was presented. P. Tamashiro passed around bags of fragments recovered from the surveys. The recovered fragments were smaller after the range use had been restricted to Navy use only. The majority of fragments are old oxidized pieces. One explanation is that the fragments have been sitting in the dirt berm for a period of time before they were ejected after strikes by bullets. She presented a map showing the density of fragments (how close fragments were to each other).

P. Tamashiro introduced Salim Rahamtulla who discussed the corrective actions that have been taken at the site. Going forward, the Navy realizes that the solutions put in to place so far have not had the effect that was desired. The Navy is looking at ways to better monitor potential ricochets. They are also looking how to reduce the SDZ, and will retain a commercial range consultant. Long-term, they will implement as many recommendations as possible, within the funding constraints.

Questions and answers discussed during the Small Arms Range Presentation are summarized below.

Question: *I worked for a company who used to clean out lead from indoor range. Why spend the time and money monitoring? With an open roof it might be impossible to control.*

Answer: *And indoor range is being considered. Two issues are cost and indoor air quality for the shooters. Air filtration systems will be very expensive. Military construction projects need Congressional approval and will take a lot of time.*

Question: *What is the caliber used on the range?*

Answer: *All calibers are 50 or less.*

Question: *Have you tried paper panels on top of the berm to see the direction of ricochets?*

Answer: *That is a possibility, but if an expert consultant comes in and looks at the way the range is used, it may not be needed to provide recommendations. One of the*

issues of extending the brow is the engineering issue of how far it can be extended.

Question: *Referring to the map, all the area left (or west) of Case Road is in the marsh. We are concerned with lead reaching the marsh and causing continuing pollution, even after doing the proposed cleanup.*

Answer: *We are in full awareness of that situation. We will resolve the additional lead release issue before we fully implement the cleanup.*

Question: *It appears that the amount of rounds used has been reduced by about half, but the number of fragments found has not decreased.*

Answer: *Perhaps more debris accumulated on the berm, and is now being ejected. There may be other environmental factors moving debris onto Case Road such as tides, rain, etc. We are still investigating this.*

Question: *If so, that is even more disturbing because debris could be washed into the marsh.*

Answer: *That is why we are working hard to find a solution before the cleanup starts.*

Question: *Are the fragments magnetic?*

Answer: *No, mostly lead or copper.*

Question: *Why are the fragments soft? Is it because of passing trucks?*

Answer: *Simply because they are made of lead, which is very pliable.*

Question: *Note that other local law enforcement agencies have outdoor ranges with no problem.*

Answer: *We are looking to our consultant to advise us of best practices that can be used.*

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

B. Reese began the project highlights portion of the presentation by acknowledging the Navy team members, regulatory agencies, and contractors. She provided background on the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), reviewed IRP and MRP sites status at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach, and identified sites on the base map. She briefly reviewed background and current status of open IRP sites, including Site 7, Station Landfill; Site 40, Concrete Pit/Gravel Area; Site 70, Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area; Site 74, Former Skeet Range; Site 75, KAYO SB Ag Well; and UST 8 (Bldg. 500), Former UST Site. She concluded by briefly

discussing the MRP Preliminary Site Inspection and Site Inspection statuses. She announced that MRP funding has been obtained to work on UXO 1, UXO 6, and AOC 2. The plans for MRP sites are very detailed and complex because of the explosives aspect, so the plans will take time to be prepared. However, this remedial investigation phase of the project is planned to be completed in 2 years.

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

Question: Are you still thinking of clear cutting Site 74?

Answer: No, we are looking to be very selective. Trying to get the biggest bang for our buck, the soil needs to be removed as referenced in the original presentation. Overall the area has good vegetation.

Question: You are running into a real problem trying to revegetate Site 7 and are not having success; you'll have more problems at Site 74.

Answer: Over all the Site 74 has much better vegetation and we are looking at other re-vegetation techniques, we are very committed to revegetating

Question: What is the depth you will be digging?

Answer: Only about 6 inches to a foot.

Question: Have any more geese died?

Answer: No, that was a one-time occurrence.

Question: Regarding Site 75, have you done a Phase I on the nearby properties to see if there are other sites?

Answer: Yes, we did some research. The Water Board is overseeing the investigations at some of these sites. The project is in the hands of Navy legal.

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Wittenberg of CKY, Inc. to deliver the technical presentation on the status of IRP Site 40.

H. Wittenberg described the remediation timeline for Site 40, showing the overall significant decrease in concentrations through time. He described the groundwater monitoring event and land use controls inspection conducted in December 2013. The results show that there may be minor rebound (a slight rise in concentration of vinyl chloride) in some of the wells that will be monitored during future groundwater monitoring events. Measurements of dissolved oxygen, oxidation reduction potential, and pH are conducive to continuing reductive dechlorination. Routine monitoring is scheduled for December 2014. He also described soil vapor monitoring using hand-held equipment to evaluate air in the vicinity of cracks in the asphalt. He described a risk analysis that was performed, showing that the most likely exposure pathway is vapor

intrusion from soil gas. Additional work needs to be done to more completely evaluate the risk, specifically, indoor and outdoor air sampling. He discussed potential proposed sampling points, subject to review.

Questions and answers discussed during the Site 40 Presentation are summarized below.

Question: *Was this the torpedo facility or the locomotive facility?*

Answer: *The locomotive facility.*

Question: *Didn't they try sodium lactate which was too thin and it went down to the water table?*

Answer: *They ended up switching to hydrogen release compound, which worked well because it was a little more viscous.*

Question: *Was dehalococcoides bacteria used there?*

Answer: *Yes.*

Question: *The dehalococcoides bacterium has four different strains – doesn't only one strain go to ethane?*

Answer: *Yes, the PCE at this site did dechlorinate to ethane.*

Question: *When will you be able to calculate a cost to complete and compare to pump and treat?*

Answer: *Costs were looked at in the 5 year review a couple years ago, but it was not compared to possible costs of alternative technologies at that stage. One thing that is not often considered is that this system does not consume power or generate as much pollution as pump and treat. Pump and treat can take a long time.*

P. Tamashiro introduced M. Cutler of TetraTech EC, Inc. to deliver the technical presentation on the status of IRP Site 70.

M. Cutler described the history of Site 70 and the original distribution of the plume. The selected alternative was enhanced in-situ bioremediation. He described the details of the process, the initial injections, the semiannual groundwater monitoring, the additional injections performed in 2013, the 2013 source area vapor monitoring, and the early 2014 performance monitoring event. Maximum and average TCE concentrations have decreased, as well as the maximum concentration of breakdown products. Groundwater flow is consistent with historical data. Point of compliance well sampling results show that the plume is remaining within the station's boundaries. Dissolved oxygen and oxidation reduction potential shows that conditions are good for reductive dechlorination, and the populations of microbes are good.

Questions and answers discussed during the Site 70 Presentation are summarized below.

Question: *Is there greater salinity in the deeper layers?*

Answer: *There does not appear to be a difference in salinity with depth.*

Question: *In one of the previous meetings, there was a concern with pH. What was done?*

Answer: *During the initial injection, in some areas of the aquifer (the shell horizon), there isn't enough buffering capacity during the reductive dechlorination and the pH dropped. In the source area, this problem didn't occur. The low pH area was monitored, and it did not drop to the point that the dechlorination stopped. The pH has rebounded and is stabilized across the treatment area now.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Tamashiro discussed the possibility of reducing the frequency of RAB meeting to semiannual or three times a year, and solicited public input from those in attendance at the RAB meeting. In response to question during the discussion, she confirmed that the website will be updated regularly. She said that the Navy would also like to continue with the site tour, perhaps having one every other year. After the discussion, a straw vote was taken, and the public present at the meeting agreed by consensus that semiannual RAB meetings would be appropriate going forward.

P. Tamashiro announced that the next RAB meeting will likely be in January 2015.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:55 p.m.

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