

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, SEAL BEACH (WPNSTA Seal Beach)  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
January 12, 2000

Participants:

Bettencourt, Philip  
Bradley, John/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Castillon, Rich  
Dick, Andrew/Southwest Division, Naval Facilities  
Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Embree, Melody/CH2M HILL  
Hamparsumian, Hamlet/Foster Wheeler  
Hannon, Patricia/Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa  
Ana Region (RWQCB)  
Lamond, Robert  
Leibel, Katherine/Department of Toxic Substances Control  
(DTSC)  
Moore, Richard  
Nguyen, Dien/Orange County Environmental Health  
Peoples, J.P.  
Pilichi, Carmine  
Saunders, Lee/Southwest Division, Naval Facilities  
Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Schilling, Bob/Bechtel National, Inc.  
Schmitt, Mike  
Seabring, Fred  
Smith, Gregg/WPNSTA, Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer  
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/WPNSTA, Seal Beach and Navy Co-chair  
Torrey, Peter/CH2M HILL  
Vessely, R. Gene  
Voce, Mario/Community Co-chair  
Willhite, Lindi  
Whittenberg, Lee/City of Seal Beach

WELCOME

At 7:05 p.m., Mr. Voce, Community Co-chair, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the meeting. P. Tamashiro also welcomed the participants to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and introduced herself as the Navy Co-chair and base Installation Restoration (IR) Program coordinator. P. Tamashiro also introduced G. Smith/WPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO)

## PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

P. Tamashiro introduced A. Dick, the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV who provided the RAB with an overview of the WPNSTA, Seal Beach's IR Program projects status. In addition, as a request from RAB members at the November RAB meeting, A. Dick provided the RAB with a brief overview of "Where are we going?" in relation to the progress of the IR Program restoration efforts. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made following the presentation are summarized below:

### Slide 13 - Where do we go from here?

**Question:** As a percentage of the site restoration project, how far along are we?

**Answer:** WPNSTA Seal Beach's IR Program currently has 65 sites and we have closed about 33 of those sites as no further action. There are 10 more sites proposed as no further response action planned pending concurrence from DTSC on the OU 4 & 5 Ecological Risk Assessment Validation Study.

**Question:** How long is this journey going to last? Will we finish it in 10 years?

**Answer:** Some of the IR Program sites (especially sites 40 and 70) will have continued long-term monitoring for 30 years or more. It's difficult to have an exact date when all sites will be closed because each site has different characterizations and different monitoring requirements.

**Question:** How do military bases, once closed, get released back into the City or public for redevelopment? How do you handle long-term monitoring on closed bases?

**Answer:** There are several factors involving the closing of a military base. They release responsibilities to the redevelopment agency. Redevelopment can depend on the cleanup levels determined for a site and there could be possible deed restrictions placed on the property (e.g., no residential development, long-term monitoring necessary, etc.).

**Question:** A map of Site 70 showed monitoring wells outside the boundary of the station, are there currently

any monitoring wells located outside the boundary of the station?

**Answer:** There are currently no monitoring wells outside the base boundary, however, one monitoring well is planned for Site 70 and will be installed just outside the WPNSTA Seal Beach boundary, near Seal Beach Blvd.

**Question:** Is hydrogen peroxide a treatment option for Site 70?

**Answer:** Yes, chemical oxidation (hydrogen peroxide) is a treatment option for Site 70 and lactate injections is a treatment option for Site 40.

#### SITE 1 REMOVAL ACTION

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Hamparsumian, the Site 1 Project Manager from Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, who provided the RAB with a presentation on the removal action activities conducted at Site 1. H. Hamparsumian discussed how the removal action was completed, including excavation methods, soil sampling results, health and safety procedures, and where the excavated soil was ultimately disposed. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made following the presentation are summarized below:

#### Slide 23 - Photograph of Downwind Ambient Air Monitoring Station:

**Question:** Did any ambient air quality problems arise during the removal action?

**Answer:** No air quality emission levels were exceeded during the removal action. For more detailed information, there is a lengthy discussion of the air quality results in Section 4.9 of the Site 1 Closure Report.

#### Slide 33 - Replacement of Aboveground Steel Gas Pipe (photograph):

**Question:** Where did the pipe get disposed?

**Answer:** The pipe was cut into small manageable lengths, removed, transported and disposed of as California Hazardous Waste at the EC/DC facility in Utah.

**Question:** Is that pipe part of a larger gas pipeline system?

**Answer:** Yes. The pipe goes into a nearby building but it is not currently used. The 300-foot section of the above ground gas pipeline was removed to facilitate soil excavation activities. The 300-foot segment of the gas pipe was later replaced with a 3-inch diameter HDPE pipe that was installed four feet below ground.

Slide 61 - Photograph of the Removal of the Southern Railroad Tracks:

**Question:** Has the Navy tested the new railroad tracks since since they were installed?

**Answer:** No, not yet. This portion of the railroad is not used very much.

Slide 76 - Backfill Material:

**Question:** Did you test the backfill material for contaminants?

**Answer:** Yes, the backfill material from the onsite pile was tested for metals, PCBs and pesticides. No metals, pesticides, or PCBs were detected above target cleanup goals (TCG). The structural fill material was supplied by the vendor who must comply with all applicable regulatory rules and regulations and provide a certification (including analytical results) that the fill material is "clean."

**Question:** Correct me if I'm wrong. You took several hundred samples of the material you took out and no samples of what went in the excavation?

**Answer:** That is not correct. The vendor obtained the backfill material from a clean, natural quarry in Orange County. The material was freshly mined and delivered to the site. Foster Wheeler representatives inspected the quarry site prior to the delivery of any material to the site. The vendor provided the Navy with a signed certificate indicating that the material is not contaminated.

BREAK 8:15 p.m. to 8:20 p.m.

GROUNDWATER MONITORING PROGRAM FOR SITES 40 AND 70

P. Tamashiro introduced B. Schilling from Bechtel National, Inc., who provided the RAB with a presentation on the status of the long-term monitoring program for Sites 40 and 70. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made following the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 20 - Well Locations at IR Program Site 70:

**Question:** What is the depth of the plume outside the station boundary?

**Answer:** At the north end of the site, the plume extends to a depth of approximately 20 to 40 feet below ground surface.

Slide 23 - Work Plan - Decision Rules:

**Question:** What level of detail do the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) get involved in selecting the groundwater monitoring well locations?

**Answer:** The Navy has been working closely with the regulatory agencies and as we get closer to the actual installation of the monitoring wells, we will sit down and obtain their concurrence with recommended well locations.

Slide 24 - Schedule:

**Question:** There is currently a 3D model for Site 70. As the monitoring program progresses will this model be updated?

**Answer:** Updating the 3D model is not planned at this time. However, over the course of the groundwater monitoring program, we will obtain and evaluate a lot of data that will allow us to observe plume behavior. If the observed behavior differs significantly from that predicted by the model, then the need to update the model would be evaluated.

**Question:** What if there is a catastrophic storm event/flood, won't the groundwater gradient change and impact the plume.

**Answer:** Previous investigations at the site have shown seasonal variations in the direction of the groundwater gradient in the shallow groundwater interval, but not in the deeper intervals. The variations in the shallow interval are attributable to precipitation and recharge during the winter months. Storm events are likely to continue to affect the shallow interval and the shallow plume as they have since the contaminants were first introduced into the groundwater more 30 years ago. The groundwater monitoring program will be capable of monitoring changes in plume geometry that may result from seasonal variations in the gradient.

#### COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro announced that M. Voce's term as Community Co-chair will be up in February and requested that nominations for the position be sent to her by March 8, 2000. Community Co-chair elections will take place at the next RAB meeting on March 8, 2000 (no meeting is scheduled for February.)

M. Voce stated that he will be unable to continue in his role as the Seal Beach RAB Community Co-chair and provided a description of what he does as community co-chair. The RAB community Co-chair attends monthly project managers' meetings as an observer at 1:00 p.m. on the days of the RAB meetings. However, this is not a requirement to serve as the community Co-chair. In addition, the community Co-chair attends RAB meetings, reviews documents, and provides comments to the Navy. M. Voce offered to discuss the role of community Co-chair in further detail to interested parties who can call him at 562/431-4760.

P. Tamashiro requested that anyone present who had not yet signed-in, to please do so before leaving. In addition, she requested that everyone remember to return their name badges to her at the end of each RAB meeting.

#### FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

No future agenda topics were suggested.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.