
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH (NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
AND COMMUNITY MEETING
May 10, 2000

Participants:

Bradley, John/United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Brenner, Jeff/Foster Wheeler
Clarke, Dean/Orange County Health Care Agency
Dick, Andrew/Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)
Foreman, Kim/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Heinle, Don/CH2M HILL
Lamond, Robert
Leibel, Katherine/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Monroe, Bruce
Reese, Kirsten/CH2M HILL
Roberts, Carol/USFWS
Sebring, Fred
Smith, Gregg/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer
Tamashiro, Pei-Fen/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach and Navy Co-chair
Willhite, Lindi/Community Co-chair
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 7:04 p.m., P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair and Base Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Coordinator, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the meeting and introduced L. Willhite, the newly elected Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro also introduced K. Foreman, Public Participation Specialist with the Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) and the replacement for Marcia Mingay, and G. Smith/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO).

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 highlighted the recent article included in the Navy's annual report to Congress describing the success of NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach RAB and thanked the RAB for its support. A. Dick also identified two upcoming projects:

- 1) The Site Management Plan (SMP) will be updated once the Focused Site Inspection Phase has progressed to the point where some decisions can be made at some sites
- 2) The Community Relations Plan (CRP) will be updated upon the return of the Community Relations Specialist.

Copies of the slide presentation and article were made available as handouts at the meeting. There were no questions asked following the RAB project highlights presentation.

After A. Dick's overview of project highlights, P. Tamashiro expressed the base's appreciation to the RAB for its contributions and support, and stated that she is looking forward to working on future RAB issues.

SCREENING AQUATIC ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF PERIMETER POND ADJACENT TO SITE 7 STATION LANDFILL

P. Tamashiro introduced D. Heinle/CH2M HILL, who provided the RAB with a presentation of the ecological risk assessment conducted for Perimeter Pond adjacent to Site 7 (Station Landfill). D. Heinle described the field activities conducted and explained the screening of the laboratory data to assess ecological risks applied from sediment, water, and mussels collected at Site 7. The results of the risk assessment, including a summary of risks, were presented, along with a list of risk uncertainties. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. One question was posed during the presentation. The question and its answer are summarized below:

Slide 16 - Typical Relationship (Sediment Screening Values)

Question: What did the authors of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) originally intend the screening values to be used for?

Answer: They were probably intended to trigger more studies or further testing.

P. Tamashiro introduced C. Roberts/USFWS, Environmental Contaminants Specialist, who will be reviewing the ecological risk assessment technical memo.

BASELINE SURVEY - SUBSURFACE SOIL AND GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATION - SITE 14

P. Tamashiro introduced J. Brenner/Foster Wheeler, who provided the RAB with a presentation of the baseline survey. The baseline survey was conducted to assess the extent of hydrocarbon impacts on subsurface soil and groundwater associated with a previously removed, leaking underground storage tank (UST) containing leaded gasoline at Site 14. A site description and history was provided, as well as information about previous investigations and studies conducted at Site 14 by the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) and Stanford University. J. Brenner also presented the soil and groundwater baseline survey results and conclusions. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 16 - Benzene Groundwater Plume

Question: Is it true your monitoring wells are not located as far out as the gasoline plume boundary delineated by USGS?

Answer: Yes.

Question: I am confused about your conclusion that the benzene plume has reduced in size since the Stanford University study of 1996.

Answer: Non-detects were measured at Well 14-1. Since non-detects were measured in wells inside the 1996 Stanford University's plume boundary, this shows that the benzene plume boundary has receded.

Question: Were these wells were sampled more than once?

Answer: Our wells have been sampled once so far.

Question: So was benzene zero or non-detect at Well 14-1?

Answer: The gasoline plume boundary delineated by our baseline was drawn using a computer program. Since the concentration of benzene, 5 ug/l, at Well 14-1 is very low compared to the center of the plume, the zero contour line was drawn passing the well location.

Slide 23 - Baseline Survey - Conclusions - Groundwater

Question: The gasoline plume boundary (subsurface soil) delineated by USGS is quite bigger than the current estimated plume boundary. Are you saying that the current estimated plume boundary is the maximum extent of the contaminated area or is there also concern about the area between the current estimated plume boundary and the larger plume boundary delineated by USGS?

Answer: USGS determined that gasoline contamination did exist outside the current estimated plume boundary and did extend into the National Wildlife Refuge. Part of the confusion lies in the computer software contouring program - two different types of data are being compared (subsurface soil data and groundwater data in slide 8). The larger plume boundary delineated by USGS represents subsurface soil contamination (as of 1984) while the current estimated plume boundary represents contamination only to groundwater (as of 1996).

Question: Didn't Foster Wheeler evaluate subsurface soil contamination?

Answer: Only within the region of the five monitoring wells. No soil borings were drilled beyond Kitts Highway. The purpose of this baseline study was to get an initial idea of the extent of contamination in this area. There are lots of questions about the validity of the USGS investigation.

-
- Question:** Did the USGS investigation provide concentrations of subsurface soil contamination?
- Answer:** No, I do not recall any specific data. I believe they estimated concentrations based on contaminants migrating into the groundwater and spreading along the water table.
- Question:** You may not want to show the USGS plume boundary, it seems to misrepresent the extent of contamination.
- Answer:** The USGS plume boundary is intended to show the maximum extent of any past contamination problems. Also, to clarify, the Stanford University study is separate from the USGS investigation because the Stanford University study was not intended to delineate the extent of contamination in the area. The Stanford University study was intended to test the effectiveness of various types of in-situ biological treatment approaches.
- Question:** Did the Stanford University study involve the injection of bacteria into the groundwater?
- Answer:** No, but the Stanford University study did investigate the effects of injecting nutrients in enhancing biological degradation of gasoline in the groundwater.
- Question:** Has the extent of contamination of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) been mapped like benzene and MTBE have?
- Answer:** No. We focused mainly on the BTEX (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene) and MTBE. TPH values were only used as indicators of contamination for this investigation.

COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro appealed to RAB members to encourage attendance. She announced that the June 2000 RAB meeting would be a site tour. The RAB site tour is scheduled for June 14, 2000 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. She reminded that tour participants should dress warmly. A sign-up sheet for the tour was circulated.

A. Dick presented the sites proposed to visit on the tour:

- Site 4 - Oil on Roads
- Site 5 - Clean Fill Disposal Area
- Site 6 - Explosives Burning Ground
- Site 7 - Station Landfill
- Site 14 - Abandoned Underground Storage Tank
- Site 22 - Oil Island
- Site 40 - Concrete Pit/Gravel Area
- Site 70 - Research, Testing, and Evaluation Area
- Site 74 - Old Skeet Range

-
- Site 1 - Former Wastewater Settling Pond (quick drive-by to show completed removal action)

A. Dick asked RAB members if they had any objections to the proposed sites or wanted to suggest others. None of the RAB members expressed any objection to the sites proposed to be visited or suggested alternatives.

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro thanked the RAB members for their attendance. The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.