DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 10121/7129
14 July 1999

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Distribution List, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 17 JUNE 1999 RAB MEETING

Encl: (1) Minutes of the June 17, 1999 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord

1. Draft minutes of the 17 June 1999 Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting are forwarded as enclosure (1). Any corrections or clarifications to these minutes can be provided at the next RAB meeting, at which time the minutes will be finalized.

2. The next RAB meeting is tentatively scheduled for ~~19~~ 26 August at the Clyde Community Center. Please note that the 29 July RAB meeting has been cancelled.

3. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr. Steve Gallo, the RAB Community Co-chair, at (925) 427-3450; or Mr. Stan Heller, the Navy Co-chair, at (925) 246-5672.

Wing Wong

WING WONG
By direction

Distribution:
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello
Mr. Steven Bachofer
Mr. Scott Etzel
Mr. Steve Gallo
Mr. Edward Gardner
Ms. Susan Gladstone
Mr. David Golick/Ms. Nina Oshinsky
Mr. Stanley Heller
Ms. Dee Kilcoyne
Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Ms. Nicole Moutoux
Mr. Marcus O'Connell

IR File

663

Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Roy Santana
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Larry Steinwandt
Mr. Gene Sylls

WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Clyde Community Center
Clyde, California

Thursday, 17 June 1999

I. Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-chair's Report, and Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on Thursday, 17 June at the Clyde Community Center, Clyde, California. Steve Gallo, Community Co-chair, welcomed attendees at 8 pm. and emphasized that the priorities of the RAB are to disseminate information to the public, welcome public comment, provide for public input, and develop community outreach efforts through a web site. He thanked the agencies for their attendance.

Roy Santana, EFA West, moved to approve the April 1999 minutes with no changes.

II. Presentation on Area of Concern 1 (AOC 1), Pump Station Area, Preliminary Assessment Report

Rik Lantz, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI), gave a presentation on AOC 1 and distributed a handout. He discussed the history, sampling results, and Navy's proposed resolution. AOC 1 is located off Port Chicago Highway and is just west of RASS-4.

Mr. Lantz explained that, in 1998, the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) installed a freshwater pump station on Navy property in AOC 1 used to distribute water to Bay Point. The CCWD originally planned to install the pump station across the street from AOC1, but was unable to obtain an easement. Sampling during the construction process, along with results from previous investigations, revealed high levels of mercury, lead and selenium.

These results prompted the Navy to hire TtEMI to conduct a preliminary assessment to research the area's history, verify the levels of the contaminants, delineate the extent of the contamination, and determine if a problem exists. The overall objective was to determine if the site should be added to the Installation Restoration (IR) Program. Mr. Lantz reviewed the site history as follows:

A 1952 aerial photo showed no developments at the site. In 1955, Carbon Collier Chemical Corporation (CCCC), a subsidiary of Union Oil, opened a fertilizer manufacturing facility which remained in operation until 1976. Mr. Lantz stated that phosphate rock is a key ingredient in fertilizer manufacturing. None of the contaminants of concern, namely lead, mercury, and selenium, are generally associated with phosphate rock. Therefore, the source of the contaminants remains uncertain.

In 1973, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) discovered a significant acid runoff from the ditch North of the site that runs down into RASS-4. Mr. Lantz noted that this low pH runoff was probably related to the acid used by the fertilizer manufacturing plant. RWQCB issued a cleanup and abatement order and containment ponds were installed by CCCC.

In 1979, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) added the site to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS).

In 1980, the Department of Health Services, or DHS (the precursor to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, or DTSC) conducted sampling and detected high levels of lead and selenium, but not mercury. DHS turned the case over to the RWQCB. In 1984, a consultant conducted an inspection and noted that DHS had found elevated selenium and lead levels. No further action was recommended for the site however, because there were no drinking water supply wells downgradient from the site, and it was also felt that the high clay content of the soil would impede migration of the metals.

After the fertilizer manufacturing plant was closed in 1976, the Navy acquired the property in 1983 since it is inside Pier 4 Explosive Safety arcs. In 1986, existing buildings were demolished. Twenty-eight samples of various wastes present in the buildings were taken prior to their demolition. Elevated levels of lead and chromium were detected, along with lower concentrations of selenium and mercury, but no obvious sources were discovered.

In 1992, before CCWD installed water supply pipeline for the pump station along Port Chicago Highway, borings were taken at every one-thousand feet along the proposed pipeline route to help identify environmental and geotechnical problems. Petroleum hydrocarbons were detected in soil borings near AOC 1, but the samples were not analyzed for metals.

In 1994, Bechtel conducted an investigation and concluded that the site did not require Hazardous Ranking System (HRS) ranking under CERCLA.

The pump station was installed in 1998. During installation, the pump station construction contractor noted a discrete 6-inch-thick deposit of black cinder-like material, possibly roadbed material, located six inches below the surface in trenches at the site of a soil stockpile. Samples of the excavated soils revealed lead, selenium, mercury and TPH, and the excavated soil was deemed hazardous waste and disposed as such. As a result, a more comprehensive investigation was initiated for the entire site.

Last spring, TtEMI conducted sampling on the roadbed material, the waste acid pond, and the gypsum piles. Nine locations were sampled. About one half of the samples were taken at the surface and then immediately underneath to determine any vertical movement. Three industrial wastes were found: cinder material at AOC 1 (confirming high concentrations of lead, selenium, and mercury); tightly packed, ash-like material in the former gypsum pile area at AOC 8; and gypsum at AOC 3 and AOC 4. A fourth waste at the site–"bare soil areas"–was not tested.

TtEMI confirmed the results found in previous samplings. Wastes containing high concentrations of lead, mercury, and selenium are present at various locations at the site. Because there is a precipitous decline in the concentrations under the waste material, it was concluded that the concentrations are largely confined to the waste material.

Human health risk was evaluated by using preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), considered to be a conservative tool for estimating risk. Although lead exceeded the industrial PRG (which assumes 25 years of exposure for 40 hours per week), there is little risk since there is minimal Station employee exposure. Since the cinder roadbed material that contains the high lead concentrations is buried, there is minimal exposure pathway except for excavation/construction.

Since there are no PRG numbers for ecological risk, TtEMI instead conducted food-chain modeling. Mercury and selenium were determined to pose an ecological risk; lead concentrations pose a potential ecological risk.

TtEMI gave the following recommendations: 1) remove the cinder roadbed; 2) evaluate ecological risks associated with ash deposits near the pump station and remove the deposits if necessary; 3) confirm concentrations in the former gypsum pile area and evaluate lateral and vertical extent; and 4) sample bare soil areas, screen for human and ecological risks, and remove materials if a risk is posed. The next step is to prepare a work plan, which is subject to approval from the regulatory agencies.

III. Question and Answer Period

Nicole Moutoux, U.S. EPA, explained that the regulators' initial conclusion that there were no problems regarding AOC 1 was based on a different context ten years ago. From the EPA's perspective, this was a small area with few isolated higher concentrations of contamination, but with no potential for exposure. Since the Navy has been duly alerted, the problem is being treated in the context of the Installation Restoration (IR) Program.

Mr. Heller added that if remedial work were to be undertaken, it would most likely be due to ecological risk , not a human health risk. Steven Bachofer asked about the habitat of the area. Mr. Heller replied that the open space contains rodents and the higher mammals that consume them. Mr. Bachofer stated that since the lead is mostly six inches or more below the surface, it is generally not accessible to the public. He also asked about the potential cost to the public for

further investigation/removal of the lead.

Ms. Moutoux replied that, although the presence of lead may not be a current risk, it should be dealt with because there is a known contaminant on the site, and also because the future reuse for the site may change. She acknowledged that cost would also be considered. The plan of action would not involve a detailed investigation as in the Litigation Area.

Mr. Bachofer asked if roads inside the site were associated with the contamination, and Mr. Lantz replied that, although the investigation began with a focus near the main road, TtEMI wanted to cover the entire area. Mr. Bachofer inquired if the amount of lead residue is related to an area's proximity to leaded gas from car exhaust on a highway. Mr. Lantz replied that the lead levels drop off precipitously as you move further from the highway and that he does not believe this contamination is necessarily associated with the highway. Mr. Heller added that there are points between the road and other areas where no lead contamination has been found.

Mr. Gallo asked if the glassy material could be slag from a smelter. Mr. Lantz replied that the source of the material is unknown, although it may possibly be bottom ash from boilers. Mr. Heller stated that the material appeared to have been used for fill, as opposed to having been purposely dumped as hazardous waste on the roadbed. He added that formerly it had been common practice to use this type of material for a roadbed.

Mr. Gallo asked if a leachability test was done and Mr. Lantz replied that it was not, but that sampling was taken directly underneath the materials to determine any vertical movement of the waste contaminants.

Mr. Gallo asked how the contamination was missed in the initial study, and Mr. Heller replied that this was partly based on not having sufficient information at that time.

Mr. Heller stated that the Navy probably would have purchased the property irrespective of any prior research, given that it is within the explosive safety arc. He said that substantial research was required to discover the contamination, adding that the Navy had reason to investigate based on the CCWD sampling data, whereas the Navy did not have this information at the time of purchase.

Mr. Santana stated that the site does not appear to pose a major contamination problem. But he pointed out that today's standards are much higher than in the past, and that ecological risk has now become a priority along with human health risk.

Mr. Heller added that since the source of mercury found in adjacent RASS-4 has never been identified, further research may clarify the results of previous investigations. Mr. Gallo stated that so far there is no indication why mercury is there, and consequently, it may also be discovered elsewhere.

Mr. Heller stated that the additional investigation will include the stressed vegetation areas. In other words, the lack of vegetation may give additional clues to the presence of hazardous substances.

Mr. Heller stated that some Navy properties were purchased subsequent to the initial assessment study (IAS). In the town of Port Chicago, on which containerization pads are being constructed, USTs have been found during construction, and it is possible other property could have similar concerns.

Mr. Santana stated that in 1983, an investigation was conducted on over 50 sites on the base which included interviews and review of aerial photos. It was cost-prohibitive to sample the thousands of acres on base every 50 to 100 feet, therefore there had to be sufficient reason to suspect contamination prior to sampling. Mr. Heller added that the CCWD sampling results prompted the subsequent AOC investigation. Mr. Santana stated that although this current investigation was not too costly, it has triggered the need to conduct additional sampling.

Ms. Moutoux stated that the targeted areas would most likely be areas that were recently purchased, given that the first step in the IR program is to conduct a search of the records. Mr. Gallo mentioned that on a certain property where he works, drilling was done almost every other foot. Mr. Bachofer inquired if there was reason to suspect contamination based on the historical usage. Mr. Heller replied that there was no specific suspicion; the objective was to establish the baseline, but little evidence of contamination was found.

Ms. Moutoux stated that the Navy acquired the property for a specific purpose and needed a certain piece of property to act as a buffer.

Mr. Santana stated that it is undecided whether it would be cheaper to remove the contaminant, or if they should go through a long, expensive CERCLA investigative process. Mr. Bachofer reiterated that the site is not necessarily a prime habitat, and costly restoration may not be justified. Mr. Heller inquired if rodents are the only pathways that can act as a conduit for the contaminants in the food chain. Ms. Moutoux replied that it can be argued that this does not pose a risk; however, given that the contaminants exist, they must be addressed accordingly. Mr. Lantz stated that removal would most likely be more cost effective than proving that there is no risk to human or environmental health.

Mr. Bachofer asked if there will be some additional testing on AOC 8 based on its apparent anomalous quality. Mr. Lantz replied that there would be. Mr. Lantz stated that the contaminants are likely to be associated with industrial wastes. He added that additional sampling will be conducted to determine the nature and extent of the contamination.

Mr. Gallo asked about the historical use of the buildings. Mr. Lantz replied that there is not much information on this.

Mr. Santana stated that the next step is to create a work plan to define the additional sampling

and investigations required before a specific recommendation on the removal, or other, action for the site can be made. Mr. Lantz added that the concentrations are higher than at most sites and probably should be removed. Mr. Santana stated that comments are due on Monday, 21 June. He added that the future work plan will be reviewed before any sampling is undertaken. Mr. Gallo stated that today's input constitutes the RAB comments.

IV. Status and Schedule Update of Ongoing Work

Mr. Santana reported that there was a public meeting on the Inland Area sites a couple of months ago, and that a Draft Final Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued in July, which needs to be finalized by the Navy and the agencies. The Draft RI report for the tidal area sites was reviewed last year, and the agencies recommended additional ecological investigation. The results are now incorporated in the Draft Final RI Report, which will be issued in early July.

Ms. Moutoux suggested a presentation on the Draft Final RI, with a focus on the additional work and its results.

Mr. Santana stated that the public comment period on the landfill ends on 17 June. The Draft Final ROD will be issued in August, which will address public comments and document the decision for the site. He added that the review period on the Taylor Blvd. Draft Work Plan ends on 28 June. A Site 29 Site Investigation Report will be issued in late July, for which there will be a 60-day review period.

V. Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

Mr. Gallo announced that the next meeting will be set tentatively for 29 July at the Clyde Community Center. Ms. Moutoux suggested using fact sheets on the RI. Mr. Gallo added that these fact sheets could also be made available on the web site. Mr. Heller replied that he would investigate these possibilities.

VI. Adjournment [no Public Comment]

Mr. Gallo ended the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

A copy of these meeting minutes will be made available for public review at the Information Repository located at the Main Branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, CA.