

WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY (WPNSUPPFAC), SEAL BEACH
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
TRAINING SESSION
AUGUST 12, 1998

Participants:

Abbasi, Rafat/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Bernitt, Captain Thomas (Commanding Officer, WPNSUPPFAC,
Seal Beach)
Bettencourt, Philip
Coffey, Michael
Crone, Walter
Dick, Andrew/SWDIV
Embree, Melody/CH2M HILL
Iacoboni, Mauro
Kennedy, John
Miles, Ben
Moore, Richard
Myles, Charles (Rex)
Rennis, Denise
Robinson, Rob/WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach
Sebring, Fred
Smith, Gregg/WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer
Sorgen, Steve/Navy Environmental Health Center
Strong, Warren
Vaughan, James
Voce, Mario
Willhite, Lindi
Wong, Bryant/CH2M HILL

WELCOME

At 6:00 p.m., R. Robinson welcomed the participants to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Training session. He thanked the new members and alternates for attending and reminded the alternates that, as RAB seats become vacant, the alternates will be used to fill those vacancies.

INTRODUCTION TO RISK ASSESSMENT

R. Robinson introduced S. Sorgen from Navy Environmental Health Center, who provided the RAB with a presentation on Risk Assessment. 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 3 - Risk Assessment Objectives:

Question: Did the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ever consider the health risk for cancer to be 1 in 100,000 instead of the current 1 in 10,000?

Answer: The EPA may have considered other acceptable levels of cancer risk. It would have been during EPA's evaluation and development of human cancer risk estimation methods, and it is possible that the acceptability of a 1 in 100,000 cancer risk level was discussed. However, it was never formally proposed. The 1 in 10,000 cancer risk level is what is formalized into statute.

Slide 5 - Four Steps in the Process:

Comment: Because there is a National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach, many of the RAB participants are interested in the ecological impacts. Please explain the approach taken with consideration to both the ecological and human impacts.

Answer: The assessment of a site's potential impact to ecological and human receptors is conducted in parallel and concurrently. The studies are similar in concept, although they have different receptors -- i.e., ecological receptors may include several surrogate species, such as aquatic and terrestrial plants and animals, whereas receptors for human health risk assessments would be only one species, humans.

Slide 6 - Data Collection:

Question: How is it determined where to sample and what is looked for?

Answer: Initially you conduct a records search and a site survey, including interviewing past employees and local long-time workers, to try to determine past disposal practices. A site visit is also performed to observe the layout of the site and to look for physical evidence. Physical evidence could include stains on the ground and disturbed vegetation. Both the physical evidence and the information on past disposal practices are used to determine the most appropriate locations to sample. This type of initial study is called a "preliminary assessment" and will be discussed further in the next presentation.

Slide 7 - Data Evaluation:

Comment: R. Abbasi/DTSC commented that there are typically no background levels for organics. He reminded the RAB members that when reviewing technical documents, comparisons of organic chemical concentrations to background are not usually possible.

Slide 9 - Exposure = Intake:

Question: Why is the Averaging Time (AT) expressed as a denominator while the others are not?

Answer: Averaging time is expressed as a denominator because that is the way the units work out in the equation. Intake (I) is expressed below as a rate; i.e., quantity per unit time (e.g., grams per day).

$$I = \frac{C \times CR \times EFD}{BW} \times \frac{1}{AT}$$

Question: What is the average body weight of an adult?

Answer: The 95th percentile of the adult population (95% of the adult population) has a body weight (BW) of 70 kilograms (approximately 145 pounds) over the exposure period or averaging time (AT). This is based on an EPA survey of the United States population.

Question: Can you change the standard weight?

Answer: The standard human health risk assessment protocol is based on pre-established standard weights and other assumptions. The risk characterization is based on default exposure factors established by EPA.

Slide (no slide number) Exposure Assessment:

Question: Does the EPA set exposure standards?

Answer: Yes, the EPA sets these standards.

Question: Are you required to use EPA's standards?

Answer: No, not if you have obtained better site-specific

data. However, you must be able to demonstrate to the regulators that your standards are more appropriate.

Slide 17 - Risk Characterization:

Comment: There are many types of cancer that are not life threatening.

Answer: Yes, that is correct. The 1 in 10,000 refers to all cancers.

Question: Are these rates universal?

Answer: No, these rates are for the United States only.

Slide 18 - Risk Characterization - Assess Uncertainty:

Question: Would noise (and heat) be assessed the same way?

Answer: In general, noise (or heat) is one area where we have good (human) data and we know with more certainty what the risk is. These algorithms used to assess human health risk are not used to assess noise (or heat) risk.

Slide 19 - Points to Remember:

Question: Is there an expressed legal requirement to conduct these types of risk assessments?

Answer: There is no legal requirement to conduct risk assessments, or a risk assessment using the method just presented. There are also lower levels of risk assessments (e.g., comparison to EPA preliminary remediation goals) that are more conservative (i.e., more protective of human health) but used for screening purposes.

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM (IRP) OVERVIEW

S. Sorgen provided the RAB with a presentation on the IRP process. Copies of the presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during the presentation are summarized below:

Slide 8 - Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS):

Comment: "Removal" does not necessarily mean excavation.

Answer: Yes, that is correct. Removal actions, for example, can include the construction of a fence around the site to keep people out, it can mean the substitution of bottled water in place of drinking water from a contaminated water well, or it can mean excavation of the contaminated soil. "Remedies" or "removal actions" are those actions that reduce the exposure or risk to human health.

Slide 14 - Opportunities for Public Involvement:

Question: Is the program being used here at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach, the same as that used at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro?

Answer: Yes.

OVERVIEW OF WPNSUPPFAC, SEAL BEACH SITES

R. Robinson introduced B. Wong from CH2M HILL who provided the RAB with an overview of the IRP at Seal Beach. 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 8 - Operable Units (OU) 1, 2, and 3 Remedial Investigation Sites:

Question: Is the risk assessment based on human health risk only?

Answer: Yes, however, we are currently preparing an ecological risk assessment that is scheduled for distribution to the RAB and regulatory agencies in November 1998.

Question: What was disposed of at Building 241?

Answer: Building 241 was a missile container repair facility. Materials used in repairing missile containers, such as rubber and wood debris, were reportedly disposed of there. But during the actual excavation, wood debris was primarily found. It appears that a wooden shed was buried at the site. There has also been automobile parts found at the site as well.

TECHNICAL DOCUMENT REVIEW

R. Robinson introduced M. Voce the RAB Community Co-chair. M. Voce thanked the participants for attending the new RAB training and encouraged the RAB alternates to continue being

involved because as RAB seats become available, alternates will be used to fill those seats.

M. Voce provided the RAB with an overview of the technical document review process. The RAB is provided copies of technical documents produced for WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach. The purpose of distributing copies of documents to the RAB is for the RAB to review and provide comments to the Navy. Because many voluminous documents are developed for this program, the Navy is proposing to send out copies of the Executive Summaries of documents, in the future, instead of the entire document. For larger reports, the document may include several technical appendices.

M. Voce commented that the members of the RAB have diverse educational backgrounds with diverse life experiences which bring different and valuable perspectives to the review process. It is important for RAB members to keep track of their comments and to follow through when the final report is produced, to ensure RAB comments were addressed.

Any comments or questions RAB members have can be directed to M. Voce at 562/431-4760, R. Robinson at 562/626-6069 or G. Smith (Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer) at 562/626-7215.

A. Dick/Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest Division (SWDIV) commented that the Navy produces some very large documents for review. So, the Navy is proposing to distribute to the RAB only the Executive Summary or the text only portion of very large documents. For example, the Site 40 and 70 Extended Removal Site Evaluation (ERSE) will be approximately five three-inch binders, including technical appendices. The technical appendices alone will contain hundreds of pages. In an effort to reduce costs and be more environmentally conscious, the Navy would like the RAB to consider the Navy's proposal to distribute the Executive Summary only.

Question: Is there a RAB office or a room where RAB members can review all documents developed for WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach?

Answer: An entire copy of the Site 40 and 70 ERSE will be available in the Information Repository located at the Seal Beach Public Library, Mary Wilson Branch at 707 Electric Avenue, Seal Beach, CA; the telephone number is 562/431-

3584. In addition, all documents developed for this project are available in R. Robinson's office at WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach. Please call R. Robinson at 562/626-6069, to obtain access to the documents.

Comment: If you send out the Executive Summary can you also include a checklist with the document, which will have an area to provide comments?

Answer: It is probably not feasible to provide a checklist for Executive Summaries because they are so condensed and are usually only three to six pages in length.

Question: Who prepares these Executive Summaries?

Answer: The author of the report, typically a Navy contractor, prepares the Executive Summary. WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach currently has three contractors working on the project. The current contractors are CH2M HILL, Foster Wheeler, and Bechtel.

Question: Who reviews the contractors' reports?

Answer: First, the contractor performs an internal review following quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures. Next, the Navy reviews the document and provides comments to the contractor who incorporates the comments, before it is distributed to the RAB and regulatory agencies. The RAB and regulatory agencies then review the document and provides comments to the Navy.

Question: The Site 40 and 70 ERSE is approximately five binders, including text, tables, and technical appendices?

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

Question: If some individuals want the appendices, text, and tables, can that be arranged?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Has the Navy considered putting all the WPNSUPPFAC, Seal Beach documents in an electronic format or on a website?

Answer: The Navy currently receives an electronic copy of the report's text, along with the hard copy from the

contractors. However, the feasibility of putting all the documents on a website, has not yet been evaluated.

G. Smith/Navy Public Affairs Officer asked how many participants have access to the Internet. Most attendees responded in the affirmative.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, at 7 p.m., in Building 110.

ADJOURNMENT

R. Robinson thanked the participants for attending the RAB training and adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.