

---

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
OCTOBER 11, 2000

Participants:

Brenner, Jeff/Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (FWEC)  
Bradley, John/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Clarke, Dean/Orange County Health Care Agency  
Dick, Andrew/SWDIV  
Eells, Brenda/CH2M HILL  
Hamparsumian, Hamlet/FWEC  
Jones, Carl/FWEC  
Peoples, J.P.  
Schilling, Bob/ Bechtel National, Inc.  
Smith, Gregg/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer  
Vessley, Gene  
Voce, Mario  
Willhite, Lindi/RAB Community Co-Chair

WELCOME

At 7:05 p.m., A. Dick opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to the meeting and introducing himself as the Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV. He announced that P. Tamashiro, Navy Co-chair for NAVWPNSTA, Seal Beach, was unable to attend the meeting.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

A. Dick provided the RAB with a Project Briefing that covered the highlights of activities being conducted at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach under the Installation Restoration (IR) Program. 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 6 - Review of IR Sites

**Question:** How many of the 39 No Further Response Action Planned (NFRAP) sites had something done at them?

**Answer:** Preliminary investigations were conducted at all of the 39 NFRAP sites.

**Question:** Was any sort of removal action taken at any of the NFRAP sites?

**Answer:** No removal or remedial actions were taken at any of the NFRAP sites.

Slide 17 - Future High Risk Removals - Site 74

**Question:** Was the Defense Planning Goals (DPGs) model developed in coordination with the EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)?

---

**Answer:** The model was developed internally with help from computer programmers. I'm not sure if the EPA was involved. The model is based on a matrix, with high, medium, and low risk assigned based on chemicals and receptors.

**Question:** Do any of the variables in the model include cost?

**Answer:** Budget is included in the model, along with relative risk and schedule.

**Question:** Would the model allow a really toxic site that is also very expensive end up in medium-risk category?

**Answer:** No. A high-risk site would always remain a high-risk site in the model.

#### ENGINEERING EVALUATION/COST ANALYSIS (EE/CA) NON-TIME-CRITICAL REMOVAL ACTION FOR IR SITE 5, CLEAN FILL DISPOSAL AREA

A. Dick introduced B. Schilling, Project Manager from Bechtel National, Inc., who provided the RAB with a presentation of the EE/CA Non-Time-Critical Removal Action for IR Site 5. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during and following the presentation are summarized below:

##### Slide 4 - Background

**Question:** Is this site similar to Site 19?

**Answer:** Waste at Site 5 is primarily concrete debris, construction debris, and glass. At Site 19, existing unacceptable risks from chemical contamination were identified; at Site 5, there are no unacceptable risks from chemical contamination but there is the risk associated with the possible presence of UXO.

##### Slide 11 - Photograph

**Question:** Is the pipe in the photograph (page 6, top photo) a vent for gases?

**Answer:** I do not know the reason for the pipe in the photograph.

##### Slide 25 - General Response Actions

**Question:** How is disposal different from removal?

**Answer:** Removal involves the physical extraction from the site; disposal involves getting rid of the material that was removed from the site.

##### Slide 31 - Schedule

**Question:** Is it too early to consider removing the entire 18,000 cubic yards at Site 5 to another site and restoring the wetlands?

**Answer:** We would consider this alternative at the Work Plan/Action Memo stage. It would have to be considered in terms of finding a disposal area and the cost involved. We recommend that you submit a formal comment during the 30-day public comment period.

- 
- Question:** How many cubic yards were removed from Site 1?
- Answer:** Approximately 15,000 cubic yards.
- Question:** Eleven pounds of ordnance-related material was found at the site. How much remains at the site?
- Answer:** We were not able to estimate the amount of ordnance-related material remaining at the site.
- Question:** Was there any actual unexploded ordnance in the site or was it all “used”?
- Answer:** The majority of material found was ordnance-related, but only one “active” fuse was found.

#### ADDENDUM BASELINE SURVEY WORK PLAN

A. Dick introduced J. Brenner from Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, who provided the RAB with a presentation of the Addendum Baseline Survey Work Plan for the Additional Groundwater Investigation at Site 14. Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. Questions and answers made during and following the presentation are summarized below:

##### Slide 2 – Site Description and History

- Question:** How far below ground surface (bgs) is the water table at Site 14?
- Answer:** The water table at Site 14 is 6-7 feet bgs.

##### Slide 8 – Former Gasoline-related Plume Boundaries

- Question:** Is there a concern that since contamination has moved into the aquifer that it may move into the National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)?
- Answer:** Based on results from the Baseline Survey, the only contamination at Site 14 was found on the side furthest from the NWR.

##### Slide 17 – Proposed/Anticipated Project Schedule

- Question:** What happens to hydrocarbons in the soil?
- Answer:** Lighter hydrocarbons, such as gasoline, are degraded by bio-organisms naturally occurring in the soil or mitigated through natural attenuation.

#### COMMUNITY FORUM

A. Dick announced that the next RAB meeting is scheduled for November 8, but proposed that the next meeting be moved to November 15 because there is no meeting in December. A. Dick will coordinate the meeting date with RAB members. *After the meeting, it was decided to hold the next RAB meeting on November 8 as originally scheduled.*

---

M. Voce asked if outdated Navy documents should be returned to the Navy or if he should recycle them. A. Dick stated since none of the documents are classified, M. Voce should preferably recycle them if he has the capability.

ADJOURNMENT

A. Dick asked if RAB members had any suggestions for future agenda items or other topics to discuss. As there were none, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.