

---

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION (NAVWPNSTA) SEAL BEACH  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
AND COMMUNITY MEETING  
March 14, 2001

Participants:

Baillie, Dave/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Environmental Director  
Bettencourt, Philip  
Bradley, John/United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Castillion, Rich  
Clarke, Dean/County of Orange Health Care Agency  
Dick, Andrew/Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Garrison, Kirsten/CH2M HILL  
Hamparsumian, Hamlet/Foster Wheeler  
Jones, Carl/Foster Wheeler  
Lamond, Robert  
Le, Si /Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV)  
Leibel, Katherine/Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
Peoples, J.P.  
Pilichi, Carmine  
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 7:03 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 Community Co-chair. P. Tamashiro also introduced A. Dick, the outgoing Remedial Project Manager (RPM) from SWDIV. P. Tamashiro explained that A. Dick had recently been promoted and reassigned. S. Le, the incoming RPM from SWDIV, was introduced. S. Le gave a brief synopsis of his professional background. G. Smith/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Public Affairs Officer (PAO) and Dave Baillie/NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Environmental Director were also introduced.

After the introductions, P. Tamashiro stated that there was one agenda change to the RAB meeting. In addition to the Project Highlights presentation, there would be one IRP presentation would be given, instead of the two presentations as announced in the mailed invitation.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

A. Dick, provided the RAB with an overview of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach's IRP projects status. The following projects were highlighted:

- 
- Sites 4, 5, and 6 Removal Site Evaluation
  - Site 5 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and Action Memo/RAP (Removal Action Plan)
  - Site 5 Removal Action
  - Focused Site Inspection (FSI) Phase II (15 sites total)
  - Site 14 Baseline Survey Investigation
  - Groundwater Monitoring Program for Sites 40 and 70
  - Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, and ROD for Sites 40 and 70
  - Community Relations Plan (CRP) Update

Copies of the Project Highlights slide presentation were made available as handouts at the meeting. Questions and answers made immediately following the presentation are summarized below:

**Question:** Are work plans for the IRP activities at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach circulated to water quality activist groups such as Surfrider and Coast Keeper, for review?

**Answer:** No, they are not.

**Question:** Does the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) defer to the USFWS on review of work plans and other documents for proposed IRP activities at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

**Answer:** The CDFG does not defer to the USFWS. They are often absent from IRP meetings and do not always comment on IRP draft documents due to manpower limitations.

**Question:** Does the Coastal Commission comment on work plans and other documents for IRP activities at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

**Answer:** Not at all times. They are not normally on the regulatory reviewer's mailing list, because most of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach is located outside of the coastal zone.

B. Wong recalled one exception when the Coastal Commission was involved with Site 7 because of the discussion of construction of a cap over the landfill. Site 7 is located within the coastal zone and the Coastal Commission participated in the discussions.

**Question:** Does the Coastal Commission impose clean-up standards for environmental activities at NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach?

---

**Answer:** No, the Coastal Commission does not have clean-up standards of its own. However, all interested regulatory agencies may provide input (including applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements [ARARs]) to work plans and other IRP documents for NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach.

After the overview of project highlights, A. Dick expressed his gratitude to the RAB and the rest of the IRP project team. He highlighted the IRP project team's accomplishments in recent years, including the completed removals at Sites 1, 8, and 19 and subsequent regulatory concurrence. He also identified that Sites 5 and 7 removal action plans were well on their way, and that Sites 40 and 70 were entering the feasibility study stage. Additional highlights included the identification of Sites 73 and 74 and SWMU 24 as removal action candidates. A. Dick commended the RAB, community members, and regulatory agencies for their achievements with respect to the IRP.

#### PRESENTATION – SITE 5, CLEAN FILL DISPOSAL

P. Tamashiro introduced H. Hamparsumian, Foster Wheeler, who gave a presentation of the planned non-time critical removal action at Site 5.

Copies of the slide presentation were made available as a handout at the meeting. The questions and answers made immediately following the presentation are summarized below:

**Question:** Are there protocols in place to protect small mammals that inhabit Site 5?

**Answer:** The Navy and its remedial action contractor will coordinate with USFWS before the start of the removal action to address wildlife protection concerns and National Wildlife Refuge issues that may arise with respect to the implementation of the Site 5 removal action. In addition, the draft Site 5 Work Plan will be submitted to USFWS for review and comment.

Under CERCLA, no permits are required to implement this work, however, informational needs of USFWS will be satisfied.

**Question:** The presentation identified that Site 5 would be re-graded to the original pre-disposal grade. What type of replacement material will be used during re-grading activities?

**Answer:** No additional material will be needed for re-grading activities. Returning Site 5 to "pre-disposal grade" is defined as the topography of the site prior to the historical disposal activities that increased the elevation of the site.

**Question:** After excavation activities, what will prohibit the excavated cavity from caving in, due to the saturated soils of the wetlands surrounding Site 5? Will shoring be required?

**Answer:** The area to be excavated will be dry material and a cavity (lower than the topography of the surrounding wetlands) will not be formed as a result of excavation activities.

---

**Question:** Why isn't a consideration being made to the use of recycled crushed and clean material excavated from the disposal site at Site 5? Offsite hauling of excavated materials is expensive and result in a shortage of material to re-grade the site after excavation.

**Answer:** We will not be short of material to re-grade Site 5 to the original pre-disposal grade if concrete and asphalt demolition material and clean soil is hauled offsite. After the Site 5 material is excavated, no imported fill material is needed, and the site will simply be re-graded. The IRP only allows the Navy to restore Site 5 to its historical topography and conditions, but not to enhance these conditions to wetlands (for example).

**Question:** Has any methane been detected?

**Answer:** No, Site 5 is mostly composed of clean fill material and was never used as a landfill for trash. So, the potential for generating landfill gas (including methane) was low.

In addition, methane gas is not usually encountered in small, shallow sites like Site 5. Also, the disposal site has been inactive for some 20 years and degradation of the small amount of trash they may have been disposed there would have occurred years ago.

**Question:** Is Site 5 subject to removal action due to the risk of unexploded ordnance beneath the soil? Is ordnance visible above the soil surface?

**Answer:** Visible surface ordnance has been removed; however, buried ordnance still needs to be removed, which is the purpose of the removal action.

**Question:** Does the "probable" hazard probability mean there is a risk of the unexploded ordnance exploding on its own without intervention?

**Answer:** The hazard probability level was assessed based upon the area, extent, and level of accessibility of the site, including taking into account the USFWS and Nature Center's close proximity to Site.

**Question:** The risk of explosion isn't related to any action or activity at Site 5?

**Answer:** Yes, it is because the site is so accessible and there is a potential for individuals to interact with the unexploded ordnance.

As always there is an option to secure the site (e.g., put up a fence) which in itself is a type of "removal action," however, maintenance of the fence and signs and loss of the use of the land are major concerns, and the Navy prefers "clean closures" that eliminate or minimize long-term maintenance.

**Question:** What is the estimated cost for complete removal at Site 5?

**Answer:** Approximately \$1.3 million.

**Question:** What is the estimated cost for construction of a fence surrounding Site 5?

**Answer:** I do not recall the exact number.

---

The benefits of this proposed removal action is the restoration of the site to the original pre-disposal grade and eliminating the explosive risk to human health and the environment at the site.

**Question:** What if, after the geophysical survey and location activities are conducted, no sizeable amounts of metals are detected within the disposal site? Will excavation and sifting continue?

**Answer:** Previous studies conducted at the site have indicated the presence of buried unexploded ordnance based on geophysical surveys. These results (i.e., anomalies within the site) are almost certain to be confirmed during our removal action activities.

**Question:** Has the surface ordnance discovered at Site 5 been documented?

**Answer:** Yes, the Removal Site Evaluation identified the types of ordnance found. The ordnance was mostly small arms (50 caliber and less).

**Question:** Have any spent gas canisters been found at Site 5?

**Answer:** No.

**Question:** Are there groundwater contamination issues associated with Site 5?

**Answer:** No groundwater issues are associated specifically with Site 5.

However, there are followup groundwater monitoring activities agreed to with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Question:** Is Site 5 a candidate site for extension of the National Wildlife Refuge?

**Answer:** Site 5 is already considered within the National Wildlife Refuge.

**Question:** Will a wetland be created at Site 5?

**Answer:** Not necessarily. The site will be returned to its original pre-disposal grade. During high tide events, this area may become inundated with water, but the site restoration plan does not propose activities to ensure that the site becomes a wetland.

**Question:** Does the USFWS have any oversight role with regard to Site 5?

**Answer:** No, they have no formal oversight role, but coordination with the USFWS will occur.

## COMMUNITY FORUM

P. Tamashiro announced that there will not be a RAB meeting in April 2001. The next RAB meeting will occur on Wednesday, May 9, 2001.

P. Tamashiro also announced an upcoming meeting of the RAB Membership Committee to discuss ways to enhance RAB membership. She requested RAB Membership Committee members to contact L. Willhite, Community Co-Chair.

---

ADJOURNMENT

P. Tamashiro thanked the RAB members for their attendance. The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.