

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

Region 4

245 West Broadway, Suite 350
Beach, CA 90802-4444
590-4868

March 29, 1993

N60258.000778
NSY LONG BEACH
SSIC #5090.3

Ms. Andrea Muckerman
Remedial Project Manager
Southwest Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, California 92132-5190

Dear Andrea:

Enclosed is the Summary of Community Concerns for the Long Beach Naval Complex. Also enclosed is Appendix A - the list of all those who participated in the community interviews. Please have this information included in the Public Participation Plan currently being prepared for the Naval Complex.

If you would like to discuss these items, please contact me at (310) 590-4949.

Sincerely,

Claire Best
Public Participation Specialist
Public Participation Unit

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Craig O'Rourke
Hazardous Materials Specialist
Facility Permitting Branch
Department of Toxic substances Control
Region 4
245 West Broadway, Suite 350
Long Beach, California 90802-4444

Mr. Alvaro Gutierrez
Waste Management Engineer
Base Closure Branch
Department of Toxic substances Control
Region 4
245 West Broadway, Suite 350
Long Beach, California 90802-4444

Ms. Andrea Muckerman
March 29, 1993
Page 2

Mr. Anand Rege
Unit Chief
Facility Permitting Branch
Department of Toxic substances Control
Region 4
245 West Broadway, Suite 350
Long Beach, California 90802-4444

LCDR, John L. Snyder
Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy
Long Beach Naval Station, Code N4
Building #1
Long Beach, California 90822-5000

Ms. C. Anna Ulaszewski
Environmental Division
Long Beach Naval Shipyard
Code 106.31
Long Beach, California 90822-5099

Mr. John Ryan, Jr.
Public Affairs Specialist
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Code 142
Long Beach, California 90822

LCDR, Steven B. Chesser
Public Affairs Officer
Long Beach Naval Station
Commander, Naval Surface Group
Long Beach, California 90822-5076

Mr. Charles Flagg
CH2M Hill
P.O. Box 15960
Santa Ana, California 92705

N60258.000778
NSY LONG BEACH
SSIC # 5090.3

ENCLOSURE (1)
DRAFT SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONCERNS

DRAFT SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONCERNS

DATED 29 MARCH 1993

DRAFT

LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX, CALIFORNIA

Summary of Community Concerns

Prepared by California Department of Toxic Substances Control

March 1993

The following is a summary of concerns and comments expressed during community interviews conducted in February and March 1993, for the Long Beach Naval Complex by the Navy and DTSC. The purpose of these interviews was to identify the interested community as well as assess their concerns, interests and needs so as to develop a comprehensive community relations plan.

Due to the level of community interest in base closure, reuse, and the environment, extensive interviews were conducted for this site. Interviewees included public officials, environmental groups, residents, and community associations. A total of 42 individuals participated in the interviews. A list of those interviewed can be found in Appendix A.

This Public Participation Plan does not attempt to respond to concerns, but rather to report them so that they can be considered and addressed during the site remediation process.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Long Beach Naval Complex is located in an industrialized area. Because of the location, and the operations conducted at the Naval Shipyard, most interviewees indicated that they were not surprised to learn that portions of the Naval Complex may be contaminated with hazardous waste. Nearby residents claim they are engaged in a "constant battle" with industry regarding environmental issues. Residents believe contamination is widespread in their community due to activities in the port. Interviewees stated they felt that adjoining businesses contributed to the contamination of the harbor as well as the Navy.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM (IRP):

Most of the interviewees were not familiar with the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) process or the regulatory framework guiding the site investigation and cleanup. The purpose of the IRP and brief overview of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the 1986 Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) was provided during the interviews. Page --of this plan contains a description of the regulatory process.

FEDERAL FACILITY PROCESS:

Local officials said they had confidence in the Navy's ability to cleanup the property under the IRP. However, it was stated that the Long Beach Naval Complex investigation and cleanup should be required to meet the same cleanup standards as a similar process at a civilian Superfund site. Community members do not want the process abbreviated or changed simply because it is a federal facility.

Concern about the standards posed on a federal facility was twofold. Most interviewees favored accelerating the remediation process to expedite reuse. Others were concerned that the Navy and DTSC will be pressured to hurry the environmental investigation and cleanup and that the Naval Complex will not be properly remediated. There is concern that if the property is not remediated properly it may be unusable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Although base closure and reuse are extremely important to the community, several interviewees expressed specific concerns about the environment as follows:

San Pedro Bay:

Interviewees frequently mentioned concern about the contamination of the San Pedro Bay. They stated that the San Pedro Bay is extremely contaminated due to the many industries in the area, including the Naval Shipyard. It is feared that run-off from the Naval Complex is continuing to contaminate the bay. Residents claimed that at one time the bay was biodiverse, but as a result of the contamination many species no longer exist at the Naval Complex. Environmental groups are concerned about the disappearance of the *Batrachoseps attenuatus*, a rare salamander without lungs, that once was abundant in the area.

Groundwater:

Interviewees asked if the groundwater was contaminated and if it could be used as drinking water. It was felt that it would be an unnecessary expenditure to remediate the groundwater to drinking water standards if it is not potable. Also, some interviewees were concerned that cleaning up to drinking water standards would set a precedent, which would significantly increase the cost and the time required to remediate other sites in the area.

Ocean/Marine Life:

Concern was expressed over hydrocarbon migration from the Naval Complex to the ocean, and from the ocean back to the Naval Complex. Hydrocarbons are chemicals found in solvents and fuels that were used by the Navy at this facility. Interviewees are concerned that tidal estuaries, commercial fisheries and marine mammals may be endangered due to contamination seeping into the ocean and moving up the food chain.

Soil Contamination:

The Navy has occupied the site since 1938. Interviewees said that over time, the various activities associated with the Naval Shipyard such as sand blasting, had caused contamination of the soil. In particular, interviewees had concerns about the dry dock area being contaminated by sand blast grit.

Dredging/Wildlife:

There is concern that sediments in the bay may require dredging. Interviewees stated that dredging would cause the re-suspension of contamination which could endanger wildlife. Re-suspension of contaminants might cause a foraging problem for the Brown Pelican and the Least Tern. Although these birds do not nest at the Naval Complex, they are present in the area and forage in the bay.

Health Effects from Contamination:

Residents believe that lead based paint and other hazardous materials were disposed of in the bay during the 1940's. There was concern these activities might have contaminated sediments in the bay. One interviewee stated that pollution indicators such as the polychaete worms which feed on hydrocarbons proliferate in the bay.

There is concern that people eating fish from the bay (specifically the white croaker) may be unknowingly endangering their health, since these fish feed on toxic polychaete worms.

Dust Control/Airborne Emissions:

Community members are concerned that currently, dust blowing from the Naval Complex may be contaminated and therefore a threat to public health.

Unexploded Ordinance:

Interviewees expressed concern about the possibility of unexploded ordinance from World War II and Vietnam existing on the Long Beach Naval Complex. They stated that the navy should investigate thoroughly to ensure that no ordinance is left behind.

PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES DURING REMEDIAL ACTIONS:

Several concerns were expressed about the potential for community and environmental impacts during any field activities. Concerns included transportation routes used for any waste removed from the site; the need for dust control during field activities; consideration of air emissions during Santa Ana conditions; potential for impact on any of the populations in close proximity to the Naval Complex, including employees of adjoining business.

DISPOSAL OF DREDGING MATERIAL:

Interviewees also stated that if dredging is necessary the disposal of dredging material would be a concern. Residents near the Naval Complex stated they were concerned that hazardous materials would be trucked off-site through their community.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CONCERNS:

In additional to the environmental concerns previously mentioned, community members raised several questions which are summarized as follows:

- o Storm water drains: were they contaminated by solvents and pcb's?
- o Underground Storage Tanks: are there any? If so when will they be removed.

- o Is the Navy aware of underground pipelines in the area?
- o When will the cleanup begin?
- o What type of contaminants are out there?
- o Will people who reuse this facility be at risk?
- o How long will the investigation take?
- o Is there anything radioactive?
- o Do we know about seeping?
- o Can students receive information on environmental issues related to the IRP process?
- o Should we be spending money to clean this site?

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Media:

Community members suggested that information about the Long Beach Naval Complex be placed in the following newspapers:

Press Telegram

News Pilot

Los Angeles Times, Long Beach Edition

Los Angeles Times, South Bay Edition

The Daily Breeze

Downtown Gazette

Wrigley Journal

Long Beach Business Journal

Long Beach Times

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- o Interviewees encouraged the Navy and DTSC to involve the public early in the IRP process.
- o Most community members suggested fact sheets as the best means of communication.
- o Community meetings were also suggested. Evenings seemed to be preferred for most people. Frequency preference was for annually, semi-annually or on an as-needed basis i.e. only when significant milestones/changes or new activity will take place; residents often cited their busy schedules as reason for not holding unnecessary meetings.
- o Community members stated they wanted timely information on the IR Program. They want the Navy to inform them of the IR Program before final decision are made. They specifically asked to review and comment on draft documents. They felt that waiting for public meetings, which usually occur after documents have been finalized does not provide the opportunity for meaningful public input into the decision making process.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Interviewees were informed of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and its function. Several interviewees expressed interest in being a member of the committee. Others were interested in attending an occasional meeting. It was suggested that perhaps some TRC meetings be held at night to accommodate interested parties who work during the day.

Several interviewees said that they were not interested in attending meetings, but that they would like to receive TRC meeting summaries or minutes. Appendix ---contains a list of TRC members.

Local officials stressed the need to provide the public with opportunities to participate in the IRP process. It was felt that the TRC could help facilitate this.

BASE CLOSURE

The predominant issue concerning those interviewed is what will happen once the Long Beach Naval Station is closed in September 1996. It was explained to interviewees that while DTSC and the Navy understood the concerns associated with base closure and reuse, the focus of the Community Relations Plan was the IRP cleanup process. Interviewees were informed that the CRP would list concerns regarding base reuse in the Summary of Community Concerns, but that separate meetings would be held to address those concerns. The DTSC has established the position of Environmental Assessment and Reuse Specialist to work with reuse groups at closing bases. The EARS for DTSC region IV is:

Ms. Gina Maria Gillette
Department of Toxic Substances Control
245 W. Broadway, Suite 350
Long Beach, CA 908
(310) 590-4990

Any questions regarding DTSC's role in the reuse process may be addressed to the above.

The Navy's point of contact for base closure and reuse information is:

Lieutenant Commander John Snyder
Civil Engineer Corps
Facilities Management Department
Long Beach Naval Station
Long Beach, CA 90822-5000
(310) 547-7513

Economic Affects of Base Closure:

Most interviewees expressed concern over the current economic situation in Southern California. Local officials were particularly concerned about the loss of the strong economic base that the Long Beach Naval Station provided to the community. The area has been hard hit by cut backs in defense spending. Recently,

the community has experienced severe lay offs in the aircraft industry. As a result of these lay offs the unemployment rate in Southern California is higher than the rest of the state. It is estimated that closing the Long Beach Naval Station will result in the loss of ---- civilian jobs.

DTSC and the Navy acknowledged that the environmental investigation and cleanup of the Naval complex would be a lengthy process. Both local officials and residents stressed the need to accelerate the process to facilitate reuse. Local officials are hopeful that reuse plans will provide employment opportunities for the community. One interviewee stated that whenever possible, local contractors should be used for any construction related to reuse of the base. In addition to concerns about the economy, other concerns were expressed regarding reuse of the property as follows:

Reuse Plans:

The City of Long Beach as well as the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles have expressed interest in reusing portions of the Long Beach Naval Station once it is closed. To date, the Navy has not selected a reuse plan. Residents in the area stated they were concerned about the type of industry or businesses that might be brought into the community once the Naval Station closes. They stressed the need to select industries that will not contribute to the existing contamination.

Cleanup Levels:

Another concern related to reuse was the establishment of cleanup levels. Interviewees felt that since the property will most likely be reused for industrial/commercial purposes and that cleanup levels should be set accordingly. There was concern that attempting to cleanup the property to residential levels would be too costly and time consuming and would impede reuse.

Parcelization:

Interviewees stated that clean parcels of land should be turned over to the community for reuse as soon as possible. They felt that waiting for the entire facility to be cleaned up prior to reuse poses an economic hardship on the community.

Interviewees suggested using clean parcels of land to house the homeless. They said the city of Long Beach has a critical shortage of available housing for the homeless. They contend that using existing buildings at the Naval Complex would provide a timely solution to the problem.

Asbestos in Buildings:

There is concern about what will happen to buildings that contain asbestos. Interviewees asked if the buildings would be demolished and the asbestos removed as part of the IRP program.

Funding:

Interviewees expressed concern over the Navy's ability to fund the cleanup. There was concern that if full remediation is not performed due to a lack of funds, reuse will be limited.

Cost:

The cost of the IRP program was also a community concern. Interviewees indicated they wanted the Naval Complex remediated in a cost effective manner.

Agency Coordination:

Interviewees stated the importance of close coordination between the Navy and DTSC during the cleanup process. They believe coordination will prevent delays and expedite reuse of the base.

N60258.000778
NSY LONG BEACH
SSIC # 5090.3

ENCLOSURE (2)
APPENDIX A

DRAFT SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONCERNS

DATED 29 MARCH 1993

Appendix A

Local and State Officials:

- Mr. James C. Hankla, City Manager, City of Long Beach
- Mr. Robert Paternoster, Director of Planning & Building,
City of Long Beach
- Ms. Bea Anderson, R.E.H.S., M.P.H. Hazardous Waste Coordinator,
Long Beach Health Department
- Mr. Jerry Miller, City of Long Beach (Economic Development)
- Ms. Julia Takehashi, Deputy, City Councilmember Alan Lowenthal
- Ms. Geraldine Knatz, Planning Director, Port of Long Beach
- Mr. Richard Steinke, Director of Properties, Port of Long Beach
- Mr. Thomas N. Teofilo, Teofilo & Associate Companies,
Economic Development Commission
- Mr. Ray Grabinski, Councilmember, City of Long Beach
- Mr. Evan Braude, Councilmember, City of Long Beach
- Mr. Andrew Kincade, Administrative Analyst,
Councilman Evan Braude's Office
- Mr. Leonard Le Capton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- Dr. Robert Kantor, Director of Planning, City of Long Beach Harbor
Department, Board of Harbor Commissioners
- Mr. Roger Powell, Field Representative for Assemblymember
Betty Karnette
- Ms. Denise Kylmas, Hazardous Materials Response Division, National
Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
- Mr. Michael Murchison, Deputy, Los Angeles County Supervisor
Dean Dana
- Ms. Claire Randall, Los Angeles Harbor Boat Owners Association
- Mr. Richard McCorkle, President, Los Angeles Harbor Boat Owners
Association
- Ms. JoAnn Wysocki, President, Wilmington Home Owners Association
- Ms. Gertrude Schwab, North Neighborhood Association
- Mr. Bill Schwab, North Neighborhood Association

Mr. Joe Mendez, Jr., Field Representative for Assemblymember
Junita McDonald

Ms. Betsy Mitchell, Environmental Scientist, Port of Los Angeles

Mr. Philip Tondreault, Property Management, Port of Los Angeles

Mr. Christopher Foley, Marine Environmental Supervisor,
Port of Los Angeles

Mr. Donald W. Rice, Director of Environmental Management,
Port of Los Angeles

Mr. Richard Nitsos, California Fish and Game

Mr. Don Kriminger, Manager, Terminal Island Marina

Mr. Joseph F. Rasch, Environmental Health and Safety Manager,
Long Beach Unified School District

Mr. Douglas Haubert, Field Representative for Assemblymember
Bob Epple

Ms. Alicia D. Loncar, Field Representative for Assemblymember Bob
Epple

Mr. Don Foltz

Mr. Michale J. Czap, Section Chief, South Coast Air Quality
Management District

Mr. Mohan Nagavedu, Supervision Inspector, South Coast Air Quality
Management District

Mr. Michael Haynes, Inspector, South Coast Air Quality Management
District

Ms. Ruthanne M. Walker, Sr. Environmental Engineer, Four Corners
Pipe Line Company

Mr. Albert B. Mead, Facility Foreman, ARCO Western Pipe Line
Company

Mr. Donald May, Earth Island Institute/Friends of the Earth

Mr. Marshall Bezoski, Long Beach Area Citizens Involved

Ms. Joan Hemphill, Long Beach Area Citizens Involved

Ms. Ann D'Amato, Harbor Area Deputy to Councilwoman
Joan Milke-Flores, City of Los Angeles

Mr. Jack Braun, Manager, Environmental, Union Pacific Resources