

**LONG BEACH NAVAL COMPLEX  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
FINAL MINUTES FROM 19 JANUARY 2000 MEETING**

The Long Beach Naval Complex (LBNC) held a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting on 19 January 2000, at the City of Long Beach Gas Department, 2400 East Spring Street, Long Beach, California.

**RAB ATTENDANCE:**

Thomas Macchiarella - Present  
Martin Hausladen- Present  
Jennifer Rich - Present  
Sue Hakim - Present  
Henry Brice - Absent  
Mary Butler - Absent  
Doug Carstens - Present  
Carol A. Churchill - Absent  
Greysen Edward Cooley - Present  
P. James Drake - Absent  
John Essington - Present  
Betsy Foley - Absent  
Howard Hargrove - Present  
Tom Johnson - Present  
Loyd Klock - Present  
Joseph Petway - Absent  
Darwin Thorpe - Present  
Karl A. Tiedemann - Present  
Anna Ulaszewski - Present  
Maria Vargas - Absent

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

David Bjostad, CDM Federal  
Julie Kercher, CDM Federal  
Anthony Caldwell, Roosevelt Base  
Jim Sturm, Base Closure Committee  
Terry Ulaszewski

**MEETING BEGAN AT 6:30 PM** – Thomas Macchiarella, Navy Co-Chair, presiding as Chair.

The Chair welcomed the RAB members and members of the audience and reminded everyone to please sign in (PRINT LEGIBLY) - **"The sign-in sheet is the official record of attendance for each RAB meeting. It is the responsibility of each and every RAB member to sign into the official record. If you do not sign in, you did not attend the meeting."**

Mr. Macchiarella reminded the RAB members that the meeting was being tape recorded. No objections were voiced from the floor.

## **Administrative Issues**

Mr. Macchiarella explained that there was a conflict with the room assignment. Another community group was assigned the same meeting room at the same time. He asked if RAB members would rather change the meeting location or change the meeting date for future meetings. The members agreed to change the meeting date to the fourth Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Macchiarella announced that Michelle Gallice-Sondrup will no longer be providing RAB technical support because she has taken another position with the Navy. Julie Kercher from CDM Federal will take her place.

Mr. Macchiarella requested that members of the RAB, Navy, regulatory agencies, and community introduce themselves.

Mr. Macchiarella requested comments on the draft 18 November meeting minutes. There was confusion because some RAB members had minutes from the July meeting instead. The November meeting minutes will be mailed to all members with the next mailing and will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Mr. Macchiarella said the Navy receives letters from RAB members periodically. He asked if the RAB members would like the letters forwarded. He clarified that he received three to four letters regarding recent documents and a couple more since then, totaling ten to twelve pages. The letters are a mixture of general comments and specific comments on the documents. He has not been distributing them or including them in the minutes.

Mr. Tiedemann suggested that authors state in the letters whether they want their letter distributed. Mr. Essington said he assumed his letter would be made public. However, Ms. Ulaszewski said some authors may not want their letter distributed. Mr. Thorpe suggested the Navy send out the recent letters and warn future authors that their letters will be distributed. Ms. Ulaszewski suggested that authors who do not want their letter distributed be responsible for conveying that to the Navy. Mr. Tiedemann stated that, in the past, letters were distributed to other members.

There was general agreement that RAB members would like to see the letters, so Mr. Macchiarella will gather the recent letters and send them out, probably in the next RAB mailing.

## **Presentation of the IR Program and CERCLA Process**

Mr. Bjostad of CDM Federal gave a general presentation meant to explain the process of investigation at a contaminated site.

Mr. Bjostad described the Navy Installation Restoration (IR) Program which follows the EPA CERCLA Process (CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980). The purpose of the program is to identify, investigate, assess, characterize, and clean up or control releases of hazardous substances. The California

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) review plans and reports and provide input and approval.

He displayed a diagram with all steps of the CERCLA process and presented each step as follows:

The purpose of the first step, the Preliminary Assessment (PA), is to discover potential hazardous waste releases. It includes site reconnaissance, document review, review of historical aerial photographs and maps, and personnel interviews.

The purpose of the second step, Site Inspection (SI), is to verify potential hazardous waste releases. It requires a Work Plan, Field Sampling Plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan, and Health and Safety Plan. The SI includes sampling (soil, groundwater, surface water, sediment, air, and/or biota) and associated laboratory chemical analysis.

The purpose of the third step, Remedial Investigation (RI), is to conduct site studies. It may require additional field sampling. The RI allows you to determine the nature and extent of contamination, assess contaminant fate and transport, identify applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), and assess risk to human health and the environment.

The purpose of the fourth step, Feasibility Study (FS), is to identify and evaluate feasible cleanup solutions. At this point, general cleanup solutions are identified, such as:

- Monitoring
- Containment
- Remove contamination and dispose offsite
- Treatment
- Institutional controls, (e.g., deed restrictions)
- No action

It also includes a preliminary screen of these general solutions against three criteria:

- Effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost

Any general solutions that pass the screening step will be further evaluated using these nine detailed criteria:

- Overall protection of human health and the environment
- Compliance with ARARs
- Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- Reductions in toxicity, mobility, and volume through treatment
- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost
- State acceptance
- Community acceptance

(Mr. Macchiarella added that these criteria have been determined by EPA and are defined specifically by them.) Next, an FS Report is then written detailing each possible solution evaluated.

The purpose of the fifth step, the Proposed Plan (PP), is to propose the remedy or remedies. The PP discusses the preferred remedy, briefly describes other solutions that were considered, and briefly summarizes the RI/FS. It is subject to a 30-day public comment period. (Mr. Macchiarella added that, for CERCLA sites, this is the first time the public has input on the process. In the case of the Navy IR Program, the public is involved much earlier through the RAB.)

The purpose of the sixth step, Record of Decision (ROD), is to document the selected remedy. The ROD describes the cleanup solution selection process as well as the final solution. It is sometimes called a Decision Document (DD). It must be signed by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team before a remedial action is started, and its completion allows remedial design to begin.

The purpose of the seventh step, Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA), is to design and conduct the cleanup solution. It converts the conceptual design into a final design and implements the design by constructing and operating the selected cleanup solution. An example would be construction of groundwater extraction wells and a treatment system.

Mr. Bjostad explained that another stage, the Removal Action Process, can be implemented at any time during the remedial action process. It may be the final solution for a site, but need not be (i.e., it might be a partial solution, such as installing a fence or removing a drum). It is sometimes appropriate for removing imminent threats (i.e., emergencies). It involves three steps:

- Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA)
- Action Memorandum (AM)
- Removal Action

The purpose of the EE/CA is to evaluate and propose removal actions using three criteria:

- Effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost

It will also identify removal action goals. There is a 30-day public review for all EE/CAs. The purpose of the AM is to select the removal action. It substantiates the need for a removal action, identifies the selected removal action, and explains the rationale for the selected alternative. A Removal Action should abate, minimize, stabilize, or eliminate the release or threat of release. Examples include:

- Cap contaminated soils
- Build stormwater run-off controls to divert water away from a contaminated area
- Excavate highly contaminated soils to prevent spread to groundwater
- Build fences around a site or post warning signs.

Mr. Bjostad described the status of the LBNC IR Sites as of January 2000:

- PA and SI steps completed at all 14 IR sites
- RI completed at 13 sites, while Site 14 is following the removal action process (through EE/CA step)
- Draft FS completed for 7 sites (Sites 7-13)
- PP completed for 2 sites (Sites 1, 2)
- ROD completed for 4 sites (Sites 3-6)

During the presentation, there were questions on institutional controls and deed restrictions. Mr. Macchiarella explained that certain institutional controls apply to the whole base, but the Navy tries to focus them on particular sites. Also, there are many non-environmental drivers for deed restrictions. He said there are only two parcels to be transferred. Parcel 1 is going through the early transfer process. Parcel 2 consists mainly of the former shipyard. There are likely to be many reuses of Parcel 2. Sites 3, 4, 5, and 6 have institutional controls per the ROD.

After the presentation, Mr. Essington asked if unexploded ordnance is part of CERCLA. Mr. Macchiarella said he believes it is covered in the IR program, although it does not come up often. When it does come up, experts are brought in and they may follow a special process of investigation.

Ms. Ulaszewski asked, for those sites requiring ongoing remediation, who oversees the action? Mr. Macchiarella explained the remedial design phase would include a Monitoring Plan and Operations and Maintenance Plan. Mr. Hausladen confirmed that this plan would be sent to the regulatory agencies. Mr. Macchiarella said that the Navy has a five-year review process in which the regulators and Navy review the situation to ensure it was correctly handled.

Mr. Tiedemann asked if methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) was being monitored. Mr. Macchiarella stated that the Navy knows where certain MTBE contamination is located at LBNC and has special projects to manage it. Mr. Bjostad explained that old sites should not be sources of MTBE because it has only been added to gasoline recently (since the 1980's). Nevertheless, it would have been identifiable by the analytical laboratory. If a site is closed and new contamination is found, it can be reopened. The regulatory closure letters state there is "no further action at this time."

### **Regulator Update**

Mr. Macchiarella explained that this is a new agenda item that will allow the RAB members to hear from the regulators and find out about any new concerns.

Mr. Hausladen started by describing what he does at the EPA. In addition to the LBNC site, he oversees both Marine Corps Air Station in Yuma and the Naval Training Center in San Diego. Currently Yuma is taking most of his time. For LBNC, he has recently reviewed the Base Closure Plans and provided comments to Mr. Macchiarella. He is also providing comments to the Port of Long Beach (POLB) on a recent permitting document. EPA is not the lead agency, so his role is to provide support to the Navy and the DTSC. Although documents

have been slow to get through DTSC in the past, he is pleased that current staff are moving documents through more quickly.

Ms. Rich said the current focus of DTSC has been the early transfer process for Parcel 1. The target date has been moved from January to March. She is working on agreements with the POLB and the Navy. She is reviewing Navy responses to her comments on the Draft ROD for Sites 1 & 2 and the Draft FS for Site 7. Other DTSC staff are reviewing the pilot study Work Plan for Site 14 and the Draft FSs for Sites 9, 12, 13, Site 10, and Site 11. LBNC is the only base to which she and Sue Hakim are assigned.

### **Open Forum for RAB Members and Members of the Audience**

Mr. Klock asked Ms. Rich what agreements were being postponed until March. Ms. Rich explained that DTSC is working with the Navy on the Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA) and the Land Use Covenant. They have a separate agreement with the POLB.

Mr. Sturm asked about the early transfer and why it is being rushed since the POLB does not have customers. Mr. Macchiarella stated the Navy can transfer Parcel 1 before it is completely cleaned up. This will benefit both the Navy and the POLB. Mr. Hausladen stated that reuse of the land is not an issue for the RAB and the regulators. Mr. Caldwell stated that he was unable to contact the POLB and that Long Beach residents are suspicious of their actions. Mr. Macchiarella told him to contact Mr. Johnson for any environmental issues, but other POLB staff are involved in reuse issues.

Several RAB member expressed concern that the early transfer process will prevent proper site cleanup. Mr. Hausladen and Ms. Rich reassured the RAB that the regulators will be involved until it is clean, no matter who owns the land. Mr. Macchiarella clarified that the Navy's goal is to transfer the property, but transfer to the POLB does not make the POLB responsible for cleanup; the Navy will continue to clean up the site. Mr. Hausladen stated that cleanup levels were determined at the beginning of the process (based on industrial reuse) and reviewed by the community; reuse has no effect on these cleanup levels. Mr. Macchiarella explained that community acceptance of these cleanup levels is determined by the Navy from the RAB response. He also stated that the Navy is following the CERCLA/IR process which is based on end use. Mr. Hausladen emphasized that the Navy has data to show that the cleanup will be effective. Mr. Hargrove and Mr. Hausladen stated that the City of Long Beach held meetings in the past to discuss the future use of the Naval Complex.

Mr. Essington mentioned that the site-specific Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) described ships offloading ordnance at Seal Beach before arrival at LBNC and that LBNC only stored small arms. However, there is evidence of ordnance in the sediments around other areas of the bay not used for Navy activities. Mr. Macchiarella said that changes were made to the Base Closure Plan as previously requested by Mr. Essington.

Mr. Hargrove asked about the dredging reports. Mr. Hausladen stated that the POLB has a large amount of information available and that they are reporting to another branch of EPA as

well as the Army Corps of Engineers and the RWQCB. Mr. Johnson stated that testing was done well before dredging. He said the reports are available and should also be summarized in the Notice of Permit Request. He added that there are procedures for evaluation of the sediments and that EPA determines where sediments can be placed.

Mr. Tiedemann asked if the POLB could present dredging information to the RAB since the POLB has done more testing than the Navy has. Mr. Cooley asked for the names of the dredging contractors. Mr. Johnson said Pier T Constructors is contracted to perform the dredging and construct the pier, with help from subcontractors. The Queensgate dredging project is a separate project managed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Ms. Ulaszewski asked about safeguards. Mr. Johnson said that they have procedures for calling in unexploded ordnance (UXO) experts if needed. So far nothing unusual has been found. He explained how the contractors use a screen to separate out large items. Mr. Johnson agreed to set up a time with Mr. Macchiarella to present dredging information to the RAB.

Having no additional comments, the RAB meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

The next LBNC RAB meeting is scheduled for 22 March 2000 at the City of Long Beach Gas Department. [Please Note: The meeting has since been changed to **29 March 2000.**]

*These minutes were recorded by Julie Kercher of CDM Federal Programs Corporation acting as the RAB Technical Support at 858-268-3383, and reviewed and approved by all members of the Long Beach Naval Complex Restoration Advisory Board.*

*Approved meeting minutes for the LBNC RAB can be found at:*

- (1) The LBNC Information Repository located at the Long Beach Public Library, Government Publications Department; and*
- (2) The Internet at the Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SWDIV) Web page at <http://www.efdswnavfac.navy.mil/DEP/ENV/default.htm> - SWDIV Point of Contact: Mr. Lee Saunders (619) 532-3100.*