

**Meeting Minutes  
Travis Air Force Base  
Environmental Management  
Building 246, Upstairs Conference Room  
Installation Restoration Program  
Remedial Program Managers Meeting**

**10 April 2002, 0930 hours**

Mr. Allen Brickeen, Travis Air Force Base (AFB), conducted the Remedial Program Managers (RPM) meeting held on 10 April 2002 at 0930 in Building 246, Upstairs Conference Room, Travis AFB, California. Attendees included:

- Allen Brickeen Travis AFB
- Glenn Anderson Travis AFB
- Dale Malsberger Travis AFB
- Tom Sreenivasan Travis AFB
- Wilford Day Travis AFB
- DeAnn Lehigh Travis AFB
- Roby Gregg Air Force for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE)
- John Lucey U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)
- Jose Salcedo Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
- Wayne Williams CH2M Hill
- Deena Stanley URS
- Elise Willmeth URS
- Brian Garber GTI/IT

Handouts distributed throughout the meeting included:

- Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
- Attachment 2 Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedules
- Attachment 3 SBBGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
- Attachment 4 CGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
- Attachment 5 NGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
- Attachment 6 Summary Sheets for Sites SD034, SS035, SD036 and SD037
- Attachment 7 Selected Remedies for Four WIOU Sites
- Attachment 8 CH2M Hill Field Activities, February 2002
- Attachment 9 GTI Field Activities, February 2002
- Attachment 10 URS Field Activities, February 2002

## **1. ADMINISTRATIVE**

### **A. Previous Meeting Minutes**

The 13 February 2002 meeting minutes were approved and finalized.

### **B. Four-Month Calendar of Upcoming Milestones and Meeting Dates**

The revised Travis AFB Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedules were distributed (see Attachment 2).

#### **Master Meeting and Document Schedule**

- Page 1, West/Annexes/Basewide Operable Unit (WABOU) Soil Record of Decision (ROD) draft final and final due dates were changed to TBD (to be determined) while the ROD dispute was being resolved.
- Page 2, Central Groundwater Treatment Plant (CGWTP) Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Manual Revision 1 schedule was revised. This document was final on 2 April 2002.
- Page 4, the Institutional Control Plan title was changed to Land Use Control Plan.
- Page 5, SD045, LF008, and LF044 Soil Remedial Design Package schedules were established. Mr. Brickeen stated LF044 will only cover the construction aspects of land use controls.
- Page 6, DP039 Reactive Wall Treatability Study Report schedule was established.
- Page 6, Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Program (GSAP) Semi-Annual Report schedule was established.
- Page 6, SS016 Expansion Interim Remedial Action Report schedule was established.
- Page 9, the RW013 Soil Remedial Design and the GSAP 2000 Annual Report were moved to the historical section.

## **2. OPERABLE UNIT UPDATE**

### **A. North/East/West/ Industrial Operable Unit**

#### **1. Landfill Cap Design**

Mr. Malsberger stated that Travis AFB is waiting for funding to complete the draft final and final landfill cap design package.

Mr. Brickeen stated that on 9 April 2002 he received news that the Air Force has identified all the military construction (MILCON) projects. AFB projects will not be MILCON, so AFCEE will have funding in a couple of weeks. The South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant operation and maintenance project and free-product removal projects are currently on contract. AFCEE is working on the contracts for the Central and North Groundwater Treatment Plants operation and maintenance.

Mr. Malsberger stated that Phase I of the CAMU will begin as soon as possible. GTI will mobilize the equipment by 1 June 2002; GTI will begin by completing the vernal pool construction started last fall in the preserve near the housing area and will then move to LF007.

## **2. Draft LF007C Groundwater Remedial Design Review**

Mr. Malsberger stated that the draft LF007C Groundwater Remedial Design Package is still under review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

## **3. NEWIOU ROD Plan of Action and Milestones**

Mr. Malsberger stated that comments on the ARARs were due on 30 March 2002. Ms. Raker had submitted preliminary comments and will follow up with final comments. Mr. Salcedo stated that he has not heard anything from his attorney, but he is sure that DTSC will have comments on the ARARs. Mr. Lucey stated that he is also waiting to hear from his attorney and expects to have something within a month. Mr. Lucey asked if this would set Travis AFB back.

Mr. Malsberger stated that it depends upon the comments. Since the ARARs are the same as those for the WABOU, the comments/changes should not be significant. (The changes made to the NEWIOU ARARs included deletion of radiological, munitions removal, and minor issues.)

Mr. Lucey asked if Union Creek and the sediments were covered in the WABOU Soil ROD. Mr. Malsberger stated that it appears that the ARARs were general enough in terms of media that Travis AFB was not aware of anything additional that would need to be added to address sediment and surface water. This is one of the reasons the Air Force requested the agencies to review the ARARs. (Most of the ARARs would be covered by the Water Board.)

Mr. Malsberger stated that comments on Sections 1 through 4 (background and historical information) are due 21 May 2002. The summary table was emailed on 9 April 2002 for review. This table will eventually become the decision summary for each site.

Mr. Malsberger gave an update on the following:

- The generic cleanup table was distributed at the last RPM meeting. The Air Force is still working on the five remaining hazard quotient values.
- Sections 1 through 4 of the ROD contain historical information about the Travis AFB environmental program and its findings. Comments on these sections are due 21 May 2002.
- A summary table of the sites was emailed to the agencies on 9 April 2002 for review. This table provides a working list of the sites and identifies the action, if any, habitat, cleanup standards, etc. This summary table for the first group of sites, which will provide site-specific information agreed upon. The table will eventually evolve into a decision summary table.

## **B. West/Annexes/Basewide Operable Unit**

### **1. Soil Record of Decision**

Mr. Anderson stated that the dispute should not interfere with the review of documents. The soil design packages deal with the construction aspects of the Travis AFB program, whereas the dispute is dealing with the administrative issue of what happens after the cleanup activities are complete, such as land use controls.

Mr. Anderson asked if it would be appropriate for Travis AFB to continue work on the designs. Mr. Lucey stated that the only concern U.S. EPA has would be placing soil in the CAMU. Since the ROD is not finalized, the CAMU is not finalized; therefore, placement of soil in the CAMU would be a violation of RCRA.

Mr. Anderson stated that everyone should be able to stay informed on the dispute through the teleconferences and meetings.

Mr. Brickeen asked if Mr. Lucey had heard anything from EPA headquarters. Mr. Lucey stated that he has heard conflicting stories that indicate that everyone has not reached consensus on how to proceed with the dispute. The main difference in opinion is that most of the people at Region IX believe that the Travis AFB dispute should not be tied to Langley AFB. They believe that the Travis AFB dispute should go on its own course. The main reason is that the dispute at Langley AFB is unclear on what will happen, how it will be resolved, and the schedule. Region IX's preference is for the Travis AFB dispute to proceed on its schedule, and go forward with the dispute. Headquarters (some of the people) think that Travis AFB should be placed on hold for 30 days while others want to move forward.

Mr. Brickeen asked who takes the lead on the dispute resolution. Ms. Lehigh stated that she would check with Mr. Jim Fisher at Air Mobility Command (AMC) for the answer.

## **2. FY02 RD/RA Schedule**

Mr. Brickeen stated that it appears that Travis AFB may receive funding for the remedial designs in time to support the Phase 2 effort. If the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) is followed, the dispute will be resolved within two months; therefore, Travis AFB wants to have the completed designs ready.

## **3. Reactive Wall Report**

Mr. Anderson stated that the draft Reactive Wall Treatability Study Report was submitted to the agencies. It contains possible options for incorporating the reactive wall into the DP039 groundwater interim remedial action. Mr. Anderson requested that the agencies have their technical experts review the report.

## **3. CURRENT PROJECTS**

### **A. South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant**

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant (SBBGWTP) performed at 99% uptime with approximately 7.2 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of February 2002. The average flow was 163 gallons per minute (gpm). Approximately 3.2 pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were removed during March 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 173.4 pounds (see Attachment 3).

All extraction wells are in operation and the plant is performing at its highest efficiency. Since the restart of the air stripper, in January 2002, there has been no evidence of system scaling, so acid washing has not been necessary. The new sequestering agent, MCT-4120, has replaced Aqua-Mag-1.

Mr. Wayne Williams reported that the final four extraction wells and seven monitoring wells will be installed late summer 2002. (The delay was obtaining the access agreement.) In April, Travis AFB will obtain the dig permits, install the gate, and conduct the surveys. In May, CPT will be done to confirm the extent of the plume.

### **B. Central Groundwater Treatment Plant**

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the Central Groundwater Treatment Plant (CGWTP) performed at 98.9% uptime with approximately 3.7 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated. The average flow for the CGWTP was 84.1 gpm during March 2002. Approximately 34 pounds of VOCs were removed during March 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 2,035 pounds (see Attachment 4).

Operation of the thermal oxidizer system improved over the last three months. Minor maintenance was needed to replace the sticking plastic floats in the blowers with metal floats.

Approximately 50,000 gallons of construction water from Area 300 was treated through the CGWTP. Because of the visible oily sheen and odor, the water contain JP-8 at concentrations that could affect the destruction removal efficiency of the ultraviolet oxidation (UV/Ox) unit. Therefore, samples were collected at the influent and effluent and analyzed for extractable petroleum hydrocarbons. TPH was detected in the influent stream but not in the effluent.

Mr. Sreenivasan asked Mr. Lucey if he had reviewed the revised operation and maintenance manual yet. Mr. Lucey said he had not, but he would have comments by 19 April.

#### **C. North Groundwater Treatment Plant**

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the North Groundwater Treatment Plant (NGWTP) performed at 60.9% uptime. Approximately 0.3 pounds of VOCs were removed during the month of March. Approximately 264,400 gallons of water were extracted and treated. The average flow for the NGWTP was 2.7 gpm for the month of March. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 150.5 pounds (see Attachment 5).

The transitioning of the NGWTP from IT Corp. to URS is complete.

Groundwater elevations continue to be too high to operate the soil vapor extraction (SVE) system.

The Air Force is continuing to address the U.S. EPA's comments on the NGWTP O&M Manual.

#### **D. LF008 O&M Manual Review**

Mr. Anderson stated that the Air Force has provided responses to the U.S. EPA comments on the draft LF008 O&M Manual. Mr. Lucey stated that he has not reviewed the comments as of this date.

#### **E. DP039 Treatability Study Report**

Mr. Anderson stated that he will remove controversial topics from the DP039 Treatability Study Report in order to finalize the document; however, this document is not a priority.

#### **F. GSAP Annual Report Review**

Mr. Brickeen stated that the quarterly sampling is complete and the report should be submitted by the end of the month. (It was previously agreed that this report would be a "data dump" report.)

The next sampling round will take place in May 2002.

**G. Basewide Soil RD/RA Plan**

Mr. Malsberger stated that DTSC and RWQCB did not have comments on the Basewide Soil Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) Plan. Travis AFB responded to U.S. EPA's and the Restoration Advisory Board's (RAB) comments. Mr. Lucey stated that he has not reviewed the Air Force's responses; however, he thinks it will be okay. He would like to take one final look and will call Mr. Malsberger by 19 April 2002.

**H. Distribution of Reports**

Mr. Brickeen stated that Mr. Roger Johnson no longer needs draft documents since Mr. Atkins is no longer on line. Unless the document is something that AFCEE specifically needs to review, do not send drafts – just cover letters. However, AFCEE does want the finals.

Mr. Brickeen will coordinate with contractors in supporting this.

**I. NEWIOU – Set 1 sites (SD034, SS035, SD036, and SD037)**

Mr. Malsberger gave a presentation on the NEWIOU Set 1 Sites and distributed handouts, which included the summary sheet for Sites SD034, SS035, SD036, and SD037 (see Attachment 6), along with a table, titled Selected Remedies for Four WIOU Sites (see Attachment 7).

Maps from the remedial investigation report were used to show all sample locations. The map also show hits, where the concentration of the contaminants of concern (COCs) exceeded the cleanup level.

Ms. Deena Stanley reviewed the site summary sheets and the proposed remedial action for each site.

Ms. Stanley stated that because much of the contamination was TPH, the Air Force had reviewed the Remediation Guidance for Petroleum and VOC Impacted Sites (RWQCB, 1996) for the North Coast, Central Valley, and San Francisco Bay Regional Boards and the LA RWQCB guidelines. The screening levels used for Travis AFB are about 100 mg/kg for TPH-p and TPH-e carbons.

**SD036**

Selected Alternative and Rational – Monitored natural attenuation (MNA) for TPH-contaminated soils. Natural attenuation of TPH will be monitored using soil gas sampling from dual-phase wells as a screening tool to determine if site is ready for closure.

Closure of soil portion of SD036 will be based on soil sample analysis for TPH to confirm that soil concentrations are less than site-specific cleanup levels

Mr. Lucey asked what the standard refers to. Ms. Stanley referred Mr. Lucey to the generic cleanup table that was distributed during the March RPM meeting.

#### **SD034**

Selected Alternative and Rational – MNA for TPH-contaminated soils. Natural attenuation will be monitored using soil gas sampling from dual-phase wells as a screening tool to determine if site is ready for closure. Closure of soil portion of SD034 will be based on soil samples analyzed for TPH to confirm that soil concentrations are less than site-specific cleanup levels.

Mr. Lucey asked if there was a sump inside the building that discharged into the sewer line. Mr. Malsberger stated that the problem was that the oil/water separators in the past were not connected to the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Salcedo asked if there was any TCE outside of the area of PD680 contamination. Ms. Stanley stated that it is not in the soil; however, there is TCE in the groundwater. Mr. Malsberger stated that it appears that the SD037 plume includes the groundwater contamination.

#### **SS035**

Selected Alternative and Rationale – Land use controls was selected because only one sample with PCB results that exceeded the residential preliminary remedial goals (PRGs). In addition, there is an ecological risk, although there is no habitat (although hazard quotient is greater than 10 and less than 100), because of the proximity of the site to Building 818 and parking ramp. Therefore, there is no pathway for ecological receptors.

Ms. Stanley stated that there are no PCB hits above the industrial PRGs and only one hit was above the residential PRGs. Mr. Malsberger stated that 0.5 ppm is for total PCBs – 0.31 ppm was the PCB-1254 congener. The cleanup chart stated that the industrial PRGs would be 1.0 ppm and residential would be 0.22 ppm. A U.S. EPA guidance document states an action should be taken for industrial land uses below 10 ppm and residential action levels are below 1 ppm (U.S. EPA, 1990).

Mr. Salcedo stated that there is a more recent guidance from U.S. EPA, which he will provide to the Air Force.

Mr. Lucey asked for a paragraph summary of what was done to compare COCs. Mr. Malsberger stated that the site summary sheet rationale could be expanded.

Mr. Salcedo stated that he believes the ecological risk assessors will need to visit the site and determine what areas are habitats.

Mr. Lucey suggested a confirmation sample at SS035; however, the general consensus was that there are enough data points.



## **SD037**

### Selected Alternative and Rationale:

- Area 1: Land Use Controls for SVOCs (human health risk) because only one isolated hit exceeds PRG for benzo(a)pyrene and risk is less than  $10^{-5}$ .
- Areas 2, 3, and 4: MNA for TPH-contaminated soils. Natural attenuation will be monitored using soil gas sampling from dual-phase extraction wells as a screening tool.
- Area 5: MNA for TPH-contaminated soils and no action for ecological risk soils because there is no habitat; – Mr. Salcedo stated this site should have land use control (below the industrial and above the residential). Mr. Salcedo stated that he will check with his toxicologist concerning lead-spread.
- Area 6: MNA for TPH-contaminated soils and land use controls only for other COCs because there is no habitat for ecological receptors and risk to humans is less than  $10^{-5}$ .
- No action for surface flux because only one isolated hit from 26 samples poses potential risk and it is located in area with dual-phase wells that extract soil vapor.

Closure of TPH-contaminated soil areas of SD037 will be based on soil samples for TPH to confirm that soil concentrations are less than site-specific cleanup levels.

Mr. Malsberger stated that the next set of sites will be presented during the June 2002 RPM meeting. Mr. Lucey asked if the information will be presented to the RAB. Mr. Malsberger answered not at this time.

Mr. Lucey commented that he would like the site characteristic section to clarify the past and current use. Mr. Malsberger stated the site description is more detailed in Sections 1 through 4 of the NEWIOU Soil ROD; however, he will take that suggestion under advisement.

The presentation will be emailed to the agencies.

Mr. Salcedo suggested that Mr. Mike Anderson and Ms. Sonce DeVries should tour the sites to determine what is and is not habitat. Mr. Brickeen agreed; however, he would like the RPMs to tour the four WIOU sites to review the sites discussed today.

Mr. Lucey suggested that a list of the sites including the remedial action category and the rationale be prepared for Mr. M. Anderson and Ms. DeVries to use to decide what sites they would like to tour. Mr. Malsberger suggested that the sites on which the RPMs do not agree or sites that may need further investigation be highlighted, then have the RPMs tour the remaining sites.

Mr. Lucey stated that he did have Ms. DeVries review the Basewide cleanup list and she had questions. He will meet with her and get back with the Air Force.

#### **4. PROGRAM ISSUES UPDATE**

##### **A. Funding FY02**

Mr. Brickeen reported that some of the fiscal year 2002 funding has been released; however, the next hurdle will be getting the contracts awarded.

##### **B. RAB Meeting Dry Run**

The RAB meeting dry run will take place on 18 April 2002 at 1:00 p.m. The main topics for discussion will be the remedial designs and the ROD. Ms. Raker is scheduled to give a presentation on the RWQCB; however, if the ROD discussion takes longer than scheduled, Ms. Raker will give her presentation at the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Brickeen stated that he has kept the RAB informed of the WABOU Soil ROD progress and answered Mr. Foster's questions.

##### **C. Field Activity Reports**

Mr. Brickeen distributed the field activity reports from CH2M Hill, GTI, and URS (see Attachments 8, 9, and 10).

**ACTION ITEM LIST  
(Action Items Closed)**

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>ACTION ITEM</b>	<b>DUE DATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
1.	DTSC	Submit “no comment” letters on the Treatment Plant Performance Monitoring Recommendations, WIOU NAAW, CAMU soil acceptance level technical memorandum, groundwater protection technical memorandum, and ST032 technical memorandum.	1/11/01	Completed. <b>Item Closed.</b>

**ACTION ITEM LIST  
(Action Items Open)**

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>ACTION ITEM</b>	<b>DUE DATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
1.	RWQCB	Follow up on the letter from the Air Force in response to the notice of violation for the NGWTP.	Open	Pending.
2.	Agencies	To review the CQCP and determine if it is necessary to review the draft document in the future.	Open	New item.
3.	U.S. EPA	To review and comment on the CGWTP O&M Manual.	4-19-02	New item.
4.	U.S. EPA	To review and comment on the RD/RA plan response to comments.	4-19-02	New item.
5.	DTSC	To provide recent PCB guidance.	Open	New item.