

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

7 August 2002, 0930 Hours

Mr. Allen Brickeen, Travis Air Force Base (AFB), conducted the Remedial Program Managers (RPM) meeting held on 7 August 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
- Wilford Day Travis AFB
- DeAnn Lehigh Travis AFB
- Roby Gregg Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE)
- John Lucey U.S. Environment Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)
- Elizabeth Allen TechLaw
- Jose Salcedo Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
- Sarah Raker Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Loren Krook CH2M Hill
- Deena Stanley URS
- Elise Willmeth URS
- Brian Garber Shaw Engineering and Infrastructure (SE&I)

Handouts distributed throughout the meeting included:

- Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
- Attachment 2 Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedules
- Attachment 3 Selected Remedies for Four WIOU Sites
- Attachment 4 Selected Remedies for OT010, WP017, SS029, and SS030
- Attachment 5 OT010 (Sludge Disposal Site) Summary Page
- Attachment 6 WP017 (Oxidation Pond Site) Summary Page
- Attachment 7 SS029 (MW329x29 Area) Summary Page
- Attachment 8 SS030 (MW269x30 Area) Summary Page
- Attachment 9 SBBGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
- Attachment 10 CGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
- Attachment 11 NGWTP Monthly Data Sheet

1. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Previous Meeting Minutes

The 10 July 2002 meeting minutes were corrected, 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 3, LF007/Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) Soil RD final due date will be changed. The Air Force is waiting for comments from the U.S. EPA.
- Page 5, SD045, LF008, and LF044 Soil Remedial Design Packages final due dates were changed to 31 July 2002.
- Page 6, RW013/LF044 Site-Specific Remedial Action (RA) Work Plan schedule was updated.
- Page 6, LF007 Work Plan Construction Quality Control Plan (CQCP) now reads as LF007 Work Plan.
- Page 7, Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Program (GSAP) Annual Report schedule was established.
- Page 8, Quarterly Newsletter schedule was updated.
- Page 10, the LF007/CAMU CQCP was moved to the historical section.

2. OPERABLE UNIT UPDATE

A. North/East/West/ Industrial Operable Unit

1. NEWIOU ROD Plan of Action and Milestone

ARAR Review

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force is reviewing U.S. EPA's comments. Mr. Salcedo stated that he has not received a response from DTSC's attorney. Mr. Salcedo has informed his attorney that it is necessary to move forward and unless there is an issue that is a "show stopper" DTSC will not provide any comments. Mr. Salcedo stated that from his review the relevant sections are in the document.

Mr. Malsberger stated that Ms. Raker submitted comments on the LF007 Soil Remedial Design concerning applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), including ARARs that may impact the record of

decision (ROD). A meeting was scheduled after today's meeting to further discuss these comments.

Sections 1 – 4 Review of the Draft ROD

Mr. Malsberger stated that he received comments from Ms. Raker and Ms. Elizabeth Allen. Mr. Salcedo and Mr. Lucey stated that they will submit their comments by next week.

Cleanup Table

Mr. Malsberger stated that DTSC has requested the Air Force to use the Lead Risk Assessment Spreadsheet (Leadsheet) for lead cleanup levels at Travis AFB. Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force will use the recommended 146 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) for exposure to a child as the residential cleanup level.

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force will use the industrial preliminary remediation goal (PRG) of 750 mg/kg as recommended by the U.S. EPA.

Set 1 and 2 Sites Decision Summary

Mr. Malsberger explained that the site summary sheets have an additional column to indicate the status of outstanding reviews and/or action items (see Attachment 3). This column will also indicate whether there is agreement or the name of the RPM who has outstanding issues.

Mr. Malsberger stated that Ms. Raker was going to investigate the relationship between Set 2 total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) sites and underground storage tank (UST) sites. Ms. Raker stated that she has reviewed various reports and developed a table of questions to pose to the Air Force concerning the historical levels of TPH that were in groundwater and the closure reports of the USTs.

Ms. Raker also stated that she does not have the EIOU information.

Mr. Lucey stated that he would like Ms. de Vreis to look at **all** sites, including the parking lots, to determine if there is habitat. Ms. Raker suggested that a tour be set up for Mr. Lucey.

Mr. Lucey stated that for every site that has habitat, the Air Force needs to provide rationale why the population is exposed and why the burrowing owl is exposed. For sites that are "not applicable (NA)", the Air Force needs to provide justification that the population is protected.

Ms. Raker asked if the ecological technical memorandum will require justification for no habitat; therefore, the burrowing owl is appropriate to be used as the indicator species. Mr. Lucey stated that rationale is

required for why the population is exposed in addition to why the burrowing owl is exposed at every site that has habitat.

Mr. Salcedo explained that confirmation needs to show that other species are protected.

Ms. Deena Stanley stated that the WIOU remedial investigation (RI) indicated that there was no risk to the burrowing owl or other species.

Ms. Raker stated that if the Air Force is using the most current approach (i.e., is the NA based on the RI or is it based on the most current approach) then the method is appropriate.

Discussion took place on whether the NA sites have habitat and/or population and the approach on which the NA is based.

Mr. Malsberger stated that at sites where there is habitat and chemicals of ecological concern (COECs), in addition to looking at the hazard quotient (HQ) of 1, the Air Force will look at the effect of the COECs on the remaining receptors

Mr. Malsberger stated that it would be better for the agencies to tour the sites after receiving the data and map that depict the COCs/COECs for all the sites.

Mr. Salcedo stated that DTSC can agree with the table on Set 2 sites.

Mr. Brickeen asked if U.S. EPA reviewed and concurred with the cleanup table. Mr. Lucey stated that the U.S. EPA concurred with the human health cleanup levels; however, Ms. de Vreis probably has not reviewed the cleanup levels for ecological receptors.

Set 3 Sites Review

Mr. Malsberger and Ms. Elise Willmeth gave a presentation on the Set 3 sites (see Attachment 4).

OT010 (Sludge Disposal Site) – (see Attachment 5)

OT010 is located in an inactive area of Travis AFB. Historically, this site was reported but not confirmed to have been used for sewage sludge disposal in the fields northeast and southwest of the sewage treatment plant; however, no source area was identified. The contaminants of concern (COCs) are metals and TPH.

Selected Alternative and Rationale

No further action (NFA) for TPH (human health risk) because the area of contamination is small; less than 10% of the samples contained TPH at concentrations above screening levels and TPH will naturally attenuate.

NFA for metals that pose a risk to ecological receptors because the risk is low and the site is of low ecological value because of its proximity to the flightline. Abatement is routinely done to discourage fowl from nesting.

Mr. Lucey asked if the materials in the sludge pond are different than the materials that were in the oxidation pond.

Ms Stanley stated that materials in the sludge pond were more of the solids while the liquids were collected in the oxidation ponds.

Mr. Lucey asked if the concrete ponds are emptied. Mr. Malsberger stated yes.

Ms. Raker asked what the concentrations in the downgradient wells were. Ms. Willmeth stated that there are no metals, but trichloroethene (TCE) is present.

WP017 (Oxidation Pond Site) – (see Attachment 6)

Approximately 30% of the area is covered by oxidation ponds. This site is located in an inactive area of Travis AFB. The sewage treatment plant was in use at this site from the 1950s to the late 1970s. Several ponds along the southern base boundary were used from the late 1970s to approximately 1990 for burial of construction materials. Three northeastern ponds are currently used as overflow for the sewage transfer station and may be a current source of contamination. The COCs are TPH, metals, and PCBs.

Selected Alternative and Rationale

NFA for TPH (human health risk) because the area of contamination is small; less than 15% of the samples had TPH concentrations above screening levels and TPH will naturally attenuate.

NFA for metals that pose a risk to ecological receptors because the risk is low.

NFA for PCBs (the maximum reported result is only 8% higher than the industrial PRG (cleanup level).

SS029 (MW329x29 Area) – (see Attachment 7)

TPH has been detected in groundwater at the grassy area near the taxiway. The source is not known but may be aircraft parking and maintenance. Location restricts land use. The site is an open field located between the abandoned taxiway and Union Creek. TPH is the only contaminant that exceeds screening levels.

Ms. Raker asked if TCE was detected in the soil and/or groundwater.

Ms. Stanley stated that TCE was not found in the soils. Monitoring well MW329x29 was installed to evaluate the source of the TCE plume at SS030.

Ms. Raker asked why SS029 became a soil site. Mr. Malsberger stated that the contractor that was conducting the RI was running out of funds to complete the effort. To expedite their effort, the contractor combined the risks of numerous analytes to total a risk of 10^{-6} .

Selected Alternative and Rationale

NFA for TPH in soils because only one sample exceeded the screening level at 1.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) and TPH will naturally attenuate.

SS030 (MW269x30 Area) – (see Attachment 8)

TCE was detected in the groundwater. COCs above screening levels are metals. Area of contamination includes grassy area near the south base boundary at Perimeter Road and groundwater treatment plant.

Approximately 25% of the area is covered by pavement or buildings.

Groundwater contamination identified during the RI included metals and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Nickel was investigated in 1997 and 1998. It was determined to be the result from the corrosion of stainless steel well screens; therefore, nickel was removed from the groundwater sampling schedule as part of the GSAP.

Selected Alternative and Rationale

NFA for ecological risk of soils from metals because, although metals in soil pose some risk to ecological receptors, the area is located along the road, is low quality habitat, and is maintained to discourage habitat formation.

The agencies will discuss Set 3 sites at the next teleconference.

Ms. Raker stated that the feasibility study (FS) is out of date with respect to COCs and risk assessment. Ms. Stanley stated that in this latest presentation the COCs are only compared to the cleanup table agreed on (based on PRGs), and are not compared to the interim remediation goals in the FS. Mr. Malsberger stated that the cleanup levels are the industrial PRGs for humans and concentrations of analytes that pose a risk to the burrowing owl. These ecological values were determined in March this year.

Ms. Raker asked whether there will be a table in the ROD that summarizes the risk value. Mr. Malsberger stated that Section 5 will address the COCs and Section 4 will explain the difference between COCs identified in the RIs versus the FS and their risks.

2. LF007 RA Work Plan

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force did not receive comments on the LF007 RA Work Plan; therefore, the Air Force proposed to make this document final.

Ms. Raker asked if it is really necessary for the agencies to review the RA work plans, since they are basically a scope of work for the contractors. She proposed that the agencies not review the contractors' work plans and that the work plans become an informational document. Mr. Salcedo and Mr. Lucey agreed.

Mr. Brickeen stated that this must be documented by letter stating that RA work plans will not be primary documents since it is in the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA). Ms. LeHigh will investigate the procedure and provide an appropriate memorandum of understanding or agreement.

There were no comments from the regulatory agencies. Mr. Malsberger stated that a label will be shipped to change the document to final.

3. Stormwater Construction Permit

Ms. Raker asked if the Air Force has all the pieces in place for a stormwater construction permit. Mr. Malsberger answered yes. Ms. Raker was given a copy of the stormwater construction permit for a construction activity at LF007 dated 22 May 2002.

4. Mitigation Appendix

Ms. Raker asked why the mitigation appendix is in the work plan and not in the design report.

Mr. Garber stated that the mitigation was conducted under a separate contract and it was the first opportunity to place it in the work plan. Mr. Brickeen stated that it was also appropriate to include the mitigation appendix in the work plan since the wetland mitigation was to be completed prior to construction activities.

Ms. Raker asked if it should be added to the design report. Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force would like to do the minimum to take the draft final design report to final.

Ms. Raker asked if the mitigation plan can it be issued on its own. Mr. Garber stated yes. Mr. Malsberger stated that it should be kept in the post-construction report, since it would be the first place consulted for research purposes. Ms. Raker concurred.

5. Other

Mr. Lucey asked if the ROD could state what documents will be produced and what documents will be considered primary documents. Mr. Brickeen stated that he would look into it.

B. West/Annexes/Basewide Operable Unit

1. ROD Dispute Status

Mr. Anderson reported that the Senior Executive Committee (SEC) is scheduled to have a teleconference on 8 August 2002 to discuss the dispute. The deadline for dispute resolution has been extended to 16 August 2002.

Unilateral ROD

Mr. Anderson stated that an action has been initiated to have the Air Force sign a unilateral ROD. The purpose of this ROD is to ensure that the agencies agree that the Air Force can proceed with those actions that do not involve the CAMU.

Mr. Anderson stated that Travis AFB does not see the need to issue a unilateral ROD because it would provide no benefit to the IRP. In the past, it has been agreed between the Air Force and the agencies to proceed with remedial actions that do not involve the CAMU.

Mr. Anderson requested a verbal agreement with the agencies and the Air Force to go out in the field to excavate at the radiological burial site and construct a fence and berm at Landfill X. The regulatory agencies agreed to conduct the remedial actions at sites RW013 and LF044 prior to the final WABOU Soil ROD being signed.

Mr. Brickeen stated that there was agreement between U.S. EPA and DOD/Air Force that the Air Force could issue a ROD signed by them that would go to U.S. EPA. U.S. EPA would not sign the ROD but would provide a letter agreeing that any action that is not involved in the dispute could be taken. Air Staff is attempting to issue the unilateral ROD in order to do the remedial actions. Travis AFB's response has been that the unilateral ROD is not necessary because regulatory agreement has already been obtained.

Mr. Salcedo stated that DTSC does not support the unilateral ROD because it raises other concerns such as DOD may want to position itself as a sovereign entity.

Mr. Brickeen stated that a letter was issued early August 2002 stating that DOD agrees that the Travis AFB ROD would no longer be tied to the resolution of the dispute at Langley Air Force.

The Air Force does not agree with the post-ROD authority and a policy may be created that determines how to handle FFA and non-FFA installations.

Mr. Lucey stated that U.S. EPA does not want to be tied to Region IX. Once the time period that the Senior Executive Committee (SEC) has to resolve the dispute has ended and if there is no resolution, the U.S. EPA administrator will issue a resolution. Mr. Lucey went on to say that there really are no time constraints because extensions can be obtained.

Mr. Lucey distributed a copy of a letter to the Air Force and regulatory agencies that presented the latest correspondence between the SEC members.

Mr. Brickeen asked Mr. Salcedo and Mr. Lucey to keep him informed as to the results of the SEC teleconference.

3. CURRENT PROJECTS

A. South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Brickeen reported that the South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant (SBBGWTP) performed at 99% uptime with approximately 5.5 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of July 2002. The average flow was 125 gallons per minute (gpm). Approximately 2.0 pounds of VOCs were removed during the month of July. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 181 pounds (see Attachment 9).

The new telemetry equipment for SS029 test well EW07x29 was installed on 31 July 2002. PLC programming modifications are complete and the new system is in operation. Equipment for the additional wells is expected to be received on 14 August 2002. Based on the performance of the test well over the first two weeks of operation, the new equipment will be installed for the remaining SS029 wells. The transition should be complete by the end of August 2002.

During a weekly monitoring check in July 2002, severe scaling was observed in the air stripper. The system was taken offline, and the process stream was redirected through the carbon vessels for treatment to allow trouble shooting of the air stripper system. Further investigation revealed that the sequestering agent pump had failed and the flow of sequestering agent to the system had stopped. The air stripper system and the transfer pump were acid washed to remove accumulated scale. Inspection of the sequestering pump and injection system revealed that the loss of flow had been caused by a sticking check valve in the line between the pump and the process stream. The sequestering agent is relatively sticky and concentration of the material around the valve is likely to have caused the malfunction. Since then, the sequestering agent is flushed with water during weekly maintenance checks to prevent build-up of the material in the check valve. Operators of the north treatment plant have been advised to follow the above procedure to avoid process interruptions.

B. Central Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Brickeen reported that the Central Groundwater Treatment Plant (CGWTP) performed at 70% uptime with approximately 2.7 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated. The average flow for the CGWTP was 87.0 gpm during July 2002. Approximately 18 pounds of VOCs were removed during July 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 2,153 pounds (see Attachment 10).

The power outages at Travis AFB caused appreciable downtime at both the CGWTP and West Treatment and Transfer Plant (WTTP), resulting in PLC failures . The PLCs have been replaced and the plants are operating normally.

Approximately 60% (1.63 million gallons) of the 2.73 million gallons of treated water was used for irrigation this month. The rest was discharged to the storm sewer.

C. North Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Brickeen reported that the North Groundwater Treatment Plant (NGWTP) performed at 95.3% uptime with approximately 1.06 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of July 2002. The average flow for the NGWTP was 25 gpm during July 2002. Approximately 8.8 pounds of VOCs were removed during July 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 165.3 pounds (see Attachment 11).

The plant went through acid washing due to scale build-up causing excessive pressure differential through the stripper. Recent process changes to inject sequestering agent took place on 30 July 2002. The process is very similar to the one at SBBGWTP and has been in operation since 1 August 2002.

Installation of a SCADA system has been initiated to allow remote monitoring of the plant. Additional work proposed includes the installation of an expanded auto dialer to be able to contact the operators in the event of a plant shut down and an additional phone line so that the system can be remotely monitored.

Ms. Raker asked if all the operation and maintenance (O&M) manuals can be placed on CD-ROMs. Mr. Brickeen stated that the Air Force is currently working on it.

Mr. Brickeen stated that administrative records will also be placed on CD-ROMs.

D. FT005 Interim Remedial Action

Mr. Brickeen reported that all three wells have been drilled, installed, and developed. Pump tests on all the three are being performed to collect data to support the groundwater model revision. Groundwater samples will be collected

from each of these three wells after completion of the pump tests to get a more accurate “pumping” concentration.

By the end of this week, the Air Force should have a good idea of what the revised design might look like.

Mr. Lucey stated that a potential buyer wants to purchase the property south of FT005 as a wetlands mitigation area. The individual informed Mr. Lucey that there is an agricultural well in the center of the property. Mr. Lucey stated that it might be prudent as a community relation action to sample the well. Travis AFB will investigate.

Mr. Salcedo asked if the Air Force is on the same timetable to install extraction wells. Mr. Brickeen answered yes, installation of all extraction wells are scheduled to be complete by the end of October 2002..

E. LF007 Phase I Remedial Action

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force ran out of funds for this project, more soil than originally estimated was moved. The trench has been excavated most of the way and the slotted pipe has been installed. Construction of the area where the CAMU will be situated is almost complete. Debris throughout the landfill will be removed. Grading the area around the Clean Soil Holding Area is still underway. Travis AFB hopes to obtain funding before the rainy season, by October 2002, in order to complete the portion to be seeded for erosion control.

Mr. Brickeen stated that AFCEE will receive \$8 million by 15 September 2002 and the funds must be awarded by 30 September 2002.

F. LF007 Soil Remedial Design

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force received Ms. Raker’s comments on the draft final soil design.

Mr. Malsberger explained that the contract to complete this design is a fixed-price contract, which will expire at the end of August 2002. Therefore, the Air Force needs to have comments resolved and issue the final document by the end of the month. If not, the Air Force will need to initiate a new contract to complete the document and will cause a delay of several months. Mr. Lucey stated that he will provide comments by the end of the week.

This document will be submitted in hardcopy and CD-ROM.

G. LF007C USFWS Formal Consultation

Mr. Malsberger stated that Travis AFB has received the biological opinion from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The opinion will be reviewed before issuing the draft final remedial design with the regulatory agencies’ comments incorporated.

H. Draft LF008 Remedial Design Package

Mr. Anderson stated that the design package has been issued as final.

I. RW013 Remedial Action Preparation

Mr. Anderson stated that the agencies will receive the RW013 RA Work Plan on 9 August 2002. Mr. Anderson requested that the agencies provide comments as expeditiously as possible in order to stay on schedule.

J. LF008 O&M Manual

The Air Force will complete the LF008 O&M manual similar to the NGWTP and CGWTP O&M manuals.

K. DP039 Dual-Phase Treatability Study Report

Mr. Anderson stated that the Air Force proposed removing the discussion concerning the rebound study in order to close out the document. This proposal was emailed to the U. S. EPA. Mr. Lucey stated that he will have a reply by the 9 August 2002.

4. PROGRAM ISSUES UPDATE - None

ACTION ITEM LIST
(Action Items Closed)

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	STATUS
1.	CH2M Hill	To provide the FT005 Spring 2002 Offbase Investigation Results and Proposed CPT Locations with additional off-base data, monitoring well, and extraction samples in PDF format.	7/15/02	Completed. Item Closed.

ACTION ITEM LIST

(Action Items Open)

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	STATUS
1.	Air Force	To determine how the remedial action work plans can be changed within the FFA from primary documents to informational documents.	Open	New Item.