Final

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

11 December 2002, 0930 Hours

Mr. Allen Brickeen, Travis Air Force Base (AFB), conducted the Remedial Program Managers (RPM) meeting held on 11 December 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
• Tom Sreenivasan	Travis AFB
• DeAnn Lehigh	Travis AFB
• Roger Johnson	Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE)
• Roby Gregg	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)
• Wayne Williams	CH2M Hill
• Ross Overby	URS
• Elise Willmeth	URS
• Brian Garber	Shaw Engineering and Infrastructure (SE&I)
• Christian Canon	ECC

Handouts distributed throughout the meeting included:

• Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
• Attachment 2	Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedules
• Attachment 3	Cleanup Table with 2002 Preliminary Remedial Goals
• Attachment 4	NEWIOU ROD – Presentation of Set 5 Sites
• Attachment 5	SBBGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
• Attachment 6	CGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
• Attachment 7	NGWTP Monthly Data Sheet
• Attachment 8	Travis AFB – CH2M Hill Field Activities (October – November 2002)
• Attachment 9	URS Field Activities, Travis AFB (September 2002)

1. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Previous Meeting Minutes

The 10 October 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).

Annual Meeting and Teleconference Schedule

— The proposed Annual Meeting and Teleconference Schedule for 2003 was distributed for review.

— The April 2003 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting is planned for San Antonio, Texas. The tentative travel date is 23 April 2003. Final arrangements are being made for the Air Force to provide transportation. Living expenses will be the responsibility of the participants.

Master Meeting and Document Schedule

— Page 1, WABOU Soil ROD draft final due date was changed to 4 November 2002.

— Page 1, Groundwater Interim Record of Decision (IROD) 5-Year Review schedule was established.

Mr. Brickeen commented that the Groundwater IROD 5-Year Review final due date is 27 June 2003 and the contract expires on 15 July 2003; therefore, a schedule slip will not be possible. If dates are missed, contracting limitations will push completion of the document into 2004.

Ms. Allen stated that Castle AFB's 5-year review is a good model to follow.

Mr. Malsberger stated that comments on the Groundwater Sampling Analysis Program (GSAP) are necessary to start the 5-year review. Mr. Lucey and Ms. Raker stated that they will provide their comments by 10 January 2003.

— Page 1, SS015 Action Memorandum schedule was added. Currently the dates have not been established.

— Page 3, SS015 Soil Remedial Design (RD) and SS041 Soil RD schedules were established. *(SS015 draft to RAB date should read 6 December 2002).* Mr. Brickeen emphasized that SS015 is a high-priority site.

— Page 4, GSAP schedule was updated. *(Agency comments due date should read 10 January 2003.)* It was agreed that the agencies would informally submit their comments on 8 January 2003 for discussion.

— Page 5, Quarterly Newsletter schedule was updated.

— Page 5, LF008 Construction Quality Control Plan (CQCP) predraft to Air Force/Service Center and comment due dates were changed to TDB (to be determined).

— Page 6, Groundwater Treatment Plants Annual Reports and Groundwater Treatment Plant Quarterly Reports schedules were updated.

— Page 7, SS041, LF008, RW013/LF044, SD045, and SD042 Site-Specific Remedial Action (RA) Work Plans schedules were updated and placed under the heading of Informational Documents. **Note:** SS041 Site-Specific RD Package heading should read SS041 Site Specific RA Work Plan, and the contractor point of contact should read Christian Canon, ECC.

— Page 8, LF007 Area C Off-Base Remedial Action Work Plan schedule was updated and placed under the heading of Informational Documents.

— Page 8, SS015 RA Work Plan schedule was added.

— Page 9, LF007 C Groundwater Area C Remedial Design and DP039 Treatability Study Report were 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 asked Mr. Lucey if he had reviewed the response to comments. Mr. Lucey stated that U.S. EPA has approved the Air Force's comments except for the Basin Plan being identified as an ARAR. The U.S. EPA's and Water Board's attorneys are currently reviewing this. Mr. Lucey will provide a formal response to this issue.

2. Sections 1 – 4 Review of the Draft ROD

Mr. Malsberger asked for an update from U.S. EPA and DTSC on their reviews of Sections 1 through 4 of the draft record of decision (ROD). Mr. Lucey stated that he is still reviewing the document and should have comments ready within the next two weeks. He elaborated that although there are not too many significant comments, some comments will be related to the discussion of the legal application of pesticides presented in Section 3.1.

U.S. EPA's position is that it does not matter that pesticides were legally applied if the concentrations pose a risk. Mr. Brickeen stated that the Air Force's position would be that if the U.S. EPA is going to require Travis AFB to remediate pesticides, then it would have to be a regionwide requirement.

Mr. Lucey stated that the U.S EPA comments will suggest a change in the language. Mr. Lucey will provide preliminary comments and follow up.

3. Table of Clean-up Levels

Mr. Malsberger distributed a revised Cleanup Table that incorporates the new U.S. EPA Region 9 2002 Preliminary Remedial Goals (PRGs) (see Attachment 3). Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force is currently reviewing site conditions and comparing the conditions to the new PRGs. The Air Force will also make site-specific decisions regarding actions considering the new PRGs.

Mr. Malsberger requested the agencies review and comment on the new cleanup table.

4. SS015 Soil Gas and Construction Interface

Mr. Malsberger stated that the SS015 RD should be received by the agencies on 12 December 2002 and SS041 will be received on 13 December 2002. The agencies comments on SS015 RD are due on 15 January 2002.

Mr. Malsberger stated that an action memorandum will be prepared for SS015 in order to get the formal authorization to proceed. The RD will be used to conduct a removal action; similar to what was done at the Cypress Lake Golf Course Annex.

Ms. Raker asked if the removal action will address solvents.
Mr. Malsberger stated no, the removal action addresses contaminants in soil. Ms. Raker expressed concerns that the construction at SS015 may interfere with future groundwater actions and that there may be soil gas concerns, where soil gas could enter the building.

Ms. Raker also asked how the design of the building would prevent the movement of soil gas into the building. Mr. Malsberger stated that the building should not interfere with the ability to take a groundwater action. The building design will be a concrete slab with a vapor barrier that should prevent the movement of vapors into the building.

Ms. Raker requested a map of the SS015 plumes and buildings.

Mr. Malsberger will provide Ms. Raker a footprint of the building in relation to the volatile organic compound (VOC) plume. Ms. Raker will look at the proposed building location, the SS015 RD, soil gas data, and groundwater data to check compatibility of the building with site conditions.

Mr. Brickeen stated that this site was being evaluated for natural attenuation. The vegetable oil study to evaluate enhanced natural attenuation was being conducted at the site. The 5-year review will address further study of the plume and the future actions needed at this site.

Ms. Raker asked if preliminary data will be presented in the 5-year review about whether or not enhanced natural attenuation is working. Mr. Sreenivasan stated that the data will be incorporated in the draft GSAP.

GORE-SORBER Data

Mr. Malsberger stated that he has provided an electronic copy of the GORE-SORBER data to the agencies via e-mail.

5. Set 1 through 4 Site Reviews

Set 1
Mr. Malsberger asked if Mr. Lucey had any additional comments on the Set 1 presentation and proposed action items. Mr. Lucey stated that he is still reviewing the information, and for the most part it looks okay; he has not finalized his comments.

Mr. Malsberger stated Ms. Raker indicated that she was satisfied with Set 1, except for SD036 pre-ROD sampling to determine if the site should be proposed for no further action (NFA), monitored natural attenuation (MNA), or land use control site.

Ms. Raker stated that she has SD034 and SD036 as MNA along with additional sampling.

The following was agreed upon:

- SD034 – MNA with land use controls to address the free-product.
- SD035 – NFA.
- SD036 – NFA with proper sampling protocol and criteria (if confirmation samples are low enough). This will be accomplished through a technical memorandum.
- SD037 – NFA, except for land use control at Facility 977.

Mr. Malsberger and Ms. Raker will look at the site data to determine if SD036 should be NFA or MNA.

Set 2
Ms. Raker stated that for P16 tank, she has a record of removal but not

for closure and she does not have any information for Tank 18. Mr. Malsberger and Ms. Raker will further discuss the tanks after today's meeting.

Set 3 and 4
Mr. Malsberger stated that he is waiting for input from Mr. Lucey and Mr. Salcedo.

Mr. Malsberger stated that an update of the proposed actions will be prepared by the Air Force.

Set 5 Site Reviews

Mr. Malsberger and Ms. Elise Willmeth presented the Set 5 Sites (see Attachment 4).

SD001 (Sanitary Sewer Systems A and C, Union Creek)
SD001 consists of Storm Sewer Systems (SSS) A and C and Union Creek. All storm sewers discharge into Union Creek at Outfalls II, III, and IV. SSS-A drains into the industrial area and is contaminated with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), metals, and total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) at concentrations exceeding screening levels.

Except for pesticides, organic compounds were detected at similar concentrations and metals at higher concentrations in SSS-A sediment compared to the concentrations in Union Creek sediment downstream. Therefore, the SSS-A is likely the source of the organic compounds and metals in Union Creek.

Although elevated concentrations of metals were reported in sediment, metal concentrations reported in surface water were at concentrations less than screening levels, indicating that sediment transport, rather than leaching, is the primary mode of metals migration through the storm sewer system.

Ms. Raker asked if the samples were collected from a storm sewer or the creek. Ms. Willmeth stated that samples shown on the figure titled "Analytes that Exceed Screening Levels in Sediment SD001 Storm Water Sewer System" were collected from the storm sewer and samples shown on the figures titled "Analytes that Exceed Screening Levels in Sediment SD001 Union Creek Southwest Travis AFB" and "Analytes that Exceed Screening Levels in Sediment SD001 Union Creek South Travis AFB" were collected from Union Creek or its banks. Ms. Raker requested a diagram that depicts the sources, preferably in color. Ms. Willmeth stated she would send this to Ms. Raker.

<u>Selected Alternative and Rationale</u>
In the East Industrial Operable Unit (EIOU) remedial investigation

(RI), surface water was shown to not be a risk to human receptors. However, metals contamination in surface water poses a risk to ecological receptors. The preferred remedial action for the surface water contamination is source control. Union Creek is not a source of contamination but a receptor of contaminated water. Water quality and ecological risk posed by surface water contamination will be addressed in detail in the ecological risk assessment.

Sediment contaminated with benzo(a)pyrene was determined during the RI to be a risk to human receptors. However, because Union Creek has been dredged approximately every two years, the sediments sampled in 1995 are no longer in the creek. Therefore, decisions regarding remedial actions cannot be made until samples are collected from the creek and analyzed to define the current sediment quality in the creek. A pre-ROD sampling plan must be generated. The plan must address the creek at large and the outfalls or areas receiving potentially contaminated sediment or surface water. The plan for characterizing the current conditions in the creek will be discussed in further detail in the ecological technical memorandum

SD033 (Storm Sewer System B)
This site includes the West Branch of Union Creek, parts of Storm Sewer II, Facilities 810 and 1917, the area around the South Gate, and Outfall II.

Surface water is contaminated with TPH, trichloroethene (TCE), and lead (ecological risk). Sediment is contaminated with TPH, PAHs, and dieldrin (ecological risk). Soil is contaminated with benzo(a)pyrene and metals.

In general, low permeability alluvium underlies the area with discontinuous permeable layers. Contaminants in groundwater are not related to surface soil and sediment contamination. Any groundwater cleanup will not directly affect surface soil or sediment but should improve surface water quality, because groundwater discharges into the creek system.

Ms. Raker asked if the conclusion in the RI was that the concentrations in the surface water are all from parking lots as opposed to leaking tanks and/or oil/water separators. She asked if there was any evidence that TPH had other sources. Mr. Malsberger stated that the risk assessment in the RI did not have TPH as a contaminant of concern (COCs).

Ms. Raker asked what the source of TPH was and what the conclusion for TPH was in the RI. Mr. Lucey stated that the RI did not address TPH because there were no standards for TPH in a risk assessment; the presence of TPH was made as a statement of fact in the RI.

Ms. Allen asked what confidence the Air Force has in the current data versus the RI. Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force will assume that the data are representative. Where there is a potential risk, additional sampling will take place to determine overall concentration of the risk drivers.

Mr. Lucey asked if the RI included sediment data. Mr. Malsberger stated that there are data for Union Creek when dredging was conducted a few years ago. Samples taken had results of non-detect (ND). He is not aware if additional sampling was conducted.

Selected Alternative and Rationale

A conclusion was made in the West Industrial Operable Unit (WIOU) RI that surface water and sediment were not a risk to human receptors. The preferred remedial action for the surface water contamination posing a risk to ecological receptors is source control. The West Branch of Union Creek is not a source of contamination but a receptor of contaminated water. Water quality and ecological risk posed by surface water contamination will be addressed in detail in the ecological technical memorandum.

Building 810

Land use controls are proposed at Building 810 to address cadmium and benzo(a)pyrene contamination in the soil. NFA is proposed for the potential ecological risk posed by surface soil.

NFA is proposed for TPH (human health risk) because the area of contamination is small, less than 4% of the samples are above screening levels, and TPH will naturally attenuate.

LF007 (Landfill 2, Areas B, C, D, E, and G)

Landfill 2 occupies 73 acres in the North Operable Unit (NOU) and was used until 1974. From the early 1950s until 1964, waste materials including oils, hydraulic fluids, and solvents were stored in the eastern portion of the landfill.

COCs in soil at Area B include PAHs and TPH. COCs in soil at Area D include PCBs, TPH, and metals. COCs in soil at Area E include PCBs, metals and TPH. Area G is contaminated with metals and PCBs.

Selected Alternative and Rationale

Excavation for PCBs and metals in Area E that pose a risk to human and ecological receptors. Land use controls will be implemented if remaining PCBs in soil are greater than residential PRGs. However, soil will be excavated to residential PRG levels outside the base boundary.

The CAMU is being designed and constructed at Area D; therefore, the PCB and metals contamination will be capped. Additionally, institutional controls will be implemented for the CAMU and areas where earthwork has occurred. Institutional controls will also be in place for the PCB contamination.

NFA is proposed for metals that pose a risk to human and ecological receptors outside Areas B, D, and E because all concentrations reported are likely natural variations of background.

NFA is proposed for TPH (human health risk) because the area of contamination is small, less than 11% of the samples are above screening levels, and TPH will naturally attenuate. Additionally, much of any remaining TPH will be removed as a result of the proposed excavation of PAH- and PCB-contaminated soil. Regardless, TPH should not be used as a driver to determine cleanup.

6. Other

Mr. Malsberger stated that the Air Force is looking at getting additional funding to complete the ROD. Travis AFB submitted a prior year fund request, which was turned down. Travis AFB is now requesting FY03 funds. The latest information is that funds will not be at AFCEE until mid-January/early-February, allowing the contracts to begin March 2003.

B. West/Annexes/Basewide Operable Unit

1. ROD Signature Status

Mr. Anderson reported that the WABOU Soil ROD was signed by all the agencies as of 11 December 2002. The WABOU soil RD/RA schedule will be mailed to the agencies within 21 days.

2. Land Use Control Process at Travis AFB

Mr. Anderson presented the land use control process on Travis AFB. Mr. Anderson stated that the Travis AFB General Plan was finalized in November 2002 and is a planning document that is used to describe Travis AFB to people who want to build buildings, renovate, etc.

The document also covers the following:

- Infrastructure;
- Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites;
- Areas of groundwater and soil contamination;
- Planning for existing and future land use;

- Restrictions;
- Proposed demolition projects; and
- The overall current condition of Travis AFB.

Currently the document discusses land use controls in general terms. The Air Force is considering providing an attachment that is specific to the restrictions placed at various sites. (Landfill X will be the first land use control update.)

Mr. Anderson and Ms. Lehigh gave brief descriptions and uses of the following forms.

- Air Force Form 813 – Request for Environmental Analysis based on (National Environmental Policy Act) NEPA to support construction projects.
- Air Force Form 332 – Base Civil Engineering Work Request (Mr. Brickeen commented that signatures on this form are actual concurrences and approval.)
- 60 Air Mobility Wing Form 55 (Digging Permit) – required when project involves excavation greater than 6 inches.

Mr. Lucey asked if the planning office has maps of the various buried utilities. Mr. Anderson stated that detailed information of that type can be retrieved from the appropriate utility office, such as the electrical shop.

Mr. Lucey asked if the underground water pipeline locations are retained in Environmental Management. Mr. Day has possession of this information within the Travis AFB GIS system. This information is also available in hard copy.

3. CURRENT PROJECTS

A. South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant (SBBGWTP) performed at 100% uptime with approximately 7.1 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of November 2002. The average flow was 164 gallons per minute (gpm). Approximately 4 pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were removed during the month of November 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 191 pounds (see Attachment 5).

The plant operated without interruption throughout the month. All the extraction wells were operating normally.

B. Central Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the Central Groundwater Treatment Plant (CGWTP) performed at 99.8% uptime with approximately 3.3 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated. The average flow for the CGWTP was 77 gpm during November 2002. Approximately 15 pounds of VOCs were removed during November 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 2,232 pounds (see Attachment 6).

Minor downtime occurred at the CGWTP and West Treatment Transfer Plant (WTTP) this month because of basewide power outages.

All treated water is being diverted to the storm sewer until next spring due to the onset of the wet winter months.

The ThermOx system was restarted after being offline for a three-month rebound study. Post rebound study suggested that additional mass is present in the vicinity of the 2-phase well (TPE-W). Focused extraction began at this well on 14 October 2002. TCE concentrations continue to decrease at the TPE-W from an initial concentration of 380 ppmv during the post rebound sampling event to 59 ppmv on 8 November 2002.

C. North Groundwater Treatment Plant

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that the North Groundwater Treatment Plant (NGWTP) performed at 86% uptime with approximately 728,000 gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of November 2002. The average flow for the NGWTP was 19.5 gpm during November 2002. Approximately 1 pound of VOCs was removed during November 2002. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 166 pounds (see Attachment 7).

Mr. Roger Johnson asked for clarification of the operating cost per pound of contaminant removed for the North Plant during November. The North Plant costs were based on a one-month cost performance calculation; the Central Plant was based on a 12-month rolling average monthly cost. Mr. Johnson requested that URS draw up a proposed method in which all contractors will report the same information.

All treated water is being diverted to the duck pond for beneficial use.

As reported at the October RPM meeting, extraction well EW566x311 had very high concentrations of contaminants. Further sampling was done to narrow down the type of contaminant present. The most recent vapor sample results collected on 5 December 2002 indicate that the majority of the contaminant stream from EW566x311 is Stoddard solvent. This result needs to be validated and validation is in progress. The vapor concentration readings taken from the extraction well were in the range of 900 ppmv. This is two orders of magnitude greater than concentrations typically encountered at the

influent to the vapor extraction system from the combined flow of other dual phase extraction wells. With such high concentrations of Stoddard solvent at EW566x311, vapor-phase granular activated carbon (VGAC) is not an effective vapor treatment alternative. Based on this, it is recommended to discontinue the vapor extraction from EW566x311be discontinued until the validation of the sample characteristics is completed and an appropriate vapor treatment system is identified.

D. FT005 Off-Base Interim Remedial Action

Mr. Sreenivasan reported that field activities in the offbase portion of FT005 were completed for the season. During summer and early fall, 24 locations, each at two depths, were sampled using a CPT rig. The extraction system was designed based on the results of this CPT investigation; and 9 extraction wells and 16 monitoring wells were installed. Analytical data and surveyed well locations are in the process of being compiled and will be available in a week's time. Field activities will resume in 2003 as soon as the ground is dry enough to support heavy equipment. It is anticipated that the conveyance, control, and electrical systems will be installed, and the new system will be up and running by the end of summer 2003. This is based upon obtaining additional funding.

E. LF007 Phase I and Area C Remedial Action

Mr. Malsberger stated that the actions for 2002 are completed.

- Phase I – gas monitoring wells and groundwater monitoring wells were installed.
- Area C – two on-base extraction wells and three on-base monitoring wells were installed.

Mr. Malsberger stated that Mr. Garber was able to get the wells developed. It appears that the extraction wells have a yield of 2 gpm or less. The Air Force will try to sample the wells during the next GSAP sampling round.

F. RW013/LF044 Remedial Action Work Plan

Mr. Anderson stated that the excavation at RW013 has been completed, the analytical results are back and currently being reviewed to ensure MARRSIM requirements were met.

The Air Force learned that the quantitation level was sufficient to determine that the residential cleanup values were met.

Mr. Johnson reminded Mr. Anderson that RW013 is running out of funds.

Mr. Anderson reported that the field activities at LF044 are completed; berms have been constructed and fences are up.

G. Phytostabilization Treatability Study Field Work

Mr. Anderson stated that Parsons Engineering Science is the AFCEE contractor for the phytostabilization study. In the last 12 months, data have been accumulated, with the conclusion that more data are required to make any meaningful conclusion.

In order to gather more data, 13 additional groundwater monitoring points were installed in front of the trees (upgradient), within the tree area, and downstream of the trees. Core samples from the trees, leaf samples, and soil gas samples around the leaves were collected to determine if TCE is being incorporated in the tree. No results are available at this time.

Mr. Lucey asked if the groundwater sampling will be included in the monitoring program. Mr. Anderson stated that it will, if it fills data gaps.

H. DP039 Well Additions

Mr. Sreenivasan stated that the CGWTP Third Quarterly Report recommended installation of extraction wells downgradient of EW563x39 to extract groundwater where TCE at concentration of 7,700 µg/L is not being captured by EW563x39. Mr. Sreenivasan stated that this is not a correct statement. Mr. Sreenivasan stated that the Air Force would like to recant this statement. This is not the vehicle to place such information. There will be a forthcoming 5-Year Review, which will access the remediation activities.

Mr. Anderson elaborated that prior to making recommendations/decisions at a site, the Air Force must look at all information. This is done in the 5-Year Review.

Ms. Raker stated that she was glad it was in the report, because it appeared that the Air Force was being proactive. Mr. Lucey and Mr. Salcedo agreed with Ms. Raker and understood that the statement was not a firm recommendation to be quickly implemented, but was a recommendation to be considered, and if found to be appropriate, incorporated into the long range planning and programming done by the Air Force.

Ms. Raker also stated that she would like to see more of this type of interpretative narrative of the performance of systems, for it appears that the analysis answers the question of whether the remedial objectives are being met. Ms. Raker recommended that extraction wells be installed in the northeast corner.

Mr. Lucey asked if by waiting for a 5-Year Review, is an opportunity of getting a project funded being missed. Mr. Brickeen stated no.

Ms. Raker stated that the quarterly reports have made recommendations in the past to turn off wells. Perhaps, by these recommendations, the Air Force could

be saving money. Ms. Allen stated that in circumstances such as that, the Air Force should be looking at cost optimization and not the 5-Year Review.

Mr. Lucey stated that he does not feel it is necessary for the Air Force to recant the statement. He did not read it as a commitment, merely an observation and a recommendation.

I. LF008 O&M Manual

Mr. Anderson stated that he will respond to U.S. EPA's comment.

J. January 03 Guardian Update

Mr. Sreenivasan stated that comments are due by Friday to formalize the newsletter.

4. PROGRAM ISSUES UPDATE

A. Field Activity Reports

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

ACTION ITEM LIST

(Action Items Closed)

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	STATUS
1.	Air Force	Check the status of the SWPPP revisions.	9-25-02	Mr. Malsberger stated that the SWPPP would be revised by December 2002. Completed. **Item Closed.**

ACTION ITEM LIST

(Action Items Open)

as of 11 December 2002

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	STATUS
1.	RWQCB	To provide the recommended changes to the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).	9-25-02	Pending. Ms. Raker stated that she will soon have the SWPPP to review and will then make recommended changes for LF007 that have not been incorporated into the O&M Program for the CAMU. In addition, the State will be authorizing the Phase II Storm Water Pollution Prevention requirements in March 2003, and Travis AFB qualifies for Phase II to increase the best management practices. Therefore, Travis AFB may need to update its SWPPP. Ms. Raker will forward this information to Ms. Lehigh and Mr. Malsberger.
2.	URS	To determine the operating cost for material removed at NGWTP (to include VOC and chlorinated). To proposed a method in which all contractors are reporting the same information.	12-12-02	New item.