

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

PUBLIC MEETING
PROPOSED PLAN FOR
SITE TS060 - FORMER SKEET RANGE

MEETING HELD AT
NORTHERN SOLANO COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS
3690 HILBORN ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA

Reported by:
Jill Dunphy, CH2M

APPEARANCES

Travis Air Force Base Restoration Staff - AFCEC/CZOW

Glenn Anderson, Project Manager

Lonnie Duke, Restoration Program Manager

Milton "Gene" Clare, Project Manager

Angel Santiago, Project Manager

Restoration Advisory Board Members:

Lt Col Robert C. Baird

Mike Reagan

David M. Feinstein

Gale Spears

Thomas Randall

Mark Pennington

Pat Shamansky

W.T. Jeanpierre

Mayrene Bates

Regulators:

Nadia Hollan Burke, Project Manager

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Adriana Constantinescu, Project Manager

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Ben Fries, Project Manager

California Department of Toxic Substance Control

Contractors:

Jill Dunphy, Community Involvement Specialist

CH2M

Jeannette Cumberland, Administrative Assistant

CH2M

Mike Wray, Project Manager

CH2M

Also Present:

Merrie Schilter-Lowe, Public Affairs

Travis AFB AMW/PA

Dezso Linbrunner, Project Manager

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District

Sarah Miller, Project Manager

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District

Haekyung Kim, Program Manager

Air Force AFCEC/CZRW (San Antonio)

Bill Cumberland

Rio Vista Resident

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

7:07 P.M.

Mr. Duke began the formal public meeting by stating that the Air Force will be preparing a No Further Action Proposed Plan and No Further Action Record of Decision (ROD) for the "Old Skeet Range", Site TS060. The reason for proposing no further action is that previous remediation activities at the site met residential cleanup goals and it is now a candidate for site closure. He then introduced Mr. Anderson, who facilitated the public meeting for this site.

Mr. Anderson noted the following:

This is our sixth public meeting; it's a little bit different than the others, because additional actions were necessary and proposed in the other five proposed plans. For this one, we are explaining the actions we have already taken, that those actions resulted in the site meeting residential use standards, and that no additional cleanup activities are needed.

If a cleanup action achieves residential use standards, no further action (NFA) is needed at the site to officially close it.

The Superfund Law requires a Proposed Plan and public meeting to tell the public about the work that has been done at a site where there is an environmental issue, to propose additional action if needed, or justify why no additional actions are needed, and to give the public an opportunity to comment on the proposal.

The April 2018 Guardian newsletter serves as the Proposed Plan for this site. This RAB discussion serves as the formal public meeting, and an opportunity for informal and formal comments will be provided at the end. Formal comments can also be sent via the provided sheet in the newsletter, phone call, or email. All comments must be postmarked or received by 7 May 2018.

The old skeet range was active between 1952-1962 and shut down after the Fairfield Air Force Station closed. Skeet shooting deposited lead shot and clay pigeon pieces that contain polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in surface

soil. Lead and PAH contamination was concentrated in one area due to shooting direction and prevailing wind direction. A portion of this site is still active, so it was not included in the cleanup actions I will discuss. When that active portion of the site is closed, it will be evaluated in the same manner as the rest of the site and cleaned up if necessary.

The Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) is a sister program to the Environmental Restoration Program, designed to address unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions, and munitions constituents, as well as small arms firing ranges and skeet ranges. The clean-up steps are very similar.

We conducted a Comprehensive Site Evaluation (CSE) Phase I, which includes a records search, site visit, and interviews, like a Preliminary Assessment. The CSE Phase II included visual surveys, limited soil sampling, and risk assessments, like a Site Inspection.

If a site is very contaminated, you want to clean it up faster. In 2012, we proposed a Non-Time Critical Removal Action in the Engineering Evaluation/ Cost Analysis, which is similar to a Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, and Proposed Plan, to remove the bulk of the contamination here, which was proposed in an Action Memorandum submitted in 2016. This document is similar to a Record of Decision. All parties agreed to the proposed actions and cleanup standards documented in this Action Memorandum. Additional remedial actions can take place after the removal action, if needed, to clean the site up to residential standards.

Sampling was completed in 2009. The contaminated areas were excavated in 2017, and confirmation samples were collected to confirm no additional excavation was needed. The site was hydroseeded and restored in 2018.

This achieved residential lead and PAH cleanup goals. No additional actions or land use controls are needed, because the site can be used for any purpose now.

Because the removal action achieved residential goals, no further action is needed at the site, but a Proposed Plan and public meeting are still necessary so that the public has the chance to review what was done and why no additional action is needed.

Formal comments received from the public are taken into consideration for selecting the remedy, and are documented

in the ROD, which is reviewed by attorneys, regulatory agencies, and others. This provides multiple perspectives on the selected remedy.

We now open the floor to informal questions.

Q: When it is decided to close a site, how many levels review this document, is it just Travis AFB?

A: Personnel from Travis AFB, State agencies, Federal agencies, and four levels of the Air Force all review the Proposed Plan and ROD, including Air Force legal review.

Q: Does Solano City Council or Solano County Board of Supervisors review?

A: Not formally because Travis AFB is a Federal facility, but anyone from those organizations are welcome to review and comment as a member of the public.

A representative from the Solano County Environmental Health Department added that his agency reviews them, although not part of the Air Force's formal review process.

Q: When will the ROD be available?

A: No time frame yet, but I'm hoping this summer; Air Force legal must review a version first, then it goes through regulatory review, and then it is available to the public.

Q: You mentioned that significant mixing of the soils occurred at the site. What is that and how does it happen?

A: Livestock walking across it during rain events are some ways that the surface and subsurface soils can get churned up and mixed.

Q: You mentioned that a portion of the site is still active. What will stop the wind from blowing contaminated dust from that area back onto the has areas that have been cleaned up?

A: Lead shot is no longer supposed to be used but the shot falls within the active area. Clay pigeons used today are environmentally friendly and don't introduce contaminants

to the soil. There is also a new shooting orientation being used. When the site is closed, it will be evaluated by the MMRP process, and if any lead or PAHs are found, the site will be cleaned up at that time.

Q: Why is there no groundwater contamination related to this site?

A: The contaminants are not mobile and not readily available in water. No, there was no lead or PAHs in the groundwater beneath or downgradient from this site. PAHs and lead don't dissolve readily in water. The Air Force has looked at other sites contaminated more heavily than this one was, and did not see resulting groundwater contaminations.

Q: How deep were the confirmation samples?

A: As deep as necessary, up to 48 inches in one location. We also collected confirmation samples from the sidewalls in addition to the excavation flooring to ensure that we met the residential standard.

Q: What is the planned future use of this site?

A: Nothing is planned aside from the current recreational use as a horse pasture, but now that it's met the most stringent standard of residential use, the Air Force can use it for whatever the mission requires. A base community planner coordinates changes to planned future land use, and our cleanup actions provide flexibility when determining appropriate potential uses to support the mission.

Q: Would you conduct additional testing if the planned future use changed?

A: No, technically the site is available for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. When this standard is met, the land can be used for anything. It's not the actual planned use that is important, but the fact that the land here can be used for any purpose without restrictions.

Q: Was the site used as anything prior to the skeet range that would have contaminated it at deeper depths?

A: No, we looked at past uses, even when the site was associated with the Fairfield Air Force Station and what chemicals were used there at the time. At one point during that time, the site was used to maintain nuclear components. The radiation issue was investigated. There was one area where uranium-235 was detected. This was dealt with in 2003. This is why the cleanup process starts with records searches, to ensure we don't miss anything.

Q: Did you do groundwater sampling as part of this assessment?

A: We looked at locations where there was a lot of lead. PAHs and lead don't dissolve readily in water. Groundwater sampled beneath a different, heavily contaminated small arms range was clean.

Mr. Anderson concluded the public meeting by asking for formal comments. None were received. He reminded the audience that formal comments can still be submitted via phone, email, or mail by 7 May 2018.

Mr. Anderson adjourned the Site TS060 public meeting at 7:48 P.M.