

May 18, 2005

**HTW BCT Meeting Minutes for Operable Unit 1
Former Fort Ord, California
May 17, 2005**

1. An HTW BCT meeting was held May 17, 2005, at the BRAC Conference Room, Former Fort Ord, California. The portion of the meeting dedicated to Operable Unit 1 (OU-1) was held from approximately 1:00 p.m. to about 1:45 p.m.

Attendees included the following representatives:

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------|------------------|----------|
| Gail Youngblood | US Army | Martin Hausladen | US EPA |
| Derek Lieberman | US Army | Bill Mabey | TechLaw |
| David Eisen | US Army | Grant Himebaugh | CA RWQCB |
| George Siller | US Army | Roman Racca | CA DTSC |
| Stewart Black | CA DTSC | Patricia Velez | CA F&G |

HGL: Bob Parkins; Roy Evans (by telephone)

A summary of key issues and decisions/actions are described in the following paragraphs.

2. FFA Schedule:
 - a. The proposed FFA schedule was submitted by E-mail on April 28, followed by a letter.
 - b. The continuation of the rains and the late blooming season for the threatened and endangered (T&E) species will delay entry onto the FONR until at least the middle of June. This will impact the current schedule. HGL is reviewing the impacts and will update the schedule as necessary.
 - c. Realistically, it is not likely that HGL will be able to construct a full remediation system on the FONR this construction season, i.e. by November 2005.
 - d. HGL considers this year's priorities to be:
 - Complete a Northwest Boundary Groundwater Barrier to mitigate further plume migration off-site.
 - Complete the off-site plume definition.
 - Provide plans for agency review and approval for a remediation system design for both the FONR and the off-site.
 - e. The priorities listed in item "2d" were discussed. Mr. Hausladen (EPA) agreed with the priorities but considered the plume delineation to be the highest priority. Mr. Racca (DTSC) also agreed that the off-site plume should be defined as soon as possible. He also noted that there have been inquiries from people living in Monterey Bay Estates about vapor intrusion. Mr. Parkins (HGL) replied that the off-site plume definition and the boundary barrier will be implemented in parallel. As an indication that preparations for the off-site work are being expedited, the access agreement for the Armstrong property is nearly complete, the County well permits have been received, permission has been obtained from the City of

Marina to build a gate to the Armstrong property from the Airport, and the geophysical contractor is scheduled to commence work on June 6.

- f. Mr. Parkins asked representatives from each regulatory agency if they agreed with the priorities so that resources can be spent effectively to achieve a collective goal. Mr. Hausladen (EPA), Racca (DTSC), and Himebaugh (RWQCB) all agreed with the priorities.
3. Northwest Boundary Groundwater Barrier: Mr. Parkins asked if a Pilot Study along the Northwest boundary would be appropriate to collect data on the aquifer dynamics and optimize the remediation system. An on-board review of the Pilot Study Design was suggested and accepted by all parties. It was also agreed that the Pilot Study Design would be presented in a single document.
 4. Off-site Monitoring and Public Involvement: Mr. Hausladen requested a “rapid turn around” for the groundwater samples so information will be available to present at the next Community Involvement Workshop (CIW) in July. Mr. Evans (HGL) noted that “rapid turn arounds” will be obtained for the hydro punch soil borings together with resistivity survey results; hence, preliminary data may be available for the July CIW. Reliable initial data from the long-term monitoring wells to be installed, however, will not be available until shortly after the CIW (assuming the current schedule holds). Mr. Eisen noted that initial hydro punch readings could be low and give a wrong impression. Mr. Evans concurred and stated that the early data should be “downplayed” and greater emphasis should be given to subsequent data from the newly installed wells, which could be shared with the public via another meeting and/or fact sheets. The participants agreed to re-consider the options for informing the public about progress in the off-site plume delineation when the schedule for obtaining verified data from the new monitor wells is better defined.
 5. Environmental Activity:
 - a. Mr. Parkins, in response to a question from Ms. Velez, described the field surveys being conducted this week by HGL’s biological consultant. The surveys are investigating:
 - i. Past work areas to ascertain impacts
 - ii. New areas not previously surveyed which may experience activity in the future
 - iii. New reference plots to serve as a base line reference for determining impacts
 - iv. Roads not previously surveyed that lead to the proposed east and west monitoring wells
 - b. Mr. Parkins also explained that the overall remediation process includes conducting annual field surveys of work areas for three years after the work activity, followed by an evaluation and determination of the biological and habitat impacts of the remediation. The need for and scope of restoration activities, if any, would then be determined in consultation

with the Army, US Fish and Wildlife Service, the University of California Santa Cruz staff and other relevant parties as appropriate.

- c. Ms. Velez expressed concern about the access roads to be used and the work site for the western monitoring well as the area is pristine with a dense concentration of T&E plant and animal species. She suggested approaching the well site from the north and east. Mr. Parkins also indicated that HGL is VERY concerned about the dense concentrations of T&E species and the inevitability of disturbances and potentially significant liability. Note: the alternative access roads suggested by Ms. Velez were initially considered but eliminated because they are inaccessible by drill rigs and large forklifts (steep grades, soft sand, narrow passages, dense oak trees).

6. Authorization for New Monitoring Wells:

- a. HGL is meeting with its insurance company (Company) in anticipation of triggering coverage for cost growth. All claims will be negotiated, line item by item. The Company has stated that it will not pay for any work that is beyond the scope of the original contract proposal unless it is documented by an official letter from the regulators.
- b. Hence, Mr. Parkins requested DTSC to issue a letter directing HGL to install the west and east cross gradient monitoring wells.

7. Action:

- a. HGL to proceed with Pilot Study Design and action as well as off-site work on the Armstrong property to delineate the plume
- b. HGL to inform agencies if a joint letter regarding the cross gradient monitor wells is acceptable or if separate letters from each are needed. HGL will also inform the agencies as to the authority level needed by the signatories.
Response: A joint letter or separate letters from agencies are OK. The appropriate signer and signature authority is left to the agencies to decide.
- c. DTSC or appropriate agency to provide written authorization for additional monitoring wells on the west and east side.

Bob Parkins, P.E.
Project Manager
HydroGeoLogic, Inc.