BRAC Cleanup Team (HTW BCT) Meeting Minutes BRAC Conference Room July 20, 2005

Final Version

Attendees:

Roman Racca, DTSC	Marc Edwards, USACE	
Stewart Black, DTSC	Erik Appel, Ahtna	
Dot Lofstrom, DTSC	Don Jones, HGL	
Martin Hausladen, USEPA	Bill Mabey, TechLaw	
Grant Himebaugh, CRWQCB	Debbie Leibensberger, MACTEC	
Gail Youngblood, Fort Ord BRAC	Bill Collins, POM Environmental	
George Siller, USACE	Jennifer Payne, COE	
Peter Kelsall, Shaw E&I	Roy Evans, HGL	
David Eisen, USACE	Derek Lieberman, Fort Ord BRAC	
Carlene Merey, MACTEC		

Agenda:

Agenua.		
FFA Schedules	Status Update	
OU2 and Sites 2/12 Treatment	Status Update	
Systems		
OUCTP RI/FS	Status Update	
Groundwater Treatment System	Status Update	Shea Homes 2/12 modifications and
Optimization		ESD
Marina Heights	Status Update	
OU2 Landfill Gas	Status Update	
Basewide Range Assessment	Status Update	
Site 39 Eco Risk Work	Status Update	
Site 3 Post Remediation Monitoring	Work Plan Status	
Range 36A Closure Activities	Status Update	
East Garrison Ranges Interim Action	Status Update	
FOST/FOSL/FOSET Issued	Status Update	
Calendar Update	Update	
Landfill use as a Habitat Area	Discussion	
OU1 Groundwater Remediation	Status Update	

FFA Schedules

Site 3 – distributed Draft schedule; will schedule a site visit in 3 weeks; agencies approved the Draft schedule at the meeting.

Site 39 – will be sending out a Draft schedule before the next meeting

OU2 and Sites 2/12 Treatment Systems

See handout. GAC changed out at 2/12 on 7/6/05.

OU CTP RI/FS

Received comments from DTSC. Discussed OU-1 site conceptual model considerations and the need to work from consistent interpretations between the two areas. Army will further review the comments and begin preparing responses.

See handouts – SVE sampling results. No significant change; likely no rebound. Reinforces interpretation that the remediation at the source location is complete.

Groundwater Treatment System Optimization

Well Destruction

Will start first phase of well destruction (see handout) soon. 6 wells in this first phase. MW-B-13-180 – suspected conduit through the SVA, will use overdrilling down to the SVA, set a casing then continue over drilling to preserve the seal between aquifers. Will also overdrill the stainless steel wells in Range 36A; 2" wells. Agencies agree to abandoning all the wells except MW-B-11-A; need to conduct further discussions about this area in relation to OU-1 activities. At the request of the CRWQCB, discussed options for sampling Site 5 (Range 36A) wells for perchlorate before abandoning. Army agreed to try and get enough water for an analysis.

University Villages

Developer is working on how to conduct construction without overlong cessation of operation at 2/12 treatment system and preparing a work plan. Agencies will want a 60-day review period. Developer is working on an ESD for using treatment system water for construction purposes (over the next 7 to 10 years) and for irrigation (long term). EPA discussed the need for a letter of significant differences or similar justifying moving extraction wells and the ramification. Army argued that these changes are not changes to the remedy and therefore do not require changes to the ROD, they are more appropriately described as system enhancements and could be described and justified in the Work Plan. EPA agreed that a work plan could be acceptable and suggests a letter to the file for the ROD, stating that the Army understands that the system will need to be shutdown for up to 6 months in order to achieve a more effective system. The letter should also acknowledge any other considerations. EPA was very concerned about shutting down the system; would rather keep it running, effectively, even in a reduced fashion. If not appropriate to run in a reduced fashion, then the Army's letter should discuss why it would be inappropriate and its ramifications.

Agencies discussed asking the developer for a fact sheet ("Reader's Digest" version) about the plan for reworking the groundwater treatment system. The Army agreed to talk to the developer further. RWQCB raised the issue of NPDES consideration; may change monitoring requirements.

Decided that the developer should take the lead on the above-mentioned documents.

OU2 Landfill Gas

EPA reviewed data from perimeter probes (provided at May BCT) showing increasing vinyl chloride concentrations in probes on north side of Area D. EPA would like to increase monitoring frequency for at least 3 to 6 months repeat data and then might find quarterly sampling sufficient (for SGP-4D). Discussed need to revise the landfill emergency response plan which is outdated and requires corrective action if methane in vents exceeds 5%. Army will rewrite the emergency response plan and consider alternative action levels and contingency plans.

Basewide Range Assessment

• Site 39 Soil Remediation

EPA –posed questions about how the soil will be disposed. Alternatives, what if there is a larger volume that needs to be removed? Army has already intended to prepare a focused feasibility study to address these types of questions (part of the revised FFA schedule above).

• Site 39 Eco Risk Work

The Army is awaiting comments from agencies on the risk assessment.

Site 3 Post Remediation Monitoring

Meeting will occur on site during early August to begin coordination for production of workplan. Attendees coordinated list of participants, timing, etc. .

Range 36A Closure Activities

DTSC has submitted a Draft Fact sheet as part of their public notice; will submit to the public by end of August. Army needs to be in the field as soon as possible to avoid being shut down by winter rains.

East Garrison Ranges Interim Action

Excavation of soil at HA80 and HA85 is complete although results from final confirmation samples have not yet been received

FOST/FOSL/FOSET Issues

See handout.

Calendar Update

See mark-up

Landfill Use as a Habitat Area

Fish and Game joined via conference call. Proposed development in the former Abrams Housing Area (Marina Heights) will result in take of Monterey sand gilia (State Threatened). In addition to the loss of sand gilia habitat, maritime chaparral habitat will also be impacted. Because the Habitat Conservation Plan is still unsigned, CDFG is requiring the developer to mitigate (replace) sand gilia and the maritime chaparral habitat. They are proposing to use an area on top of the landfill cap to replace the taken habitat. Grant H. described his concerns regarding water quality impacts if deep-rooted woody plants compromised the landfill cap system. Bill Collins suggested CDFG consider the use of early successional maritime chaparral species for the restoration. This would eliminate the need to plant and maintain woody species on the landfill cap. CDFG thought that maintaining an early successional habitat might mitigate the loss of maritime chaparral loss as a result of the housing development, but would have to consider the proposal further. Discussed restoring other areas on the landfill parcel instead of the cap – would need to look available restoration areas on the parcel and at the previous agreements identifying where development on the parcel is planned. Another option might be for CDFG to consider signing the HMP which would provide an agreement that the federal conservation lands will be protected and managed in perpetuity which should alleviate the need to prepare a take permit for lands which already mitigated under the Federal ESA and HMP agreement.

OU1 Groundwater Remediation (see OU1 meeting minutes)