

McClellan AFB Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

Meeting Minutes

February 5, 1997

6:30 p.m.

Aero Haven School Auditorium

RAB Members Attending:

Randy Adams, Department of Toxic Substances Control; Elaine Anderson; Del Callaway; Mannard Gaines; Bill Gibson; Dennis Green; Sheila Guerra; Joe Healy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; John Leuthe; Jeannie Lewis; Alex MacDonald, Regional Water Quality Control Board; Bill Shepherd; Chuck Yarbrough

RAB Members Not Attending: Dale Anderson, Pete Berghuis, Stephen Brown, James Bryant, Brad Gacke, Susan McKee, Ben Norman, Simeon Okoroike, Cody Tubbs, Burl Taylor

Alternates Attending: Dennis Lewis

Others Attending: Matthew Alix, Victor Auvinen, Barry Bertrand, Danny Durkee, Susan Ellis, Kim Emerick, Frederick Gayle, Margaret Gidding, Jim Graydon, Scott Hartung, Ron Hergenrader, Genevieve Holderby, Don Jones, Bob Leighton, Dayle Lewis, John Lucero, Franklin Mark, Amir Matin, Frank Miller, Adriana Rivarola, Douglas Self, Major Robert Senchy, Rick Solander, Jerry Vincent, Anna Whalen

ACTION ITEMS

Action	Champion	Timeframe	Status
Determine when guard wells near CW-132 were last sampled, what the results were, and why those data were not in the <i>Groundwater Monitoring Plan (GWMP)</i>	McClellan AFB EM	Not specified	Closed
At next TRRC committee meeting, discuss GWMP. Explain how wells are classified (> MCL, < MCL),	McClellan AFB EM	Next Technical Report Review Committee meeting (not yet scheduled)	Closed

using MW-111 as example.			
Report back to RAB on the outcome of the discussion of the GWMP.	TRRC members.	Next RAB meeting	Open
Provide comments on pre-draft EIS/EIR to McClellan AFB.	RAB members. (EIS sent to Chuck Y. and Del C.)	February 20	Closed
Review proposed changes to by-laws and charter. Give comments to any committee chair or community Co-Chair.	RAB members	By next Executive Session (March 6)	Closed
Distribute RAB calendar to public so they can attend committee meetings	McClellan AFB EM	Next RAB meeting	Closed
Review draft GWMP and submit comments by March 10.	Chuck Yarbrough, Del Callaway	By March 10	Closed
Review suggested training topics and schedules, and provide feedback to EM.	RAB members	By next Executive Session (March 6)	Closed
Provide Relative Risk Ranking Committee update on FY97 budget: how its going, fallout funds, etc.	McClellan AFB EM	Next RRRC meeting (February 20)	Closed
Discuss the matter of the security guard	RAB members	Next Executive Session (March 6)	Open Discussed at Mar 19

			CR mtg
Discuss alternate pool (from CR committee)	RAB members	Next Executive Session (March 6)	Closed
Discuss business cards (from CR committee)	RAB members	Next Executive Session (March 6)	Closed
Elect new committee chair for coming year	Each RAB committee	By April RAB	Open
Submit names to Co-Chair Nominating Committee (Committee chairs)	RAB members	by next Executive Session (March 6)	Closed
Determine who was paid the \$1500 for the service contract on the IR microfilm machine and when, and who maintains the IR.	McClellan AFB EM	Not specified	Closed
Call RAB members not present at meeting and see if they would like to attend the Government Conference on the Environment. If not, give ticket to Frank Miller.	Chuck Yarbrough	ASAP	Open
Determine if members of the public are invited to the VIP tour at McClellan AFB and UCD on Feb 19. Let Chuck Yarbrough know.	McClellan AFB EM	ASAP	Open
Discuss Rideshare program at next ECF.	McClellan AFB EM	May ECF meeting	Open

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Chuck Yarbrough, RAB Community Co-Chair, at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Yarbrough informed the RAB that copies of all recent RAB correspondence were available for review. He asked RAB members to introduce themselves to the public.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The previous RAB meeting minutes were approved. Frank Miller said that the minutes stated the security officer was present to provide a secure environment for RAB members. Mr. Miller said that the security officer had told him that he was directed to watch Larry Button, which contradicted what was said in the minutes.

Organizational Changes in DTSC and McClellan AFB EM

Elaine Anderson, Air Force Co-Chair, introduced two new participants of the RAB: James Chang (U.S. EPA), who will be assisting Joe Healy, and Randy Adams (DTSC), who will be replacing Mark Malinowski as RPM for the state.

Ms. Anderson also introduced three new team members in Environmental Management (EM): Craig Marchione, Franklin Mark, and Craig Varnau (who was not at the meeting). All are from Mare Island with experience in closure, restoration, radiation, and cleanup.

NEW BUSINESS

"Cleanup in Progress"

Ms. Anderson gave a presentation on cleanup progress at McClellan Air Force Base (AFB). She gave a picture of where the base stands today, where they have identified contamination, what work remains, where McClellan has captured or contained the plumes that have been identified, and where McClellan will focus their efforts in the next couple of years.

Ms. Anderson explained that McClellan is taking a two-pronged approach to cleanup strategy. One prong is the groundwater cleanup strategy. For the groundwater, an Interim Record of Decision (IROD) has been signed, which outlines a containment strategy. All cleanup systems are expected to be in place by 2008. The soils strategy will have a Record of Decision (ROD) in the near future. The basewide ROD date is projected for 2003, which means that all cleanup decisions will be made. Cleanup systems are planned to be in place to address all soil and groundwater cleanup by the year 2015. The final date for completion of all cleanup actions is 2034.

Composite maps were put together in the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS), which summarize the areas of contamination across the different environmental media. The maps categorize areas of the base on the basis of whether they are contaminated and where remedial actions are necessary or have been taken. Ms. Anderson said EM is focusing its efforts on the areas which have yet to be investigated, Operable Units E-H.

EM currently has sampling plans in review; the investigation of OUs E-H will be a major part of the program for the next two years. Another focus area will be to fully contain groundwater contamination on the east side of the base.

The EBS has been released in final form, which is part of the process for closure. This document is a snapshot of all base contamination, all buildings and their environmental condition. Although the document is final, the regulatory agencies (U.S. EPA and DTSC) are reviewing it for their concurrence on the parcels identified as clean.

Two areas have been identified as not having contamination and are available for immediate transfer.

Dennis Green asked if the EBS was a requirement for the transfer of property. Rick Solander of EM said that was correct. Mr. Green then asked, if that was so, how could the document be final when a significant portion of the base has yet to be investigated? Mr. Solander explained that the document just establishes the condition of the property at the time it is produced and that it is updated at least annually.

Mr. Green asked if the updated document is open to public comment. Mr. Solander said that this document is not required to go through public comment; however, the base has chosen to present it to the RAB for comment. The updates are submitted to the agencies for their concurrence.

Sheila Guerra asked about City Well (CW)132 and how often the well is being sampled. Alex MacDonald of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) said that that particular well is not being used; however, there is a group of monitoring wells that are sampled quarterly, as far as he knew. CW 132 is on standby for fire protection purposes only.

Del Callaway asked Mr. MacDonald if he could explain why Monitoring Wells (MWs)1016, 1046, and 1054 had not been sampled quarterly, as said in the *Draft Final Monitoring Plan*. He asked why the Air Force is soliciting RAB comments on a draft document with erroneous dates. Bob Shirley informed him that this document is in draft form and is under review by the regulatory agencies. If there are errors in the document, they will be corrected.

Mr. Yarbrough asked how the plume on the southwest side of the base became separated from the main plume. Mr. MacDonald explained that, when Base Well 18 was shut off for a period of time in the 1980s, the plume migrated off base. When BW 18 became active again, the well was able to pull some of the contaminants back on base. However, some of the contamination migrated beyond BW 18's zone of influence, creating the separated portion of the southwest plume.

Mr. Yarbrough asked about the categorization in the EBS maps. He asked that someone take time and explain to him the formula that is in the *Groundwater Monitoring Plan* and

what determines if a well is considered to exceed MCL. Ms. Anderson assured Mr. Yarbrough that this would be done.

Ms. Anderson said that McClellan AFB also installed several cleanup systems/bioventing systems for soil contamination in Operable Units A and D. Expansion in these areas is planned to take place in the next couple of years.

Radiation Update ³/₄ EPA Van Scan

Major Robert Senchy gave an update on the radiation scan performed by the U.S. EPA's radiation experts from Las Vegas, Nevada. EM requested that the U.S. EPA conduct a radiation scan on the base to identify areas of radioactive contamination. The scan took place from October 28 to November 1, 1996.

The scan was done via a specially equipped van, which had three different radiation detectors: one to determine location; one to detect the amount of radiation; and one to detect the type of radiation. The team scanned all areas of the base reachable by their van. There were some areas on the far western and northern side of the base where the van could not go. These areas are considered wetlands and contain vernal pools.

The van identified 12 areas, of which 8 had been known previously. The four new sites were:

- A classified waste (green) incinerator, made of firebrick which contains naturally occurring radium. It was deemed that this was not a health hazard; therefore, no action will take place.
- Storage yard northeast of Building 655. This is a two-acre lot covered with granite rock fill. It was deemed not to be a health hazard. Granite naturally contains uranium. Therefore, no action will take place.
- On the northwest end of the taxiway, the scan found a 40 ft by 40 ft area that is about three times background. The source was unidentified. Although this is not a health hazard, McClellan will clean up the area this year.

Mr. Yarbrough asked what will McClellan do with the dirt. Major Senchy replied that the dirt will be shipped to a landfill in Utah that has been approved for low-level radioactive waste.

- Just off Dudley Road, a 15 ft x 15 ft area of elevated readings was found. A small point source was suspected since a small area within the area was measured at 100 times background. The point source could not be found. This area was considered a potential health hazard. The Air Force removed a barrel and a half of dirt, which reduced the level by 90%. A fence has been installed around to the area to restrict access. This area will be cleaned up this year.

Confirmed Site (CS) 10

Eleven borings were drilled into CS 10 as part of the Phase 2 Remedial Investigation. Most of CS 10 has been characterized, except the drum area. Above background readings were found around the drum area. The Air Force plans to remove the drums from the area by 1998.

Mr. Miller asked what the source of the contamination in all of the aforementioned areas was. Major Senchy answered that no one knows for sure and that it has not been identified through the preliminary assessment.

RAB Nomination Committee

RAB members received recommendations for changes to the RAB Charter and By-laws. Mr. Yarbrough requested that the RAB members review this information prior to the next Executive Session. Comments are to be given to any committee chair.

Mr. Yarbrough announced that Bill Gibson had submitted his resignation as the Relative Risk Committee Chair. He has accepted a position as an Engineering Consultant for Aerojet and is working full-time. Mr. Gibson will remain on the RAB.

The committees will meet at their regularly scheduled time to select a chair for the upcoming term. The Relative Risk Committee will meet on February 20, 1997, at 6:00 p.m. at the Environmental Management conference room. Each committee is to bring the name of the new committee chair to the Executive Session for the confirmation.

Mr. Yarbrough requested that the RAB calendar be provided to the public in the event that they may wish to attend meetings other than the general RAB meeting.

Mr. Yarbrough suggested that the nomination committee for electing the new RAB Co-Chair be comprised of the committee chairs. The nomination committee would present the name of the nominees at the Executive Session on March 6, 1997, in order to select the RAB Co-Chair. Mr. Dennis Green so moved, and Mr. Del Callaway seconded. It was unanimously approved.

Other

Ms. Anderson reviewed some actions from various committee meetings during the last quarter, in particular the Relative Risk and Community Relations committees.

Several action items were addressed through the RAB worksheet process:

- The Relative Risk Committee requested a presentation on the State Water Board Resolution 92-49.
- A request was made to sample Monitoring Wells (MW) 111, 112, and 113 quarterly. The Air Force constructed a road to the wells and a foot bridge that goes across Magpie Creek to improve access. The *Groundwater Monitoring Plan*

will identify the frequency and what wells will be sampled. Currently the wells are being sampled according to the latest sampling plan.

Further discussion and clarification on the sampling frequency issue will take place during the Technical Report Review Committee meeting.

- A request was made concerning training for the RAB members. The Air Force has budgeted for training and is looking at what local regulators may have available. At the next Executive Session, discussion will be planned on what type of training is desired.
- The *Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)* will be submitted on February 6, 1997. Copies will be distributed to Mr. Yarbrough and Mr. Callaway. These comments are due by February 20, 1997.

COMMITTEE REPORTS/RAB RECOMMENDATIONS

Relative Risk Ranking

Mr. Bill Gibson announced his resignation as Chair of the Relative Risk Ranking Committee (RRRC) and said that he will continue with the RAB. He presented the Committee's Mission Statement (see attached).

The committee had three meetings since the last RAB meeting. A number of issues were reviewed, commented, and moved upon. One issue during the October 1996 RRRC meeting was the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (Water Board's) Resolution 92-49. At the time of the meeting, there was a difference of interpretation between the Water Board and the Air Force. The Relative Risk Committee chose to support the Water Board's position. Since that time, the Water Board and the Air Force have negotiated toward a compromise.

Mr. Gibson reviewed the procedure for the RAB Advisory Worksheet. These will now be on a tracking system in order to make sure all are addressed.

Alex MacDonald, of the Water Board gave the background of and explained his agency's position on Resolution 92-49 Anti-Degradation Policy.

In 1968, the State Water Resources Control Board developed Resolution 68-16, an anti-degradation policy to protect the state's existing water quality. The policy said that if any degradation of existing water quality were to take place, it would have to be in the best interest of the citizens of the State.

In 1992, the governor asked that the state develop a consistent approach on how to apply 68-16 to the cleanup of environmentally contaminated sites. Resolution 92-49 (92 stands for 1992—49 stands for the 49th resolution of that year) applies 68-16 to soil, groundwater, and surface water contamination. Any discharges must be in accordance with 68-16. In other words, soil contaminants must be removed from the soil column to

prevent degradation to groundwater as much as possible. The state recognizes that it is too expensive to remove all the contamination, so some contamination may be left in place. If cleanup to background cannot be achieved, the alternate cleanup level must be:

1. Consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state;
1. Not unreasonably affect present and future beneficial use of the water; and
1. Not result in water quality that is less than that prescribed by the State and Regional Water Boards.

Resolution 92-49 seeks to maintain groundwater quality. There are no naturally occurring levels of volatile contaminants, such as trichloroethene (TCE) in groundwater. Technically, TCE contamination should be removed to non-detectable levels in order to comply with 92-49. This also includes any contamination in the soil above the groundwater table that may eventually migrate to the groundwater. The Air Force disagrees that this is a legal requirement they must follow.

The Water Board's *Basin Plan* clarifies how the Water Board regulates water within the basin. It says soil must be cleaned to the greatest extent possible. If removal of every trace of contamination is not possible, some may be left in place as long as it does not impact groundwater quality.

Mr. Green asked if the background levels been established or agreed to for groundwater and soil. And were they determined at off-base sampling locations?

Mr. MacDonald answered that for soils, background concentrations for VOCs are non-detect. Since VOCs do not occur naturally in soil, there should be no background concentrations for VOCs. McClellan has established background levels for metals. Background levels were established at on-base and off-base locations. For sediments, background was determined using samples from upstream and on-base creeks.

Mr. Yarbrough moved that the RAB accept the recommendations of the Relative Risk Committee, which chose to support the RWQCB and their interpretation of the Resolution 92-49. Because the committee's recommendation was unanimous, there was no need for a second.

Mr. Leuthe asked for clarification about the three points—whether they could ever be in conflict. Mr. MacDonald said that the least stringent guidelines allowed is the minimum the Water Board would accept. For example, an estimate of a one-time cancer risk of one in one million. Background would be the most stringent.

The RAB voted unanimously to accept the committee's recommendation.

Mr. Gibson continued, saying that Relative Risk Committee met in December to discuss the funding for FY98 and FY99. This meeting resulted in a prioritized budget being established for FY98 and FY99.

Mr. Green asked where on the list the funding line stops. Do all of the projects, numbered 1 through 33, get funded? Ms. Elaine Anderson answered yes.

Ms. Anderson explained that the travel and supplies are minor expenditures. If McClellan AFB does not receive what they expect in terms of funding, they will look at the bottom projects that have been prioritized with the regulators and the RAB input, and determine what projects or portion of projects would be cut. It is Ms. Anderson's intent to keep the group involved.

Mr. Green asked if McClellan had a list of other projects that would be added in event that McClellan received more money than expected. Ms. Anderson replied that there are no more requirements to add to this list. Ms. Anderson said that there are two types of money: IRP and compliance-related. There will be more projects coming in for the compliance-related projects.

Mr. Green requested that the Relative Risk Committee give a detailed update on the budget. Ms. Anderson said that that will be done at the next RRR committee meeting.

Mannard Gaines asked if money had been budgeted for the abandonment of the off-base wells. Ms. Anderson replied, yes.

Mr. Leuthe requested that the budget be presented in such a way that it could be determine what percentage is going to each item, possibly lump the administrative costs together. Mr. Green added that the idea would be fine for the general RAB; however, for the Relative Risk Committee, he would prefer it as is.

Mr. Gibson reported the worksheet issue on Monitoring Wells 111, 112, 113 had been closed. At the January 9 meeting, the committee voted unanimously to request the Air Force to sample the wells quarterly through next summer to provide a baseline of a 1-year period of sampling. Mr. Gibson moved the RAB accept the committee's recommendation. The RAB voted unanimously to accept the committee's request to advise the Air Force to take this action. Motion was carried. The RAB voted unanimously to accept the committee's request to advise the Air Force to take this action. Motion was carried. Mr. Yarbrough said that, because of the location of the wells, they should be sampled quarterly. Mr. Green suggested this position be reflected in the RAB comments on the *Groundwater Monitoring Plan*. At the suggestion of Ms. Anderson, this discussion was deferred to the Technical Report Review Committee.

Community Relations Committee

Sheila Guerra gave an update on the activities of the Community Relations Committee. The committee met on December 18, 1996. Comments for the September 18, 1996, meeting minutes should be submitted by March 17, 1996.

A special meeting took place on January 14, 1997, to review the community relations budget for FY97 in the amount of \$137,000. Two line items were added to the budget for FY98 and FY99:

- A study to transfer microfilm documents to CD-ROM.
- Six additional RAB training workshops, to total eight.

An additional meeting to discuss budget is scheduled for February 12, 1997, in Building 269D at 6:00 p.m.

On other topics, Ms. Guerra reported that the topics of the security guard, the alternate pool, and RAB business cards will be discussed at the Executive Session. The meeting minutes of all committees will be sent to all RAB members.

Ms. Guerra said that she had heard complaints concerning the Informational Repository (IR) located at the Rio Linda Community Center. She visited the repository and was very dissatisfied with what she observed. She said that it was inconvenient, the microfilm reader did not work, books were misplaced, and that she was unable to locate needed information.

Danny Durkee, of EM, who is in charge of the IR explained that the maintenance contract for that machine had lapsed and been recently reinstated. He said that a maintenance worker was out to repair the machine on the previous day, February 4, and it was semi-operable. However, he explained that some replacement parts were necessary to make the machine fully operable, and that it would take some more time.

Mr. Green asked how often the repository was used. No one in the audience indicated they had ever been there.

Mr. Green asked Mr. Durkee how often he had checked the machine over the past few years. Mr. Durkee replied that, in the past two years, he had been out to the Community Center to check it about four times. He told the RAB that there are three other Information Repositories located at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) San Francisco office, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Rancho Cordova office, and McClellan Air Force Base's own office.

Margaret Gidding said that the Community Relations Committee has an open action item to find a better location for the IR, one that is more convenient and user friendly. Ms. Guerra will give an update on this issue at the next general RAB meeting.

Ms. Anderson suggested that if there were any further concerns about the Information Repository, that they be forwarded to the Community Relations Committee.

The members discussed how much the contractor who was maintaining the microfilm reader was being paid. Mr. Durkee explained that until April 1, 1996, the entire Administrative Record was operated by one of McClellan's contractors. Since that date, McClellan EM has operated the Administrative Record and the Information Repository. The maintenance contract for the microfilm reader is with Kodak, and is worth \$1,500 per year.

They also discussed the costs of copying at the IR. Mr. Durkee explained that, originally, copies on the microfilm reader were \$0.20. However, McClellan had removed the coinbox, so printing copies from the reader, currently, is free. The Library charges \$0.20 per page to make copies on their copier.

Mr. Callaway asked that the amount of the service contract be verified.

Mr. Yarbrough and Ms. Guerra reminded members to attend their committee meetings, where much of this information is discussed.

Base Reuse Committee

Mr. Callaway announced that the Government Conference on the Environment will be held on February 19, 20, and 21, 1997. Mr. Callaway was able to obtain 15 complimentary tickets to the exhibits at the conference and made them available to RAB members and the public.

Mr. Yarbrough announced that he had received five passes from EM, to hear all of the presentations at this conference. He made them available to the RAB members.

Mr. Callaway said that he reviewed the *Groundwater Monitoring Plan* and found many inconsistencies and/or discrepancies. This will be the main agenda item for the next Technical Report Review Committee meeting. Also to be discussed is how the wells are categorized as above or below the MCL.

Mr. Callaway informed the RAB that he attended three meetings with the County. The main agenda of the County at this time is to solicit community involvement to obtain financial backing for reuse from bankers, realtors, and others. Mr. Callaway gave the County information about Delta Airlines being interested in finding a place to move their airframe repair center and Continental looking for an engine shop.

Technical Report Review Committee

Mr. Leuthe said that the Technical Report Review Committee met in January to discuss how well EM was performing. He requested a copy of the Quarterly Status Report and found it inadequate. Mr. Leuthe documented his concern and what he felt should be included in a status report. This was submitted to EM, who will be resolving this issue.

Chairperson's Committee

Mr. Yarbrough reiterated the Government Conference on the Environment to the RAB members. Mr. Miller said that he wanted a pass, and Mr. Yarbrough informed him that the other RAB members must be given the opportunity to go before the passes could be distributed to the public. Mr. Yarbrough said he would get back with Mr. Miller if that was the case.

Mr. Yarbrough distributed articles from the *Sacramento Bee* and *The Kelly Observer*. The *Sacramento Bee* article implied that privatization would cost taxpayers money. The *Kelly Observer* article mentioned that Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, is proposing to privatize environmental management.

Mr. Yarbrough reminded the RAB that comments are currently being accepted on proposed guidance about Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs). TAGs make funds available to the RAB to hire a technical advisor for training. Mr. Yarbrough requested that if the RAB members have any input on the issue, to submit them to himself or a committee chair in time to have them consolidated and submitted to DoD by February 25, 1997.

Mr. Yarbrough announced that there would be a VIP Program Tour to the University of California, Davis (UCD) to observe new environmental technologies. Those wishing to go, should contact UCD to have their name added to list and/or for more information. The question was raised whether members of the public could attend. If they wanted to, they should contact Mr. Yarbrough to find out.

OTHER BUSINESS

Community Bulletin Board

Ms. Margaret Gidding gave an update on the Community Bulletin Board. The Investigation Cluster 23 Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) system was selected as the remedy under the basewide Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and is out for public comment. The comment period has been extended due to the recent flooding. The new date is March 15, 1997.

The next RAB Executive Session will be on March 6, 1997, 6:30 p.m. at McClellan Air Force Base, Building 269D main conference room.

The Community Relations Committee will be meeting in February to review the FY98 and FY99 budget. Those that are interested are invited to attend.

Major Senchy announced that the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR) will be sponsoring a training session for doctors and health care providers. This will take place on March 1, 1997, 8:00 a.m. at the Red Lion Inn. This is a joint venture with McClellan Air Force and Kaiser Permanente. The attendees will be learning about what to do with patients that may have been exposed to VOCs, what the signs and symptoms are, and the appropriate treatment.

Develop Next RAB and Executive Session Agendas/ Committee Action Items

Mr. Yarbrough announced that the next Executive Session will be on March 6, 1997. The agenda will include discussion on training, proposed changes to the charter, proposed changes to the by-laws, Committee Chair confirmation, and nominees for RAB Co-Chair.

Mr. Leuthe requested that Dave Green, of EM, speak at the Executive Session concerning the leasing of buildings. Mr. Leuthe is concerned about how much a building needs to be cleaned or decontaminated before it can be reused.

The next general RAB meeting will be on April 23, 1997. It is scheduled to be held at Vineland Elementary School.

Vote on last two RAB Members Recommended—Pete Berghuis/Brad Gacke

It was decided that this would be postponed until the next Executive Session since they were not present at the meeting.

Mr. Yarbrough contacted the gentlemen who desires to be an alternate, however, he was not able to attend this meeting. He will be at the next Executive Session for confirmation to be on the alternate RAB pool. Mr. Yarbrough made an appeal to the audience for anyone interested in being a RAB alternate to see him at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Gibson informed the RAB that his alternate, John Bowles, has resigned.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Miller asked for a status report of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) issue. He said that there was report of a lack of cooperation and/or refusal of the Air Force to comply with laws or requirements of the NPDES program. Late last year there were two incidents of illegal discharges. He said that Mr. MacDonald is quoted in the *Sacramento Bee* as saying that he wasn't satisfied with the McClellan's response, and that there had been a hearing.

Mr. MacDonald responded that there were two issues. One is the NPDES permit. The Air Force believes that they do not need a permit because they operate the GWTP under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) program. The Water Board disagreed with the Air Force and issued the permit anyway. The second issue was the non-compliance due to the violation of that NPDES permit, and the groundwater IROD guidelines. Currently, the state has recommended penalties for those violations. Assessment of penalties is still under consideration.

Mr. Healy, of U.S. EPA, said that he has drafted a letter that would assess penalties. It is under consideration and review in his office and back at EPA Headquarters in Washington. It is a complicated issue because one federal agency is considering assessing

a penalty on another federal agency. The process is taking a long time. He said that he is expecting a response later in the week.

Mr. Miller asked if the Rideshare coordinator contract is being audited and commented that it should be terminated.

Ms. Gidding responded that the next Environmental Compliance Forum is tentatively scheduled for May 8, 1997. The Rideshare coordinator program will be on the agenda.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Adams if he had ever been a base employee prior to joining DTSC. He answered no.

CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURN

Mr. Yarbrough thanked EM for allowing the RAB to go through the Community Relations Budget development process to provide input.

Response to Questions not Answered at the Meeting:

Mr. Callaway asked about a possible spill near Building 258 on Thursday, January 30, 1997. Ms. Anderson said that she did not have any information on that, but would get back to him.

An incident occurred on the east side of Building 655 on January 29, 1997, at approximately 0712 hours. A hydraulic line on a contractor's (US Rental) vehicle broke, causing a 2 - 4 gallon spill. Personnel from the shop cleaned up the spill and the drum was transported to the Conforming Storage Facility for disposal. There is no record of a spill occurring behind Building 658 on January 30, 1997. Mr. Callaway agreed that this was most likely the same incident.

Mr. Callaway also asked about the guard wells on the south west side of the base and why those wells are not reflected in the groundwater monitoring plan. Ms. Anderson said that she did not have an answer, but that she would get back with Mr. Callaway on this issue.

The monitoring wells (MWs) 1050, 1051, 1052, and 1053 are located off base near City Well (CW) 132 and were sampled in the third and fourth quarter 1996. The results for trichloroethene (TCE) in parts per billion (ppb) are as follows:

3rd Quarter 1996 MW 1053 0.68 ppb

<i>4th Quarter 1996</i>	<i>MW 1050</i>	<i>6.74 ppb</i>
<i>4th Quarter 1996</i>	<i>MW 1051</i>	<i>1.41 ppb</i>
<i>4th Quarter 1996</i>	<i>MW 1052</i>	<i>2.17 ppb</i>

The wells are listed in the draft GWMP with a proposed sampling schedule.

Mr. Miller asked if McClellan at any time ever expended taxpayers' funds to Eureka Laboratories. Ms. Anderson said that it was her recollection the Restoration side of EM had not used this company, but other parts of EM had. Ms. Anderson further said an investigation had been conducted to determine if any suspect data were used to determine whether a remedial action was required. At this time, none had come to surface.

Only a limited set of analyses, those involving a specific piece of equipment (the GC/MS), were brought into question by the investigation. In answer to the questions:

- 1. McClellan AFB did not use Eureka labs for analysis of samples within the IRP program.*
- 2. Eureka labs was used for sample analysis in the underground storage tank program. However, sufficient additional samples have been taken to properly characterize the sites and make appropriate cleanup decisions.*
- 3. Eureka labs did perform analyses for compliance programs such as the NPDES permit monitoring. Historical samples prior to the use of Eureka labs and samples collected post the use of Eureka labs shows consistent results between the contractors. These analyses do not typically involve the equipment that was part of the investigation.*

It is impossible to determine if McClellan ever received false data from Eureka labs. However, sufficient follow-on

sampling and cross comparisons between labs assures us our data is sufficient to answer the decision needs.

Question from poster board station: Why clean non-naturally occurring (radioactive material) when natural is higher?

The question has been raised by comparing the radiation levels of two areas; one area located near Building 655 (a storage lot) and another near the NW Taxiway. The storage lot has higher radiation levels (due to natural radioactivity) than the area near the Taxiway (which is non-natural radioactivity). The lot is not proposed to be remediated while the Taxiway is proposed for remediation.

The decision to remove contamination from a site is based not only on radiation exposure, but an evaluation of its potential for inhalation and/or ingestion, and negotiated clean-up levels. In this case, the radioactivity at the storage lot is tightly bound to the granite rocks and has little potential for inhalation/ingestion. The radioactivity at the Taxiway is due to radium dial paint chips and therefore has a potential for inhalation/ingestion.

Determine who was paid the \$1,500 for the service contract on the IR microfilm machine.

McClellan AFB contracted with Radian Corporation at a cost \$1,498 for the service contract on the microfilm machine. Radian Corporation sub-contracted this task to Kodak Corporation. The timeframe of this contractual requirement was from December 1, 1991 to April 1, 1996. The \$1,498 was an annual cost.

McClellan AFB contracted with Kodak Corporation at a cost of \$1,468 for the service contract on the microfilm machine. The timeframe of the contractual requirement is from October 1, 1996 to September 30, 1997.

When and who maintains the IR?

Radian Corporation maintained the IR from December 1, 1991 to April 1, 1996, with contractor oversight accomplished by Danny Durkee, EMRP, during that time.

Danny Durkee, EMRP, has maintained the IR since April 1, 1996.

Mr. Miller asked how much McClellan had been paying Radian to support the Administrative Record. Ms. Anderson said that she would get back to him with that answer.

CONTRACT COSTS PAID TO RADIAN

Administrative Record Support

<i>Oct 90 - Sept 92</i>	\$ 780,000	10 Employees
<i>Oct 92 - Mar 93</i>	\$ 76,652	4 Employees
<i>Apr 93 - Mar 94</i>	\$ 216,768	4 Employees
<i>Apr 94 - Mar 95</i>	\$ 290,260*	3 Employees
<i>Apr 95 - Mar 96</i>	\$ 212,937	3 Employees
<i>Total</i>	\$1,576,617	

**Developed and implements the Integrated Document Management System.*