

Response to Comments

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3						
Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Response to Comments on Final Asbestos Language:						
1	5.3	4	N/A	EPA Mar 26, 2004 Bob Carr	Referring to text: "ACM in Utility Lines: No CERCLA remedial action for ACM in below ground utility pipelines is required." While this statement may be correct in most cases, it requires some explanation/basis because asbestos in utility lines can be in a variety of forms from transite pipe to steam line insulation which have very different properties. Proposed modification: Add the phrase "so long as the utility line is not disturbed or moved from the ground".	AFRPA has incorporated the suggested language. Sentence now reads, "ACM in Utility Pipelines: No CERCLA response action for ACM in below ground utility pipelines is required so long as the utility line is not disturbed or moved from the ground".
2	5.3	4	N/A	EPA Mar 26, 2004 Bob Carr	Is it correct to say that there are no building demolition sites at McClellan AFB? If the AF cannot make that statement, what happens to the statement which follows? Proposed modification: "portion of the base which includes the parcel(s)"	The text should have reflected the parcels associated with this FOST. The sentence was changed and now reads, "Based upon an inspection of the property and a review of the environmental baseline survey reports, no such locations are specifically known on the portions of the base that include these parcels".
3	5.3	4	N/A	EPA Mar 26, 2004 Bob Carr	In both cases the word "remedial" should be replaced with "response" since it is unlikely that demolition debris will even require a full-blown remedial action.	The word "remedial" was replaced with the "response".

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
4	5.3	4	N/A	EPA Mar 26, 2004 Bob Carr April 30, 2004 Email from Joe Healy concurred with new language	Need to add the word “pre-transfer” since the Air Force only intends to respond to asbestos which constitutes a “release”. The language both in the FOST and deed should distinguish between the action that put the asbestos in the ground, e.g. building demolition, and the action which results in a post-transfer “release or threat of release”, e.g. excavating or uncovering the asbestos. Proposed modification: Add the word “pre-transfer” or use language comparable to that in the (h)(3) covenant limiting the AF responsibility where the action of the transferee releases a new hazardous substance giving rise to the need for a response action.	The word "pre-transfer" was not included in the text. However, alternative language was worked out between AFRPA and EPA attorneys. The following language was added after the 2 nd sentence of the General paragraph, “As to asbestos found in demolition debris, the above warranty will apply unless the transferee fails to comply with the requirement of the preceding paragraph regarding prompt notification of the Air Force of any demolition debris containing friable asbestos”. Concurrence with language obtained via email dated April 30, 2004.
1	None	None	N/A	DTSC Francesca D’Onofrio Email dated April 5, 2004	DTSC had no comments and is in agreement with the language.	No response required.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Response to Comments on Draft Final FOST:						
Information Request	N/A	N/A	N/A	DTSC Sep 25, 2002 Email (Kevin Depies)	As part of our “due diligence” for the Category 1 FOST, we need to review the potential risks associated with nearby contamination. I have identified several IRP sites in the vicinity of the Category 1 FOST parcels. These are: PRL P-010, PRL S-033, Magpie Creek, AOC G-1, AOC G-2, PRL P-007, PRL S-40, AOC H-1, AOC H-13, PRL S-047, AOC H-12. We need a brief summary for each site. This would include the following: Reason the site was identified as an IRP site (background), Sources of contamination, COCs, Nature and extent of contamination, The HHRA for the site. Lastly, we need similar information on the source of the red soil gas and ground water “blob” in the Buildings 4, 10, 7 area. We need this info to assess the risk of the FOST parcels.	Information provided to Kevin Depies via email and hard copy on October 9, 2002. Based on DTSC review and response letter dated December 20, 2002, they find that the adjacent parcels do not pose an environmental or human risk to the parcels being transferred under this FOST.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	DHS Nov 15, 2002 (Penny Leinwander)	DHS requests that the Air Force confirm that the original information provided in the SSSEBS documents is still accurate even though new historical information has been compiled and address the historical site assessment issues covered in the November 14, 2002 DHS memorandum.	The Air Force validates the accuracy of the SSSEBSs before property transfer. In the case of this FOST, updates to the SSSEBSs are documented in Environmental Condition Reports (ECRs) and visual site assessments, provided as FOST attachments 5 and 6, respectively. As it relates to radiation, information regarding building 786 was updated. At the time the SSSEBSs were completed, the radiological clearance for building 786 had not been received. The ECR for lease amendment 14-3 documented that the Air Force received DHS radiological clearance for unrestricted use of building 786. Based on historical use of the buildings and land associated with this FOST (office, recreational, educational, and residential), there is no indication that any other buildings or property associated with this FOST are impacted by radiological issues. In addition, no CERCLA sites exist on this FOST property. The DTSC agrees that there are no radiological issues associated with this FOST parcel as indicated in their draft final FOST comment letter dated December 20, 2002. In addition, DTSC provided an email on January 15, 2003 re-confirming that there are no radiological issues associated with this FOST. The Air Force will continue to address the historical use issues cited in the November 14, 2002 DHS letter as they relate to property and buildings outside the FOST area.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	DTSC Dec 20, 2002 (Dan Ward)	DTSC letter requiring Air Force to complete RCRA corrective action requirements before property can transfer.	In a letter dated March 11, 2003, the AFRPA provided the information requested in the December 20, 2002 DTSC letter. The DTSC is proceeding with its requirements to terminate corrective action authority on the FOST property. Air Force actions are considered complete based upon this submittal.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	RWQCB Jul 15, 2002 (James Taylor)	We have reviewed the FOST and Responses to Comments and have determined that our comments on the draft (letter dated 25 April 2002) have been adequately addressed.	None Required.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	U.S. EPA Jul 16, 2002 (Joe Healy)	EPA is satisfied with the response to our comments on the draft version of the subject FOST. We have no additional comments on the draft final version.	None Required.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Response to Comments on Draft FOST:						
Specific Comment 1	4	N/A	N/A	EPA Apr 24, 2002 (John Hamill)	<u>Section 4 Environmental Condition of the Property.</u> Has the Air Force obtained EPA's certification that this property meets the criteria for Environmental Category 1? If so, the FOST should cite the EPA concurrence.	No formal certification has been received. In the last para of Section 4, we state: "Based on information from recent groundwater and vadose zone monitoring reports (Third Quarter Calendar Year 2001 Report and Fourth Quarter Calendar Year 2001 Report, respectively) and sampling data from the Operable Unit E-H Remedial Investigation Characterization Summaries (RICS) (March 2000), the BRAC Cleanup Team updated the contamination status maps for soil, soil gas, and groundwater. The resulting composite contamination status map shows that the property associated with this FOST is ECC 1." The BRAC Cleanup Team has supported the ECC 1. This FOST is to serve as formal certification for the ECC 1.
Specific Comment 2	4	N/A	N/A	EPA Apr 24, 2002 (John Hamill)	<u>Section 4 Environmental Condition of the Property.</u> If lead-based paint [LBP] has been released to the environment, the property cannot be classified as ECC 1, since EPA considers LBP to be a CERCLA-regulated hazardous waste. The property could be classified as ECC 3, if the LBP is below action levels.	The Air Force does not believe that there has been a CERCLA release of LBP and considers the property ECC 1. The text has not been changed as a result of this comment.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 3	5.4 & 5.5			EPA Apr 24, 2002 (John Hamill)	These sections must be revised to reference and be in compliance with (1) the DOD/EPA Lead Based Paint Guidelines for disposal of DOD Residential Real Property - A Field Guide, and (2) the TSCA 403 Rule which became effective 6 March 2001.	Section 5.4 and 5.5 have been amended to indicate compliance with (1) the DOD/EPA Lead Based Paint Guidelines for disposal of DOD Residential Real Property - A Field Guide, and (2) the TSCA 403 Rule which became effective 6 March 2001. The following text was added to these sections, "The disclosure and notification requirements for lead-based paint are in accordance with the most recent AFRPA policy on management of lead-based paint: "Operating Procedures for the Management of Lead-Based Paint at Air Force Base Realignment and Closure Installations" dated May 2001. These new procedures incorporate the DoD/EPA Field Guide, HUD regulations, and EPA's TSCA 403 standards."
Specific Comment 4	7			EPA Apr 24, 2002 (John Hamill)	If the property is ECC 3, this section must be revised to reflect the CERCLA Section 120(h)3 covenants, not the 120(h)4 covenant.	As stated in response to Specific Comment #2, the Air Force does not believe that there has been a CERCLA release of LBP and considers the property ECC 1. The text has not been changed as a result of this comment.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 5	5.1	N/A	N/A	EPA Apr 24, 2002 (Steve Anderson)	<u>Section 5.1 Hazardous Substances Notification</u> The first sentence should be reworded to make it clear that there are different notification requirements in 40 CFR 373.1 applicable to the <u>release</u> of hazardous substances than to the <u>storage</u> of hazardous substances. A hazardous substance notification is required when hazardous substances are known to have been <u>released</u> in quantities greater than or equal to the substance's CERCLA reportable quantity found at 40 CFR 302.4. The standard stated in Paragraph 5.1, "quantities exceeding 1,000 kilograms or the hazardous substances reportable quantity found at 40 CFR 302.4 (whichever is greater)," applies only to the <u>storage</u> of hazardous substances.	The first sentence of Section 5.1 has been modified to read as follows: "A hazardous substance notification is required by 40 CFR Part 373.1 for the sale or transfer of any real property owned by the United States where during the time of ownership any hazardous substance was stored in quantities exceeding 1,000 kilograms or the hazardous substance's reportable quantity found at 40 CFR Part 302.4 (whichever is greater) or are known to have been released, or disposed of in quantities greater than or equal to the hazardous substance's reportable quantity found at 40 CFR Part 302.4."
Specific Comment 6	5.2	N/A	N/A	EPA Apr 24, 2002 (Steve Anderson)	<u>Section 5.2 Installation Restoration Program . . .</u> The first sentence should be reworded to more closely follow the wording of CERCLA Section 120(h)(4)(D), which provides for: a covenant warranting that any response action or corrective action found to be necessary after the date of such sale or transfer shall be conducted by the United States.	The first sentence of Section 5.2 has been reworded to read as follows: "A CERCLA 120(4) covenant will be included in the Deed warranting that any response or corrective actions found to be necessary after the date of delivery of the deed will be conducted by the United States."
Specific Comment 7	5.4	N/A	N/A	EPA Apr 24, 2002 (Steve Anderson)	<u>Section 5.4 Lead-Based Paint (LBP) - Facilities other than Housing</u> It is unclear whether a restriction will be imposed on residential use of the property.	No restriction on use is intended by this Section.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 1	5.2	3	2	RWQCB Apr 25, 2002 (James Taylor)	Section 5.2, page 3, second paragraph, last sentence: This sentence mentions that a Sacramento County ordinance codifies a prohibition against drilling drinking water supply wells on and in the vicinity of McClellan AFB. The citation for the McClellan Prohibition Zone ordinance is as follows: <i>Sacramento County Code, Title 6, Chapter 6.29</i> . Please include this ordinance citation in this section.	Section 5.2 has been amended to cite the local ordinance prohibiting drilling drinking water supply wells. The last sentence of para 2 now reads: “Also, it should be mentioned that a Sacramento County ordinance (ref. Sacramento County Code, Title 6, Chapter 6.29) codifies a prohibition against drilling drinking water supply wells on and in the vicinity of McClellan AFB.”

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 1a	5.2		3 & 4	DTSC Apr 26, 2002 (Francesca D'Onofrio)	Section 5.2, Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Areas of Concern (AOC). As stated in this section, groundwater underlying the property proposed for transfer is not contaminated. However, it is known that groundwater contamination does exist on adjacent parcels. Therefore, please provide a descriptive summary in support of the conclusion that adjacent groundwater contamination does not pose a health risk to future users of the property to be transferred. Also include an analysis of sampling conducted to date that would support this conclusion. Until such time, DTSC withholds supporting a finding of suitability to transfer.	As stated in Paragraph 2 of Section 5.2, the deed will prohibit the drilling of wells for groundwater use. A new paragraph 3, Section 5.2, was inserted to read as follows: “Groundwater contamination underlying adjacent property does not pose a health risk to future users of the property to be transferred. The above mentioned prohibition against drilling drinking water wells on the property to be transferred combined with the continued operation of adjacent groundwater remediation systems are expected to prevent a risk exposure from occurring.” Groundwater sampling analyses are contained in the Groundwater Quarterly Monitoring Report. The most recent report was issued in May 2002 for Fourth Quarter 2001 data. Based on the estimated contours and groundwater flow direction, it is believed that there is no groundwater contamination under the footprint of this FOST. The Quarterly Monitoring Report recognizes the groundwater data gaps on the adjacent property and that an FSP is being developed to address these data gaps. The data gap that could possibly impact this FOST property is in the target area of Groundwater Extraction Well (EW) 333, which is between buildings 4 and 7 (outside the FOST property). A data gap sampling location is proposed in this area north of building 9 and on the border of parcel L3. See FOST attachment 2 (sheet 2 of 3) for the location of this sampling point. (response continued on next page)

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 1a (cont.)	5.2				(see above)	The prohibition on drilling drinking water supply wells will prevent risk exposure from potential contamination discovered as a result of the data gap efforts. A new paragraph 4, Section 5.2 was inserted to read as follows: "Groundwater data gaps sampling is underway in areas adjacent to the property associated with this FOST to further define the nature and extend of groundwater contamination target areas adjacent to the property. The above mentioned prohibition against drilling drinking water wells on the property to be transferred will ensure that there is no risk exposure from potential contaminated groundwater migration from adjacent source areas."
Specific Comment 1b			4	DTSC Apr 26, 2002 (Francesca D'Onofrio)	Section 5.2. The document doesn't address the VOC groundwater data gaps in the vicinity of Parcel A3. The GWOU Phase 3 Data Gaps FSP shows that there is uncertainty on the extent of VOC contamination in two plumes in this area. Based on a review of the figures in the FOST and the FSP, it is difficult to determine if the data gap in this area is in, or very close, to Parcel A3.	See response to DTSC comment 1a above.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 2	5.5		2	DTSC Apr 26, 2002 (Francesca D'Onofrio)	Section 5.5, Lead-Based Paint (LBP) - Target Housing. Based on sampling activities previously conducted by the Air Force, it is DTSC's understanding that lead in soil does not pose a health risk in the areas to be transferred. However, the FOST does not include any discussion in support of this conclusion. Therefore, as discussed in a phone conference with AF staff during the week of April 8, 2002, please expand this section detailing all lead in soil sampling activities, and sampling analysis, that have been conducted to date.	Section 5.5, para 2 has been added to read as follows: Soils around Wherry Housing, dormitories, temporary lodging facilities, and playground areas were sampled for lead in 1998. Lead concentrations ranged between 13 ppm and 74 ppm, which are below the minimum action level of 400 ppm established by the U.S. EPA. Specific sampling results and locations are contained in the Air Force document "Sampling Lead In Soils For Target Housing Field Sampling Report, McClellan Air Force Base, California, January 1998."
Specific Comment 3	5.6			DTSC Apr 26, 2002 (Francesca D'Onofrio)	Section 5.6, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs). Please insert "fluorescent" before "light ballasts..."	Section 5.6 has been amended to clarify that the ballasts are for fluorescent lamps. The last sentence of the section now reads: "However, fluorescent light ballasts in facilities constructed prior to 1979 are suspected to contain PCB oils, unless the facility has undergone light retrofitting."

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FOST FOR McCLELLAN PARCEL A1, A2, A3, A7, L1, AND PARTIAL L3

Comment Number	Section	Page	Paragraph	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Specific Comment 4				DTSC Apr 26, 2002 (Francesca D'Onofrio)	Section 5.10, Sanitary Sewer Systems (Wastewater). This section states the sanitary sewer system downstream from the footprint of the FOST may be contaminated with radionuclides. Therefore, the AF proposes delaying transfer of the sewer system until investigation of the downstream portions are conducted. It is not clear if this approach will be applied to just specific segments of the sanitary sewer system or all sewer lines within the area proposed for transfer. Also, please explain if a buffer zone has been placed on and around the sanitary sewer system. If so, has the buffer zone been approved by all members of the BCT? The issue of potentially radionuclide impacted sewer lines has been discussed by the BCT for early transfers, but has not been addressed in support of this FOST. Therefore, until this issue is addressed and resolved by the BCT, DTSC withholds supporting a finding of suitability to transfer.	For clarity, Section 5.10 has been modified. The text after sentence 2 reads as follows: "The segment of sanitary sewer system associated with this FOST is not being transferred at this time. It will be transferred under a utility Bill of Sale when other segments downstream and outside this FOST footprint are ready for transfer. Segments of the sanitary sewer outside this FOST footprint will not be ready for transfer until cleared of potential radiological issues. Based on the Final Basewide Conceptual Model for Radiation at the Former McClellan Air Force Base (June 2002), there are no radiological issues associated with the segment of sanitary sewer within this FOST. Therefore, no buffer zones to prevent potential radiological exposures are warranted for the property with this FOST footprint. However, the deed will ensure that the Air Force maintains right of access to the sanitary sewer to conduct maintenance and repairs as needed. There are no Industrial Wastewater Lines located within the footprint of this FOST."