Former Williams Air Force Base (AFB)
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes

May 17, 2011, 7:00 p.m.
Highland High School
4301 E. Guadalupe Rd.
Gilbert, AZ

Attendees:

Ms. Michelle Lewis	**Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE)/Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC)/Air Force Co-Chair**
Mr. Len Fuchs	**RAB Community Co-Chair**
Mr. Andre Chiaradia	**Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Remedial Project Manager**
Mr. Don Atkinson	**ADEQ**
Ms. Beverly Selvage	**RAB Member/Mesa**
Mr. Dale Anderson	**RAB Member/Gila River Indian Community**
Ms. Pat Tennant	**RAB Member/Arizona State University (ASU) Polytechnic**
Mr. James Holt	**RAB Member/Queen Creek**
Mr. Thom Schuett	**RAB Member/Queen Creek**
Mr. Dennis Orr	**RAB Member/Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport**
Mr. Alan Ruffalo	**RAB Member/Power Ranch HOA**
Ms. Amber Cargile	**Cargile Communications, LLC**
Mr. Jay Harbin	**URS Corp**
Mr. Charles Helms	**Booz Allen Hamilton**
Mr. Jeff Schone	**BEM Systems**
Mr. Dan Kelley	**Tierra Dynamic**

Mr. Fuchs called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and RAB members and attendees introduced themselves. Mr. Fuchs introduced the RAB's Air Force Co-Chair, Ms. Michelle Lewis. The RAB approved the March 2011 meeting minutes without changes. Ms. Lewis began the main presentation with updates of major environmental remediation actions.

First, Ms. Lewis and Mr. Harbin provided a program update on Site LF004, the former base landfill. Mr. Harbin said the Air Force will soon obtain access from the City of Mesa and the Flood Control District of Maricopa County to install nine nested monitoring wells on land just south of the former base boundary and the landfill. The wells will be installed and sampled later this year and will help the Air Force determine the boundary of the tetrachloroethene (PCE) and trichloroethene (TCE) plumes in the landfill. Mr. Harbin showed a map where the new wells will be installed (slide #9 of the attached presentation).

Mr. Ruffalo asked if the Air Force thinks the plume is contained within the landfill. Mr. Harbin said that they think the PCE plume extends slightly off the former base boundary (as shown on the map on slide #9 of the attached presentation). He said the TCE plume boundary on the map is "inferred", meaning that is where they think it probably extends, but testing the new wells will help delineate the actual plume boundary. He added that monitoring wells on the west side of

the base boundary line have been tested and show the plume does not extend off the western base boundary.

Next, Mr. Harbin provided an update on site ST012, the former liquid fuels storage area. Mr. Harbin said the Air Force sampled groundwater in February 2011 at the site. The Air Force took samples from 11 monitoring wells and analyzed groundwater for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes (BTEX). The results were similar to previous sampling. Samples at well #W37 detected benzene, toluene and ethylbenzene levels that exceed maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). Samples at well #W36 detected benzene exceeding the MCL. Samples at the other nine wells did not detect BTEX levels above the MCLs. Mr. Harbin said the Air Force would be sampling again in May and December 2011.

Mr. Ruffalo asked if there are approximately 30 monitoring wells around site ST012. Mr. Harbin said there are at least 30 monitoring wells on the site. He said the Air Force samples 30 wells each year as part of its regulatory compliance, but it also goes a step further and conducts additional voluntary sampling 11 wells each quarter. Mr. Ruffalo asked if it's possible that the contamination could flow outside the area of the sampling wells many years from now. Mr. Harbin said the Air Force monitors the plume to watch for migration. Ms. Lewis said the Air Force regularly monitors the site so that it can be proactive and take action if it is evident the plume is migrating. Mr. Ruffalo asked if it migrated, if it would require additional contracting and remediation. Ms. Lewis said it would, but that the benefit of regular sampling is that the Air Force can monitor the plume and response to changes early.

Mr. Holt asked if the test results are higher or lower than previous samples at site ST012. Mr. Harbin said the results are fairly consistent and the trend at the site is flat. Mr. Holt asked if that means the soil vapor extraction (SVE) system at the site is not having a significant effect. Mr. Chiardia said that SVE addresses soils, not groundwater.

Mr. Ruffalo asked whether the Air Force ever tests groundwater 800 or 900 feet below ground surface. Mr. Harbin said that they do not test that deep because petroleum contaminants float in groundwater and are not normally found that deep. Mr. Ruffalo asked if there are any contaminants that can migrate that deep. Mr. Harbin said that chlorinated solvents are able to migrate deeper because they are heavy. TCE and PCE, for example, sink as long as there is ample mass. He added that they are often stopped from sinking by geologic formations and that the standard protocol is to keep testing deeper into groundwater until you find the "bottom" depth of the contamination.

Mr. Holt asked if the Air Force intends to treat the groundwater at site ST012. Ms. Lewis said the Air Force plans to treat the groundwater. Mr. Ruffalo asked if groundwater would be treated 300 feet or more below ground surface. Ms. Lewis said the Air Force would treat it at any depth if it was contaminated, but that testing does not indicate contamination exists that deep at site ST012.

Next, Mr. Harbin discussed repairs and optimization to the SVE system at site ST012. He said the Air Force replaced gauges and flow meters, and repaired piping and the oxidizer units in the system. He also provided an update on SVE system performance at the site. He said 28,700 pounds (4,400 gallons) of petroleum hydrocarbons (PHC) were removed between January 1 and March 31, 2011, at a rate of approximately 312 pounds per day. He added that more than 1.5

million pounds (236,000 gallons) have been removed since the SVE system was implemented in 2005.

Mr. Harbin next provided an update of remediation efforts at site ST035, the former base gas station (also known as Bldg. 760). This site is an underground storage tank (UST) site that is now part of the ASU Polytechnic campus. Mr. Harbin said groundwater samples were collected from 13 monitoring wells and analyzed for BTEX, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), 1,2-dibromoethane (EDB), and 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA) in February 2011. (MTBE is an additive to unleaded fuel and EDB is an anti-knock additive in leaded fuels.) He said sampling results were very similar to quarterly testing conducted in November 2010. (See table on slide 22 of the attached presentation and enlarged attached handout.) He added that the Air Force will conduct quarterly sampling again in May 2011.

The SVE system has removed 16,800 pounds (2,700 gallons) of PHC from site ST035, Mr. Harbin said, at a rate of approximately 189 pounds/per day from January 1-March 31, 2011. The system has removed a total of 50,000 pounds (8,100 gallons) of PHC since the SVE treatment began in October 2010. He said they converted the oxidizer in the SVE system to catalytic mode in March 2011 to increase operation efficiency.

Mr. Ruffalo asked how the Air Force measures the amount of PHC captured through SVE. Mr. Harbin said that the Air Force takes weekly samples before and after treatment and since they know the flow rate of the system, they can calculate how much is pulled through and how much is destroyed. He said the system uses some of the captured PHC vapors to fuel itself and they find more than 98% of PHCs are burned and destroyed in the oxidizer. He added that the Maricopa County Air Quality District monitors the output and the Air Force consistently exceeds clean emission standards.

Mr. Harbin provided RAB members with an update of site SS017, part of Operable Unit 6 (OU-6). This site is the former pesticide shop, located under the water tower near the ASU Polytechnic campus, with one monitoring well at the site indicating an elevated reading of the pesticide dieldrin. He said the Air Force submitted a revised Final Removal Action Completion Report for OU-6 in May 2011. The report covers work done several years ago at the site.

Mr. Harbin said URS Corporation is contracted to prepare an amended Proposed Plan for OU-6, and the Air Force is reviewing an internal draft and has scheduled a June meeting to discuss it with ADEQ and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Once the draft is complete, the Air Force will hold a public meeting to present the plan and provide a 30-day comment period for public review and feedback. The Air Force will then consider all public input and draft a Record of Decision (ROD) for the site, which will include a Community Responsiveness Summary.

Ms. Cargile next discussed the status of the Five Year Review of the former base. She said the Five Year Review is a federal requirement for all Superfund sites and is a comprehensive, periodic review of the remedies that have been put in place across the former base. Public feedback is one of many parts of the review process. URS Corporation is contracted to perform the Five Year Review for Williams and she performed the public feedback survey portion, which involved several RAB members. She said she conducted personal and phone interviews and collected online survey feedback in December 2010/January 2011. Feedback was taken from 12 community participants including major economic stakeholders as well as residents of Mesa, Gilbert and Queen Creek and an ASU Polytechnic student.

Ms. Cargile said based on the responses, the public is satisfied with the remedies in place at the former base. She noted that there are still community concerns about cleanup, the two largest being the pace of cleanup (the desire for faster cleanup, transfer and redevelopment of property) and concerns about potential migration of contaminants off site from the former landfill. She added that community officials and stakeholders also urged the Air Force and regulators to consider a partial de-listing of the site from the National Priority List. Lastly, she said community members indicate they are pleased with community outreach efforts and the availability of information about cleanup.

Mr. Harbin said URS Corporation will submit its internal draft of the Five Year Review to the Air Force in June and the Air Force will, in turn, submit a draft to regulators in August or September 2011. Public review of the document will likely occur in late 2011.

Ms. Lewis provided an update on property transfer at the former base. Three sites remain to be transferred: Parcel N (including the landfill), Site FT002 (former fire training site) and Site SS017 (the former pesticide shop).

She said although ASU would like an early transfer of Site SS017 to the university, the Public Benefit Conveyance program does not allow an early transfer to the Department of Education without a Record of Decision (ROD) for the site. Once there is a signed ROD, then the Air Force can transfer the property to ASU.

Site FT002 may require some additional remediation actions for the ROD amendment to be complete, Ms. Lewis said, and it is intended to be transferred to the airport authority.

The last remaining large property parcel awaiting transfer is Parcel N. Ms. Lewis said that the ROD for the site identifies the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) as the property recipient. She said BIA has until the end of July 2011 to decide if they still want the property.

The final update of the evening was a brief update on the Performance-Based Remediation (PBR) contract. The PBR is a 9.5-year contract covering all remediation sites at Williams except for the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) work being done on Parcel N. The contract provides longevity, continuity and performance metrics for contracted cleanup work at the former base.

Ms. Lewis said that Mr. Terry Yonkers, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment and Logistics, has directed that the Air Force accelerate the clean up of sites so that they can be closed, redeveloped and reduce long-term costs.

She said that a recent memo from Mr. Yonkers placed high emphasis on the use of performance based tools . Using PBR contracts, the Air Force can conduct complete cleanups where it is technically feasible and cost effective, and free up these properties for redevelopment, which is good for the environment, good for the property recipient and good for the taxpayer.

She said the Williams PBR contract has not been awarded yet but is under review. She expects it will be awarded before the August RAB meeting. In the meantime, URS Corporation continues to perform remediation operations and maintenance at Williams under a quarterly bridge contract.

Mr. Ruffalo asked if the Air Force will oversee the PRB contractor. Ms. Lewis said the Air Force will continue to be fully engaged and will manage the project and oversee the contract. Mr. Chiardia added that the contractor must also work within the regulatory framework to meet cleanup goals.

That concluded the information portion of the evening. Ms. Cargile noted no action items taken from the meeting and no topics were suggested for the next meeting. Ms. Lewis thanked the RAB for attending. Mr. Fuchs adjourned the meeting at 8:32 p.m. The next Williams RAB meeting date is scheduled for Tuesday, August 23, 2011 at 7:00 p.m., at Highland High School.

Attachment:
May 2011 RAB meeting slide presentation