

**Phoenix-Goodyear Airport (PGA) Area/Western Avenue Plume
Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting**

**Thursday, May 02
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Goodyear Justice Center
195 N. 145th Avenue, Goodyear, AZ**

FINAL MINUTES

CAG Members in Attendance:

Diane Krone
Lisa Amos
Jeff Raible-Co-chair
Earl Smith
Karl Havlicek - Alternate
Tim Birdsall

ADEQ Staff in Attendance:

Delfina Olivarez, Western Avenue Project Manager
Travis Barnum, PGA North and South Project Manager
Wendy Flood, Community Involvement Coordinator
Andre Chiradia, Remedial Projects Unit Manager
Harry Hendler, Project Manager, Federal Project Unit

Facilitator:

Marty Rozelle

EPA Staff in Attendance:

Cathrine Brown
Glenn Bruck
Alejandro Diaz

Others in Attendance:

Ailiang Gu, ITSI Gilbane; Nancy Nesky, ITSI Gilbane; Nimisha Patel, AMEC; Tom Suriano, Clear Creek Associates; Harry Brenton, Matrix New World Engineering; Stephanie Lyn Koehne, AMEC; Jeff Sussman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Amy Wilson, TRC; Jim Creedon, Crane Company; Randy McElroy ECO; Mark Holmes, City of Goodyear; Ron Clark, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Kathy Hunter, Hargis+Associates, Inc.; Michael R. Long, Hargis+Associates, Inc.; Chris Legg; Brown & Caldwell; Julie Riemenschneider, City of Phoenix Aviation Dept. ; Paul Jeffers, AMEC; Briana Velasco, AMEC; Joe Husband ITSI Gilbane; Scott Zachary, Haley & Aldrich

Welcome and Introductions – Co-Chair called meeting to order. Introductions were made by CAG Members and audience. CIC coordinator introduced a new reporting format that allows the responsible agencies to present information and updates instead of the consultants for the agencies.

PGA NORTH & SOUTH SITES

Water Resources Department (WRD): Mark Holmes, City of Goodyear

Mr. Holmes discussed the City's application to the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) for remediated groundwater exemptions for both sites and the benefits of those; discussed it's goals for the remediated water, the replenishment district service area and areas for where the remediated water will be distributed.

See slide presentation

A CAG member asked if the City was required to report withdrawals and what amounts were put to beneficial use. The WRD responded that the City will be metering all of the delivered remediated groundwater and it is the City's responsibility to report that annually. It was also asked if the reporting function was for the City to satisfy it's obligation that it is not withdrawing more than its allotment. The WRD responded that the City is receiving remediated groundwater (treated by another party) and as a result that is less water that the City is pumping. Since the City isn't using aquifer water there is zero net negative impact on the aquifer.

Another CAG member asked if the use of the potable water is restricted or can it be used as drinking water. The WRD responded that other City's have a policy for this type of water use, however, Goodyear does not have a policy regarding remediated groundwater supply. The WRD speculated that due to potential liability to the Superfund responsible parties they may not want that water to be used for that purpose. The City has enough potable drinking water at this point that it won't need to have this discussion for any foreseeable future.

A third CAG member wanted to know if the City's public areas that were receiving the remediated water would have posted signs notifying the public of its use. The WRD responded that the water being used meets the water quality standard for potable water therefore signs probably won't be posted. The WRD stated he would verify and respond back.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Catherine Brown, Project Manager & Glenn Bruck, Hydrogeologist

An overview of existing treatment systems, Subunit A plume containment on both sites, trend analysis/groundwater statistics at both sites, current and future activities, the hydraulic barrier and proposed plan for PGA North were discussed.

See slide presentation

A CAG member asked if there is now containment of the plume in Subunit A, PGA North, in the northeast area and, the containment work now being done in the northwest plume area, is there containment anywhere outside of the northern sections. EPA responded that they understand containment has only been north of the I-10. A capture analysis would not be able to be produced for Subunit B or C south of I-10 because the groundwater investigation has not been completed. A consultant continued to say that the capture zone report represented the entire site of PGA North and the conclusion was that the natural flow of the groundwater is to the north and northwest.

Additionally, there is complete capture in the northeast and that they are working on capture in the northwest. The northwest is the only area where they don't have complete capture, as well as a small area along Van Buren that they are trying to better characterize to see if any remedial action necessary in that area. Besides that capture is complete throughout the rest of the site.

A CAG member wanted clarification on whether there is containment, as the EPA and a consultant do not agree, but the capture analysis indicates that there is capture. The EPA consultant responded that he felt that all parties agreed that in Subunit A, the northeast is contained but the northwest was not except for the small area around Van Buren just east of Litchfield Road. Based on the capture analysis there is seasonal containment during February and November. Depending on groundwater flow direction during May and August groundwater is not contained in Subunit A.

The EPA continued the presentation and went through the PGA South discussion. Travis Barnum with ADEQ presented information on trending of key wells. **(See Slide Presentation)**

A CAG member asked if the agency had an idea of where the injection wells near PGA North monitor well MW-51A would be located. The agency responded that it did and it would be presented later in the presentation..

A CAG member asked where groundwater monitoring well 63-A is located in PGA North. A consultant answered that it was installed about a month ago, north of Van Buren on west side of Litchfield Road, across from Schlotsky's restaurant. The same member asked what is indicated by how the wells are named. The EPA responded that the lettering indicates which subunit is being monitored by the well, so 4B will be monitoring the Subunit B plume. The number of Subunit B wells will increase with future installations. The member also asked if monitoring will be done in the impervious layer area. The response was that Subunit B doesn't really have an impervious layer but rather clay or silt layers. Well 4B is located on the Celebrate Life Way, or formerly Fillmore Street, west of Litchfield Road across the street from the hotels, and east of the Cancer Treatment Center. The Subunit B wells are purposely put next to existing extraction wells completed in Subunit C so that when pumping is occurring in Subunit C, monitoring of Subunit B can be done to determine the interaction of the three subunits and assess whether water is moving from Subunit A to C. The CAG member recalled that Subunit B is not very thick. Crane's consultants provided a description of the thickness of Subunit B and its hydraulic properties.

With regard to the hydraulic barrier along Van Buren, it was asked by a CAG member to confirm the understanding that this barrier is not a hydraulic barrier but rather a capture barrier where well EA-09 was intended to serve in place of well EA-04, thus anything that would bypass well EA-04 would be captured by EA-09. The Crane's consultant confirmed he was correct on both accounts.

A CAG member asked the reasoning for not replacing well EA-04, how long it had been out of production and whether well EA-09 can handle capture in the area. The consultant responded that well EA-04 has been nonfunctional since the mid 1990's, but they also stated they did not say they wouldn't replace well EA-04. Well EA-09 was installed as a permanent part of the remedy for the site; Crane would rather evaluate data from well EA-09 and determine the best location for a permanent extraction well as part of the design for in-situ remediation, which may not be the current location of well EA-04.

The consultant also stated they believe they have capture along Van Buren, east beyond Litchfield Road, with the data analysis from two extraction wells in the area. The goal with well EA-09 is to remove all the TCE mass in the area and to help maintain groundwater flow directions.

EPA's consultant also indicated Well EA-09 will capture TCE mass in the highest concentration area and that capture of the contamination is one of the most important lines of evidence for proving capture.

A CAG member asked if there was a possibility that the contamination from the main drywell source area in PGA North could go in a different direction than expected and if so, what would be done if it did. EPA responded that the remedy would be installed in an area by area, phased-approach with a closed loop system. The treatment and effects will be monitored closely and modifications to the design could be made to mitigate any unexpected impacts.

A CAG member asked if in the protection of public drinking water, which has the greater priority of importance to that end, Subunit A or Subunit C. The EPA responded that they are equally important and that the problem is that Subunit A is not a drinking water aquifer but is the source of the contamination in Subunit C. The intention is to go after the source area and stop plume expansion and thus discontinue the contamination of the other subunits and the drinking water sources.

A CAG member asked if EPA had any financial restrictions to complete the work they wanted to rather than what they could do with a restricted budget. The EPA responded that there were no restrictions in that regard.

Western Avenue (WA) WQARF site: Delfina Olivarez, ADEQ Project Manager

A quarterly update on groundwater monitoring, Draft Feasibility Study Report and preliminary results of the Time-Series groundwater sampling of (COG) well # 1 was presented.

See slide presentation

A CAG member inquired about the yellow line on the graph. The ADEQ stated that the yellow line represented nitrate levels in samples collected from COG-3 and pink was for perchlorate concentrations.

A CAG member asked if the perchlorate was analyzed and if so, what were the results beyond the 8/hr test since the data is not presented. The ADEQ confirmed that the nitrates and PCE were not tested beyond the 8/hrs.

The board facilitator inquired if there was a conclusion from the time-series testing. The ADEQ stated that it is believed that the PCE seeps down from Subunit A and comes in through the annulus of that well and builds up when the well is inoperable. When the well is turned on the PCE gets flushed out or diluted. It also distinguishes that most of the water drawn into that well comes from Subunit C. ADEQ also stated that the data collected from transducers is confirmation of this, as shown in the presented graph.

An audience member wanted to confirm the number of times the well was shut off in regard to the time series sampling results for COG-1, as only one shut off bar is listed. The ADEQ stated that the shut off line was a notation indicating where the post sample test was done and confirmed that that well was not shut off during the 8/hr test.

When the 8/hr sample was taken the well was shut off and post-test samples were taken one day, seven days and fourteen days after the end of pumping. Per the audience member's suggestion the graph would be updated for clarification.

A CAG member indicated that they were unaware of a test well in Subunit C (Well EMW-22LC) or had seen that annotated on a map. The ADEQ representative stated that the well was not a Western Avenue well but a PGA South well; COG-1 & MW-1 are Western Avenue wells.

A CAG member wanted to confirm that most water in COG-1 draws in from Subunit C and has no PCE in it, the water from Subunit A leaks down into C and when drawing water from Subunit C, there is some PCE in the water even though the source of the PCE is from Subunit A. ADEQ indicate that yes that is the current conceptual model and interpretation of the test data.

A CAG member asked if COG-1 was screened to pump out of Subunit A and C or was it built only to pump out of Subunit C. The City of Goodyear responded that they didn't know the original depth of the screen but that it is currently screened in Subunit C. They did state however, there may be holes in the older casing.

A CAG member wanted to know if COG-1 was classified as a potential conduit well. ADEQ consultant confirmed that it was.

A CAG member asked for clarification on the color coding of locations of dry cleaning business listed on the map being discussed during the feasibility study recap. The ADEQ responded that the red locations indicated they were evaluated during the preliminary assessment and site inspection phase. The green locations were not evaluated due to lack of historical or contamination evidence to move forward with an assessment or inspection.

A CAG member asked that even though the ADEQ isn't at a point to make a conclusion, is one of the considerations that as the groundwater drops, the reason the concentrations go down is because the problem is closer to ground level or, that the groundwater is dropping below where the concentration of the contamination is in the vadose zone. The ADEQ responded that is a possibility. As the elevations drop, that the levels of contamination also drop along with it and that the plan would have contingencies to deal with this type of occurrence. The ADEQ consultant described the historical investigations at the potential sources and that those investigations did not indicate that a vadose zone source exists at those sites. However, the feasibility study and the upcoming Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) will have contingencies to deal with these types of events.

An audience member asked how the ADEQ could complete a feasibility study without having identified a source of contamination and that they thought it would make more sense to characterize it first. The ADEQ responded that the feasibility study is addressing the contamination in the aquifer and that there hasn't been enough evidence to spend more money to identify a source area. The water is only 2 ppb above the standard MCL at one well, MW-1 for PCE and that is the driver on the study. The ADEQ consultant stated that the feasibility study does not mean that monitoring or changes/contingencies to address new issues won't be addressed when they arise.

A CAG member asked if once the feasibility study is completed and shared at the next meeting what is to be expected from it; will it provide conclusions or directions as to what will be the proposed remedy for the area. ADEQ indicated that the study will identify the remedy and then a PRAP will be prepared to complete the remedy.

Community Involvement Plan (CIP) – Alejandro Diaz, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator

The draft CIP was distributed and reviewed it. Mr. Diaz let the CAG know that comments were requested back to him by May 31, 2013.

See slide presentation

A CAG member wanted to know if the CIP would be used for presentation purposes; if not, what is the presentation to the public and if there was only one meeting during the public comment period.

The EPA responded that the meetings will be EPA-initiated public meetings to explain the proposed plan process and the CIP is an overall plan for the entire Superfund site. The CIP summarizes the general concerns of the public, polled at an earlier date, and how the agencies could best respond and communicate answers and information back to the public. The presentations can take place prior to and during the public comment period and includes details about the proposed plans.

CAG Business: Wendy Flood, ADEQ Community Involvement Coordinator.

- ✓ Acceptance of the February 7, 2013 meeting minutes without comment or changes.
- ✓ Previous Action items added to Agenda for notification of completion
 - Follow-up with Crane and/or ECO on whether 3-D graphic board was provided to ECO for public engagement / educational uses.
 - All other items were confirmed as completed.
- ✓ Charter Acceptance and Signing- Postponed until next meeting so that the other co-chair and more of the permanent members of the board available. ADEQ CIC also requested any final comments or changes emailed to her prior to the next meeting so they could clear the charter from action items.
- ✓ Co-Chair nominations & voting – Jeff Raible indicated he would stay on as Co-chair for the next quarter. Frank Scott, a Co-chair was not available at the meeting to indicate his desired status. Since that was the case the nominations and voting process was tabled until the next meeting. The ADEQ CIC was to contact Mr. Scott about his status. Once that has been complete, board members would be notified via email. If Mr. Scott opts out of the position, nominations would be sent via email to the CIC for notification to the board prior to the next meeting so the voting process could take place.
- ✓ Updates to the CAG Contact list.

Call to the Public - NONE

Future Meeting Agenda Discussion

The next two CAG meeting dates are scheduled for Thursday, August 8th at the Goodyear Justice Center and Thursday, November 7th, beginning at 6:00 p.m. The location for the November meeting will be determined at a later date.

Action items:

1. Crane/ Matrix New World will update the 3-D graphic from last page of Matrix New World's presentation and prepare a copy in Poster format to be given to ECO for public engagement / educational uses.

Adjournment