

**MEETING SUMMARY
FORMER WALKER AIR FORCE BASE (WAFB)
ROSWELL INDUSTRIAL AIR CENTER (RIAC)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
19 JULY 2001**

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>RAB Members Present: Richard Cervantes Ron Courts Kay Havenor Kerry Hunter Leroy Lang Dick Smith David Henry Ethel Logan</p> <p>RAB Members Absent: Kathleen Aisling Tom Day Steve Harris Julie Jacobs Eloy Ortega Raymond Prescott Mary Kay Samples</p> <p>Facilitator: Sandra Chaloux</p> <p>Guests Present: Mr. Bob Wilson</p> | <p>Affiliation: ENMU – Roswell City of Roswell Local Geologist, Community Co-Chair Citizen NM Farm Bureau Citizen USACE, Project Manager Citizen, Y-O Acres</p> <p>EPA Nova Bus Chaves County NM Environmental Department Chaves County Commissioner Citizen Citizen, Latimer Subdivision</p> <p>CEC, Inc – RAB support Contractor</p> <p>Affiliation: USACE, Tulsa District</p> |
|--|--|

Meeting Summary Review

- Kerry Hunter noted that his name is spelled incorrectly in the meeting summary from last time and the change was noted.

USACE Update

- David Henry informed the RAB members that David Gregory is now working for DOE and the Corps has hired him as the replacement. He graduated from Sul Ross State University as an environmental geologist. Upon graduation, he worked for the city of Alpine, Texas, as an environmental specialist then as the utilities director. Then, he worked for the State of New Mexico Environment Department until now.
- David Henry updated the group on activities over the last three months. At the last RAB meeting, Mr. Morgan Nelson informed the RAB about some areas where TCE may be disposed of at the former Base. The Corps performed a soil vapor analysis with a geoprobe rig on site. The geoprobe pushes a rod into the ground so that soil vapor samples can be collected from the subsurface. They sampled around 12 feet below ground surface and in

some places a little deeper. They extracted vapor from the soils and analyzed them for TCE using a gas chromatograph and found some significant hits.

- The Corps came to a decision about water rights issues in the area. The Corps may be able to pump more water from the Base. The only obstacle to overcome is whether the wastewater treatment plant will allow the pumping of more contaminated water into their system. Ron will work on that before the next RAB meeting and we will hopefully be able to make a decision to increase pumping on the one good well. The well (# 2) is currently pumping about 40 gallons a minute.
- The issue of bio remediation is being put on hold for a couple of reasons. David reviewed the steps in the CERCLA cleanup process. A project site begins with Site Discovery, then a Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection is done, then a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, then the Record of Decision (which describes the remedy), then the remedy is put into place. Currently, the project is in the feasibility study phase of the CERCLA process and the Corps would like to complete the feasibility study document before beginning more pilot studies. Then, they can move on to the Record of Decision, which sets a remedy in place.
- Sandra asked that he give some background on the feasibility study. David told the RAB that the feasibility study evaluates all the data and identifies any data gaps. It then evaluates cleanup alternatives to determine which remedial activity suits the situation best. The feasibility study is not complete yet. The three alternatives that have been discussed so far are pump and treat (which is what they have been doing), enhanced bio remediation, and natural attenuation (leaving it alone).
- Ethel Logan pointed out that information about cleanup technologies for TCE is available on the Center for Public Environmental Oversight (CPEO) Web site (www.cpeo.org). She said there are 10 technologies listed in detail for treating TCE in groundwater and listed them for the RAB. David commented that many of those items are basically part of pump and treat technology. He said he was not as familiar with the insitu treatment technologies. Ethel said that she appreciates the materials produced by CPEO and its Web site because everything is presented in plain language that the public can understand.
- Sandra asked Ethel to tell the RAB members about the meeting she would be attending that is sponsored by CPEO. Ethel read the information about the Center for Public Environmental Oversight's forum that she was scheduled to attend in Portland, Oregon, on 4 August. The forum will explore stakeholder experiences with the Department of Defense in relation to the cleanup of FUDS. CPEO is an organization that promotes and facilitates public participation with its roots in community activism. Some items that will be discussed include: the need for better funding, ordnance cleanup, real estate considerations, workable community involvement tools, and difficult balance between right to privacy and right to know. Similar forums are being held in other parts of the country.
- Kay Havenor pointed out that the Department of Defense funds this organization to act as a liaison. There was a discussion about the meeting in St. Louis last year that Kay attended, where Department of Defense officials had changed their opinions based on opinions from stakeholders. Ethel asked the RAB if they have any issues they would like her to bring to the

meeting. Kay mentioned that Ethel would have the opportunity to learn from other RABs and borrow from their successful actions. He suggested that she find out how other RABs get more community participation. He said that there has been lack community participation on the Walker RAB. A RAB member asked if the RAB meetings are advertised. A public notice is placed in the newspaper before every meeting. The RAB discussed an article that ran in the newspaper in October about the project. Ethel asked for a copy of the article to take with her and Sandra said she would email it to her.

- David reiterated the need to complete the feasibility study process. They are looking at increasing the pumping rate and will have some kind of answer by the next RAB. Ethel asked who is participating in the feasibility study and David said that it has not yet been determined. The agencies involved include the EPA, State of New Mexico, city of Roswell, and the Army Corps of Engineers. They will meet to discuss how to proceed and want the process to be open. The Corps would like input from regulatory agencies and the public. David anticipates hiring a contractor to conduct the feasibility study. Sandra said that the benefit of the feasibility study is to have a formal evaluation of all the options to identify which one is best for the area.
- David showed graphs with the “best fit” line as requested by Kay Havenor. Kay said he thought it would be easier for people to see what is happening. One graph shows Well No. 3 on the east side of the Base. There is a gradual increase in TCE in Well No. 3, but not enough time shown on the graph to see what is really going on. Graph No. 2 (Well No. 2) shows a decline, but with data gaps, the graph may be slightly skewed.
- David told the RAB about a suspected TCE burial site that they were informed about. We performed a soil vapor analysis to about 12 feet deep and did not see anything. The soils were difficult to penetrate with the geoprobe and did not appear to have been disturbed prior. We do not believe a burial deeper than 12 feet is likely, so it is unlikely there is burial site there.
- There is a storm drain line that runs up from the hangars and discharges out in the drainage channels. The Corps took five samples and did not find anything. He said that we couldn’t draw any conclusions from this; the data is inconclusive. In front of the second hangar from the terminal, going north, there is an old drain. It runs the whole width of the hangar and has been backfilled with concrete. The Corps used a geoprobe and went down to 30 feet in one place. The Corps found higher concentrations of TCE in the soils than has been found on site before (about 1000 ppb). It is likely that TCE was dumped in the drain line but don’t know how much or for how long. The Corps is not sure if TCE from the drain has reached the groundwater yet. As the depth of the probe increased, more TCE was found. David indicated they used a field-screening instrument and that the results were not confirmed by a lab, which would have higher quality control procedures.
- A RAB member asked about a pond nearby and whether it could have been affected by the hot spot. David Henry said that this pond has been investigated thoroughly and he did not believe the pond was a concern. David said he is not sure that the abandoned drain is connected to the storm drain system. Kay said it could have been a dry well where something was dumped. Ethel asked if they had plans to go deeper. David commented that they have drilled a lot of wells and does not want to continue on with the same approach

that has been used. He hopes to develop a more structured approach to the work at the site rather than randomly putting wells everywhere.

- A RAB member asked “If you have found a hot spot – can you have too much data?” David said that they would discuss the appropriate course of action when he had his meeting with the State. Another RAB member suggested taking money from wells that haven’t shown any elevated results and putting the funds into a well at the hot spot. “As long as I have been on the RAB we have been talking about it and we are still sampling at these wells (that haven’t showed any elevated readings).”
- A RAB member asked where the location of this vapor is in relation to the wells that are being sampled and David explained that there is no relationship. Kay suggested a well down gradient and close to the hot spot and up gradient of the Y-O acres area to determine if the hot spots were feeding the contamination in Y-O acres. David said he was considering two wells close to the hot spot.
- Sandra said she wonders if people were dumping along the fence line and David said that with his experience with the military, things may have been dumped in many locations. Sandra asked if there were comments or questions.
- A RAB member asked what’s next? David said a meeting with the State regulators, Tulsa District, EPA and the City between now and the next RAB.
- A RAB member asked for a report on this meeting before the next meeting so RAB members added e-mail addresses to the sign-in sheet.
- Dick Smith said he thought the findings were a breakthrough and feels that this is more encouraging than anything mentioned before.

New Business/Special Issues

- Ron volunteered to look into the water rights issue for the group last time. He said he did not see a problem with the Corps accessing more water from the existing wells but that transferring water rights from other wells would be tough right now. He needs to look into the requirements of the sewage treatment plant in terms of the TCE limits to see if more water could be discharged into the sewage treatment plant. He will find out the information and let David know. A RAB member said that they might not need to transfer water rights; there is plenty of water there. Ron agreed saying, that it is mostly a discharge factor.
- The Web site for the project will be hosted on the Army Corps Web server. Sandra presented four possible design options and passed them around to get the RAB’s opinion. She also asked for feedback from the RAB on what items should be included on the project Web site. Sandra hopes that the site will aid in public participation by making more information available. A RAB member said that the local paper has a section that lists Web sites. A design was chosen by the RAB. The page will contain project information and RAB information. Sandra asked the RAB what contact information they would like posted online. The members think having the information is important and also suggested that there be links to the site from the Chamber of Commerce and the City. The project Web site will include: project information, RAB information, newsletters, links (including Center for

Public Environmental Oversight, DOD, EPA), photos, public notices, and contact information. A RAB member suggested keeping the site simple and possibly adding a guide to acronyms.

- David Henry commented that he would like to see the RAB meetings grow in size. He wants suggestions to increase public participation and in turn help to increase funding. Ethel feels the only time the public responds is when they are scared or something costs them money. Sandra suggested that students from the College might be interested or people who work at RIAC or live close by.
- Kay suggested rescheduling the meeting time, so he could bring his geology class. His class meets on Monday and Wednesday nights and he could bring 10-15 students to the RAB.
- Sandra said that sites with active RABs tend to be funded well. David doesn't think funding has been a big problem. He said that Tulsa gives Albuquerque the funds to do the work in the area. Bob Wilson said that getting the funds is not a problem.
- Sandra told the group that a business reply card was sent with the last mailing to update the mailing list and approximately half of those that returned it wanted to be taken off the mailing list. A RAB member said that the work at the site is brought up regularly at the Planning and Zoning meetings. A RAB member said that the Chamber is sponsoring a project called, "It's your problem" and suggested that the RAB may be a good topic for one of their future meetings. Another RAB member suggested that we contact retired military personnel that worked on the Base.
- The RAB discussed publishing the next newsletter after the October RAB.
- David Henry said that the Corps has hired another consultant, Souder Miller and Associates, to do the UST (Underground Storage Tank) investigation at Pump House 7. They will be providing the quarterly reports for the UST, as required by the State. The first round of sampling will begin within two weeks. They will collect samplings from 19 wells, looking at total petroleum hydrocarbon products, biological indicator parameters and metals. David showed a map of the project location. He is increasing communication with the State by providing the required quarterly reporting. Unless there is free product in the groundwater, there are no plans to put a remedial system in place.

Next Meeting

- The next RAB meeting was set for Wednesday, October 17, 2001, at 7:00 p.m. at the National Guard Building #534. Agenda Items include:
 - Brief History for Kay's students
 - Web site demonstration.

Action Items

- Email Report on Meeting with State to RAB before next meeting (David Henry).