

**MEETING SUMMARY  
FORMER WALKER AIR FORCE BASE (WAFB)  
ROSWELL INDUSTRIAL AIR CENTER (RIAC)  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)  
17 JANUARY 2002**

**RAB Members Present**

Kathleen Aisling  
Ron Courts  
Kerry Hunter  
David Henry  
Leroy Lang  
Ethel Logan  
Julie Jacobs  
Eva Gomez  
Dick Smith

**Affiliations:**

EPA  
City of Roswell  
Citizen  
USACE, Project Geologist  
NM Farm Bureau  
Citizen, Y-O Acres  
NM Environmental Department  
Citizen  
Citizen

**RAB Members Absent**

Richard Cervantes  
Steve Harris  
Kay Havenor  
Ken Hirst  
Raymond Prescott  
Mary Kay Samples

ENMU – Roswell  
Chavez County  
Local Geologist, Co-Chair  
NM National Guard  
Citizen  
Citizen

**Facilitator:**

Sandra Charloux

CEC, Inc. RAB Support Contractor

**Guest Present:**

John Forslund  
Hank Iarrusso  
Rick Smith  
Penni Walker  
Cecilia Horner  
Teri McMillan  
T.C. Shapard  
Brent Bullock

USACE, Tulsa District  
USACE, Tulsa District  
USACE, Tulsa District  
USACE, Tulsa District  
USACE, Albuquerque District  
Atkins Engineering  
NMED  
PVACD

**Meeting Summary Review**

Sandra Chaloux reviewed the minutes from the October 17<sup>th</sup> RAB meeting and there were no changes noted.

**U.S. Army Corps Update**

David Henry provided the RAB members with a copy of his US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS UPDATE – WAFB RAB (1/17/2002) and then made a presentation of that material for discussion.

### *Pump House 7*

Pump House 7 is the petroleum product release site. The monitoring well installed during the month of September 2001 did not develop properly and did not produce enough water for sampling. The new monitoring well (PH7-W20) was re-drilled during the month of December 2001 and is now a functional monitoring well. It was installed to replace PH7-SW01 that was vandalized.

Future plans are to install 2 to 3 additional wells. USACE originally planned to install an extraction system; however, more data is needed first. The center of the LNAPL plume has not been identified, and seasonal fluctuations in groundwater depth and flow direction influence the plume. LNAPL has only been detected in one groundwater-monitoring event, and that was during the summer when groundwater was at its lowest level for the year.

David explained that LNAPL is light non-aqueous phase liquid. It is petroleum and is lighter than water. Non-aqueous means it is not dissolved into water but separated from it. BTEX is Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylenes. And Naphthalene is a constituent of petroleum. He said that free product might not be detectable until summer, when the water table lowers.

### *Waste Oil Disposal Area*

David said that a contract for investigating this former disposal area should be awarded next week. The Waste Oil Disposal Area (WODA) was used by the Air Force for disposal of waste oils. It may have been a shallow burial pit.

The City of Roswell approached David about repairing the Earl Cummings Loop, which crosses the WODA site, because of the dips in it. The City asked David if they could regrade it, but David requested that the City postpone repairs until the site investigation is complete to insure that no chemical hazards exist. This site has been designated as Project 14 in a prior report for the Corps to review.

The Corps plans to proceed with up to 15 borings, 25 feet in depth and collecting three samples from each boring. The chemical analysis for each will include: Metals, Semi-volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs).

In the event that contaminants are found above regulatory benchmarks, two monitoring wells will be installed to determine the depth of contamination. If no contamination is found in the borings, no monitoring wells will be installed. David anticipates the work to be completed by the next RAB meeting. David explained that volatile means it evaporates very readily when exposed to the atmosphere, so semi-volatile doesn't evaporate as quickly. An example of a volatile versus semi-volatile organic compound provided to the RAB was gasoline versus diesel.

### *TCE Plume*

There have been a number of RAB members requesting that the Corps drop sampling at some of the monitoring wells that have not shown elevated levels of contaminants from the quarterly sampling effort. The Corps received approval from the State of New Mexico to drop sampling from three monitoring wells (MW-SW012,

MW-DW02 and MW-DW04) that have had below 5 ppb of TCE (Federal Maximum Contaminant Levels) for 8 consecutive quarters. The State standard for TCE is 100 ppb.

In place of the wells that were dropped, monitoring was added at three wells (PH7-SW16, PH7-SW19 and PH7-SW13). One of the wells (PH7-SW16) tested at levels of 160 ppb. David showed slides of the new well locations, and said that it looked like the TCE problem might be originating from the Hanger near PH7-SW16. David explained that the contour lines on the map represent different TCE concentrations and that there is a gradual change in concentrations between the lines, from one to the next.

During the December sampling event performed by Atkins Engineering and Assoc., Inc., the groundwater sample collected from monitoring well PH7-SW16 contained TCE at 440 ppb. This is in the area where the soil vapor hits were very high. Concentrations varied from 440ppb to 50ppb. There are two sets of testing data from different sampling points, taken at different times. The first set of data was from samples at the Pump House wells. Atkins Engineering data points (the second set) are from different wells, and they were collected on the same day.

Ethel asked what it means that the numbers go from 440 ppb to 50 ppb and David said that as the groundwater moves away from a "hot" area (or source), concentrations decrease. David explained that groundwater flow is reasonably predictable in this area. In the winter, groundwater here tends to flow to the east and south. In the summer time because of the irrigation, it shifts to the north.

Dick Smith asked about the drain lines to the pond. David said that tests were run along the drain line with the geoprobe and in many places tests were made 3 feet below the drain line and detected some minor hits, but nothing that substantial. Dick said he suspected that what went down the drain must have volatilized before it reached the pond.

### *Work Plan*

David asked Rick Smith to discuss the project work plan. Rick said the Corps has been working since the last RAB on the work plan. He said that Albuquerque and Tulsa have discussed what has been happening at the former Walker AFB, and have begun to formulate ideas about what to do in the future to enhance the pilot study. They have come up with a number of tasks in a draft proposal.

First, the Corps plans to install two monitoring wells at Hanger #58 where high concentrations have been found. There is also a ditch that has been backfilled that may be a possible source. The plan is to excavate in the backfilled ditch with a backhoe, collect samples, and test for contamination.

The second task involves taking all the data from the past 8 years of work, and compiling it into one location to get a better overall picture and determine any trends. This should allow a better assessment of the quality of the data, enhancement of the pilot study, and development of a restoration strategy for the shallow aquifer.

Once the two tasks have been completed, the Corps will meet with the City of Roswell with the intent of evaluating the pumping program and making changes as needed. Rick said he expected it would take 2-3 years to complete these tasks.

#### *Discussion about a Possible New Responsible Party*

Hank Iarrusso, an attorney for the Corps, told that the RAB that there is reason to believe that there is another responsible party for the TCE contamination near Hanger 58.

Julie said that the State supports the Corps' efforts to find the sources so that they can address the contamination. Kathleen Aisling, EPA, said she would not expect the news of a new responsible party to change the way the site is being cleaned up or cause the site to become a Superfund site.

Hank did not think that adding a new responsible party would slow the process. It would just mean that there would be another party sitting at the table to work through the process.

Ethel commented that at the Center for Public Environmental Oversight (CPEO) meeting she attended, the meeting attendees and government officials present agreed that there was not any military base that did not have some sort of contamination. The government agencies present at CPEO said they had to prioritize which areas should be remediated first. Ethel said that she felt in New Mexico, because of the water shortage, anything that affects the water supply is serious. A RAB member stated that his concern is not who's to blame, but that something is being done about it now. Hank said that the Corps is moving forward on both the remediation and the legal tracks.

Kathleen Aisling said that she wanted to clarify her earlier comments. The process that is being followed here is the same as, or similar to, the Superfund process. If EPA was lead on the site they would be subject to the same laws and procedures. As soon as EPA had information that showed someone else as responsible, they would need to pursue that lead because they are working with public funds. At a lot of sites, EPA does not know who is responsible at first, so they proceed with the cleanup work. The cleanup continues and if investigations indicate another responsible party, EPA would pursue it and do a cost recovery. Cost recovery in regards to responsible parties is mandatory in the Superfund program.

A RAB member asked if someone is found responsible and pays, would that money go towards the cleanup or back to the government? Kathleen said it depends on if they are recovering past costs already expended or paying for new costs. There would probably be some type of legal agreement.

Eva asked how the Corps could tell there is another responsible party. David said that one method is to look at the breakdown products of TCE. The Corps would have to collect data on the chemical and biological characteristics of the aquifer and estimate how long it takes to degrade compounds. Another method is to identify the types of fuels. For example at Pump House 7 they want to see if the fuel is JP4 or JP8 and that will help to determine the timeline of activity.

One of the chemists from the Corps also explained that by identifying additives in the groundwater samples, you can determine how old the TCE is.

David said that investigating other responsible parties would not slow the Corps' cleanup effort. There may be a point, if other responsible parties are found, that they will be brought into the process. Kathleen commented that there are a lot of different legal ways to pursue responsible parties while continuing with the work.

### *Other Discussions*

David referred to the graphs he had distributed. They indicate that as groundwater levels rise, the TCE concentrations go up for most of the wells. David said that testing in the future will continue to be done quarterly.

Ethel said that that Atkins has gone to her well twice and she asked for those test results. David said her well has 16 ppb of TCE. Sandra informed Ethel that at her request, a letter was sent to Atkins Engineering and a representative from the company was at the RAB to answer any questions. David asked if Ethel had gotten the results of tests at her well in the mail. She said no. The highest TCE level found in Ethel's well was in 1991 when it was 38 ppb. David commented that the decrease could be because of natural attenuation.

Dick Smith voiced concern that the Corps didn't take vapor tests at the pond and David said that the remedial investigation showed no indication of the pond being a source. David said the pond has been thoroughly investigated, but that is not to say that the Corps wouldn't investigate it again.

Ethel said that there was once a list of possible treatments for TCE and there was going to be a meeting to narrow it down and decide on a plan. She asked if there had been a decision. David said that they cannot make that decision yet and that different treatment options are still on the table.

### **New Business**

Sandra announced that the project Web site is accessible on the Internet. She asked for suggestions to advertise the project Web site locally. David said that suggestions or comments on the Web site should be sent to him or Sandra.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2002, at ENMU in the Campus Union Building, Room 110 (the multipurpose room). Agenda items include:

- Corps Progress Report
- Questions and Answer period

### **Action Items**

Atkins Engineering to mail copies of quarterly sampling results to affected residents.