



**ANDERSEN AFB
GUAM**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET**

AR File Number 294

**ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)**

**MINUTES OF MEETING - 21 NOVEMBER 1996
DEDEDO COMMUNITY CENTER**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Col V. Jaroch - Installation co-chair
- Sen. J. Brown - Community co-chair
- Mr. J. Jenson - RAB Member
- Mr. F. Castro - RAB Member
- Mayor E. Artero - RAB Member
- Mr. J. Flores - RAB Member
- Mr. M. Gawel - RAB Member
- Mr. M. Stacy - RAB Member
- Ms. J. Tarkong - for Sen. M. Charfauros - RAB Member
- Mr. N. Rodriguez - RAB Member
- Mr. V. Wuerch - RAB Member
- Ms. J. Duwel - RAB Member
- Mr. J. Iglesias - RAB Member
- Mr. V. Blaz - RAB Member
- Ms. M. Schutz - RAB Member
- Ms. J. Poland - RAB Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

- Mr. D. Cruz
- Mayor N. Blas
- Mr. M. Cruz
- Ms. C. Taitano
- Mr. J. Baza

PUBLIC ATTENDEES:

- Mr. T. Churan - AAFB
- Ms. A. Loerzel - Pacific Daily News
- Mr. B. Bloomer - AAFB
- Mr. M. Petersen - GEPA
- Mr. J. Lazzeri - EA Pacific
- Mr. T. Ghofrani - EA Pacific
- Mr. M. McDonald - Montgomery Watson
- Dr. J. Rosacker - Booz-Allen Hamilton
- Mr. J. Sullivan - HQ PACAF
- Mr. W. Oxford - Booz-Allen Hamilton
- Mr. J. Torres - AAFB
- Mr. F. Leon Guerrero - AAFB
- Ms. E. Leon Guerrero
- Ms. M. Miclat - AAFB
- Mr. G. Ikehara - AAFB

Mr. R. Tsutsui - Navy
Ms. A. Lofquist - Bechtel
Mr. J. Herwig - Ogden
Ms. S. Lipinski - EA Pacific
Mr. B. Shambach - EA Pacific
Mr. S. Olive - EA Pacific

The meeting started at 6:50 p.m.

Colonel Victor D. Jaroch welcomed the RAB members and congratulated Senator Brown on her re-election. Senator Brown thanked everyone for coming and pointed out the fact that the RAB has never had a problem getting a quorum. She said that this speaks well for this group.

I. REVIEW OF OLD BUSINESS

The minutes of the August 1996 meeting were approved

Update of the Tumon Well: Captain Agapito Lambert, industrial hygienist at Andersen AFB, presented an update on the Tumon Maui Well. He reported that the expected completion date for the air stripper is December 21, 1996. He showed a diagram of the air stripper and the location of the sampling locations. The Tumon Maui Well and Wells MW-1, 2 and 3 will be sampled before the air stripper, after the airstripper, and after chlorinating. Analysis of all Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) will be conducted in the Tumon Maui Well and MW 1, 2, and 3. Captain Lambert expects removal efficiency to be 99 percent.

Captain Lambert also reported that the Tumon Maui well will be incorporated into Andersen AFB's monthly well sampling program. Sample results will be presented to GEPA. After a six month period, if all goes well, the Air Force will request permission from GEPA to go to quarterly sampling instead of monthly sampling. There will be a three-day training course for operations and maintenance of the air stripper conducted by the contractor.

Fred Castro asked if there was a way to recirculate the water once it achieves the 99 percent efficiency rate. Captain Lambert answered that there is a holding tank at Booster Station 2 where the water will be pumped into. The Air Force will keep the water in the tank until the sample results are known.

Mike Gawel asked if the sampling result showed that the PCE and TCE are no longer in the groundwater, will the air stripper be taken down? Capt. Lambert said that has yet to be determined. If sample results show that the water is clean, then those involved in the process will consider various options including setting a date for removing the air stripper.

Mr. Gawel asked what is the lifespan of the air stripper? Capt Lambert reported that the air stripper is designed to withstand this climate (corrosive and high winds), but he does not know the expected lifespan of the unit. Capt. Lambert told RAB members that he will look into the matter and that the RAB will be given the information in the next meeting.

Senator Brown asked about the status of sampling. She asked if there has been a decrease in the level of these chemicals in the wells? Captain Lambert said that the sample results from the Tumon Maui well are not yet available and the level of TCE in MW-2 has fluctuated slightly, but remains under the MCL.

II. FIELDWORK UPDATE/PRESENTATION

A. Groundwater and Groundwater sampling: Gregg Ikehara from the Andersen AFB Installation Restoration Program (IRP) presented an update on groundwater. All of the new monitoring wells have been constructed. He reported that wells including all IRP wells, selected production wells, and rehabilitated wells have been sampled since the last RAB meeting. This was the second round of sampling this year, but the first round in which all of the newly constructed monitoring wells were included.

Because of the density differences in various target chemicals, not all contaminants are found at the top of the fresh water. The Air Force obtains samples at the top and at the bottom of the fresh water lens to determine what the vertical distribution is. Shallow and deep monitoring well pairs have been constructed at selected locations for this purpose

The IRP has made improvements in the sampling process by 1) use of piston pumps, which do not allow aeration of the ground water before the sample is collected, and 2.) the use of low volume/low flow rate purging and sampling techniques by which we can obtain better representative samples and reduce the amount of investigative derived wastes

Groundwater samples are analyzed for metals, volatile organics, pesticides, semi volatile organics, and PCBs. Mr. Ikehara described and showed slides of the sampling procedures for groundwater.

Mr Ikehara reported that ground water sample results depicted on a map of the Mainbase and Northwest Field show no significantly high concentrations or accumulations of PCE or TCE. The only location where TCE concentrations exceed the 5 part per billion MCL in the ground water samples taken from monitoring wells on the Mainbase is in the vicinity of the aircraft maintenance area. The low concentration levels suggest that the TCE exists in diffuse quantities, not in concentrated pools. The suspected source of TCE in this area is an underground storage tank near the former pneudraulics shop. The material has been removed from the tank, and the tank will be removed under the base's Underground Storage Tank removal program. No production wells are in the area, therefore there is no threat to drinking water sources.

Col. Jaroch asked if the results of the water sampling from April are similar to the sample results from October. Mr. Ikehara responded that there was very little departure between sampling results.

Mr. Castro asked if the IRP is tracking rainfall data to analyze possible flushing effects. Mr. Ikehara said that rainfall data is available from the base's weather people, but it is not incorporated into their data base or sampling schedule. He pointed out that the sampling is done on a semi-annual basis, once during the rainy season and once during the dry season and to date, results between both seasons have been similar.

Mr. Castro wondered if heavy rainfall would correlate with the contaminant concentrations. Mr. Ikehara said that this is possible. A large amount of recharge going into the lens is just one of many factors to consider; however, it is difficult to correlate the amount of rainfall with the concentrations of chemicals in the groundwater.

Mr. Castro asked if the IRP had a general idea of the age of the water in the groundwater lens below Andersen AFB. Mr. Ikehara said that some researchers suggest a five to seven year cycle for the upper portion of the lens. The lower levels probably have a longer cycle.

B. Northwest Field Operable Unit/Main Base Operable Unit Proposed Funding

Prioritization: Marriane Miclat and Gregg Ikehara from the Andersen AFB IRP stated that at the last RAB there was a concern about when the remaining high risk sites would be funded. Work on seven Northwest Field and Mainbase sites is currently ongoing. There are thirty sites on the Main Base and Northwest Field; nineteen of which are in the high risk category. Eleven of the high risk sites have funding. Eight of the 19 do not have funding. By FY-98, the IRP hopes to have funding for all 19 high risk sites. By FY-99, the IRP hopes to have funding for the remaining three medium and one low risk sites.

Mr. Ikehara and Ms. Miclat reported that the sites are prioritized on the basis of several criteria items. The relative risk ranking is the major consideration in determining the prioritization status. There are other considerations. For example, in the monitoring well where groundwater sampling indicated levels of trichloroethylene (TCE) exceeding safe drinking water standards, the nearby IRP sites are high priority sites to determine if they are potential sources. Additionally, previous activities or the site history are also considered. The Hazardous Waste Storage Area, for example, is a high risk site based on the material that was stored there. If sample results show that contaminants are not present, then the site's relative risk may be lowered to a medium or a low level.

Pathways and receptors are other criteria. The accessibility and the frequency of contact by humans with the site is considered. For example, the pathway for contaminants in groundwater to reach humans is through drinking the water.

The location of the site is a criterion. The cliffline sites, for example, are low to medium risks because it is unlikely that humans will come in contact with these sites. They could become high risks if it is discovered that hazardous waste was dumped at these sites, and there are potential receptors. In comparison, the PCB storage pad is more accessible to humans and therefore is a higher risk site.

Mr. Ikehara and Ms. Miclat also stated that the IRP seeks process continuity in their projects. The IRP seeks to see the project all the way through to clean up. Other factors that impact the prioritization of sites include the concerns of the RAB, the concerns of the general public, coastal zone issues, and protection of sensitive ecosystems. RAB members, for example, influenced the prioritization process by requesting that the Harmon sites be addressed first because of the land issues.

Mr. Gawel asked that when priorities are set, does the IRP look at possible future land uses in an area? Mr. Ikehara replied that the IRP relies on the input from RAB members and GovGuam's land use plans for the site. The IRP also looks at what the land use plans are in the area surrounding the site.

Mark Stacy asked if the base has a stormwater management plan and if the IRP refers to this plan when setting priorities. Mr. Ikehara replied that he believes the base's stormwater management plan is in the process of being updated.

Mr. Castro asked about the scope of work planned for FY-97 and FY-98. He wondered if all of the sites were at the same stage? Ms. Miclat said that most IRP sites are at the remedial investigation stage but ongoing work for the other sites, which may be in more advanced stages, does not stop as a result of the FY 97/98 budgets.

Mr. Castro asked how much Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) work remains? Joan Poland said that all of the EBS areas have been funded except for Barrigada and the Australia Cable Housing. Phase I studies have been completed for all areas except these two.

Mr. Castro asked if the other IRP sites are at the remedial investigation stage for Harmon? Ms. Poland said yes.

C. Harmon Operable Unit Fieldwork Progress: Joan Poland, Chief of the IRP, Andersen AFB presented an overview of the three IRP sites at Harmon. Funding for these medium and low risk sites was changed at the request of the RAB. She reported that the IRP has not found anything that indicates that Landfill 23 was really a landfill. Five unexploded ordnance were found at Landfill 23, but there is no indication that there were landfill activities at this site. The program is waiting on soil gas sample results.

Ms Poland said that the IRP is in the middle of field work for Landfill 24. It has a lot of construction debris, household waste, cars, and debris.

Ms. Poland reported that drums have been found at the Harmon Substation. Even though the substation was initially thought to be a low risk site, it appears that there is more there than expected. The results of the field work may show that this site is actually a medium to high risk.

D. Environmental Baseline Survey: Ms Poland presented a summary of the EBS for P.L. 103-339. Out of the 53 Areas of Concern (AOCs) identified in P L 103-339, 24 AOCs require no further action. Something was detected at six other AOCs, but they were not above any standards and thus require no further response. Seventeen have sanitary trash which is not hazardous. Six other require limited remediation, such as cesspools, which are more of a physical hazard. These cesspools will be filled in once EPA and GEPA concur with the base recommendation.

Ms Poland reported that the EBS reports have been submitted to USEPA and GEPA for review. Once the regulators concur with the findings, the IRP will finish the AOC investigations.

E. Schedule of Harmon Annex Activities

Landfill 23 will probably have a no further response document, which will take 60 days to prepare. Reports will also be prepared for the other two IRP sites with recommendations for remedial action. Ms. Poland also said that one round of groundwater sampling was just completed for all wells. The second round will be in March, 1997. After this second round of water samples, the IRP will take all of the data and analyses from all of these studies and investigations and conduct a full evaluation for the Harmon Annex.

Vincent Blaz asked why is there a gap under the last item on the groundwater timeline. Ms Poland said that groundwater samples are taken semi-annually. There is usually a five to six month gap between sampling events. One during the wet season and one during the dry season.

III. NEW ITEMS

Mr. Gawel asked if someone could clarify what is going on in the MARBO area. Ms. Poland said that there are six IRP sites. The Remedial Investigation is completed and is out for review by the regulators. The IRP is in process of revising the document. There will be an update at the next RAB. The IRP found nothing at the six IRP sites that would indicate that one of these sites is the source of the TCE in the groundwater.

A. Funding Needs for Waste Piles 1 & 2: Ms. Miclat reported that Waste Piles 1 & 2 have drums with tar in them. The tar was sampled and found to be free of contaminants. These are now low risk sites. The Air Force would like to remove the tar so that soil samples can be taken underneath the drums. The IRP wants the RAB's permission to secure funds to remove these drums with tar and take soil samples underneath the drums. She reported that this has been successfully in Hawaii and Alaska.

Senator Brown asked if pursuing these funds would affect the work at the other higher priority sites? She asked if this is just a way for the Air Force to ask for more funding? Ms. Miclat said that a removal action was budgeted for the sites and that continued work on the sites will not take away money from high risk sites. The RAB members approved this request as long as it does not take funds away from the high risk sites.

B. Membership Policy: Ms. Miclat said that existing By-laws for the RAB have a two-year term limit for RAB members. She proposed that the By-laws be amended to provide for an indefinite term for RAB members. The concern is that the two-year term is coming to an end for all RAB members in February. For the sake of continuity, the Air Force does not want everyone to have to resign at the same time and be replaced by new members. She said that the IRP will send renewal notices to existing RAB members on a yearly basis. Current RAB members would have the opportunity to indicate if they still want to serve. The Air Force will also run an ad in the Pacific Daily News and solicit members through the Fact Sheets that are being finalized.

There was a motion to amend the By-laws to change RAB membership from two-year terms to indefinite terms. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Col. Jaroch said that prior to the February RAB, the Air Force will send out the minutes, the agenda, and a form to fill out for those members interested in continuing to serve on the RAB. A notice to solicit new members will also be placed in the Pacific Daily News.

C. Federal Register Publication of RAB Proposed Rule and DOD Request for Comments: Ms. Poland said that a couple of months ago the Air Force sent each member the proposed regulation for RABs with guidance on how to run RAB and how to get funding for RABs. The comments from RAB members were due by November 4, 1996.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

Status of Federal Register Guidelines Surrounding Funds for RAB:

Ms. Poland reported that the one thing missing from the guideline that RAB members probably noticed was where to get the money. Ms. Poland said that another guideline will be put together that will tell RABs and community how to get funding for additional studies or other RAB activities.

Mr. Castro asked who will manage the fund? Ms. Poland said that she believes that the funding will be under the control of the Wing commanders although she has not been given much information on how much will be available. Col. Jaroch said that when the Air Force gets the new guidance, it will send it to each RAB member.

V. Public Comment:

No one signed up to make a public comment.

Ms. Poland mentioned that at the last meeting, the RAB officially adopted the new Operable Unit structure. The IRP proposed new deadlines to the regulators based on the new Operable Unit structure and cut off nearly two years off the old schedule. She said that the input from the RAB was very beneficial.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

APPROVED/DISAPPROVED

COLONEL VICTOR D. JAROCK, USAF
Installation Co-Chair
Restoration Advisory Board

Date

SENATOR JOANNE SALAS BROWN
Community Co-Chair
Restoration Advisory Board

Date

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE