



**NAVAL AIR STATION
FORT WORTH JRB
CARSWELL FIELD
TEXAS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET**

AR File Number 276

Naval Air Station Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base, Carswell Field
Restoration Advisory Board Monthly Meeting

Minutes Of 11 January 1996

Monthly Meeting

A meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Carswell Field, was held on Thursday, 11 January 1996, at the Carswell Air Force Base Conversion Agency (AFBCA) Conference Room. The meeting was called to order by Olen Long, Installation Management Officer/Base Environmental Coordinator, at 7:00 p.m.

In Attendance

Mr Olen Long, AFBCA/OL-H
Ms Mattia Merritt, AFBCA/OL-H

Mr Joel R Sanders, South Div.
CPT. James A. Junot, Texas Army Nat. Guard
Mr Geof Meyer, TNRCC

Mr Tom Davis, Community Co-Chair
Mr Ed Von Kahn, Citizen Westworth Village
Mr Joe Lavy, White Settlement Citizen
Mr I Michael Gross, IMG & Assoc.
Mr Greg Hendrickson, River Oaks Citizen
Mr D.W. Owen, River Oaks Citizen

Mr L.M. Brennan, Jr., Carter & Burgess
Ms Shamaine Chambers, Informatics Corp.
Ms Louise Delano, GeoMarine
Mr Bob Garrett, Maximum Tech
Ms Beth Thompson, Administrative Support

Welcome

Mr Olen Long opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. by welcoming everyone to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. He expressed appreciation of everyone's attendance and explained the purpose of the RAB.

AFBCA Update - Mr Olen Long

- Operations of the main base turned over to the Navy on 10/1/95 which includes the Fire Department, Police Department and Public Works. Since that time, all has been relinquished except for the environmental program and 18 buildings. All land still belongs to the Air Force. The Bureau of Prisons operates as a permittee of the Air Force.
- High level Air Force (AF) and Navy officials met in December to establish a plan for transferring the environmental program to the Navy. Dr Wolf of the Air Force and Admiral Schrieffler of the Navy met and agreed that the compliance program would transition by 1 October 1997. When the plan for transfer was presented to the next higher authority. It was vetoed. It was sent farther up for review by the Department of Defense. That decision has not been made. It appears that the primary controversy is over money.
- The presentation to be given at this meeting represents approximately \$184 million: \$50 million to the Navy and \$135 million to the Air Force. There is controversy now over who is going to fund it. If the plan is approved, the Navy will be responsible for the environmental program on the base proper, or inside the fence. The Air Force will be responsible for the environmental program that is outside the fence.
- Both the Navy and the Air Force will be required to have a RAB for their area of environmental cleanup. The citizens on the RAB must decide how that should be handled.

Introductions

Each person present introduced themselves and explained their role in the RAB.

Mr Mike Gross *We discussed before the possibility of having a joint RAB between Plant 4, the outside and the inside. Is that still a possibility?*

Mr Olen Long Yes. John Doepker will be down here the 24th. We will make a decision on that to set the next one together.

Ms Shamaine Chambers Both RABs are interested in that. It is a matter of getting the leadership together to decide how to go about doing it.

Mr Tom Davis Everyone here will get a copy of the minutes of the discussion today.

Presentation of AFBCA Environmental Program 1996-2021 - Mr Olen Long

*LTM-Long Term Monitoring; O&M-Operation and Maintenance; RA-Remedial Action; RD-Remedial Design; RI-Remedial Investigation; Risk-Risk Assessment; RFI-Remedial Field Investigation; TCE-Trichloroethylene

Slide	Comments
<p>RD/RA Base Service Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA [Defense Environmental Restoration Act] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RD - FY97 » RA - FY96-97 ● BRAC [Base Realignment and Closure] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » R1 - FY96 » Risk - FY96 	<p>Gasoline was leaking into the Trinity River. All pipes and tanks had been removed from the gas station area but we were continuing to get fuel into the river although we had removed all sources. The tanks had not leaked but the pipes had. The pipes and "com" lines had been the source of the leakage. A remedial investigation and risk assessment have been done with BRAC funds this year. DERA funds will be used in '96 & '97 to take the remedial action to stop the leaking.</p> <p><i>Mr Tom Davis When was that discovery made?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long About 9 months ago. However, the knowledge of the possible source was very recent. I looked at some drawings and there were several possibilities.</p> <p><i>Mr Tom Davis The remedial investigation will clarify that point?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long Yes. Because this problem is inside the Base (inside the fence), this will eventually be a responsibility of the Navy. At this point, it is the AFs responsibility and is funded with AF money.</p>
<p>Basewide Well Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » LTM - FY96-13 	<p>Long term monitoring through the year 2013, presently funded by the Air Force. It is scheduled to be transferred to the Navy.</p>
<p>Remediate Storage Tank Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY97 » RD - FY98-99 » RA - FY00-01 » LTM - FY02-13 	<p>Storage tank sites with tanks still in place. some propane, some butane, some that were previously overlooked when the other tanks were removed, others that were deliberately left in place because they were going to be used by the Navy. The Navy has since reevaluated its needs and they are no longer needed. This project is presently funded with Air Force money. After it is turned over to the Navy, it will be Navy funds.</p>
<p>Landfill #5. RD/RA (TCE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98-99 » LTM - FY01-10 	<p>A TCE plume was found in this area and it is a hot spot. Fifty-55 gallon drums had been buried there that have rusted through. Several hundred gallons of TCE were penetrating into the soil and groundwater.</p>
<p>Landfill #6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96-97 » RD - FY98 » RA - FY99-00 » LTM - FY02-10 	<p>This is located next to Landfill #5. It has hydraulic oils, anti-freeze, cleaning fluids, and other miscellaneous contaminants. It is not a household garbage dump. This area will be studied to identify the contaminants and how they are affecting the soil and groundwater.</p>
<p>Waste Burial Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98-00 » LTM - FY01-10 	<p>This area is being investigated.</p>
<p>Remediate Landfill #3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY98 » RD - FY99-00 » RA - FY01-02 » LTM - FY03-12 	<p>Landfills #1, #2 & #3 are capped. They are next to the Trinity. We do not anticipate finding any contamination there.</p>
<p>Remediate Landfill #9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY01 » RD - FY02-03 » RA - FY04-05 	<p>Needs site investigation. It will be funded in 2001. The monitoring wells are not picking up anything.</p>

<p>» LTM - FY06-15</p> <p>Remediate Landfill #8 Needs site investigation</p> <p>● DERA</p> <p>» RFI - FY00</p> <p>» RD - FY01-02</p> <p>» RA - FY03-04</p> <p>» LTM - FY05-14</p> <p>● BRAC</p> <p>» RFI - FY97</p>	<p>Located next to Landfill #9. Both Landfill #8 & #9 are within the base, near the runways. Contains a hot spot of TCE. Maps differ as to the area designated as Landfill #8. It appears it could also be located under the golf course. We are not exactly sure. Investigation will be done by the Air Force and the Navy. There is possibly a dump there that does not appear on the maps anywhere. Monitoring wells show nothing. We tested it with a hydropunch and hit TCE. This was identified in the last two months.</p> <p><i>Mr Geof Meyer I want to go back to the runways. What is involved in solving that problem under a runway on the Air Force Base?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long Actually, the dumps are not in the runways themselves. They are at the edges. Where we thought it was and where it appears to be now . . . it is too vague to know. It is a possibility it may be a different dump completely. It is just one that was never recorded. This is not uncommon.</p> <p><i>Mr Geof Meyer If you find something there, does it involve shutting the runway down?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long No.</p> <p><i>Mr Geof Meyer Does that affect how you approach the cost to fix it?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long Correct. It will affect our approach. Our commitment to the Navy is that we will not shut down operation unless there is absolutely no other way. They must also concur.</p>
<p>Remediate Landfill #7</p> <p>● DERA</p> <p>» RFI - FY99</p> <p>» RD - FY00-01</p> <p>» RA - FY02-03</p> <p>» LTM - FY04-13</p>	<p>Nearly all the landfills are in, relatively the same location. There is nothing showing in the monitoring wells that there are any increases in contamination. We have it scheduled for '99 to investigate. That will be with Navy funds.</p> <p><i>Mr Geof Meyer As I understand it, DERA funds are for all federal facilities regardless of whether they are closing or not. BRAC funds are strictly for bases that are either closing or realigning?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long Correct.</p> <p><i>Mr Geof Meyer The environmental funds for BRAC are really to clean up the bases so they can be given back to the public in a condition that they can use them? There's a glitch. If I understand, BRAC funds are limited to closing bases when the properties are going to be transferred. So, when you get the job done, the funds are gone and that's fine. But, DERA funding is apparently under attack by congress pretty severely. I think I read something that says that the military needs to cut back on the DERA funds to 20% of what it was in '96. In other words, '97 funds will only be 20% of what they are in '96. So, when you look at these numbers or by the year 2002 on DERA funded project . . . can you safely assume that DERA funds will be there? Or could it be picked up by another fund.</i></p> <p><i>Mr Tom Davis At that point, why wouldn't it go to BRAC funding?</i></p> <p>Mr Geof Meyer BRAC is for closing bases.</p> <p>Mr Joel Sanders There was an interpretation that, all along, we all thought that BRAC would be used to clean up inside the fence. Then all of a sudden there was an interpretation by the lawyers in Washington that we can't use BRAC to transfer to the Navy the stuff inside the fence.</p> <p>Mr Olen Long That's correct. We had an interpretation by Navy lawyers that said we could use BRAC funds. Some of our lawyers in our area said you could and some said you couldn't. There was enough disagreement that they kicked it on up to the General Council. The General Council came back with a reading. Basically, there is no recourse after that.</p> <p><i>Mr Tom Davis So, if it is inside the fence, you default it to the DERA funds?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long That's correct.</p> <p>Mr Joel Sanders Now, DERA, everything is based on growth and risk. If it is ranked as a high risk site, that's where all the DERA money will be concentrated. Congress is pushing that 60% of the money be used on actual cleanup and 40% used on study.</p> <p><i>Mr Ed Von Kohn Have any of these sites turned up what would be considered a high risk area?</i></p> <p>Mr Olen Long None of these has. Everything that we have here are in the '96/'97 program. Anything that is out in '98 or beyond is either medium or low, based on the information we have. It appears that it is household garbage. Our well doesn't show anything. We have to go with that until we get a chance to study it. Nothing out there right now is directly harmful to human health</p>
<p>Remediate Landfill #10</p> <p>● DERA</p> <p>» RFI - FY02</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RD - FY03-04 » RA - FY05-06 » LTM - FY07-16 	
Remove USTs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RD - FY96 » RA - FY97-98 	These are the last of the known tanks to be removed. It is funded and should start in February. There are approximately 13 tanks containing various substances.
Remediate Landfill #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY03 » RD - FY04-05 » RA - FY06-07 » LTM - FY08-17 ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Risk - FY96 	This one has already been built on and is considered closed. We still need to accumulate the documentation. There is no risk involved.
Remediate Landfill #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY03 » RD - FY04-05 » RA - FY06-07 » LTM - FY08-17 	At the DRMO area. It is capped. We have no problem with it. Need to close it.
Airfield Groundwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96-97 » RD - FY98 » RA - FY99-00 » LTM - FY01-10 	This is one of the biggest projects we have. It is all the water under the base. It is broken down into 2-3 different phases. TCE plume may be contiguous to the Air Force Plant 4 (AFP4) TCE plume. We are going to spend the money now to prove it belongs to AFP4. We have no option about that. JP [fuel] will have to be taken care of as a separate item.
Remediate Basewide Groundwater Phase I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96-04 » RD - FY01-06 » RA - FY05-06 » LTM - FY06-18 	The monitoring wells, hydropunches, and magnflux show that there are hot spots under the concrete. This is one of the most expensive parts. Horizontal drilling may be involved to get under the concrete of the runways.
Remediate Basewide Groundwater Phase II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RD - FY98-99 » RA - FY00-01 » O&M - FY02-21 	Phase II is for the groundwater not under the runways, where there is more grass. It is the least expensive. The monitoring wells show TCE out there.
RA East Groundwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DERA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY97 » RD - FY98 » RA - FY99-00 » LTM - FY02-11 	This includes the RV parking area and the base service station.
Inv/Rem Oil/Wat. Sep. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Compliance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98-99 » LTM - FY01-10 	The investigation and remediation of the oil/water separators is a compliance issue. They have all been cleaned and repaired. The soil samples around them are high in lead, chromium, etc. We are trying to prove that those elements are occurring naturally, by performing a background study. If we can prove that, we believe the State will allow us to close those.
Inv/Rem Waste Accumulation Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Compliance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98-99 » LTM - FY01-10 	We are looking at basically the same thing. They are clean. The lead, chromium, etc., is too high. We believe a background study will take care of it also.

Solid Waste Fees ● Compliance » RA - FY95	This is compliance. We don't show a funding budget for that. All tenants pay for these services.
Solid Waste Disposal ● Compliance » RA - FY95	
PCB Disposal ● Compliance » RA - FY95	We have completed cleaning out the PCB building. This base has none left except in airfield lighting vault. They are labeled and sealed units. All swipes came back non-detect.
Quarterly Stream Sampling ● Compliance » RA - FY95	This a compliance item. We have it under contract. The Navy will pick up our contract and continue with it.
NPDES Sampling, ● Compliance » LTM - FY95	This too is under contract. The Navy will pick it up also and continue with the same contract we have.
UST Monitoring ● Compliance » LTM - FY95	Compliance problem. Funded through a contract. The Navy will also pick it up and continue it in '96. Even if we do not transfer this base to the Navy, these costs will be picked up by the tenants.
Clean Oil/Water Separators ● Compliance » RA - FY95	This is a year-in/year-out thing. Since this base closed, this is the third time we have cleaned them.
UST Fees ● Compliance » RA - FY95	These are fees we have to send to the State. The Navy will continue with that.
Inv/Rem RV Park Area ● BRAC » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY96 » RA - FY97 » LTM - FY99-08	Septic tanks tied into the city sewer.
Remediate Golf Course Maintenance Area ● BRAC » RFI - FY95 » RA - FY95 » LTM - FY99-08	Basically fuel, oil and sprayer spills.
Unnamed Stream ● BRAC » RA - FY96	It is an un-named stream. There has been some detection in wells this week. We are not sure where the fuel is coming from. We have not characterized it, yet.
Landfill #4 ● BRAC » RFI - FY96 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98 » LTM - FY01-10	Radar sight.
Close TSDF ● BRAC » RA - FY96	The Temporary Storage Disposal Facility (TSDF) was built in the Defense Reutilization Managemnt Office (DRMO) area to store chemicals for long term disposal. There is nothing in it now. It may become the pharmacy for distribution of hazardous materials on base.
Inv/Rem Sanitary Sewer System ● BRAC » RFI - FY97 » RD - FY98 » RA - FY99 » LTM - FY01-10	Funded under BRAC. Runs inside and outside fence.
Inv/Rem WSA	The remote weapons storage area (WSA) is off base about 15 miles from here. Paint, oil and explosives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BRAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY97 » RD - FY97 » RA - FY98 	were stored here.
BoP Hospital <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BRAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » RFI - FY96 	This project is funded now. Investigation will start next month or the month after. This includes a background survey which will establish the levels of various substances existing prior to possible contamination.

Question and Answer

Mr Ed Von Kahn *Is that \$184 million over what has already been spent?*

Mr Olen Long That's correct.

Mr Ed Von Kahn *How much has already been spent?*

Mr Olen Long \$12-\$14 million, or something like that.

Mr Ed Von Kahn *I was sitting here calculating it out and if it is \$184 million and twenty some-odd years, you are looking at basically \$8 million per year. That's probably not reasonable to think that with budget crunches, that kind of money is going to be available for this base, does it?*

Mr Olen Long That's absolutely correct. The fact is, in actual reality, Joel, what do you think?

Mr Joel Sanders About \$2-\$2 1/2 million or \$3, at the most. The way things are right now, the next 2-5 years it will be high and after that it will start going back down.

Mr Olen Long Part off this will be BRAC funds. We'll pick up \$20-\$30 million. We're not in as bad a shape as we could be. In reality, it could be the year 2030 before we are done.

Mr Ed Von Kahn *What is the possibility that the on-base stuff will just die away because it is not being closed, it is being maintained by the military that all those sites will just disappear in time?*

Mr Olen Long Well, they will.

Mr Ed Von Kahn *I mean without anything being done to them, just fade into the hereafter because they are still on an active duty type base?*

Mr Olen Long That's not possible. We'd still have to monitor them. Some of the items we will be able to close quickly and with less cost. Maybe we can use the funds somewhere else more is needed.

Mr Joe Lavy *You said earlier that the land this base is sitting on belongs to the Air Force?*

Mr Olen Long That's correct.

Mr Joe Lavy *So does Plant #4. Why wasn't it all in one package to start with? I'm looking at a picture where you were describing that plume that you are afraid you are going to have to by-pass the study that costs \$200,000. You won't know for sure whether the part that is under your portion of the base is completed or not?*

Mr Olen Long That's correct.

Mr Joe Lavy *How did they determine that plume was there?*

Mr Olen Long We have used their data, too; but they have left some holes in their data. Consequently, they have come to a determination that they have come up with some non-detects. They said, "we've run out here and there's a plume over here and there was this little knot over here that we used to think was part of ours, but we had two non-detects out there, therefore, they're not connected." We think that's a bunch of garbage. Two non-detects doesn't mean that they aren't connected especially when you're looking at 900 to 2000 feet. You just hit the two high points. In order to tie them back together, you have to put some more points out there and find out how does the plume tie together. They may be right. They can guess as well as I can. I'm guessing the other way that it is tied together. From their standpoint, they're looking at money they have for NPL and we each get our business taken care of with our money. Right now we have a little bit different pockets.

Mr Joe Lavy Yes and theirs has \$10 million in it just for those plumes.

Mr Olen Long We offered them \$12 million to help us. They have a big program manager that wasn't as helpful.

I want to hand out to you these bar graphs. This is the entire program. Some of these items are according to priorities. Some are in the time frame they are strictly because of my whim. When you look at it, there's no reason why we can't move one ahead of another if they have basically the same risk. After we get through doing the risk this next year, we will be able to tell you exactly which order we have to go in, in order to get funding. The '96 & '97 program is pretty well driven by the letters we have from the State of Texas. We're not willing to change those.

Mr Michael Gross *On your LTM's on contracts, do you have a time frame for them or do you give them an open end?*

Mr Olen Long The long term well monitoring is a compliance deal. We plan to add to that contract as we complete a project.

Mr L.M. Brennan *How many wells do you have in your program now?*

Mr Olen Long Seventy, I think. That doesn't include Air Force Plant 4 which we will collect data off of, too. They have almost as many.

So, we'd like you all to look at this. See what is important to you. You now know what we are doing. We want the citizens to be able to modify it. We need to know who is running what, coordinate the RABs. This is strictly a paper exercise to decide what to do. Does the RAB want to meet on a monthly basis? Tom, what do you want to do? Base Cleanup [Team] meeting is in this building at 1:30 on the 2nd Thursday in February. It isn't a closed meeting, but it isn't really an open meeting either. You are welcome to come. Contractors will be doing briefings.

Mr Joe Lavy *What is the minimum number of meetings the RAB is allowed to have between now and next January?*

Mr Olen Long There's no minimum. The law says we have to have a RAB and we have to have RAB meetings. Basically, it is at the whim of the citizens. I have to have one.

Mr Joe Lavy *Based on that, I recommend we don't plan one any sooner than 3 months from now.*

Mr Olen Long I would like that too, unless something comes up, you can notify everyone and we can schedule it then.

Mr Ed Von Kahn *Have they detected any contamination in the area of Kings Branch concerning contamination areas? Westworth Village is very interested in acquiring that property for a building program.*

Mr Olen Long The only thing we know of in that area is chlordane which was used for treatment of termites. That's the only contaminate we know of

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m. The next RAB meeting will be called in approximately three months. RAB members are invited to attend the BCT meetings on 8 February and 14 March. During the interim, the Air Force Plant Four RAB leadership will be contacted to discuss a having both RAB meetings on the same evening.



Mr Olen Long, GM-13
Installation Management Officer



Mr Tom Davis
Community Co-Chair

276008

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE