

# FINAL

## Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting Subject:</b> Norwalk Tank Farm Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Quarterly Meeting	<b>Meeting Date:</b> <u>2 August 2001</u> <b>Meeting Time:</b> 6:30 p.m. <b>Meeting Place:</b> Norwalk Arts & Sports Complex
<b>RAB, PROJECT TEAM, AND OTHER ATTENDEES</b>	
<b><u>RAB Community Members</u></b> E. Garcia B. Hoskins M. McIntosh (Co-Chair) W. Miller J. Rifilato W. Sterner	<b><u>Other Members</u></b> J. Anderson (City of Norwalk) J. Jefferson (KMEP) (Co-Chair) A. Townsend (RWQCB) Lt Col Wilson (DESC-LA) (Co-Chair)
<b><u>Other Attendees</u></b> S. Collins (Citizen) E. Conard (KMEP) K. Hekimian (HVN Environmental) N. Irish (GTI) M. Klug (March ARB) S. Lines (Congresswoman Napolitano) K. Olowu (DESC) J. O'Neill (March ARB) C. Quinn (KMEP) J. Schuhrh (Citizen) P. Sonnenfeld (CTL Environmental) T. Whyte (URS) D. Williams (Geoscience) T. Winkler (Citizen)	DESC-LA.....Defense Energy Support Center- Los Angeles GSA.....General Services Administration GTI.....Groundwater Technology, Inc.; a wholly- owned subsidiary of IT Corporation KMEP .....Kinder Morgan Energy Partners OCCS .....Offsite Chemicals Cleanup Subcommittee RAB .....Restoration Advisory Board RBCA.....Risk-Based Corrective Action RWQCB.....Regional Water Quality Control Board URS.....URS Corporation WRD .....Water Replenishment District of Southern California
<b><u>Absentees</u></b> R. Babel (City of Cerritos) D. Caughey J. Leserman (WRD) M. Young	
<b><u>Not Attending</u></b> Dr. Duran (OCCS) Dr. Landolph (OCCS)	
<b><u>BACKGROUND</u></b> DESC-LA and KMEP are conducting environmental cleanup activities at the area in and around the Defense Fuel Support Point Norwalk, also known as the Tank Farm, located at 15306 Norwalk Boulevard, Norwalk, CA. The RAB is an advisory committee of local citizens and project members that reviews and comments on documents relating to the environmental cleanup. All RAB meetings are open to the public and are scheduled quarterly on the last Thursday of the month at 6:30 p.m. unless otherwise voted on by the RAB community membership.	

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.	<p><u>Introduction</u> Lt Col Wilson, DESC-LA, Meeting Chair</p> <p>Lt Col Wilson called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and introduced Mr. James O’Neill from the March Air Reserve Base (ARB) environmental office. Jill Jefferson introduced Kinder Morgan Energy Partner (KMEP) employees Eric Conard and Catherine Quinn who are new on the Norwalk project.</p> <p><b>Community Co-Chair Election.</b> Lt Col Wilson read the rules for election of the Community Co-Chair. He asked if there were any other community members interested in running for Community Co-Chair in addition to Mary Jane McIntosh. Ms. McIntosh gave a short statement. Since there was only one candidate, Lt Col Wilson called for a voice vote of approval of Ms. McIntosh from the community members. Ms. McIntosh was confirmed for a two-year term without opposition.</p> <p><b>Review of Minutes.</b> Lt Col Wilson asked for comments on the minutes of the April 26, 2001 meeting. Wanda Sterner and Bob Hoskins pointed out some typographical errors on pages three and five. Lt Col Wilson asked for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was made and seconded. The motion passed without opposition.</p>	N/A	
2.	<p><u>RBCA Update</u> Jill Jefferson, KMEP</p> <p>Ms. Jefferson said they still have not received comments yet from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on the Risk-Based Corrective Action (RCBA) Plan report. Ana Townsend said they would be ready soon. Ms. McIntosh asked for the RAB members to be notified when the comments arrive.</p>	KMEP	By 10/18/01
3. & 4.	<p><u>Semi-Annual Monitoring Event</u> and <u>KMEP Update</u> Jill Jefferson, KMEP</p> <p><b>Remediation Update.</b> Ms. Jefferson described the soil vapor extraction summary for KMEP. They have removed 12,100 gallons of fuel from the soil since the April 2001 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and a total of 362,320 gallons since September 1995.</p>		

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	<p>The groundwater/product extraction system has eight groundwater wells in the West-Side Barrier area, five groundwater/product wells in the South-Central Plume area, and two groundwater/product wells in the 24-inch Valve area. Approximately 314,360 gallons of water have been pumped from the South-Central Plume area, 262,940 gallons from the 24-inch Valve area, and 568,450 gallons from the West-Side Barrier area since the April RAB meeting. A total of 25.3 million gallons have been removed since September 1995. No free product was removed since the April RAB meeting. Approximately 8,735 gallons of free product has been removed since September 1995. They typically do not remove any free product in the spring when the water levels have risen.</p> <p><b>Sentry Well Monitoring.</b> Sentry well monitoring was performed in February. This included the original 11 sentry wells as requested by the RAB, the five Exposition wells, and 12 wells as requested by the RWQCB. Water levels were measured (or the wells “gauged”) in 27 wells, and 24 wells were sampled. No free product was found, except in well GMW-58, located in the northeast area. Chemical concentrations were similar to previous events, and no chemicals were detected in the Exposition wells.</p> <p><b>Semi-Annual Monitoring Event.</b> At the Semi-Annual Monitoring Event, which took place in May 2001, 154 wells were gauged and 102 wells were sampled. The groundwater elevations were slightly higher than measured in the previous event. The gradient in the upper zone was generally towards the northwest with significant influence from the treatment systems. The gradient in the Exposition Aquifer remained to the southeast. Free product in the northern and south-central areas was similar or less in extent than in previous events. In most areas, concentrations of TPH (total petroleum hydrocarbons), benzene, 1,2-DCA (1,2-dichloroethane), and MTBE (methyl tertiary butyl ether) were similar or less than in previous events. High concentrations of 1,2-DCA and MTBE were detected in well MW-20(MID). They are unsure why this well had high concentrations, so it will be resampled in August. TPH concentrations decreased between the north-central and south-central plumes. MTBE was not detected off-site to the west, except in well WCW-7. 1,2-DCA decreased in well WCW-3. The extent and concentration of MTBE decreased in the 24-inch Valve area.</p>		

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
1	<p>Ms. Jefferson pointed out a mistake in the report text. The report states that no chemicals were detected in the Exposition wells. However, both Secor and IT Corporation sampled well EXP-2. The Secor sample was non-detect, and the IT sample detected small concentrations of toluene and xylene. Ms. McIntosh requested corrected pages be sent to the RAB members.</p> <p>Eugene Garcia asked if the concentrations in May 2001 reported as similar or less than previous events were due to more water beneath the site. Ms. Jefferson said concentrations could change as a result of increased water elevations, depending on the configuration of free product trapped in the soil. Mr. Garcia said it also depends on the solubility of the chemicals to which you are referring. Ms. Jefferson said you do expect fluctuations over the long term, but you can see decreases or increases over the short term. Mr. Garcia said that therefore, when the text states that concentrations are similar to previous events, it does not mean anything. Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Garcia, and Neil Irish discussed the issue, and agreed that only when you can see a long term decrease in concentrations over time does it mean anything.</p> <p>Ms. McIntosh said she noticed three things in the report. First, there was a significant decrease in wells GMW-1, GMW-11, GMW-36, GMW-O-10, and GMW-O-14. Ms. Jefferson said wells GMW-1 and GMW-O-10 are on cross gradient from the south-central plume. As the remediation system treats the and there is less and less free product in soil and on the groundwater, the concentrations in these will decrease with time. Mr. Irish said that well GMW-11 has decreased because they are seeing less interaction between the south-central and northern plumes. Ms. Jefferson said the decrease in GMW-36 is due to the increased pumping in the 24-inch Valve area. Well GMW-O-14 is also close to free product, so this is another well seeing impact of the remediation system.</p> <p>Second, Ms. McIntosh noticed there were some wells that showed significant increases in concentrations. Well GMW-32 had an increase in TPH as gasoline. Mr. Irish said six to eight wells had a significant increase. They plan to expand the air sparging from 16 to 32 wells to help control the free product on the east and bring concentrations down. The new air sparge wells should be online by the next RAB meeting</p>	KMEP	10/18/01

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	<p>and their effect should be seen by the next sampling event. Ms. Townsend that the RWQCB has also been looking at these wells. The wells are GMW-32, GMW-45, GMW-47, GMW-57, GMW-58, GMW-59, MW-16, and MW-28.</p> <p>Third, Ms McIntosh noticed five wells had detections that previously did not have any data. GMW-17 had TPH in concentrations over 100,000 mg/l. Mr. Irish said chances are the well previously contained free product, so now they are able to sample it without free product in the well. Well GMW-35 had levels of 22,000. Well GMW-O-7 did not have significant levels. Ms. Jefferson said the well GMW-O-7 information was from 1999, and it is not on the semi-annual sampling program. Ms. McIntosh also mentioned wells HL-3 and HL-5. HL-5 had data from 1997. Mr. Irish said those two wells were very old. He is putting together a proposal to remove them from the sampling program and destroy them. Ms. McIntosh asked that the proposal be presented at the next meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Jefferson said that she and Mr. Irish are working on implementing a new sampling program for 2002 and will present it at the next meeting. Wanda Sterner asked how the product canisters were doing. Ms. Jefferson said the canisters have not had any free product.</p> <p><b>Removal of KMEP Equipment.</b> KMEP is scheduled to begin removing their equipment on August 6, 2001. It should take approximately one month to complete. They will blind all station piping from operating pipelines, similar to the picture in the latest newsletter. They will drain and clean all station piping and remove the 3 mainline pumps, some valves, and the 2 provers. Starting in about two weeks there will be trucks entering and exiting the site.</p>	<p>IT Corp.</p> <p>KMEP &amp; IT Corp.</p>	<p>10/18/01</p> <p>10/18/01</p>
4.	<p><u>DESC-LA Update</u> Lt Col Wilson, DESC-LA; Kola Olowu, DESC; Neil Irish, IT Corp.</p> <p><b>Status of Closure.</b> Lt Col Wilson said all of the fuel has been removed and the lines have been “pigged,” a type of squeegee operation to force out all the product. They conducted vacuum truck operations to remove all the water. Most of the pipelines have been inerted with nitrogen. The tanks have been welded shut, ladders have been removed, and the gauges have been removed. Only a few items remain to be removed. Jill Anderson asked about the nitrogen. John Rifilato said nitrogen is used to keep oxygen out of the pipes</p>	N/A	

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	<p>so they will not rust. They will finish the nitrogen placement next week. Then only a few minor items remain prior to turning the property over to caretaker status. Caretaker status will include 24-hour security, monitoring of the 8-inch and 10-inch pipelines, maintenance of weeds, and authorizing entry of KMEP personnel. The fire system is still intact. The truck racks have been dismantled but not removed yet. Ms. Anderson said the City is working with DESC for long term security so the site will not become overgrown and vandalized.</p> <p>Bill Miller asked if the phytoremediation trees have reached the groundwater yet. Ms. Jefferson said they have grown to about 25 feet tall, so they should be close. When they do, they may lose a few trees because the nutrient quality in groundwater at the site is not good. They may do additional sampling in the area to monitor the effect of the trees.</p> <p>Ken Hekimian asked if this would be the appropriate time to ask when the tanks will be coming down. Ms. Anderson said the City's position is they would like to see them removed as soon as possible, but the Department of Defense disagrees. Lt Col Wilson said that they are still trying to find the best way to hand over the land in the best condition and in an expedient manner. They have no dates set yet for these actions. Ms. Anderson said the City met with Congresswoman Napolitano in March, and they are working with the General Services Administration (GSA). The Congresswoman has the Tank Farm as a top priority. She is looking at next year for possible legislation and can make things happen without legislation. Mr. Hoskins noted that in the meeting people have mentioned "turning the land over to the City," but it has not been determined that the City will gain the whole site. Lt Col Wilson said that before the land is transferred, reuse will be determined, and that will depend on how clean the site is. Remediation will continue. Ms. McIntosh said she went to a conference in St. Louis where the DESC officials committed to cleaning up the site.</p> <p><b>Central Plume Remediation System Update.</b> Kola Olowu said DESC intends to clean the site to make it safe for the community. DESC has other sites where they worked for 10 years or more to clean it up for reuse.</p> <p>Mr. Olowu said they continue their efforts to ensure maximum efficiency. They redeveloped four horizontal wells, HW-1, HW-3, HW-5, and HW-7, to increase air flow.</p>		

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	<p>The wells were jetted with water, and sand and debris were vacuumed. They were video logged with a camera to ensure they were cleaned. They anticipate this will result in an increase in hydrocarbon destruction.</p> <p>Two new total fluids wells were installed. Well TF-25 was installed near Tank 80006. This well should increase product recovery near well PZ-3. Well TF-26 was installed near Tank 80002 and replaced TF-24. The wells were installed with air-sparging capability for future use.</p> <p>Mr. Olowu said that since April 1996, the central plume remediation system has recovered and destroyed approximately 134,465 gallons of hydrocarbons, including 55,653 gallons of free product and 77,485 from soil vapor extraction. Approximately 31.7 million gallons of water have been pumped and treated. Approximately 1,327 gallons of dissolved phase hydrocarbons have been recovered. Approximately 96,813 gallons of fuel have been removed through bioremediation. A total of approximately 231,278 gallons of fuel have been recovered. No free product was recovered in the last quarter. Mr. Irish said the horizontal wells were off last quarter, so that is why only about 1,000 gallons were recovered through soil vapor extraction. When water levels rose, the wells were flooded so they could not turn them on for a while. Now the wells are operating at a very high efficiency, so we should see an increase in recovery totals at the next meeting. A question was asked if they had seen any biofouling. Mr. Irish said they did not video log the wells before, but they felt the redeveloping would have an influence on the area to the east. They will shut the wells down and turn them back on again from time to time to increase recovery rates and save on natural gas costs with the thermal oxidizer. To control biofouling, they acid wash the wells. They have a regular program to perform vacuum gauging when the rates decrease. Mr. Hekimian asked what was the significance of the dissolved phase hydrocarbon recovery number, since it is a relatively small amount? Mr. Irish said it is just to track it. It is collected by total fluids wells or groundwater pumping. The water goes through an air stripper and then goes through the thermal oxidizer. The water goes through carbon canisters. A third carbon vessel was added to handle MTBE. The treated water is checked and then discharged under a NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit. They submit NPDES reports quarterly. They do not test for metals, since metals are not a likely to occur in elevated</p>		

# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	<p>levels at the site. Ms. Townsend said that DESC and KMEP recently had their NPDES permits renewed for another five years.</p> <p><b>Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS).</b> Mr. Irish said IT Corporation was contracted through the Air Force to conduct an Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) for the Tank Farm. An EBS is a document that looks at all the information available at the Norwalk site and the pipeline from Norwalk to San Pedro. No new information is collected. The document provides a snapshot of the site and puts the information into a single, comprehensive document that the Air Force will use as they are preparing to transfer the land. The EBS will include history, setting, environmental factors, adjacent property, and what is known and what is not known and is needed to fill data gaps. Environmental factors considered include nine common sources of hazardous substance or petroleum product storage, release, or disposal. The nine sources cover “soup to nuts” to see if any the items were handled at the site. It is based on interviews and reviews of historical documents. The EBS also looks at six other areas that are not usually sources of environmental contamination unless a release has occurred such as PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls), radon, and asbestos. Then they have to categorize the site from 1 to 7. Categories 1 through 4 means the site is suitable for transfer, while categories 5 through 7 means the site is not ready for transfer. Mr. Irish estimates the Norwalk site might be a category 2 since it is a petroleum facility.</p> <p>They have a pre-draft document going to the Air Force for review tomorrow. The draft will be prepared in about one month, and then the final document will be ready in two to three months. There will be no public comment on the draft document since it is just a report of available information. The final document can be released to the public. Ms. Jefferson asked if it is similar to a Phase 1 document. Mr. Irish said yes. Jim O’Neill said it is an environmental document for a real estate transaction. Mike Klug said the document is a necessary step to turn the property over, so it is a significant step for the Air Force. Mr. Klug was asked if the EBS is part of a FOST. Mr. Klug said no, a Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) is only required for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) sites. For the Norwalk site, the Air Force will prepare a Declaration of Excess and then turn the property over to the GSA for screening for other interested agencies. Mr. Hekimian asked if Geomatrix</p>		



# FINAL

MEETING MINUTES		2 August 2001	
Item	Description of Discussion and Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
	prepared an EBS in 1993. Mr. Irish said no, but a Phase 1 was prepared for the Chang property in 1992. They also did some offsite air monitoring. Lt Col Wilson said that getting the Air Force involved early helps expedite the process. Ms. McIntosh said that the Air Force has been sending representatives to the RAB meetings for two years and thanked them for their involvement.		
5.	<p><u>Set Date and Agenda for Next Meeting</u></p> <p>The next quarterly RAB meeting will be held <b>Thursday, October 18, 2001, at 6:30 p.m.</b> in the Norwalk Arts &amp; Sports Complex.</p>	All	10/18/01
6.	<p><u>Public Comment Period</u></p> <p>Ms. McIntosh moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rifilato and passed without opposition. Lt Col Wilson adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m.</p>	N/A	