251 0

File: 17G
A.F.

NAVAL AIR STATION
FORT WORTH JRB
CARSWELL FIELD
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 251

AIR FORCE PLANT 4
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
11 APRIL 1995 7 PM - 9 PM

ATTENDEES:

CITIZENS:

J. T. Cockerham	B. K. Presley	H. L. Preslor
Mike Gross	Sara Brewer	Bill Keeler
Tom Gross	J. McDonoughdear	Carol Chickowsky
Bob Scott	Robert Taylor	Denise Gordon
William Olshefski	Vince Wilcox	Art Rogers
J. Douglass Oniroga	Danny Anderson	
Ken Elliott	Barbara Baldridge	

REGULATORY AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES:

Gary Baumgarten - United States Environmental Protection Agency
Tim Sewell - Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission

LOCKHEED FORT WORTH COMPANY:

Norm Robbins - Public Relations

AIR FORCE REPRESENTATIVES:

Kamel Mardini - RAB Co-Chair and Air Force Plant 4 Team Chief
John Doepker - Restoration Remedial Project Manager
Ed Finke - Assistant Remedial Project Manager
Ann Farmer - Public Affairs

FACILITATOR:

Thom Robinson - Robinson Communications

SUMMARY:

The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the interested stakeholders to their role as Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members, introduce the Air Force and RAB members to each other, provide an open dialog to address questions about

the RAB and establish RAB operating procedures. The meeting agenda is as follows:

- Statement of Purpose
- Introduction of Air Force Representatives
- Introduction of Citizens
- What a RAB Does
- Roundtable Discussion of Local RAB Operations
- Selecting the Community Co-Chair
- RAB Member Selection Process
- Establishing a RAB Charter
- Action Items for Next Meeting

The meeting commenced with an introduction of the purpose of the meeting by Thom Robinson. This was followed by introductions of the Air Force personnel and the citizens in attendance. Each person introduced themselves and stated why they were interested in being a RAB member. The attendees represented a diverse group of interested stakeholders from the community surrounding Air Force Plant 4 (AFP 4).

Thom Robinson then proceeded to describe the function of a RAB, member responsibilities, and an overview of how a RAB functions.

This was followed by a question and answer period. Below is a brief summary of the questions asked and a response to those questions.

Q. What is done with the advice that is given by the RAB members?
A. The input, comments, and advice given by individual RAB members and the RAB as a whole is considered in the decision making process by the Remedial Project Manager. The board itself is not considered a decision making body and is not expected to reach a consensus on all issues concerning the environmental cleanup. A formal report is not generated by the board. Comments and concerns are documented in the meeting minutes and are used in the decision making process to improve the soundness of government decisions and ensure that the cleanup is responsive to the communities needs.

Q. How much money has been spent to date for cleanup at AFP 4 and how much is projected for the future?
A. To date, approximately 31 million dollars has been spent on study of potentially contaminated sites and early remedial actions at AFP 4. An additional 30 million is projected to be spent on future cleanup at AFP 4.

Q. How many RABs are there around the country and when was the first RAB established?
A. RABs are required to be established at all Department of Defense (DOD) installations that are undergoing active cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). An internal DOD directive required that the process of establishing a RAB be started by December 1994. Other federal agencies have also established similar advisory boards to increase public involvement in the cleanup process.

Q. Can we obtain copies of past environmental reports about AFP 4?
A. The administrative record, maintained at the White Settlement Library, contains historical reports concerning the various environmental studies and actions conducted at AFP 4. These reports are on reserve at the library for public review.

Q. What is the priority of AFP 4 for cleanup when compared to other cleanup sites in Texas and around the country?
A. Sites are placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The EPA uses a mathematical formula contained in the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) to "score" a site or facility based on the toxicity of waste, proximity to drinking water, and other factors. An HRS score exceeding 28.5 is the criteria for inclusion on the NPL. Currently, there are 1,084 general (non-federal facility) NPL sites across the nation. There are 154 federal facility NPL sites. In the state of Texas, there are 24 general NPL sites and 4 federal facility sites, one of which is Air Force Plant 4. HRS scores can not be directly compared because the sampling and scoring is discontinued once the score for a facility exceeds the 28.5 threshold.

The Department of Defense has developed a Relative Risk Site Evaluation framework as a means of categorizing individual IRP sites in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program into High, Medium, and Low risk groups. The categorization of sites into relative risk groups is based on an evaluation of contaminants, pathways, and human and ecological receptors in groundwater, surface water and sediment, and surface soils. Funding for cleanup operations at individual sites at a location will be based on the relative risk of that site. The idea is to cleanup the "worst" sites first.

Q. Will we address other issues besides the cleanup of historical groundwater and soil contamination at AFP 4?
A. No. The RAB will only formally address issues related to the cleanup of AFP 4. Non-restoration related issues and concerns will be referred to the appropriate office within Aeronautical Systems Center for response and appropriate actions. It is important to stress that this board will not

address issues relating to the cleanup of Ft. Worth Naval Air Station, Joint Reserve Base (formerly Carswell Air Force Base) not associated with the groundwater plume extending onto that property.

Q. Does AFP 4 still use Trichloroethylene (TCE) in its operations?
A. Lockheed no longer uses TCE as a degreaser to clean aircraft parts. A water based parts cleaner has been developed to replace the TCE. It was stressed that Lockheed and the Air Force is committed to achieving zero chemical discharge from the plant.

Q. Are Lockheed and the previous plant operators contributing to the cleanup costs at the plant?
A. Currently, the Air Force is fully funding the restoration program at AFP 4 to expedite the cleanup process. This issue of operator contribution is currently being examined at the Air Staff Level in Washington D.C.. One RAB member stresses the need for other potentially responsible parties to contribute to the cleanup costs.

It was decided that all citizens present who wanted to participate as RAB members would indicate so on the sign in sheet at the conclusion of the meeting. The election of the community co-chair will be deferred to the next RAB meeting. The development of the formal RAB charter will also be deferred to a future RAB meeting.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Prepare a mailing to the RAB members to include: Site background information, health and safety information on Trichloroethylene, and the Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidance.
2. RAB members should submit a brief profile on themselves and indicate if they are interested in being the community co-chair on the profile. The selection of a community co-chair will occur during the next RAB meeting from the list of interested members.

NEXT MEETING:

It was decided that the next RAB meeting will be held on **11 May, 7 PM**, at the **Senior's Services Center** in White Settlement.

251 S

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE

201 6

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE