

**Draft Meeting Notes: Community Advisory Group (CAG) –
Aerojet General Corporation Superfund Site Issues
Meeting Date: January 20, 2016**

1. Introductions and Attendees

Janis Heple, CAG Chair, began the meeting with introductions at 7:00 p.m.

Attendees:

- Allen Quynn, City of Rancho Cordova
- Alex MacDonald, RWQCB
- Alta Tura, Sacramento Area Creeks Council
- Burt Hodges, Save the American River Association (SARA)
- Chris Fennessy, Aerojet Rocketdyne (Aerojet)
- Daniel Wolfe, City of Folsom
- Heleana Galvan, HDR – EPA Contractor
- Jackie Lane, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Janis Heple, CAG Chair
- Jerald Drobesh, Community Member
- Jim Rohrer, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
- Jimmy Spearow, Community Member
- Julie Santiago, EPA
- Kathy Lawson, Golden States Water
- Kevin Thomas, Sacramento Suburban Water District
- Larry Ladd, Community Member
- Lynn Keller, EPA
- Stephan Green, SARA
- Steven Ross, DTSC

Draft Meeting Notes from November 19, 2015 (minor changes that are shown below were made to the minutes)

- Page 1: The Central OU9 has a draft sampling plan
- Page 2: Typo in Sailor Bar Park
- Spell out ROD and LUC – Land Use Control throughout document
- Julie Santiago had the same related comments as comments/edits above

2. Aerojet Community Updates & Property Issues – Chris Fennessy, Aerojet & Alex MacDonald, RWQCB

Area 40 Hillsborough Development Project Update [C. Fennessy]

City of Folsom's Sphere of Influence (south of 50)

- ✓ City requires a storm water detention basin to mitigate potential flooding and enhance water quality
- ✓ Sacramento County will widen Prairie City Road to four lanes
 - Widening is approx. 200 feet westerly onto the Aerojet Superfund site
 - Current right-of-way is also part of the Aerojet Superfund Site

Aerojet's partial Consent Decree process requires notification of agencies for transfer of property.

- ✓ Sent two notices to agencies as follows:

- City of Folsom for basin
- Sacramento County for road widening

Q: What's the purpose of the detention basin and is it designated for Hillsborough and Area 40?

A: [C. Fennessy] Notices alert agencies of requirements (i.e. for basin, City must submit plans to agencies for review and consistency with remedial plan). Detention basin is a mitigation for flooding and directs flow to Buffalo Creek. The basin is intended to serve development drainage.

Q: This is not a water quality detention basin?

A: [A. MacDonald] Basin serves two purposes: 1) for water quality, settling solids as they travel through basin; 2) storm water peak flow control (main goal of basin)

Q: Will basin handle storm water for the development area?

A: [A. MacDonald] Yes

Q: Why would we put the detention basin on the Superfund Site side rather than within the Easton Corporation development? Would it require a partial Consent Decree?

A: [C. Fennessy] The City and County were engaged in setting the locations for the detention basin. There are multiple basins within the development to protect from flooding, channelized water, to settle solids and to allow drainage into Buffalo Creek.

Q: Would the City own the basin and how large is it?

A: [C. Fennessy] The City of Folsom is responsible for it but we are unclear of size.

Q: Who would own the property?

A: [C. Fennessy] Aerojet would own the property where the basin resides, the City would be responsible to maintain and operate the basin through an established easement (similar to right-of-way easements along roadways).

Q: Is the detention basin located within City boundaries?

A: [D. Wolfe] The basin is not within City of Folsom limits. However, through a maintenance easement, the City would be responsible.

Q: Will the City operate the drainage basin?

A: [D. Wolfe] The City of Folsom is currently working on their master plan, which will identify who will be responsible for operation/maintenance.

Q: Who is proposing the basin to be sited there?

A: [A. MacDonald & C. Fennessy] The City of Folsom is proposing this basin as part of their drainage system. Aerojet is the grantee for the property and doing certain things on the property.

Q: Where is the water coming from now?

A: [C. Fennessy & A. MacDonald] The water is from rainfall runoff collected within several drainage ditches along Prairie City Road which drain to Coyote Creek.

Q: Is there a drainage study?

A: [C. Fennessy & D. Wolfe] There is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the entire project with an infrastructure plan. There are a lot of elements that cross City/County borders that will be included in the final master drainage plan that is not complete yet.

Q: Will there be a requirement for water testing before flows hit creeks and rivers?

A: A. MacDonald] The City has its own storm water permit and they do sample as part of their storm water management.

Q: Will EPA require monitoring of runoff for contamination?

A: [C. Fennessy] The purpose of the detention basin is to capture flow from Area 40 and the surrounding community. Aerojet is addressing contamination impacts from Area 40.

Q: Will the basin be constructed before Area 40 contamination is addressed?

A: [C. Fennessy] I don't know.

Q: What implications will result from Prairie City Road moving over 200 feet?

A: [C. Fennessy] The Area 40 chemical plume extends across Prairie City Road so any utilities in the area (drainage/water/sewer) will have to include vapor control mitigations to keep the plume from migrating along the utility lines.

Q: Is the County going to construct a new Prairie City Road?

A: [C. Fennessy] We do not have that answer yet, it is still being worked out. The developer could construct as part of their development although it is still in County right-of-way.

Q: Will the basin and widening of Prairie City Road have to go into a process to get approved under the partial Consent Decree for things that happen on the Superfund property?

A: [C. Fennessy] There is a separate requirement for a transfer of interest in the property that requires Aerojet to notify the agencies prior to transfer. As part of the remedial action for Area 40, land use covenants will be developed that require agency review of the construction plans for the roadway expansion. Additionally, Mr. MacDonald commented on the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the South of Highway 50 Backbone Infrastructure, stating prior to allowing the construction of these basins, it needs to be demonstrated that the basins will not create conditions that could exacerbate the remediation of groundwater pollution that is in close proximity to the basins proposed for Area 40 and down gradient of the basin within the Eastern Operable Unit.

Q: What about vapor control in association with the sewer?

A: [C. Fennessy] Any utilities in Prairie City Road and adjacent to the Area 40 contamination will require mitigation for off-gas of chemicals in the groundwater. This mitigation action will be listed in construction specifications.

Q: What direction does the contamination flow from Area 40?

A: [C. Fennessy] Primarily to the west until you get across the road; at this point a portion goes to the north and a portion to the south.

Q: Is Don Nottoli's office in the loop on this?

A: [C. Fennessy & A. MacDonald] We generally do not update the Supervisor unless they reach out with questions. It is unclear if their office is aware of this issue.

Q: While some stormwater will go under Prairie City Road to a basin, some will remain onsite collected by other detention basins?

A: [C. Fennessy] Yes.

Q: That's the only one we have to worry about?

A: [C. Fennessy] Another basin is proposed on the east side of Prairie City Road. The determination of need for a separate basin that is associated with the contamination at Area 40 will be made as part of Area 40 remediation.

AMPAC Project Update [C. Fennessy]

Aerojet has been coordinating with AMPAC since June 2015. AMPAC is manufacturing a new chemical to make a drug to treat hepatitis which requires a new building. The partial Consent Decree requires that any construction within the Superfund site must be noticed to agencies for review/approval.

AMPAC's original location was within a potential source area (31E). After initial sampling, PCBs were found so AMPAC identified an alternate location to the south of their existing facility and outside of any known source areas. Aerojet collected soil and vapor samples and submitted documentation to the agencies, which are currently reviewing to determine mitigation needs during construction/maintenance of the building.

To construct a new building, AMPAC will need to:

- Move roadway south
- Relocate fire water supply line
- Construct buildings and new concrete pad.

PCB's above screening levels were found in three locations near the original concrete pad location so additional investigation is required to determine remediation needs in that area. AMPAC is looking to have responses from agencies by the end of January 2016.

Sailor Bar Park Project Update [C. Fennessy]

Aerojet has drilling equipment at Sailor Bar Park. Sacramento County has a water supply well for the park pond. Water from that well is sent back to Aerojet for treatment at Aerojet's ARGET facility. Aerojet is putting a monitor well near the supply well to evaluate draw down of the supply well and its capture zone.

Mather Area Project Update [C. Fennessy]

Aerojet has several extraction wells north of Mather Field. Currently, one of those wells, 4675, is being rehabilitated.

Well 4670 Project Update [C. Fennessy]

In the Southeast Zone 2 portion of the Perimeter Groundwater Operable Unit (OU-5), well 4670 was constructed some 10-15 years ago. The well was never operated as an extraction well until recently. Using the extraction well as a mass reduction well for the hog out facility, the well is now part of the OU-5 remedy. Initially, the water from the well contained 50 micrograms per liter of perchlorate so it was connected to the GET AB facility. At start-up it pumped 45-50 gallons per minute and by the following month the water from the well contained 49,000 micrograms per liter. The GET AB facility is not designed to cost-effectively handle this high of a perchlorate concentration. So in the interim, Aerojet placed an ion exchange system on to pretreat the water before it goes to GET AB facility. The plan now is to connect a pipeline from 4670 to GET EF and its biological treatment system for perchlorate that can handle those concentrations. This project will start in the next two months and it will all be on Aerojet property.

Aerojet Partial Deletion Request and Land Use Covenants Update [A. MacDonald]

In 2000, the western and much of the northern portion of Aerojet was carved out of the Superfund site with property use restrictions (i.e. no homes, hospitals, daycares, senior citizen homes, etc.) on areas that were deemed to potentially pose an unacceptable vapor intrusion risk due to off-gas of TCE from groundwater. Since that time, the TCE risk value for vapor concentrations has been lowered.

The areas in red on the map were areas without land use covenants having the prohibitions, but need additional evaluation to determine if there are concentrations of TCE below them, or upgradient, that would potentially present an unacceptable risk due to the lowered TCE vapor risk value. The yellow dots (part of OU-5) represent investigated source areas that were determined to have no remediation necessary or cleanup has already occurred. These properties, which are ready for closure, still require development of land use covenants.

Land use covenants are also instituted for contaminated soil sites. An example of this is C41 area where perchlorate extends to the water table. Aerojet dug down to 12 feet below ground surface and removed contamination that could potentially impact residents. The 12 feet is determined by the health risk estimate saying that most people who live on property won't normally dig beyond that to do swimming pool, utility work, etc. Now that property is zoned for residential use, any work done below

12 feet will require notification/approval as a deed restriction. Decisions on that property and Land Use Covenants have been made and are ready to be approved by DTSC, RWQCB and EPA.

We are still determining land use covenants sequentially for the remaining sites and once we have a template for one site; we will apply it to the next. The LUC template for sites with soil contamination is complete and we are now focused on sites that have potential groundwater generated vapor impacts into buildings.

Q: Are these sites just part of OU5 or some part of OU6 as well?

A: [A. MacDonald] Almost all of them are OU5 except for one site which is 10D & 11D. This site is located in OU6. The Aerojet development does not want this small swath of Superfund site in the middle of their development. The rest of the sites were part of the carve-out process and investigated under the Perimeter Groundwater OU.

Q: With new EPA guidance on TCE, how do we protect pregnant women in businesses? Will that impact use areas?

A: [A. MacDonald] Yes that scenario is a consideration and the yellow area on the map has already been carved out and has restricted use. Aerojet is aware of this concern and it will be evaluated.

Area 49000 SVE Project Update [A. MacDonald]

This area is at Folsom Boulevard and Hazel Avenue. It was determined in the OU5 remedy to require SVE (soil vapor extraction) to protect groundwater and future buildings from adverse vapor intrusion. Aerojet has constructed an SVE system with a couple of extraction wells. After design of a full-scale system, 22 new extraction wells were added and a fence will be constructed to protect the site.

Q: What is the SVE depth?

A: [A. MacDonald] It is fairly shallow because groundwater is about 30-40 feet below ground surface. Soil vapor can only be extracted in the non saturated zone. The contamination has been there for 30-40 years.

Q: Is anyone thinking about using the site for development?

A: [A. MacDonald] This site will probably be part of Westborough, but we don't know how it will be used.

Aerojet Landfill Process Project Update [A. MacDonald]

The CEQA document (Mitigated Negative Declaration) is being released next month by Sacramento County for the landfill removal project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration contains modifications to the original document. That means that the impacts are minor, but they still need to be addressed.

Community Resident Concern Update [Larry Ladd]

Larry spoke to a resident near the AC6 area who was aware of another resident in the area that was pre-exposed to groundwater contamination back in 1997. This resident

had concerns about her 14 year old daughter drinking the water and being exposed to the contamination that could end up possibly having her bear children with Angleman disease. Larry assured her that if she starts to see people getting really sick then to let him know and he will ensure the water wells are turned off.

3. EPA Report – Julie Santiago & Lynn Keller, EPA

Update on issues discussed in November [J. Santiago]

- EPA secured two contractors for oversight support (EA & Gilbane). EA will support RI/FS for OU4, OU7, OU8 and OU9, while Gilbane will support RD/RA for OU6, OU3, OU5 and OU10 (Area 40). HDR is a team subcontractor to EA.
- EPA representatives will not be present for March or May meetings (Julie will be out from March to June)
- OU3 & OU5 will be taken care of by contractors. Still working on 5-year review. US Army Corps of Engineers attended Site technical meetings. Process is moving forward and setting deliverables. EPA hopes to provide update at July CAG meeting on progress of 5-year review as well as OU3 & OU5 moving forward.

Area 40 internal work between EPA/DTSC & creation of new OU10 [L. Keller]

Q: City of Folsom had meeting with developers interested in Area 40 for park site/open space. When will Area 40 be ready for development? What is the timeframe?

A: [L. Keller] We are working on agreement between EPA and DTSC to formally transfer OU10 to the DTSC. The DTSC has more capacity to fast track while EPA is responsible for all Aerojet OUs in addition to other sites. Aerojet is moving forward with all reporting and an FS is due in February. EPA will still review the documents but DTSC would take the lead regulatory oversight role. EPA cannot commit to a development timeframe.

Note: The community members expressed agreement that EPA should not be able to give a firm deadline for completion, given the nature of the work and unknowns.

EPA is working on the draft transfer agreement with DTSC. Following the FS, a RAP (Remedial Action Plan) will be completed and include a CEQA document; potentially both can be adopted at the same time.

Q: Are development needs driving EPA cleanup priorities?

A: [EPA] No, development needs are not driving priorities. EPA's priorities remain with the areas of the site deemed most critical to address due to protection of human health and the environment.

Q: The community expressed concern about time and resources being drawn away from other areas of contamination that are spreading at Aerojet, versus being focused on a developer's accelerated timelines.

A. [A. MacDonald] RWQCB stated that no work will be diverted by the State in exchange for Area 40 work. The State expects all other work to track as it would without the Area 40 work.

4. Regional Board Aerojet Cleanup Overview – Alex MacDonald, RWQCB

Note: A schedule and map were distributed (see final meeting notes attachment).

Comments:

- Some of these tasks may be accelerated due to new contractors
- Might be good to see schedule at the beginning of each meeting

5. New CAG Attendees

- Jim Rohrer from DTSC is taking over for Steven Ross
- Allen Quynn from City of Rancho Cordova is replacing Brit Snipes

6. 2016 Meeting Dates

- March CAG - Wednesday, March 16, 2016 (American River South Room)
- May CAG - Wednesday, May 18, 2016 (American River South Room)