



FINAL
Hazardous and Toxic Waste (HTW)
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
Cleanup Team (BCT)
Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2025



BRAC Conference Room and Microsoft Teams Teleconference
 Former Fort Ord, California

Agenda

Reference the handout titled “HTW BRAC Cleanup Team Meeting Agenda, Thursday, September 18, 2025, at 10:00 AM, Former Fort Ord, California.”

1. Attendance and Announcements

Last Name	First Name	Organization	In-Person	Remote
Anderson	Thor	Harris Environmental	x	
Bascomb	Dawn	California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)		x
Carter	Sommer	Ahtna Global, LLC (Ahtna)		x
Cervantes	Christina	Chenega for U.S. Army Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), Fort Ord Office		x
Clancy	Maeve	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	x	
Corr	Erin	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)		x
Dillon	Holly	Ahtna		x
Facchini	Hudson	Chenega for BRAC	x	
Faulkner	David	DTSC		x
Gomez	Joseph	USACE	x	
Gutierrez	Alberto	DTSC	x	
Henson	Alex	Ahtna	x	
Hession	Shaelyn	Ahtna		x
Johnson	Nikita	USACE		x
Kellett	MaryClare	USACE		x
Kowalski	Bart	Chenega for BRAC	x	
Lam	Nancy	USACE		x
Leary	Brett	DTSC		x
Lewis	Deb	USACE	x	
Lieberman	Derek	Ahtna	X	
Lippa	Antonio	Ahtna	x	
Lobo	Joelle	U.S. Army BRAC, Fort Ord Office	x	

Last Name	First Name	Organization	In-Person	Remote
Martinez	April	USACE		x
Mauck	Andrew	Ahtna	x	
Nozaki	Chieko	JBW Federal for BRAC	x	
O'Meara	Kelly	Ahtna		x
Rogers	Keegan	Ahtna		x
Savage	Tom	USACE		x
Schmidt	Eric	Ahtna	x	
Sellinger	Amber	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region (CCRWQCB)		x
Steckling	Karyn	CCRWQCB		x
Stiebel	Cary	JBW Federal For BRAC	x	
Weisenfeld	Greg	Chenega for BRAC	x	
Valdez	Val	Chenega for BRAC		x

2. BCT Minutes Status

The May HTW BCT meeting minutes are in draft review; July BCT minutes are in internal review and should be sent out draft for review shortly.

3. Community Outreach Update

The handout titled "U.S. Army Fort Ord Environmental Cleanup Community Outreach Update" was reviewed. Additional discussion included:

- Chieko Nozaki with JBW Federal for BRAC presented details on the handout.
- Recent activities highlighted include:
 - Report on the analysis of the 2023 community survey and community outreach actions 2023-2024 nearly ready for regulatory agency review. Hoping for review to be completed by the first week in October. 2025 survey targeted to go out second week in October.
 - On July 22, a community inquiry was made by a local instructor about background information of the technical staff to gauge what would be needed for students interested in a similar field.
 - On July 23, a controlled detonation notice was sent for the detonation that occurred on July 24.
 - On July 26, a community involvement mobile workshop and open house was held (46 community participants).
 - On July 29, a technical review committee (TRC) meeting was held.
 - On August 21, a York School safety presentation was held.
 - On August 29, an information table was held at the Monterey County Fair.
 - On September 15, FOCAG responses to comments were mailed under separate cover for two documents.
- Upcoming activities highlighted included:
 - In October, the 2025 community survey and interviews will be held
 - In November, an annual newsletter will be distributed.

- Karyn Steckling with CCRWQCB asked if the regulatory agencies have the opportunity to provide input on the community survey. Chieko responded that the regulatory agencies would have the opportunity. She also stated that the questions generally stay the same and any changes to the questions would be presented in the report. Chieko offered to send Karyn the previous survey questions and report from 2023.
- Karyn noted that she and Amber received a public record act request and they will be sending a response tomorrow and will copy Jason. The inquiry was regarding a small part of a large parcel that was former officer barracks. The inquiry was an “all records” request and it appeared routine.
- Maeve Clancy with USEPA noted that the Division Director for Superfund and Emergency Response of USEPA Region 9, Mike Montgomery, was at the Monterey County Board of Supervisors meeting (September 17) regarding the Vistra Energy facility at Moss Landing. He was approached by a community member who handed him several documents and expressed concern about the planned prescribed burn at Fort Ord. Maeve will provide information about the documents provided to USEPA.
- Chieko noted that the organization behind the military poisons website was trying to collect money for sampling at the former Fort Ord in October. Karyn added that they had not received any new information about the planned sampling in October.
- Karyn noted that CCRWQCB has a board meeting in October, the agenda for which includes the Monterey One Water (M1W) project that includes injection of treated wastewater into the Seaside Basin near the former Fort Ord boundary. CCRWQCB staff will attend the meeting to address any questions or comments regarding the cleanup at Former Fort Ord.

4. Habitat Restoration

The handout titled “Site 39 Inland Ranges Habitat Restoration Status Update” was reviewed by Thor Anderson with Harris. Additional discussion included:

- 2025 spring monitoring data is being evaluated in preparation for the annual report.
- Ten total Phase 1 sites entered their final year of monitoring.
- Caretaking activities, including removal of invasive tree species and spreading native mulch, continue to take place.

5. OU2

a. Groundwater Remedy/Monitoring – The handout titled “Operable Unit 2 Data and Status” was reviewed by Holly Dillon with Ahtna. Additional discussion included:

- Table 1 shows that the OU2 groundwater treatment plant (GWTP) was online 100 percent (%) of the time in July with a flow rate of approximately 806 gallons per minute (gpm). The GWTP was online 88% of the time in August with a flow rate of approximately 741 gpm. Since treatment began over 10 billion gallons of water have been treated and over 1,000 pounds of Chemicals of Concern (COC)s have been removed.
- Table 2 shows that 2,500 gallons of treated water were used in July, 2,000 gallons were used in August, and a total of 4.3 million gallons have been used since October 2016.
- Recent and upcoming key events were discussed as listed in the handout.
- August 26, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) regional power outage due to a blown transformer caused a power surge that damaged OU2 groundwater treatment system (GWTS) components, including variable frequency drives (VFDs) for two GWTP effluent pumps and two extraction wells.
- Analytical results for treated water (injection) sampling that occurred over the reporting period were below discharge limits.

- Groundwater data was shared from the Third Quarter 2025 groundwater monitoring program (GWMP) event at OU2. Monitoring points with increased COC concentrations compared to the previous quarterly GWMP event were highlighted. Trend charts were shared for select Hydraulic Zone 5 wells (MW-OU2-05-AR, MW-OU2-06-AR, MW-OU2-07-A), including COCs above their aquifer cleanup levels (ACLs) at MW-OU2-75-A and MW-OU2-08-A.
- Third quarter data for the Upper 180-Foot was presented, including time concentration plots for MW-OU2-28-180 and MW-OU2-62-180.
- Karyn asked about the COC concentration trends for monitoring well MW-OU2-08-A shown on slide 9 and what station was sampled in the well.
 - Holly stated that samples were collected at the deepest station in the well.
 - Derek Lieberman added that, because operation of the Fort Ord Landfills was over an extended time and waste was deposited in the different Landfills areas at different times, it is likely that contaminants were being released intermittently to the aquifer from different locations over time.
 - Karyn asked if a similar trend related to intermittent contaminant release is also seen in the Upper 180-Foot Aquifer.
 - Derek responded that these trends are typical along with seasonal variation. There generally are smoother trends in concentrations in the upper 180-foot aquifer as opposed to the A-aquifer.

b. Landfills Operations and Maintenance (O&M) – The handout titled “Former Fort Ord Operable Unit 2 Landfills Data and Status” was reviewed by Eric Schmidt with Ahtna. Additional discussion included:

- Eric highlighted key Second Quarter 2025 events and planned Third Quarter 2025 events as shown in the handout.
 - The Monterey County Department of Health (MCDH) quarterly inspection was completed on September 3.
 - 1,700 cubic yards of mulch generated from vegetation removal for prescribed burn fuel breaks was brought to the Landfills.
 - The date for annual mowing of the Landfills vegetative cover is to be determined.
 - The date for the next MCHD quarterly inspection is to be determined. The Army will plan to coordinate this inspection with CCRWQCB staff.
- Eric noted the PG&E power surge in Marina also damaged a VFD for a blower unit on the thermal treatment unit (TTU) that now requires replacement.
- A summary of the TTU operations was presented. In 2025, the TTU has operated for 756 hours and removed approximately 61,130 pounds of methane.
- The methane concentration at the TTU influent was last measured at 34.9%. Generally, the amount of methane removed from the OU2 Landfills decreases over time as the OU2 Landfills age.
- Eric presented a figure with data for landfill gas extraction points and announced that the TTU operational schedule will change to 1 week on and 2 weeks off to evaluate the declining methane concentration trends.
- Eric noted that approximately 100 gallons water were removed from Area D condensate tank and methane concentrations from the Area D extraction points have since rebounded to typical values.

6. Sites 2 and 12 (Sites 2/12)

The handout titled “Sites 2 and 12 Data and Status” was reviewed by Derek Lieberman of Ahtna. Additional discussion included:

- Derek presented the operation and sampling data of the GWTP and soil vapor extraction treatment system (SVETS).
- The GWTP operated 65.9% of the time in July and 68.0% of the time in August.
- The concentrations of COCs in treated water injection samples from July through August were below the discharge limits.
- Recent and upcoming key events were discussed as listed in the handout.
- Groundwater tetrachloroethene (PCE) results were discussed including Second Quarter 2025 GWMP data and preliminary Third Quarter 2025 results. The COC concentration trend charts for EW-12-08-180U, MW-12-20-180U, and MW-12-24-180U were shared. Derek mentioned that the spikes in concentrations of COCs seemed to be connected to water years with higher than normal precipitation.
- Groundwater trichloroethene (TCE) results were discussed including Second Quarter 2025 GWMP data and preliminary Third Quarter 2025 data. The COC concentration trend charts for MW-02-13-180M and MW-12-14-180M were shared. EW-12-05-180M was brought back online due to TCE concentration trends observed at MW-12-14-180M.
- The SVETS was restarted on June 18, 2025 and no COC concentrations exceeded the soil gas cleanup levels (SGCLs) at the soil vapor extraction (SVE) wells. The SVETS was shut down on September 5, 2025 to assess rebound.
- The Second Quarter 2025 Soil Gas Monitoring Program (SGMP) data were presented, and no SGCL exceedances were observed. Time concentration plots were presented for SG-12-04 and SG-12-02. There is no indication that the SVETS will need to be operated again soon.
- Additional soil gas sampling results in the southern Site 12 area for first and second quarter for the TCE plume investigation were presented and discussed. All results were below the screening and trigger levels. Preliminary results for third quarter data were presented. The highest TCE concentrations were observed at the SG-12-16 soil gas probe cluster, which is adjacent to Jetty Street.
- Dawn Bascomb with DTSC said that DTSC and CCRWQCB are not concerned so much about the cleanup goals, but looking at potential vapor intrusion risk to the buildings. Dawn said that it does appear the TCE concentrations greatly exceed the California Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs), which would indicate the need for additional sampling in the buildings to determine if there is an indoor vapor intrusion risk.
 - David Faulkner with DTSC added that he agreed with Dawn's concern and that indoor air sampling is warranted.
 - Derek responded that SG-12-16 (which has the highest TCE detections) is not adjacent to the buildings.
 - Karyn stated that, for soil gas probe cluster SG-12-17, there are TCE detections that exceed state screening levels and this probe cluster is closer to buildings.
- Derek presented preliminary language regarding decision rules to be outlined in the draft of the Soil Gas Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Addendum.
 - Dawn inquired whether the review of the language was expected today or whether there will be a separate period for comments. She stated that the proposed action levels presented with the preliminary decision rules are higher than California ESLs for vapor intrusion risk.

- The regulatory agencies were invited to provide comments today during the BCT meeting or within the next few weeks. Alternatively, they can provide comments on the draft Soil Gas QAPP Addendum. The goal of presenting the information during the BCT meeting was to give the regulatory agencies the opportunity to see the logic behind the decision rules.
- The BCT considered discussing the topic in a separate meeting. Maeve added that she would like to have additional personnel with USEPA review before discussing it further.
- Karyn added that she compared the proposed action levels (69 micrograms per cubic meter [$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$] and $300 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) to the California ESLs for short-term related issues of TCE exposure and they are very close, which was appreciated.
- Amber Sellinger with CCRWQCB wanted to confirm her understanding of the action levels. Based on Table 13 in the handout, the concentrations of TCE at SG-12-17 were above $100 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ action level for additional soil gas probe cluster installation. She inquired as to whether that would mean additional soil gas probes would be installed to further delineate the TCE plume. Derek said that additional soil gas probes could be installed if action levels are exceeded for three consecutive quarters per the proposed decision rules.
- Amber inquired about the two extraction wells proposed to be decommissioned by Shea Homes because they are proposed for sampling during the per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) Remedial Investigation (RI).
 - Derek responded that Shea Homes has not provided a timeline for construction and, if Shea Homes came to the Army with a request to decommission the wells, the Army would have to approve it. It is the understanding that the wells were proposed for decommissioning because they are in the footprint of a future building.
 - Maeve asked if there was any pre-notification that Shea Homes could be given.
 - Joelle said that the Army can reach out to Shea Homes.
 - Derek added that, if Shea Homes wants to decommission the wells in the near term, an alternative would be for Shea Homes to install replacement new well(s) that would provide equivalent data.
- Karyn noted that sampling for three consecutive quarters may not be representative if there are strong seasonal effects.
 - Derek asked Karyn whether she was suggesting decisions should be made based on a subset of data to account for seasonal trends.
 - Karyn responded yes.
 - Derek said this will be considered to determine if there should be a decision rule to address potential seasonal trends.
- Derek noted that, for the southern part of Site 12, SVE wells VE-12-01 through VE-12-05 were intentionally not operated during the last SVETS operational cycle so as to not skew analytical results for the soil gas probes in the area.
- David inquired about the occupancy status of the buildings in the area being constructed.
 - Derek responded that the residential units are currently still unoccupied, but they do have furnished models and are actively trying to sell the units.
 - David asked whether there was any general timeline for selling the units and how urgent are the investigation activities.
 - Derek responded that this was not known.
 - Joelle confirmed and added that the residential units closest to the existing soil gas probes are the model homes.
 - David asked whether the developers can be reached.

- Derek stated that that previous attempts to reach the developers have not been successful, but there may be another way to get ahold of them.
- Maeve noted that she recognized David's point from a public health perspective and wondered if there is a way to perform sampling before people move in.
- Derek responded that this is part of the reason the decision rules are being developed, but it is a stepwise process.
- Karyn noted that, if previous data for SG-12-24 is indicative of what is currently under the building, action limits would not be exceeded. She suggested that the empty model homes could be classified as commercial spaces until they are actually occupied by residents.
 - David agreed that the model homes could be referred to as commercial spaces. The sampling effort without the SVE wells in operation was important and the right decision. The measures to trigger indoor air sampling are important if a continued rise in soil gas COC concentrations is observed.
 - Derek noted that there have been three rounds of sampling at SG-12-24, which is the soil gas probe cluster closest to a model home at about 130 feet away, and the TCE concentrations there have been consistently low. Previous data for the TCE plume, even with seasonal variation and with recent construction in the area, have shown the plume to be stationary. The goal of the current study is to recharacterize the TCE plume with respect to vapor intrusion risk and plume maps will be updated accordingly.
 - David noted that this was all very helpful information.
- Erin said that some dates will be coordinated to schedule a meeting.
- Derek presented the preliminary decision rules flow chart.
- Referring back to slide 1 from the handout, Karyn asked whether there was a plan to get the blower replaced and air stripper back online.
 - Derek responded that the air stripper was installed as a polishing treatment in 2007. The air stripper was added because elevated vinyl chloride concentrations were observed and vinyl chloride is not as effectively treated with granular activated carbon (GAC) as other COCs. However, concentrations of vinyl chloride effectively disappeared shortly after the installation of the air stripper. It has still been operated since but it is not necessarily needed for the groundwater remedy. Two options are being evaluated: repair/replace the blower and bring the air stripper online or bring a second GAC vessel online.
 - Karyn asked whether there was a need to work with the Air Resources District to ensure compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). Derek said the Air Resources District was consulted with when the air stripper was installed.
 - Karyn asked if there was a concern about meeting discharge requirements if there is only a single GAC vessel operating. Derek responded that this was recognized, and the frequency of discharge compliance monitoring was increased to account for this.
- Maeve asked whether the air stripper was required by a decision document. Derek responded that it was not.
- Maeve inquired whether the final Soil Gas QAPP Addendum will be issued early next year. Joelle said that it would.
- Maeve inquired whether all of the soil gas probes will continue to be sampled quarterly throughout the production of the Soil Gas QAPP Addendum through early spring. Derek and Joelle both confirmed that this is the plan.

7. Operable Unit Carbon Tetrachloride Plume (OUCTP)

a. Groundwater Remedy/Monitoring – The handout titled “Former Fort Ord Operable Unit Carbon Tetrachloride Plume Data and Status” was reviewed by Holly Dillon of Ahtna. Additional discussion included:

- Recent and upcoming key events were discussed as listed in the handout.
- One right-of-entry (ROE) has been completed for proposed monitoring well installations in the City of Marina; the other two ROEs are still in progress.
- Plume maps and time concentration plots were presented.
- Table 1 shows carbon tetrachloride concentrations in A-Aquifer wells during Third Quarter 2025. No increased concentrations were observed compared to Second Quarter 2025.
- Table 2 shows carbon tetrachloride concentrations in Upper 180-Foot Aquifer wells during Third Quarter 2025. There were no notable increases in carbon tetrachloride concentrations compared to Second Quarter 2025.

b. TCE in the Lower 180-Foot Aquifer – TCE is not a COC for the Lower 180-Foot Aquifer, but it is being monitored to assess for potential impact on the downgradient drinking water supply wells. Only one well (MW-BW-59-180) indicates concentrations of TCE above the ACL. The concentration of TCE increased during the Third Quarter 2025 GWMP event.

There were no questions regarding the OUCTP presentation.

8. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)

There was no handout presented. Additional discussion included:

- Erin Corr shared details for PFAS-related action items and documents.
- The RI and site resolution documents are still in progress.
- Maeve inquired about the anticipated timeline for these documents.
 - Joelle responded that they were a couple months out.
 - Derek noted that, as reflected in the document schedule, the documents will likely be out in late November.

9. Basewide Range Assessment (BRA) and Lead Evaluation Status

There was no handout for the BRA and Lead Evaluation Status. Discussion included:

a. BRA – The Comprehensive BRA Report Revision 3 responses to regulatory agency comments are in progress.

b. Lead Evaluation at HA 18D and HA 23D – The Lead Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) will be drafted once the TCE ESD is completed.

c. Explanations of Significant Differences – The Lower 180-Foot Aquifer TCE ESD is in internal review. An update on the schedule will be provided at the next HTW BCT meeting.

- Maeve inquired whether both of the ESDs could be final by the end of the next fiscal year.
- Joelle indicated she anticipates the TCE ESD to be completed in federal fiscal year 2026 and would follow up on the timeline for the Lead ESD.

10. Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Schedule

a. Status Update – The FFA schedule is provided to the agencies with the upcoming primary documents with the month the Draft and Draft Final versions will be issued. For primary documents, Draft versions have a 60-day review period and Draft Final versions have a 30-day review period. Secondary documents are not included on the FFA schedule.

b. Document Schedule – The handout titled “Former Fort Ord HTW Document Schedule” was reviewed and near-term documents were identified by Erin Corr of USACE. Additional discussion included:

- The regulatory agencies have provided comments on the PFAS public fact sheet.
- Karyn observed that multiple documents are scheduled to be issued around the same time and stated that CCRWQCB would like document issue dates to be staggered two weeks apart.
 - Erin stated that extensions on document review periods can be requested and, starting in November, the Army would implement a new document schedule designed to stagger agency review periods as previously discussed with the BCT.
 - David agreed that it can be challenging to review multiple documents from different sites in a similar timeframe.

11. Action Items

The handout titled “HTW BCT 2025 Action Items” was reviewed by Erin Corr of USACE.

- Karyn was asked about the OU2 Landfills-specific meeting and she did not have an update.
- Karyn stated that she had requested to see the revisions that were made to a document in response to community comments.
 - USEPA and DTSC have no comments on the revisions.
 - Derek stated that if no other agencies have comments on the revisions, with BRAC or USACE approval, the revised version of the document can be sent.
 - Joelle approved sharing the revised version.

12. Calendar Update

The calendar was reviewed for upcoming HTW BCT meetings and community event dates:

- The next BCT meeting was tentatively scheduled for December 11.
- The date for the subsequent BCT meeting was suggested to be in February 2026 in conjunction with the Community Involvement Workshop and Technical Review Committee meeting.

HTW Governing Document References

The latest QAPPs in use and decision documents, including Records of Decision (RODs) and Explanations of Significant Differences (ESDs) are listed below. These are typically final documents not currently being reviewed. These documents can be used as references for site COCs, ACLs, monitoring, remedies, and project decision criteria. Fort Ord document numbers given below.

- **Current QAPPs:**
 - Landfill Gas Revision 9: Final [OU2-702Y](#) (February 2025).
 - Soil Gas Revision 9: Final [BW-2792Y](#) (December 2024).
 - Groundwater Revision 12: Final [BW-2785Z](#) (August 2024).
 - Groundwater Revision 11, Addendum No. 2, OUCTP Upper 180-Foot Aquifer Extraction Well Installation: Final [BW-2928B](#) (May 2024).
- **Decision Documents:**
 - OU2:
 - ROD: [OU2-480](#) (1994).
 - ESD No. 1: [OU2-406](#) (1995).
 - ESD No. 2: [OU2-458](#) (1996).
 - ESD No. 3: [OU2-523](#) (1997).
 - ESD No. 4: [OU2-656](#) (2006).
 - Sites 2/12:
 - ROD: [RI-025](#) (1997).
 - ESD: [BW-2794](#) (2016).

- OUCTP:
 - ROD: [OUCTP-0021D](#) (2007).
- Site 39:
 - ROD: [RI-025](#) (1997).
 - ROD Amendment: [RI-041E](#) (2009).