

PROJECT REVIEW MONTHLY CALL SUMMARY
FORMER DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
12 May 2015
10:30-11:05 AM ET/9:30-10:05 CT

LOCATION: Conference Call

ATTENDEES:

Army, Base Realignment and Closure Division (DAIM-ODB): Carolyn Jones

USACE: Tulsa - Tyler Jones; Mobile – Laura Roebuck

CALIBRE: BEC - Joan Hutton

TDEC Division of Remediation, DDMT Project Manager: Jamie Woods

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, DDMT Project Manager: Diedre Lloyd

HDR EOC: Tom Holmes

GENERAL

Ms. Hutton opened the call by announcing those present on the call.

MAIN INSTALLATION

Remedial Action - No current remedial action

MI Year 4 EBT Annual Report, Rev0 Mar 2015. Comments due May 15, 2015.

Mr. Woods and Ms. Lloyd stated they did not have preliminary comments to discuss but expect to complete their reviews this week.

Supplemental Remedial Investigation/Focused Feasibility Study

Mr. Holmes reviewed the status of well installation for SRI Phase 1 and referenced the summary table provided with the agenda. Site mobilization occurred on Monday April 27 and drilling began the following day. Six wells were completed at the depot during the first shift; a seventh well was drilled yesterday. There are two more wells to be installed on the depot. Access agreements for two off-depot wells are not yet approved and if not received soon, these wells will need to be installed during a later field shift. One of the off-depot wells, MW-262, was to be installed first and the findings used to locate a third off-depot well, MW-273; the delay for MW-262 will likely require an additional field shift for MW-273. Notification will be provided if delay in well installation is expected to impact the project schedule.

Mr. Woods asked how the drilling subcontractor, Cascade, had performed. Mr. Holmes stated that other than a slow start on the first day Cascade had performed well.

DUNN FIELD

Remedial Action - FSVE system shut down in 2012. AS/SVE system operating.

Mr. Holmes reviewed the AS/SVE operations. The system was restarted March 6 and operated until early April when the air sparge wells were closed for a month. The air sparge wells were opened in early May for another month of operation. The AS wells are closed to implement the planned change

PROJECT REVIEW MONTHLY CALL SUMMARY
FORMER DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
12 May 2015
10:30-11:05 AM ET/9:30-10:05 CT

in operations to run the AS/SVE system in alternate months in order to restore the pre-treatment groundwater flow.

The system is currently operating with a single SVE blower due to a fault with the second blower. Mr. Holmes stated that the second blower should be repaired and back in operation soon. A vapor effluent sample was collected in March and a quarterly report in preparation will provide more information on system operations.

Ms. Lloyd asked for clarification of the operations; for example, was the air sparge operating full time in March? Mr. Holmes replied that the air sparge wells are normally operated for several hours each day, and a single SVE blower is operated all day alternating between the two blowers in six hour periods. The part-time operation of AS wells still appeared to impact groundwater flow. The change to bimonthly operations was made to limit AS operations further by closing the wells for a month at a time in order to restore the northerly groundwater flow into the AS/SVE treatment zone. The SVE blower continues to operate during the month that the AS wells are closed.

LONG TERM MONITORING

LTM continuing with 99 wells on the MI and 86 wells on Dunn Field/Off Depot Area.

Mr. Holmes discussed status of the *Annual LTM Report - 2014, Rev0*. Responses to EPA comments were discussed on May 5 in a conference call with Ms. Lloyd, Ms. Hutton, Ms. Jones and Mr. Holmes. Revised responses were submitted by Ms. Hutton. Ms. Lloyd stated she did not expect any issues with the revised comments and would review them following the call.

Mr. Holmes stated that one of the EPA comments noted the difference in related well classifications between the MI (background and boundary) and Dunn Field (background only) and raised an issue of consistency in data quality objectives. Ms. Lloyd stated that this did not require action on this call but would like the other team members to consider the issue and discuss it on a later conference call. Mr. Holmes stated the well classification criteria would be sent to the team members for their review.

Mr. Woods raised the issue of timing of sample events which had been another comment on the 2014 LTM report. He had polled other site managers in the TDEC Memphis office who oversee sites with semiannual groundwater monitoring; the sample periods ranged from late March through April and late September through October. Thus, the DDMT sample schedule fell within the same period as most Memphis sites. Ms. Lloyd agreed the poll provided useful information but considered a review of site-specific data was warranted to validate the DDMT sample schedule. She noted that contaminants can be missed if sampling is done at the wrong time and that the purpose of the precipitation data comparison is not to track the water table but to look for smear zones. Ms. Lloyd wants to ensure that we capture these contaminants.

Ms. Hutton noted she and Mr. Holmes had discussed the review and planned to request precipitation records from the Memphis airport which is only a few miles from DDMT. Mr. Woods stated a co-worker at TDEC also manages the weather data at the airport and he would ask him for the precipitation records. The team discussed the data required for the review and the purpose of the review. Ms. Lloyd suggested that the Army decide on the amount of precipitation data to review but

PROJECT REVIEW MONTHLY CALL SUMMARY
FORMER DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
12 May 2015
10:30-11:05 AM ET/9:30-10:05 CT

recommended that it should be for a period longer than one year. Mr. Holmes will include this information in the semi-annual LTM report.

Mr. Holmes discussed preliminary results from the April semiannual sampling event. The analytical data has been reviewed and data validation was in progress but figures had not been created. The event included semiannual sampling at the MI (approximately 50 wells sampled) and biennial sampling at Dunn Field (86 wells). One well, MW-31, at Dunn Field was not sampled due to access being blocked by debris. The April analytical results were similar to previous events with some differences. Several wells at the MI appeared to show rebound, reflecting the end of EBT injections last August; increased concentrations of PCE and TCE and decreased concentrations of cDCE and VC were observed at those locations. The increased concentrations may indicate sorbed contaminants below the water table or contaminant migration from the vadose zone. The Dunn Field results showed slight increases in the two wells on Dunn Field which have indicated rebound, but the results remain below MCLs. The number of Dunn Field wells exceeding MCLs decreased from the previous event and concentrations decreased at locations near the AS/SVE system following operations being re-started. The semiannual LTM report is being prepared.

Ms. Hutton noted the Army has made some changes to streamline reports and asked if there were any suggestions for additional changes. No suggestions were made but participants agreed to give it consideration

Ms. Hutton asked Ms. Lloyd if she would like to receive some or all of the semiannual LTM report figures as large-scale drawings, as with figures on previous reports. Mr. Holmes noted the printed drawings were approximately 24 by 36 inches. Ms. Lloyd stated that only one large-scale drawing for the Dunn Field area was needed. Mr. Holmes noted that the Dunn Field drawings included plume maps for total CVOCs (all the primary Dunn Field contaminants), TCE, TeCA and PCE, and suggested the total CVOCs or TCE figure would probably be most useful. Ms. Lloyd agreed to review a previous report to determine what would be needed. Mr. Woods stated that the electronic submittal would be sufficient for him.

Mr. Woods asked about a request to Mr. Holmes last week regarding the status of MW-43. The well was on a site that a Memphis consultant was reviewing for a Phase 1 investigation and had requested information from TDEC regarding the status of a well on the property. Mr. Holmes stated that the well location was checked by the HDR geologist overseeing SRI well installation and the well had been abandoned but the grout surface was about 6 inches below ground and the remaining PVC well casing extended to just above ground. HDR will cut the PVC casing and add concrete to the ground surface during the current SRI field work.

OTHER ISSUES

All agreed that the monthly calls were helpful in staying up-to-date with project activities and issues.