

SITE MANAGEMENT TEAM MONTHLY CALL SUMMARY
FORMER DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
10 October 2017
10:30-11:30 AM EDT

LOCATION: Conference Call

ATTENDEES:

Army, Base Realignment and Closure Division (DAIM-ODB) – Jay Foster (absent)

CALIBRE BEC – Joan Hutton

USACE: Mobile – Laura Roebuck

U.S. EPA, Region 4, DDMT Project Manager – Diedre Lloyd

TDEC Division of Remediation, DDMT Project Manager – Jamie Woods

HDR EOC – Tom Holmes

Trinity – Todd Calhoun (absent)

GENERAL

N/A

MAIN INSTALLATION

Supplemental Remedial Investigation (SRI)/Focused Feasibility Study (FFS)

Phases 1 and 2

Mr. Holmes stated that the SRI Phases 1 and 2 Report is in internal review and should be submitted in the next few weeks.

Phase 3 Wells

Mr. Holmes stated that the Phase 3 Work Plan was recently submitted to Ms. Hutton and Ms. Roebuck for review.

Mr. Holmes stated the number and location of Phase 3 wells were reviewed per Mr. Foster's comment during the August meeting. The original plan for Phase 3 was to install the wells not installed in Phase 2 due to funding. Mr. Holmes stated that in addition to reviewing those locations, he considered data gaps noted in the Phases 1 and 2 report and other data gaps identified in his review. Mr. Holmes stated the Phase 3 work plan includes 20 Fluvial wells and 4 Intermediate wells and he provided an overview of the well locations. He stated that the wells will investigate potential impacts to the Intermediate aquifer (IAQ), groundwater flow at the window, and delineation of the existing plumes. Mr. Holmes noted that the proposed Phase 3 well locations have not been reviewed or approved by USACE and Army.

Mr. Woods asked if this was a follow up to what Mr. Foster had indicated for additional wells for the data gaps. Mr. Holmes responded that was his intent.

Ms. Hutton asked Mr. Holmes if HDR had funding for the additional wells. He responded that would have to be determined by Ms. Roebuck and Ms. Hutton, but the number of wells recommended was less than the total planned for Phases 3 and 4.

Ms. Hutton asked about the screened interval and depth of the three new wells at the window. Mr. Holmes responded that the screen locations were not identified in the current plan and needed additional review. MW-107 has two screened sections in the Upper Claiborne sand and the water level was about 35 feet above the upper screen. The boring log does not show a clay layer between the Fluvial and Upper Claiborne sands and the water table is within the Fluvial sand. Mr. Holmes stated that he thought that the screen for the adjacent Phase 3 well (F-3) would probably be just below the water table. MW-214A/B are also screened in Upper Claiborne sand and the adjacent Phase 3 well (F-2) would be installed in the upper part of the Fluvial Aquifer. Mr. Holmes stated that the purpose of these wells was to understand the vertical hydraulic gradient at the entrance to the window. Mr. Holmes noted a proposed Phase 3 well pair (F-1 and I-3) were located between MW-107 and MW-207A/B; he did not expect to find clay between the Fluvial aquifer and the IAQ at that location.

Mr. Holmes stated that the IAQ groundwater elevation contours in the LTM Report indicate the groundwater flow in the northwest MI is to the northwest, but the few IAQ wells in the central MI south of the window indicate flow is to the south. A Phase 3 IAQ well (I-4) was added next to F-20 to evaluate the hydraulic gradient between the IAQ and Fluvial Aquifer as well as investigate groundwater contamination. Mr. Holmes noted that F-20 was one of the wells remaining from the Phase 2 plan located in areas without previous groundwater investigation, similar to Phase 2 wells, MW-274 and MW-283.

Mr. Woods asked if I-4 and F-20 are intended to close the gap on the gradient and see if there is a sink in the south-central MI. Mr. Holmes responded that he does not think the presence of a Fluvial aquifer sink is in question based on the Phase 1 and 2 wells around MW-259. Mr. Holmes noted the shape of the TTA-2 and South-Central plumes also indicate groundwater flow toward the sink. Mr. Woods asked if less saturation and thickness is seen in that area. Mr. Holmes responded that the clay was observed in wells within the area of the sink and the fluvial aquifer was relatively deep but the thickness of the clay is not known. Mr. Holmes stated an IAQ well (I-2) is to be installed near MW-259 with a protective casing into the clay and the well screened below the clay. Mr. Holmes stated that other Phase 3 IAQ wells (I-3 and I-4) may be screened in the Upper Claiborne sand without penetrating the clay.

Risk Assessment Update/Review

Mr. Holmes stated that the Risk Assessment Update/Review is in progress and is scheduled to be submitted for internal review in the next couple of weeks.

Groundwater Model

Mr. Holmes stated the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) for the groundwater model has been submitted to the Army and comments have been received from Ms. Hutton and Ms. Roebuck.

Mr. Holmes stated that HDR tried to reach the USGS contact provided by Ms. Griffin at Memphis Light, Gas and Water (MLGW) regarding a recent groundwater model. No response has been received yet. Ms. Hutton stated that in reviewing the CSM, it is important that information from the more recent MLGW model be incorporated as Ms. Griffin indicated that the results of the recent

model changed the output of the earlier model. Mr. Holmes concurred and noted there are no controls for groundwater elevations in the Memphis Aquifer off the MI. The model will include the Memphis Sand with MLGW extraction wells based on the average daily pumping rate. However, there is no way to check the model without additional data.

Ms. Hutton confirmed that the USGS contact is Mike Bradley. Mr. Holmes forwarded Ms. Hutton's email with the contact information to Mr. Woods and Ms. Lloyd.

Vapor Intrusion Survey

Mr. Holmes stated that the Vapor Intrusion (VI) Technical Memorandum was in review at EPA and TDEC. The VI Soil Gas Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) has been reviewed by Army and USACE; responses to comments have been submitted and Mr. Holmes will prepare the Rev0 submittal upon approval of the responses.

Ms. Hutton asked about the time frame for starting the field work for soil gas samples. Mr. Holmes responded that based on time for submittal and review of the QAPP by EPA and TDEC, field work will tentatively begin late January/February.

Mr. Holmes asked about TDEC VI screening levels provided by Mr. Woods. The screening levels were lower than HDR's because TDEC used Hazard Index (HI) of 0.2 and HDR used 1.0 in accordance with the Dunn Field ROD. Mr. Woods stated that he would check with TDEC's risk assessment team on the guidelines. Mr. Holmes asked Ms. Lloyd whether EPA agreed with 10^{-6} for cancer risk and 1.0 for HI. Ms. Lloyd responded that her VI expert had reviewed the VI Technical Memorandum but has not yet provided comments. Mr. Holmes stated that the plan is to do soil gas sampling next and see what the results are before deciding whether indoor air samples are needed. Ms. Lloyd stated that she is fine with doing the soil gas first but wants to have the VI comments before going further.

DUNN FIELD

Status of AS/SVE Operations

Mr. Holmes stated that oil was observed on the floor beneath the AS compressor during the weekly inspection in late September. The compressor was shut down for a few days, but has been repaired and was running this morning. Mr. Holmes stated that HDR and Trinity are currently collecting the second quarterly sample and the semi-annual report will be prepared once results are available.

AS Well Installation Update

Ms. Hutton stated that due to the lack of response from Ms. Griffin she requested that Mr. Foster contact her. Ms. Hutton stated a letter to the commissioners may be the next course of action if Mr. Foster is unable to get a response from Ms. Griffin. Mr. Woods and Ms. Lloyd noted their support for Army's course of action.

TDEC Well Data

Mr. Holmes stated HDR received approval for additional work to assess and sample the TDEC wells north of Dunn Field and is moving forward. Mr. Woods helped HDR staff locate the 11 wells installed by TDEC. Ten of the wells are usable and one (WB-04) is not. Mr. Holmes stated that HDR repaired one well (WB-03) that did not have a surface completion or well cap, redeveloped the ten wells, and will complete sampling the wells today.

Ms. Hutton asked Ms. Lloyd her opinion on the density of the wells located off-site. Ms. Lloyd stated there may be a few gaps but it is hard to say until the screen levels are known and the water level and analytical data is available.

Ms. Hutton stated that WB-04 was capped and locked by HDR but the Army won't abandon it. Mr. Woods responded that TDEC will have their contractor assess and close WB-04 at some point.

OTHER ISSUES

Community Involvement Line (CIL)

Ms. Hutton stated that no calls have been received.

With the community newsletter coming out in December, Ms. Hutton mentioned that last year Carolyn Jones suggested that a note be added on the last page providing information to the public on contacting Fort Campbell to file a claim or complaints. Ms. Hutton stated that she was going to follow up with Mr. Foster on whether to retain that statement this year; based on the statute of limitations, no claims will be approved. Ms. Hutton asked the team their opinions on whether it should be retained. Mr. Woods and Ms. Lloyd concurred that it didn't seem helpful to provide the information if the claims will not be considered.

Submittal Schedule

Mr. Holmes stated that he received Ms. Lloyd's approval letter for the 2016 Annual LTM Report. Mr. Woods stated that he would provide his letter to Mr. Holmes this week.

Mr. Holmes noted the submittal schedule was included in the "SMT Oct2017 Handouts" pdf sent via email with the monthly agenda.

Next Call

The next call is scheduled for Tuesday, 14 November at 10:30 EDT. However, it may be rescheduled due to conflicting schedules.