

Response to Comments
Revised Draft Monitoring Well Abandonment Report for Former Choccolocco Corridor Ranges
Fort McClellan, Anniston, Alabama

Comment #	Reviewer	Section/ Page	Paragraph /Line	Comment	Response
1.	ADEM	General		The Department notes that the Army used Groundwater Branch Guidelines for Well Abandonment. However, for future well abandonment activities, please follow the well abandonment procedures described in Section B.5.2© of the Alabama Environmental Investigation and Remediation Guidance.	The comment has been noted, and the noted guidance will be used for any future well abandonment activities.
2.	ADEM	1.0		This section states that 23 monitoring wells were abandoned “through a combination of casing removal (where applicable) and abandonment in place (plugging).” However, Table 2.1 shows that all 23 wells were plugged and abandoned implying that none of the casings were removed. Please clarify if any of the casings were removed, and if none were (as stated in Table 2.1), please revise Section 1.0 accordingly.	The requested change was made. The 2 nd paragraph of Section 1.0 was revised to state: Under the task order, HGL plugged and abandoned 23 monitoring wells in place at former CCR in place accordance with Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) Groundwater Branch Guidelines for Well Abandonment (ADEM, 2015).”.
3.	ADEM	2.2		On Page 2-2, the third bullet states, “The outer casing (if applicable for double-cased wells) and primary well casing was removed from each well.” This implies that some of the wells were double-cased; however, Table 2.1 indicates that all wells were single-cased. Please clarify if any of the casings were double or if all well casings were double or if all the well casings were single-cased as stated in Table 2.1.	All wells at CCR are single-cased. HGL revised the 1 st paragraph Section 2.0 to state: “A total of 23 single-cased monitoring wells were abandoned according to ADEM guidelines...”
4.	ADEM	2.2		Please include a discussion that addresses the handling of any displaced water due to the placement of grout in the monitoring wells during abandonment activities.	The requested change was made. HGL included the following after the bulleted items in Section 2.2 “The original basis for abandoning the wells was the lack of any contaminants of concern in the groundwater at the site, as determined by the previous remedial investigation (Shaw, 2010). Any water that was displaced as a result of the placement of grout during abandonment activities was allowed to be discharged to the ground surface at each well location.”
5.	ADEM	2.2		The section goes into detail as to how the well abandonment procedure took place. However, the Groundwater Branch Guidelines for Well Abandonment states, “Complete, accurate records of the abandonment shall be kept for each well abandoned”. Static water depths, quantity of sealing materials used, and changes made to the well during sealing details are details that need to be documented according to the above guidelines. Please provide this information and describe and describe any changes that	Abandonment details were documented for each well abandoned on the Well Abandonment Forms provided in provided in Appendix B. Static water depths/levels were added to these forms. The remaining details, including quantity of sealing materials, surface material removal, casing removal depth, and other changes to the wells are included on the forms.

Comment #	Reviewer	Section/ Page	Paragraph /Line	Comment	Response
				were made to the well during the abandonment process.	
6.	ADEM	Appendix		Please provide boring logs in the appendices.	The requested change was made. HGL rearranged the Appendices and included historical boring logs of the abandoned wells in Appendix A. The boring logs were referenced in the 2 nd sentence of the 1 st paragraph of Section 2.0 to state "These wells are summarized in Table 2.1 and historical boring logs are provided in Appendix A."