Baker

03.01-6/8/93-02439

Baker Environmental, Inc.
Airport Office Park, Building 3
420 Rouser Road
Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108

(412) 269-6000
FAX (412) 269-2002

June 8, 1993

Commander
Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1510 Gilbert Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Attn: Ms. Linda Berry, P.E.
Code 1823

Re: Contract N62470-89-D-4814
Navy CLEAN, District III
Contract Task Order (CTO) 0160
RI/FS Project Plans for Operable Units 7 & 10
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Dear Ms. Berry:

Attached are the minutes to the June 1, 1993 scoping meeting for the referenced contract task order. Copies of these minutes have been forwarded to Mr. Neal Paul (MCB Camp Lejeune).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (412) 269-2016.

Sincerely,

BAKER ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Daniel L. Bonk, P.E.
Project Manager

Attachment
DLB/nd

cc: Mr. Keith Simmons, P.E., Code 0223 (without attachment)
Ms. Lee Anne Rapp, Code 183 (without attachment)
Mr. Neal Paul (with attachment)

Meeting Minutes
CTO-0160
RI/FS Scoping Meeting for Operable Units 7 & 10
MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

June 1, 1993

A Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) scoping meeting was conducted at LANTDIV's office in Norfolk, Virginia on June 1, 1993. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the RI/FS scope of work and sampling strategy associated with Operable Unit No. 7 (Sites 1, 28, and 30) and Operable Unit No. 10 (Site 35).

The following personnel participated at this meeting:

Ms. Linda Berry, LANTDIV
Mr. Neal Paul, MCB Camp Lejeune
Mr. Peter Burger, North Carolina DEHNR
Mr. Daniel Bonk, Baker Environmental, Inc.
Mr. Raymond Wattras, Baker Environmental, Inc.

Mr. Raymond Wattras presented the RI scope of work for Sites 1, 28, and 30. Mr. Daniel Bonk presented the scope of work for Site 35. Due to time limitations associated with the discussion of Site 35, the actual scoping meeting was concluded via conference call on June 2, 1993.

The following comments/remarks pertaining to each site were noted during the meeting:

Site 1 - French Creek Liquids Disposal Area

- Michelle Glenn stated that the collection of 5-foot composite soil samples at the POL/battery acid disposal areas for lead and TPH analysis may present a problem from the standpoint that the sample may give a false negative analysis due to "dilutional" effects associated with the length of the composite. Ray Wattras indicated that the analysis would be of Level II data quality and the results would only be used to screen the area to identify possible POL/battery acid disposal areas. Ray Wattras also indicated that the composite interval can be changed to the top two feet of soil, which may be sufficient to identify "hot spots". The project plans will clearly state that the data is of Level II data quality.

  The depth of soil sampling was discussed further. Michelle Glenn was concerned that the lead contamination may be deeper than the top two feet due to the acidic conditions caused by the battery acid. Ray Wattras stated that at two lead battery sites that he is familiar with, the lead was primarily present in the top foot of soil. (This was further investigated by Ray Wattras with Baker personnel on June 2, 1993. The migration of lead in soil appears to be site specific and may be dependent of the amount of carbon in the soil and the redox potential of the soil. High organic soils will tend to bind the lead whereas low organic soils and acidic conditions will incluence the vertical migration of lead.) The proposed sampling procedure may be changed to collect a soil sample from the top two feet and from a deeper depth (above the water table). Baker will evaluate the use of XRF (X-ray fluourescence) analytical technique suggested by Michelle Glenn.

- Samples collected from approximately 10 percent of the sampling locations (within each grid) will be analyzed for full TCL organics and TAL inorganics (Level IV data

quality) for purposes of performing the risk assessment. Samples will be collected at the surface and just above the water table. Michelle Glenn suggested that the sample locations be spaced appropriately to represent the entire area of concern. Samples collected for full analysis will therefore be collected from the corners and center portions of each sampling grid at Site 1.

- Ray Wattras indicated that based on the reported disposal of POL wastes at Site 1, it would be expected to find BTEX constituents or semi-volatile constituents (e.g., naphthalene, phenol) in groundwater samples. However, only low levels of TCE were detected in the existing wells. The source area of the TCE is unknown and will be difficult to identify in the vadose zone based on the low levels detected in groundwater at this site. There are several buildings at this site where vehicle maintenance is performed, with no apparent visual indication of disposal areas. The results of the proposed soil gas survey may provide additional information to determine the source area.

  Michelle Glenn commented that it may be possible that the contamination is present below the depth of the existing shallow wells. The deeper portion of the aquifer will be investigated as part of the RI.

  Supply well HP-638 is located within Site 1 and is sampled periodically, according to Mr. Neal Paul. The well is not reported to be contaminated and is operational. Ray Wattras stated that the depth of this well is believed to be over 150 feet (actual depth reported to be 198 feet).

- A minimum of one deep monitoring well (40 to 50 feet in depth) will be constructed directly west of Site 1-S, downgradient of groundwater flow. Additional deep wells may be installed based on the results of the soil gas survey. Michelle Glenn suggested that a deep monitoring well also be paired with the background monitoring well.

- The actual location of the proposed shallow wells within Site 1-N and Site 1-S will be based on the results of the soil gas survey. If the soil gas survey does not identify any areas of concern (i.e., hot spots), then one shallow well will be installed in the center portion of Sites 1-N and 1-S.

- Peter Burger questioned the land use to the east of Site 1, which is where the background monitoring well is proposed to be located. Ray Wattras indicated that the French Creek area of the base has many uses including housing, maintenance, storage, and recreation. There are likely underground storage tanks associated with the buildings throughout the area. The proposed location of the background well may be moved north of Site 1-N. This area appears to be wooded and free of military activity.

Site 28 - Hadnot Point Burn Dump

- No significant changes to the proposed scope of work were identified.

- Ray Wattras notified both the State and EPA that soil excavated during trenching would be backfilled as opposed to containerized due to the large quantity of soil that would result. Michelle Glenn and Peter Burger concurred that this appears to be reasonable. Michelle Glenn suggested looking at recent EPA guidance dealing with IDW disposal. Ray Wattras indicated that he was familiar with the IDW guidance.

- Michelle Glenn commented that the ecological evaluation of Cogdels Creek should summarize the results of other studies along Cogdels Creek that are being conducted as part of the RI/FS at Sites 24 and 78. The evaluation of Cogdels Creek during the Site 28 RI/FS would complete the entire watershed. Ray Wattras concurred that the ecological risk assessment report should take into account all of the studies along Cogdels Creek.

Site 30 - Sneads Ferry Road Fuel Tank Sludge Area

- The only change in scope involved the location of the background monitoring well. The well will be re-positioned farther north along Sneads Ferry Road so that the well configuration is more triangular for purposes of determining groundwater flow direction.

Site 35 - Camp Geiger Fuel Farm

- Most of the discussion on June 1 centered on the approach for conducting the RI/FS due to the fact that a highway is planned for construction over the site in the near future (actual construction will begin anywhere from one to three years).

- Various strategies for expediting cleanup were discussed such as conducting a remedial action under either a non-time critical removal, critical-time removal, or interim remedial action alternative. Baker will prepare a letter report evaluating the pros and cons of each cleanup strategy.

- Ray Wattras inquired about the approach for conducting a baseline human health risk assessment given that some action will be taken at the site (source removal) and the impact of contructing the highway over the site. Michelle Glenn stated that she will bring this matter to the attention of the risk assessment specialists at EPA Region IV.

- Dan Bonk suggested that the project plans for this site be prepared initially under the assumption that the RI/FS will be completed prior to the initiation of a removal action. That is, any field sampling proposed for the area within the boundaries of the impacted soil zone would be included in the project plans. This sampling associated analysis could be readily deleted at a later point in the project when it becomes more apparent as to the course of action that will be taken.