W

FOSTER WHEELER ENVIRONMENTAL CORPORATION

June 11, 2002 AFCEE.023-02X-011

Mr. Paul Baker Pacific Environmental 5001 S. Miami Blvd., Suite 300 Durham, NC 27703

Subject:

AFCEE Contract No. F41624-00-D-8025, Delivery Order 23

Camp Stanley Storage Activity, SWMU B-3 Post-Award Meeting Minutes

Ref:

CDRL B003

Dear Mr. Baker:

Enclosed is a copy of the final conference minutes from the Post-Award Meeting on May 17, 2002.

Should you have any questions regarding the minutes, please call me at 281-597-4821.

1 101

Frank P. Frey

Houston Operations Manager

FF/da

Enclosure

Cc: Teri DuPriest/ AFCEE/ERD (1 copy)

Brian Murphy/CSSA Base POC (1 copy)

Alice Blakey/AFCEE/MSCD (letter only)

Herminia C. Ruiz/ AFCEE HSW/PKVBB (letter only)

Brian Vanderglas/Parsons (1 copy)

Emily Sorrel/Pacific Environmental (1 copy)

Sina Seyedian/FWENC (1 copy)

Janet Stanley/FWENC (1 copy)

AFCEE Program File (1 copy)



Meeting Minutes SWMU B-3 Kick-Off Meeting Camp Stanley Storage Activity AFCEE Contract No. F41624-00-D-8025, Delivery Order 23

Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation

Date:

May 17, 2002

Time:

9:15 - 12:00

Place:

Camp Stanley Storage Activity, Boerne, Texas

Subject:

Project Kick-Off

Attendees:

Name	Company	Phone Number
Frank Frey	Foster Wheeler Environmental	281-597-4821
James Harden	Foster Wheeler Environmental	281-597-4827
Teri DuPriest	AFCEE/ERD	210-536-4745
Brian Murphy	CSSA 210-698-5208	
Jeff Aston	Corps of Engineers - CSSA	210-295-7451
Chris Beal	Worldwide Performance and Innovation - CSSA	210-295-7417
Brian Vanderglas	Parsons	512-719-6059
Kyle Caskey	Parsons	210-865-9629
Joe Fernando	Portage	210-805-7471

Minutes prepared by Frank Frey, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

A meeting agenda is in Attachment 1; a meeting sign-in sheet for this meeting is in Attachment 2.

Project Management

The meeting started at 9:15 with brief introductions and the circulation of a sign-in sheet. Project Management issues were the first items addressed. Progress reports are submitted monthly. During field work, Brian Murphy wants to have a field kick-off meeting with people working the site and a daily meeting with the field operations lead to briefly discuss the plan of day. At the conclusion of field operations each day, Brian Murphy wants to have a de-brief on the day's activities. Brian Murphy indicated that he did not need to be contacted routinely when field work was not on-going.

Parsons is responsible for preparation of a quarterly report describing all environmental activities at CSSA. Foster Wheeler will provide a brief summary of major activities performed during the reporting period and indicate work projected for the next quarter. The submittal will be in the form of a bullet list with important dates and submitted to Parsons for incorporation in their report. The next report is due for the period May 1 through July 31, 2002.

Appropriate contact and communications were discussed. Brian emphasized teaming among Foster Wheeler, Parsons, CSSA, and AFCEE as critical to the success of the project. Parsons has a significant amount of information about B-3 and surrounding sites, most of which is available on the Environmental Encyclopedia. General communication between Foster Wheeler and Parsons should be routed to Frank Frey and Brian Vanderglas. Kimberly Riley and Julie Burdey are contacts at Parsons for the Environmental Encyclopedia. Kyle Caskey should be contacted for information of field conditions, subcontractors, etc.

Teri DuPriest mentioned that the invoice address may be incorrect. She suggested that we closely follow payment on the first invoice and let her know if there is any delay.

Project Goal

The primary project goal is to secure closure of SWMU B-3 as a land-based unit under Texas RRR Standard 1 (closure to background).

Scope

Frank briefly summarized the scope of work. Major modifications mentioned were:

- Work plans will be issued as addenda.
- RFI will be limited to soil; no deep borings will be installed.
- No exploratory trenching will be performed; six borings will be installed in the two trenches to characterize their contents. An additional twelve borings will be installed outside the trenches to determine horizontal extent.
- Estimated volume of material to be excavated and disposed off-post is 8,000 CY (in-place).
- Of the excavated material 40% is assumed to be Class 1 non-hazardous waste; 60% is assumed to be Class 2 non-hazardous waste.
- Technology Review will not involve any bench or pilot scale testing; this will be a paper study only.
- The EMS task will not be started until after the interim remedial action is complete. The EMS will be limited to a needs analysis only.

Schedule

The original schedule submitted with the written proposal was distributed for discussion. The duration of the Interim Remedial Action (IRA) will need to be extended since the estimated volume of materials to be excavated was increased during the technical evaluation.

Brian Murphy and Kyle Caskey noted that we should avoid wet weather to the maximum extent practicable, which would cause a stop in work. The IRA should start by August. This greatly accelerates the project schedule. Brian Murphy committed CSSA to expedited government reviews (one or two weeks) of plans and reports to accommodate the schedule.

Project Plans: WP, HSP, SAP Addenda

It was agreed that project plan addenda should be short and not require exhaustive detail. Brian Vanderglas is the appropriate contact at Parsons for questions about the existing project plans. A DQO meeting was scheduled for June 4, from 9:30 – 4:00, which was rescheduled later for June 3, to further develop specifics for the project and any SAP addenda. Foster Wheeler will begin developing draft plans ahead of the scheduled DQO meeting. Brian Murphy agreed to send Frank a copy of the DQOs used on previous work (groundwater and Building 90) as a sample document.

RFI: Goals & Approach

The goal of the RFI is to determine the limits of excavation for the remedial action, and the characteristic of the excavated materials to be disposed off-post. The post has developed site-specific background metal concentrations that will be used to define the limits of excavation during the RFI for inorganic materials. IDW will be drummed, paletted and left on-site for disposal during the IRA.

IRA: Goals & Approach

Frank mentioned that the general approach was to excavate to the limits defined in the RFI, segregate according to characterization data and FID results from the RFI, then sample stockpiles for waste characterization. Brian Murphy mentioned that we should expect a significant amount of metal banding materials that will require an excavator with a thumb attachment to handle. On the adjacent trench, SWMU B-10, a great deal of metal banding material was encountered and segregated by shaking off the dirt prior to placement in roll-offs for recycling at a metal scrapper. Based on his experience at SWMU B-10, Kyle believed that the pits at B-3 were constructed by excavating with a dozer, which may have been constructed with a ramp at each end, with the deepest part near the center. Kyle thought the southern portion would be most likely to contain metal banding material and we could also expect to find empty ammo cans. Brian Murphy reiterated that UXO is not expected. Kyle suggested D-6 or similar type dozer be used in conjunction with the excavator.

Kyle thought that PCE concentrations were unlikely to be hazardous due to the small volume of material exhibiting high concentrations and volatilization may occur as a result of the excavation process.

Brian Murphy emphasized the need to adhere to post security requirements during the IRA. Security guards for the construction entrance must be arranged. If security guards are not available or hours are limited, access and egress will be limited as well. A complete list of drivers that will enter the facility is required. Drivers that do not appear on the list will be denied entry. All drivers must be U.S. citizens.

Brian Murphy stated that excavation and disposal should start in August to avoid the project extending into the typical rainy season.

Technology Review

Brian Murphy agreed this would be a paper study only. The results of the study would identify which technologies warrant further investigation, such as with bench or pilot scale testing. Brian Vanderglas noted that Parsons is currently performing a similar task for Building 90, and the technologies reviewed should be similar. Foster Wheeler and Parsons will coordinate on the technology review. Brian Murphy wanted the technology review completed prior to the remedial action, in case some testing or other useful tasks could be performed while the excavation is open.

EMS

Brian Murphy expressed reservations about Kevric performing the EMS. He suggested re-competing that portion of the work and recommended Zephyr as a potential bidder. Frank agreed to consider Zephyr for the task.

Submittals

The CDRL requires 16 hard copies and an electronic submittal of reports. Brian Vanderglas stated that 14 copies should be three-hole punched and put in a binder; the remaining two should be GBC bound. After some discussion, it was decided that Foster Wheeler will send one reproducible and one electronic copy of reports to Parsons for reproduction and distribution. A copy of the transmittal letter will be sent to AFCEE/ERD. An additional hard copy and electronic copy will go to Pacific Environmental for incorporation into the web site. Paul Baker and Emily Sorrell are points of contact for Pacific.

Areas of Potential Change

Frank noted that if the borings outside the pits are above background levels, we may need to install additional borings which are not budgeted. The most cost-effective approach is to install the borings while the equipment and personnel are mobilized. Foster Wheeler will note any additional borings on a Field Change Request and fax to Teri DuPriest. Brian Murphy and Teri DuPriest will concur with any additions before proceeding. Any additional cost will be discussed also.

Frank pointed out that the most serious potential for large cost impacts is from waste characterization. There is no budget for hazardous waste disposal and the cost differential between hazardous and non-hazardous wastes are significant. Should there be a significant increase in the quantity of materials classified as hazardous or Class 1, disposal cost could increase dramatically. Brian Murphy and Kyle thought the best mitigation was to stockpile the material, segregating the materials based on field screening tools (FID), and to characterize the soils from each pile.

Frank also noted that the disposal costs could increase if the volume of material increases. Brian Murphy thought the current estimated volume (8,000 CY in-place) was a good estimate and was not seriously concerned.

The risk of achieving RRR standard 1 was raised. If the pits are excavated to bedrock, and excavation sidewalls are still above background, the TNRCC may not approve a RRR Standard 1 closure. Brian Murphy and Kyle thought the appropriate mitigation was to leave the excavation exposed and then resample to meet the closure requirements. If

Camp Stanley Storag. Activity, SWMU B-3 Contract F41624-00-D-8025, Task Order 23

Meeting Minutes May 17, 2002

the results were still above background, or exceeded background for metals, we should consider whether additional materials can be excavated and if so, continue removing materials until a sample is obtained which does not exceed background. Should the results be slightly above the approved background levels then CSSA could potentially negotiate with the TNRCC to obtain closure through alternative means.

Frank pointed out that management of water may create changes on the project. Brian Murphy did not want Foster Wheeler to manage the water. Brian Vanderglas pointed out that pumping the water out may constitute generation of a hazardous waste. Brian Murphy preferred to allow the water to drain back into the formation should any accumulate during the excavation process. As this may take several days to over a week, a rain event will cause a delay in excavation activities. To minimize the potential for weather related delays, Brian Murphy wants to start excavation in August. Should water be encountered, Brian Vanderglas recommended that it be tested to determine if it is hazardous. If not hazardous, it could be pumped out and/or treated in the on-site GAC unit.

The meeting ended at 12:00.

ATTACHMENT 1

Camp Stanley Storage Activity, SWMU B-3 Contract F41624-00-D-8025, Delivery Order 23

Kick-Off Meeting Agenda

May 17, 2002

Introductions

Project Management

- Progress Reports
- Meetings
- Communication & Contact Info
- Invoice Requirements

Project Goal

Scope Modifications

Schedule

Project Plans: WP, HSP, SAP Addenda

- Content and Level of Quality
- Schedule

RFI: Goals & Approach

- Overburden only
- Limits of Excavation (volume)
- Waste Characterization

IRA: Goals & Approach

- Cleanup Criteria (RRR Std 1)
- Excavation, Segregation & Characterization
- Transportation & Disposal

Technology Review

- Paper study (no bench or pilot work)
- Identify technologies for bench/pilot evaluation
- Utilize data from GW investigation planned by Parsons & RFI

EMS

- Needs analysis only
- Not to start until after IRA complete

Areas of Potential Change

- RFI: additional borings to define background
- IRA: Volume & Waste Characteristics
- Achieving Std 1 closure if rock surface remains above background
- Water Management

ATTACHMENT 2

Camp Stanley Storage Activity, SWMU B-3 Contract F41624-00-D-8025, Delivery Order 23 Kick-Off Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Hame	- Company	Phone #
Frank Frey James Handen	Foster Wheeler Fosder Wheelen	231.597.4821
Bran Vanderglas Chris Beal	Parsons WPI	281-597-4827 (512) 719-6059
Joe Fernando Kyle CASKey	Portage	210-808-747/ 210-808-747/ 210-865-7623
Teri Dufriest BRIAN MURPHY	AFCEE/ERD CSSA	210-536-4745 210-698-5208
TEFF ASTON	CORPS OF ENGRS-CSSA	210-295-7451
		recipied and the same of the s