

**DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVES NO. 3  
MEETING MINUTES  
CONSTRUCT OF OUTFALL REUSE SYSTEM,  
ABOVEGROUND STORAGE TANK (AST) RELOCATION,  
AND INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS AT AOC-65 AND SWMU B-3  
CAMP STANLEY STORAGE ACTIVITY, TEXAS  
FA8903-04-D-8675/DELIVERY ORDER 0006  
PARSONS 744223.01000**

Date: Thursday, 04 August 2005  
 Time: 8:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.  
 Place: Camp Stanley Storage Activity (CSSA)  
 Subject: Data needs to address completion of various project tasks

Attendees:

Attendee	Organization	Phone
Glare Sanchez	CSSA ENV	(210) 698-5208
Jeff Aston	USACE	(210) 336-1270
Chris Beal	Portage	(210) 336-1171
Joe Fernando	Portage	
Ely Wright	CSSA	(210) 336-0077
Brian Vanderglas	Parsons	(512) 719-6059
Henry Dress*	Parsons	(512) 719-6063
Eric North	Parsons	(512) 719-6054
Scott Pearson	Parsons	(512) 719-6087
Eric Tennyson	Parsons	(210) 396-0136

\*Minutes prepared by Eric North and Brian Vanderglas, Parsons.

**INTRODUCTIONS AND TO 0006 REQUIREMENTS**

The meeting was conducted by Brian Vanderglas and Henry Dress. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss data needs, technical requirements, and issues in relation to completing each of the required project tasks. The meeting opened with a short discussion on the AST upgrade and Outfall 001 issues. This discussion was conducted from 8:30 A.M. - 9:45 A.M and attendance was limited only to those most involved with this portion of the project. After a 15-minute break, the meeting reconvened to discuss project DQOs. Meeting notes are included on the attached pages.

## MEETING NOTES

(Thursday, August 4, 2005)

### 1. OUTFALL 001 AND AST UPGRADE DISCUSSIONS

This portion of the meeting was conducted by Henry Dress and attended by Brian Vanderglas, Eric North, Chris Beal, Jeff Aston, Kyle Caskey, and Ely Wright. The Outfall 001 issues were discussed first. The main points that were covered during this discussion include:

- Eliminating the chlorine tank and going to another treatment alternative, such as ultraviolet (UV) light or bleach.
- Addition of a supplied-air breathing cylinder to the outfall housing.
- Addition of another ventilation fan to the outfall housing.
- Deciding what items to include in the AST upgrade rebid.
- Going with a 10,000-gallon diesel tank.

The main issues surrounding the chlorine gas tanks were safety-related. Due to the hazardous nature of the chlorine gas, several items were discussed to make operating and changing the tanks safer.

Ely stated that the outfall water was only requiring 1 to 2 pounds/day of chlorine and that a chlorine supply tank lasted about 3-4 months between change outs. Ely also said that the tank change out is somewhat of a guess because she doesn't have a sure way of knowing when a tank is completely empty. Possible ways to increase the safety of dealing with the chlorine tanks is to install a supplied-air breathing cylinder in the outfall housing for use during any activities that take place in the outfall housing. Additional safeguards that were discussed include installation of a gas detector and addition of a new ventilation fan.

The idea of replacing the chlorine tanks with a safer alternative was discussed, specifically UV light and bleach. Henry Dress explained that both could work, but UV light would require higher energy and maintenance costs, while bleach would require handling larger volumes of treatment materials and a system to mix the bleach with the effluent. It is likely that about 1 gallon/day of bleach would be necessary for treatment. CSSA requested that Parsons prepare an alternatives evaluation letter comparing commonly practiced disinfection technologies for the outfall.

AST upgrade issues composed a small portion of the discussions. Switching from a 2,000 gallon diesel tank to a 10,000-gallon tank was discussed, along with the issue of installing a vapor recovery system for the AST. Henry Dress explained that the initial bid produced no compliant bids and the one subcontractor that produced a bid was \$40K higher than our original estimate. He also mentioned that the bidders were concerned about the testing requirements for vapor recovery and the difficulty in successfully modifying the existing ASTs with a vapor recovery system.

### 2. DQOS

Brian Vanderglas took over at this point in the meeting to lead each of the DQO discussions. A brief introduction was presented on the project as a whole to explain how the SVE system, bioreactor, and Westbay wells function. Glare Sanchez and Joe Fernando attended the DQO discussions. Since Glare was unable to attend the AST/Outfall portion of the meeting, Brian gave a short summary of what was discussed. Glare Sanchez stated that the vapor recovery requirement should be removed from the design, and the AST upgrade should be recompleted. Parsons indicated that they would perform a search to identify at least two additional first to ensure that a compliant bid would be received.

### **SVE O&M**

The SVE O&M discussion covered two slides of information. Brian discussed the SVE process as a whole and the status of the AOC-65 and B-3 systems. The AOC-65 system recovery rates have dropped to 25-30 pounds/year and the B-3 system is currently not operational.

Brian discussed the need to get back into Building 90 to check the AOC-65 system and the need to get the B-3 blower motor replaced. Brian also discussed the monitoring schedule for the SVE systems, including the sampling routine and methodology. CSSA did not raise any issues concerning the SVE sampling details.

### **SVE Expansion**

The SVE expansion discussion covered seven slides of information. Topics discussed included:

- Types of data collected during project
- Reasoning for proposed well locations
- Current B-3 SVE setup and future location of bioreactor
- Well completion depths
- Sustainable rates and performance data for SVE system

CSSA did not raise any issues or objections to the information presented.

### **Enhanced Bio Treatability Study**

The enhanced bio treatability study discussion covered eight slides of information. Gary Cobb led most of the discussions during this portion of the DQO meeting. Topics discussed included:

- Where the preliminary injection well location has moved and why
- Groundwater gradients in the area and their impact on proposed injection well location
- Desired injection interval is 20-30 ft in thickness
- Types of tracers that can be injected into the formation
- Indicator parameters that will show that the bioreactor is working

CSSA did not raise any issues or objections to the information presented. Ms. Sanchez and Chris Beal requested additional info on the breakdown processes that will occur in the bioreactor. Gary agreed to post two publications on CSSA's ftp site for review.

At the conclusion of this section of the meeting, Joe Fernando had to leave. Therefore, a short discussion of screening versus definitive data was conducted before Joe exited the meeting. The discussion determined the following points:

- Definitive data should always follow CSSA QAPP
- Collect one or two duplicate samples during first round of phospholipids sampling since the test method is not routinely practiced, and
- Collect Westbay samples at the well-head

### **Pumping Test**

The pumping test discussion covered one slide of information. Ms. Sanchez and Joe Fernando exited the meeting at this time and did not return. Scott Pearson led the discussion of the pumping test plans. The discussion was short, with the main topic concerning the usefulness of the data. Scott explained that this test will provide valuable data to understand the confining characteristics of the Bexar Shale. A slide was presented showing drawdown data from RFR-10 to help explain the type of data we are expecting to see from this pumping test.

Scott also explained how TSU is involved in the study and how they will provide numeric modeling of the data.

Parsons recommended that a pumping test also be performed on the Lower Glen Rose formation in addition to the Cow Creek Formation described in the technical approach to optimize the use of the pumping test equipment rentals and set up to obtain data that would be helpful in further defining the conceptual groundwater flow in the vicinity of SWMU B-3.

### **B-3 Removal Action and Construction**

A short discussion of the SWMU B-3 removal action was led by Mr. Vanderglas and covered three slides of information. The main topic covered here was the reuse of the excavated overburden material. The conclusion was that the TCEQ and the EPA would ultimately be involved in deciding the sampling frequency and required analyses for reuse of the overburden material, but that Parsons would prepare recommendations for their consideration.

### **Bioreactor O&M**

This short discussion was led by Mr. Vanderglas on the Bioreactor O&M wbs task. The topics covered included:

- Westbay measurements (pressure and bioindicator parameters)
- Piezometer data in bioreactor to monitor effectiveness
- Analytical data from Well 16 inflow

CSSA did not raise any issues or objections to the information presented.

**FOLLOW-UP ISSUES AND ACTION ITEMS**

- Add documents on enhanced anaerobic bioremediation to CSSA ftp site
- Contact the TCEQ and EPA concerning reuse of overburden material, prepare presentation material of all existing data and information for characterizing SWMU B-3, and
- Perform recomplete procurement for AST upgrade
- Prepare alternative evaluation letter for Outfall 01 reuse and determine most appropriate disinfection approach for the effluent.