6966-3.2-192

Brown & Root Environmental

Foster Plaza VII 0032
661 Andersen Drive
Pittsburgh, PA 15220-2745

(412) 921-7090
FAX: (412) 921-4040

C-49-02-6-273

February 26, 1996

TO: DISTRIBUTION

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62467-94-D-0888
Contract Task Order No. 0003

Subject: Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Fridley, Minnesota
OU3 Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, and Record of Decision
January 11, 1996 Meeting Minutes

As directed by the Navy, per reference contract, attached are minutes from the January 11, 1996 meeting to discuss the Draft OU3 Remedial Investigation Work Plan.

Please contact me at (412) 921-8195 or Mark Perry at (412) 921-7217 if you have any questions or comments.

Very truly yours,

Mark T. Perry for

Kevin F. Donnelly, P.E.
Task Order Manager

KFD/dt

Enclosure

Distribution
Scott Glass, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
David Cabiness, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
Kerry Morrow, NAVSEA
John Aubert, NAVSEA
Tom Bloom, U.S.EPA
Dave Douglas, MPCA
John Betcher, MPCA
Mark Ferrey, MPCA
Paul Estuesta, MPCA
Luke Charpentier, MPCA
Eric Gredell, RMT

c: Project File 6966
K. Donnelly
M. Perry

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Topics

Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant (NIROP) Fridley Operable Unit (OU) 3 Remedial Investigation (RI) Draft Work Plan.

Meeting Date and Time

January 11, 1996 from 1:00 to 5:00.

Meeting Location

NIROP Fridley, MN.

Meeting Attendees

Scott Glass	Southern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM)
David Cabiness	SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
Kerry Morrow	Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA)
John Aubert	NAVSEA
Tom Bloom	United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA)
Dave Douglas	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
John Betcher	MPCA
Mark Ferrey	MPCA
Paul Estuesta	MPCA
Luke Charpentier	MPCA
Kevin Donnelly	Brown & Root Environmental (B&R Environmental)
Mark Perry	B&R Environmental
Eric Gredell	RMT

Discussion Summary

1. The Navy issued a letter stating their position on the OU2/OU3 combination and Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) issues that were raised by MPCA in letters dated August 4 and August 30, 1995.

2. The U.S.EPA was concerned that the Draft Work Plan did not follow the required format as outlined in the FFA. The U.S.EPA and MPCA stated that the Navy met the Draft Work Plan submittal date specified as part of an enforcement settlement. However, the U.S.EPA and MPCA are requesting that the Navy resubmit the Draft Work Plan in a different format. A pre-QAPP meeting (as required in the FFA) will be held to agree upon the appropriate format. The U.S.EPA agreed to issue a letter explaining the rationale for the resubmittal. The Navy will be required to resubmit the Draft Work Plan 30 days from the date of the final letter requiring resubmittal or 30 days after the pre-QAPP meeting.

3. The Navy stated that they intended to follow the recent U.S.EPA Data Quality Objective (DQO) process guidance during Work Plan development. The Navy proposed to present the DQO process guidance at the pre-QAPP meeting.

4. The MPCA formally requested that the Navy investigate the United Defense property. The MPCA considers the Navy the operator for the entire site. The Navy pointed to the definition contained in the FFA which indicates the investigation is for the "Navy-owned" portion of the facility. The Navy does not plan to investigate the United Defense portion of the facility unless it is determined that a contaminant plume from the Navy's property has migrated to the United Defense property. The Navy suggested that the MPCA pursue United Defense to complete an investigation of the United Defense property.

5. The Navy plans to have Pete Haene from the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) visit NIROP Fridley the week of January 22, 1996, to discuss the benefits and limitations of geophysical investigation techniques (e.g., seismic imaging) that could support the characterization of the subsurface lithology at the NIROP.

6. The MPCA questioned why a broader suite of analysis was not specified at sumps where only volatile organic compound (VOC) analysis was proposed in the Draft Work Plan. The Navy explained the rationale for only conducting VOC analysis at these sumps in Phase I. The MPCA will consider the Navy's explanation during their Draft Work Plan review.