

M00263.AR.000628
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON TREATMENT OPTIONS FOR
NON-AQUEOUS PHASE LIQUID SOURCE ZONES AT SITE 45 DRY CLEANING FACILITY
SPILL AREA MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC
7/10/2008
U S EPA REGION IV

From: Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov
To: Singletary.Michael A CIV NAVFAC SE
Cc: AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov; Sanford.Art F CIV NAVFAC SE; barkerjs@dhec.sc.gov; Cook.Charles CIV NAVFAC SE; darrel.pittman@usmc.mil; Kelly.Taylor2@ch2m.com; Sladic.Mark; mmcrae@TechLawInc.com; timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil; Paul.Dahlen@asu.edu; koroma-llamas.lila@epa.gov
Subject: RE: FW: Organizing site visit for Parris Island
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2008 12:02:29 PM

Hi Mike,

I appreciate your response. I did not see this before I saw Charles's, so excuse my other email which appears as if I was not paying attention.

I still have concerns from what you say in that you state the potential for additional treatment, but appear to imply that would be in-situ. However, I have requested several times that we place a removal and ex-situ source zone treatment alternative in the FS and I am keeping an open mind to this until we select a remedy. I feel certain removal and ex-situ treatment would disrupt the study, to say the least. But my hope was that they simply are planning a short data gathering study that would be completed prior to us getting to the point of an additional action. We still have the FS, then PP, then RAWP to get thru before we could even get started. So to me, the schedule, clear expectations, and commitment to open minds are critical to a satisfactory outcome for both projects. I look forward to the call.

Thanks,
Lila

-----"Singletary, Michael A CIV NAVFAC SE" <michael.a.singletary@navy.mil> wrote: -----

To: Lila Koroma-Llamas/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, "Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE" <charles.cook2@navy.mil>, <AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov>, "Sanford, Art F CIV NAVFAC SE" <art.sanford@navy.mil>, <barkerjs@dhec.sc.gov>, "Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE" <charles.cook2@navy.mil>, <darrel.pittman@usmc.mil>, <Kelly.Taylor2@ch2m.com>, <mark.sladic@ttnus.com>, <mmcrae@TechLawInc.com>, <timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil>
From: "Singletary, Michael A CIV NAVFAC SE" <michael.a.singletary@navy.mil>
Date: 07/09/2008 10:11PM
cc: <Paul.Dahlen@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: FW: Organizing site visit for Parris Island

Hi Lila,

The proposal that was sent to the team was the generic proposal that went to ESTCP as part of the selection process, and only had a generic list of potential demonstration sites. I've worked with Paul Dahlen of ASU to identify potential sites within NAVFAC SE's area of responsibility. Site 45 at PI is a good candidate site as part of the research project is looking at source zone natural attenuation of post treatment residuals. The partial treatment of the source zone at Site 45 with the emulsified zero-valent iron falls into this category. In addition, ASU may look at how implementation of further treatment would accelerate natural attenuation of the source area.

As far as I know, Site 45 is on the list as a demonstration site for this project. ASU is developing a demonstration plan, which the project team will have the opportunity to review and provide input. The plan is to still run this site through the FS process and select a remedy that will likely include some active treatment. In parallel, we will evaluate natural attenuation of the source zone (as part of the ASU ESTCP project) through data collection and analysis and further refinement of our

conceptual site model. I don't see the ESTCP project delaying selection and implementation of the remedy at Site 45. Natural attenuation will no doubt be a component of the remedy at Site 45, as it usually plays a role in polishing residual contamination. Whatever in situ treatment technology we implement at Site 45, we'll not remove all contamination and we'll have to rely on natural attenuation as part of the treatment train. As I'm sure you're aware, natural attenuation is very promising at Site 45 based on the significant reduction in plume concentrations along the groundwater flow path and the presence of dechlorinating microorganisms in groundwater.

You bring up very good points in your email below. Look forward to yours and the rest of the team's input as the demonstration plan is developed and planning for the field work begins.

Thanks,
Mike

Mike Singletary, P.E.

NAVFAC Southeast
P.O. Box 30, Bldg. 2
EV3 Environmental Restoration
Naval Air Station
Jacksonville, FL 32212-0030
Phone - 904.542.4261 Fax - 904.542.6833
michael.a.singletary@navy.mil

From: Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wed 7/9/2008 4:51 PM

To: Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE; AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov; Sanford, Art F CIV NAVFAC SE; barkerjs@dhec.sc.gov; Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE; darrel.pittman@usmc.mil; Kelly.Taylor2@ch2m.com; mark.sladic@ttnus.com; mmcrae@TechLawInc.com; timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil

Cc: Paul.Dahlen@asu.edu; Singletary, Michael A CIV NAVFAC SE

Subject: Re: FW: Organizing site visit for Parris Island

Hi folks,

I am a little confused on what is being proposed here. We are not on the list in the plan. I put a call into Paul this morning and have not heard back. For fear of forgetting to follow thru on this I thought I would go ahead and just jot my thoughts down on this while I can, without the benefits of having answers to my questions. So forgive me if I am way off base.....

General Comments:

- 1) The report does not list PI as a potential site. What makes us think it is? Other than Paul asking for a contact for logistics for his site visit.....
- 2) In the potential site descriptions it sounds as if being a site with no future action anticipated is a plus for Paul. I could not put us in that category. We have not even started the FS. An action will likely still be taken, and I would hate to see it delayed due to waiting on data collection efforts to end.
- 3) However, it depends on the timing of data collection. The schedule in this plan appears to be ending by 4th qtr 2009, which would likely be