

N42237.AR.000437  
NSB KINGS BAY  
5090.3a

LETTER FROM NAVY INVITING REPRESENTATIVES FROM GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF  
NATURAL RESOURCES TO PARTICIPATE IN SITE 11 PROJECT TEAM MEETING ON 16  
JUNE 1998 NSB KINGS BAY GA  
6/10/1998  
NSB KINGS BAY

31547-000  
09.01.00.0132

5090  
Ser FE4/1582  
10 JUN 1998

CERTIFIED MAIL  
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Bruce Khaleghi  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
Environmental Protection Division  
205 Butler Street, SE, Suite 1252  
Atlanta, GA 30334

Subject: **Site 11 Kings Bay Team Meeting and Meeting Summary, Restoration  
Advisory Board Meeting, April 7, 1998, Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay,  
Georgia**

Dear Mr. Khaleghi:

The Site 11 Kings Bay Team would like to invite your Mr. Billy Hendricks and Ms. Madeleine Kellam to attend a Site 11 Team Meeting on June 16, 1998 at the United States Geological Survey office in Atlanta, Georgia. Enclosure (1) is a draft agenda for this meeting. Please feel free to suggest changes to this agenda. Also attached, as enclosure (2), is the Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes of April 7, 1998.

The SUBASE Kings Bay point of contact on this matter is Ms. Rhonda L. Bath, (912) 673-2001, extension 1217. Please address all correspondence to "Commanding Officer, 1063 USS Tennessee Avenue, Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, GA 31547-2606."

Sincerely,

---

JOHN R. GARNER  
Leader, Environmental Division  
Facilities & Environmental  
By direction of the  
Commanding Officer

cc:  
Anthony Robinson  
ENS Rader  
Dominique Broadus  
✓Herman Bauer  
Chris Leeth

**Site 11 Kings Bay Team Meeting  
June 16, 1998 Atlanta, Georgia**

- 0830-1000 Address DRAFT NOD Deficiencies.  
#7 Bechtel - Sam Ross (Irrigation Well Sampling Results)  
#8 USGS - Dr. Chapelle
- 1000-1015 Break.
- 1015-1115 Update on Remediation Implementation.  
(Recovery Well Installation, Schedule, Injection Permit, etc.)
- 1115-1145 Open Discussion.

Remediation Advisory Board Minutes  
April 07, 1998  
SITE 11 OLD CAMDEN COUNTY LANDFILL

Ensign Dan Grimsbo introduced attendees and offered copy of last meeting minutes. He introduced the speakers for the evening and explained this meeting will address the results of US Geological Survey (USGS) last round of testing and the draft Corrective Action Plan (CAP) we intend to send to the State of Georgia on or before April 28, 1988 for State approval.

Sam Ross, Bechtel engineer, summarized the CAP. He addressed identification and selection of alternatives to remediated Site 11. He pointed out the areas of concern the alternatives should address such as source area, area downgradient from source and across spur 40. The Alternatives considered were No Action, Monitored Natural Attenuation, Groundwater Removal with UV/OX Treatment and Groundwater Removal with UV/OX and In-Situ Chemical Oxidation. Evaluation criteria are protection of the environment, short and long term effectiveness, productive toxicity value, implement ability and cost. Last mentioned alternative is the preferred alternative.

Chris Leeth of USGS described investigation to pinpoint source area. He explained use of geoprobe to identify major source areas. He explained the problem was PCE and daughter products. They found hot spots but could not identify cause.

Chris Bergren of Bechtel explained in-situ oxidation as utilized at the Savannah River Site to remediate perchloroethane. He explained the overall problem there and how they reduced the PCE by 94% in one week. He recommended this treatment at Site 11.

---

Frank Chapelle of USGS discussed monitored natural attenuation. He explained the site is attenuating naturally very good but not good enough to use as the only clean up technology. He described the attenuation process PCE to TCE to DCE to VCL to CO2. The problem is to reduce the source enough to meet the clean up goals at the property line of the subdivision which are Maximum Cleanup Levels for drinking water. He explained how if the source is removed down to about 100mg/l for total VOCs the site will clean

up naturally on its own and meet the clean up criteria at the subdivision property line. The installed wells would continue to clean up the site but the in-situ is intended to clean it up faster.

There were a number of questions from the audience as follows:

1) Why can't we just dig it up? The engineers explained why this was not feasible and the problem must be remediated in the ground.

2) When will the chemical oxidation start? The engineers explained it will start in about one year.

3) One person expressed frustration because clean up is taking so long. The engineers explained we are moving as fast as we can at this point.

Billy Hendricks from the Georgia Environmental Protection Division mentioned how they will have to hold a public hearing on the CAP.

The RAB generally agreed to try to hold another meeting before September but earlier if new information came to light.

RAB adjourned.