

FINAL



FORSUM

## **CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN**

**FOR THE**



3d Inf Div (Mech)

# **3d ENGINEERING BRIGADE, NORTHWEST OF BUILDING 1340 (SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 27F) AT FORT STEWART MILITARY RESERVATION FORT STEWART, GEORGIA**

Prepared for



**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
SAVANNAH DISTRICT**

Contract No. DACA21-95-D-0022  
Delivery Order 0078

**July 2002**



FINAL

**CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN  
FOR THE  
3d ENGINEERING BRIGADE, NORTHWEST OF BUILDING 1340  
(SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 27F)  
AT  
FORT STEWART MILITARY RESERVATION  
FORT STEWART, GEORGIA**

REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act  
40 *CFR* 264, Title II, Subpart C, Section 3004;  
42 USC 6901 et seq.

Prepared for  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Savannah District  
Under Contract DACA21-95-D-0022  
Delivery Order Number 0078

Prepared by  
Science Applications International Corporation  
800 Oak Ridge Turnpike  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

July 2002

The undersigned certifies that I am a qualified groundwater scientist who has received a baccalaureate or postgraduate degree in the natural sciences or engineering and have sufficient training and experience in groundwater hydrology and related fields, as demonstrated by state registration and completion of accredited university courses, to enable me to make sound professional judgments regarding groundwater monitoring and contaminant fate and transport. I further certify that this report was prepared by myself or by a subordinate working under my direction.

  
Patricia Stoll, P.E.  
Technical Manager  
Science Applications International Corporation



**SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION**

contributed to the preparation of this document and should not  
be considered an eligible contractor for its review.

# CONTENTS

|                                                                                        |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| FIGURES .....                                                                          | v    |
| TABLES.....                                                                            | v    |
| ACRONYMS .....                                                                         | vi   |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION .....                                                                 | 1-1  |
| 1.1 SCOPE OF THE CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN .....                                          | 1-1  |
| 1.2 SITE BACKGROUND .....                                                              | 1-2  |
| 1.3 REGULATORY BACKGROUND .....                                                        | 1-2  |
| 1.4 REPORT ORGANIZATION .....                                                          | 1-3  |
| 2.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION.....                                                         | 2-1  |
| 2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY.....                                                  | 2-1  |
| 2.1.1 Phase I RCRA Facility Investigation Activities.....                              | 2-1  |
| 2.1.2 Phase II RCRA Facility Investigation Activities.....                             | 2-5  |
| 2.2 TOPOGRAPHY/PHYSIOGRAPHY/CLIMATE .....                                              | 2-5  |
| 2.3 SITE GEOLOGY .....                                                                 | 2-5  |
| 2.4 SITE SOIL.....                                                                     | 2-6  |
| 2.5 SITE HYDROLOGY .....                                                               | 2-6  |
| 2.6 ECOLOGY .....                                                                      | 2-6  |
| 2.7 CONTAMINANT NATURE AND EXTENT .....                                                | 2-9  |
| 2.7.1 Surface Soil .....                                                               | 2-9  |
| 2.7.2 Subsurface Soil.....                                                             | 2-11 |
| 2.7.3 Groundwater.....                                                                 | 2-11 |
| 2.8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PHASE II RFI.....                           | 2-12 |
| 2.9 SUPPLEMENTAL DATA EVALUATION .....                                                 | 2-13 |
| 2.10 SITE-RELATED CONSTITUENTS FROM PHASE II AND SUPPLEMENTAL<br>DATA EVALUATION ..... | 2-15 |
| 2.11 CONTAMINANT FATE AND TRANSPORT .....                                              | 2-15 |
| 2.11.1 Generic Soil Screening Analysis .....                                           | 2-15 |
| 2.11.2 Fate and Transport Modeling .....                                               | 2-15 |
| 2.12 PRELIMINARY RISK EVALUATION.....                                                  | 2-16 |
| 2.12.1 Human Health Preliminary Risk Evaluation .....                                  | 2-16 |
| 2.12.2 Ecological Preliminary Risk Evaluation .....                                    | 2-16 |
| 2.13 BASELINE HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT .....                                       | 2-17 |
| 2.14 CONCLUSIONS AND ESTIMATED EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION .....                           | 2-18 |
| 2.15 MODELING FOR EVALUATING MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION .....                       | 2-20 |
| 3.0 JUSTIFICATION AND PURPOSE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION .....                               | 3-1  |
| 3.1 PURPOSE .....                                                                      | 3-1  |
| 3.2 REMEDIAL RESPONSE OBJECTIVES .....                                                 | 3-1  |
| 3.3 IDENTIFICATION OF REMEDIAL LEVELS.....                                             | 3-1  |
| 4.0 SCREENING OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.....                                               | 4-1  |
| 4.1 SCREENING CRITERIA .....                                                           | 4-1  |
| 4.1.1 Effectiveness .....                                                              | 4-1  |
| 4.1.2 Implementability .....                                                           | 4-1  |
| 4.1.3 Cost.....                                                                        | 4-9  |
| 4.2 EVALUATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES.....                                  | 4-9  |



|       |                                                        |      |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 4.2.1 | Surface Soil .....                                     | 4-9  |
| 4.2.2 | Groundwater .....                                      | 4-9  |
| 4.3   | CORRECTIVE ACTION ALTERNATIVES .....                   | 4-10 |
| 4.3.1 | Evaluation Factors .....                               | 4-10 |
| 4.3.2 | Evaluation of Corrective Action Alternatives .....     | 4-11 |
| 5.0   | CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN .....        | 5-1  |
| 5.1   | SELECTED CORRECTIVE ACTION .....                       | 5-1  |
| 5.1.1 | Justification for Selection of Corrective Action ..... | 5-1  |
| 5.2   | CONCEPTUAL DESIGN .....                                | 5-2  |
| 5.2.1 | Establishment of Institutional Controls .....          | 5-3  |
| 5.2.2 | Monitored Natural Attenuation of Surface Soil .....    | 5-3  |
| 5.2.3 | Monitored Natural Attenuation of Groundwater .....     | 5-3  |
| 5.2.4 | Well Abandonment .....                                 | 5-5  |
| 5.3   | OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE PLAN .....                  | 5-5  |
| 5.4   | LIFE-CYCLE COST ESTIMATE .....                         | 5-5  |
| 5.5   | IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE .....                          | 5-5  |
| 5.2   | REPORTS .....                                          | 5-6  |
| 5.2.1 | Corrective Action Plan Progress Report .....           | 5-6  |
| 5.2.2 | Corrective Action Completion Report .....              | 5-6  |
| 5.3   | IMPLEMENTATION PLAN .....                              | 5-6  |
| 6.0   | REFERENCES .....                                       | 6-1  |

## APPENDICES

|   |                                                                                                |     |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A | FATE AND TRANSPORT MODELING .....                                                              | A-1 |
| B | COST ESTIMATE SUMMARIES FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION ALTERNATIVES .....                               | B-1 |
| C | OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE PLAN .....                                                          | C-1 |
| D | IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION<br>OF CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN ..... | D-1 |

## FIGURES

|     |                                                                                                                              |      |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 2-1 | Regional Location Map for Fort Stewart Military Reservation, Georgia .....                                                   | 2-2  |
| 2-2 | Location Map for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                                                                  | 2-3  |
| 2-3 | Site Features and Phase II RFI Sampling Locations at SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                              | 2-4  |
| 2-4 | Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map for Shallow Wells (May 2001), SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....               | 2-7  |
| 2-5 | Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map for Deep Wells (May 2001), SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                  | 2-8  |
| 2-6 | Supplemental Sampling Locations for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                                               | 2-14 |
| 2-7 | Estimated Areas of Potential Soil and Groundwater Contamination, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                   | 2-19 |
| 4-1 | Alternative 1: Monitored Natural Attenuation for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                                   | 4-15 |
| 4-2 | Alternative 2: Monitored Natural Attenuation and Specialized Bacteria Addition for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340..... | 4-17 |
| 4-3 | Alternative 3: Excavation and Enhanced Bioremediation for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                         | 4-19 |
| 5-1 | Corrective Action Schedule, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                                                        | 5-7  |

## TABLES

|     |                                                                                                                           |      |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 2-1 | Summary of Site-Related Contaminants, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                                          | 2-10 |
| 2-2 | Remedial Levels for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                                               | 2-18 |
| 2-3 | Remedial Levels for Surface Soil, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                                               | 2-18 |
| 3-1 | Recommended Remedial Levels in Soil and Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                           | 3-2  |
| 4-1 | Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Soil, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 .....                        | 4-2  |
| 4-2 | Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                  | 4-4  |
| 4-3 | Corrective Action Alternatives, Implementation Time, and Costs for Remediation, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340..... | 4-12 |
| 5-1 | Estimated Cost for Selected Alternative for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340.....                                     | 5-5  |

## ACRONYMS

|        |                                                        |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| amsl   | above mean sea level                                   |
| AT123D | Analytical Transient 1-, 2-, 3-Dimensional             |
| bgs    | below ground surface                                   |
| BHHRA  | baseline human health risk assessment                  |
| CAP    | Corrective Action Plan                                 |
| CFR    | Code of Federal Regulations                            |
| CMCOPC | contaminant migration constituent of potential concern |
| COC    | constituent of concern                                 |
| COPC   | constituent of potential concern                       |
| CY     | calendar year                                          |
| DO     | dissolved oxygen                                       |
| DPT    | direct-push technology                                 |
| ECOPC  | ecological constituent of potential concern            |
| EPA    | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency                   |
| EPRE   | ecological preliminary risk evaluation                 |
| ESV    | ecological screening value                             |
| FSMR   | Fort Stewart Military Reservation                      |
| GEPD   | Georgia Environmental Protection Division              |
| GSSL   | generic soil screening level                           |
| HHCOCC | human health constituent of concern                    |
| HHCOPC | human health constituent of potential concern          |
| HHPRE  | human health preliminary risk evaluation               |
| HQ     | hazard quotient                                        |
| ID     | inside diameter                                        |
| MCL    | maximum contaminant level                              |
| NTU    | nephelometric turbidity unit                           |
| O&M    | operations and maintenance                             |
| OSWER  | Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response           |
| OVS    | oil/water separator                                    |
| PVC    | polyvinyl chloride                                     |
| RBC    | risk-based concentration                               |
| RCRA   | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act                 |
| Redox  | oxidation-reduction potential                          |
| RFI    | RCRA facility investigation                            |
| SESOIL | Seasonal Soil Compartment                              |
| SRC    | site-related constituent                               |
| SVOC   | semivolatile organic compound                          |
| SWMU   | solid waste management unit                            |
| TRV    | toxicity reference value                               |
| VOC    | volatile organic compound                              |

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 SCOPE OF THE CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 27F, northwest of Building 1340, is one of two oil/water separators (OWSs) that support the vehicle maintenance activities of the 3d Engineer Brigade and one of 32 OWSs distributed across 29 sites that support the vehicle maintenance facilities within the garrison area. A Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facility investigation (RFI) report has been completed for SWMU 27F, and the results were reported in the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report for 16 SWMUs (SAIC 2000). With the concurrence of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GEPD), the revised final Phase II RFI report recommended that a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) be developed for SWMU 27F to address human health constituents of concern (HHCOCs) in groundwater (benzene) and soil [benzo(a)pyrene].

The conclusions and recommendations listed below were made based on the results of the Phase II RFI [see Chapter 11.0 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000)].

- The nature and extent of soil contamination at the site were determined during the Phase II RFI activities, and the information gathered is sufficient for development of a CAP.
- Benzo(a)pyrene was identified as an HHCOC in surface soil. Benzo(a)pyrene was detected above its remedial level in only one (MW10) of the 11 surface soil samples collected at the site. It was not detected in the surface soil collected from MW11, the deep well located adjacent to MW10. Benzo(a)pyrene was not identified as a contaminant migration constituent of potential concern (CMCOPC), indicating that it is not likely to migrate to groundwater. The extent of benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil is confined to a single location near the OWS and the heavily used vehicle maintenance facility. This limited surface soil contamination does not represent widespread contamination and is probably the result of the operations of the maintenance facility rather than a release from the OWS. The OWS is located within a fenced, active maintenance area. The extent of benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil has been defined by the Phase II RFI, and no additional investigation and/or evaluation is required. A remedial level of 0.89 mg/kg was recommended for benzo(a)pyrene in soil.
- Benzene was identified as an HHCOC in groundwater. A remedial level of 5 µg/L was recommended for benzene in groundwater.
- Fort Stewart recommended that a CAP be developed for SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340, and submitted to GEPD in accordance with a schedule to be determined by the Director [Condition IV.E.2 of Fort Stewart's Hazardous Waste Facility Permit #HW-045(S&T)], if this recommendation was approved. The purpose of the CAP would be to determine the appropriate corrective action(s) to remediate benzo(a)pyrene in soil and benzene in groundwater to the proposed remedial levels.

This CAP report uses information from the Phase I and Phase II RFIs to evaluate institutional controls and various remedial actions for achieving the remedial levels proposed in Section 10.7 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000). The options analyzed for achieving the stated remedial levels included an evaluation of monitored natural attenuation in



accordance with the published guidance document (EPA 1999). This report analyzes the feasibility of applicable remedial actions, monitored natural attenuation, and institutional controls on a site-specific basis.

This report has been prepared by Science Applications International Corporation for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District, under Contract No. DACA21-95-D-0022, Delivery Order No. 0078.

## **1.2 SITE BACKGROUND**

A Phase I RFI was conducted at SWMU 27F in 1998 to determine if a release to the environment had occurred. Direct-push technology (DPT) techniques were used to collect four soil and groundwater samples at the site. The four soil samples were collected based on field headspace screening for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The soil and groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs, semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and lead. The results of the Phase I RFI [see the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) for these results] indicated a release to the environment had occurred, and a Phase II RFI was recommended.

The objectives for the Phase II RFI, as defined by the work plan (SAIC 1997) approved by GEPD on October 10, 1997, were as follows:

- determine the horizontal and vertical extents of contamination;
- determine whether contaminants present a threat to human health or the environment;
- determine the need for future action and/or no further action; and
- gather data necessary to support a CAP, if warranted.

The scope of the Phase II RFI fieldwork performed in October 1999 included the activities listed below.

- Collection of soil samples during monitoring well installation.
- Installation of permanent groundwater monitoring wells both upgradient and downgradient of the site.
- Groundwater sampling at newly installed monitoring wells around SWMU 27F.
- Surveying of the positions of all sample locations.

## **1.3 REGULATORY BACKGROUND**

The regulatory authority governing the action at SWMU 27F at Fort Stewart is Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 264, Title II, Subpart C, Section 3004 (Title 42, United States Code, Part 690 et seq.). With the promulgation of RCRA and the subsequent approval of the Georgia Hazardous Waste Management Act by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the state was granted RCRA permitting authority. In accordance with RCRA, the state issued a Hazardous Waste Permit [Georgia Environmental Division Permit HW-045 (S&T)] to Fort Stewart in August 1987. The permit was renewed in August 1997. The 3d Engineer Brigade, northwest of Building 1340, (SWMU 27F) is a listed SWMU in Appendix A of Fort Stewart's Subpart B Permit and, therefore, is subject to investigation according to 40 CFR 264.101(c) [as reported in Section 10.15 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report dated April 2000 (SAIC 2000)] and to corrective action (the subject of this CAP), if necessary.

## **1.4 REPORT ORGANIZATION**

This CAP consists of six sections. Chapter 1.0 summarizes the scope of the CAP, describes the background of the site and regulatory authority, and gives the report's organization. Chapter 2.0 discusses the site characterization and RFI results and summarizes the natural attenuation modeling results. Chapter 3.0 describes the justification and purpose of the corrective action and presents the remedial response objectives and remedial levels developed in the RFI. Chapter 4.0 presents the screening of the corrective actions. Chapter 5.0 summarizes the report conclusions and recommendations for the corrective action. The references are presented in Chapter 6.0.

This report also contains four appendices. Appendix A presents the detailed results of the fate and transport modeling. Appendix B contains a cost estimate summary for the corrective action alternatives. Appendix C contains an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan for the selected corrective action, monitored natural attenuation. Appendix D lists considerations for the selection of monitored natural attenuation in accordance with the guidance provided in Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) Directive 9200.4-17P (EPA 1999).

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**

## 2.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

Fort Stewart (then known as Camp Stewart) was established in June 1940 as an antiaircraft artillery training center. Between January and September 1945, the Installation operated as a prisoner-of-war camp. The Installation was deactivated in September 1945. In August 1950 Fort Stewart was reactivated to train antiaircraft artillery units for the Korean Conflict. The training mission was expanded to include armor training in 1953. Fort Stewart was designated a permanent Army installation in 1956 and became a flight training center in 1966. Aviation training at the Fort Stewart facilities was phased out in 1973. In January 1974 the 1st Battalion, 75th Infantry was activated at Fort Stewart. Fort Stewart then became a training and maneuver area, providing tank, field artillery, helicopter gunnery, and small arms training for regular Army and National Guard units. These activities comprise the Installation's primary mission today. The 24th Infantry Division, which was reflagged as the 3d Infantry Division in May 1996, was permanently stationed at Fort Stewart in 1975.

The Fort Stewart Military Reservation (FSMR) is located in portions of Liberty, Bryan, Long, Tattnall, and Evans counties, Georgia, approximately 40 miles west-southwest of Savannah, Georgia (Figure 2-1). The cantonment, or garrison area, of FSMR is located within Liberty County, on the southern boundary of the reservation.

### 2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340, is one of two OWSs that support the vehicle maintenance activities of the 3d Engineer Brigade and one of 32 OWSs distributed across 29 sites that support the vehicle maintenance facilities within the garrison area (Figure 2-2). The OWS is located along the northwestern boundary of the motorpool area, approximately 200 feet northwest of Building 1340 (Figure 2-3). The OWS was closed in 2001. The closure consisted of placing plywood over the metal grates covering the OWS and plugging the drains located at the adjacent, covered maintenance pad. The OWS received wastewater from an adjacent, covered maintenance pad. Maintenance activities for military vehicles are performed at the maintenance pad. Floor drains from the maintenance pad are piped to the OWS; however, as part of the closure activities, these drains were plugged. The effluent from the OWS discharged to the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant, and the oil was pumped out of the holding unit and burned at the Central Energy Plant. No surface water or sediment pathways exist at this site.

#### 2.1.1 Phase I RCRA Facility Investigation Activities

A Phase I RFI was conducted at SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340, in January 1998 [see the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) for the results]. During the Phase I RFI, DPT techniques were used to collect four soil and groundwater samples at the site. The soil and groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, and lead.

Acetone, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, and lead were detected in subsurface soil samples and were considered to be site-related constituents (SRCs) in subsurface soil. Toluene; total xylenes; 1,1,1-trichloroethane; 1,1,2-trichloroethane; 1,1-dichloroethane; acetone; benzene; ethylbenzene; methylene chloride; styrene; 2-methylnaphthalene; bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate; naphthalene; and phenanthrene were identified as SRCs in groundwater. The Phase I RFI concluded that the vertical and horizontal extents of potential groundwater contamination had not been determined and recommended that additional groundwater screening and shallow and possibly deep groundwater monitoring wells be installed at the site (upgradient and downgradient).











Figure 2-2. Location Map for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340





**Figure 2-3. Site Features and Phase II RFI Sampling Locations  
at SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

### **2.1.2 Phase II RCRA Facility Investigation Activities**

A Phase II RFI was conducted in October 1999 that consisted of initial screening using DPT techniques to collect 14 groundwater samples to determine the horizontal and vertical extents of groundwater contamination. The DPT groundwater screening samples were analyzed for VOCs. Two vertical-profile borings were installed at the groundwater screening locations that indicated the highest levels of contamination to investigate its vertical extent. The vertical-profile samples were analyzed for VOCs. The results of the groundwater screening were used to locate 11 monitoring wells (eight shallow and three deep) at the site. One shallow and one deep monitoring well were installed upgradient (background). In addition, a recovery well (MW12) was installed to recover potential free product identified on a clay lens encountered at approximately 8 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Two soil samples were collected at each well and were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, and RCRA metals. Geotechnical samples were collected at each monitoring well. All of the monitoring wells were developed until the turbidity was less than or equal to 10 nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs). All wells were sampled using low-flow techniques. Groundwater samples collected from the monitoring wells were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, and RCRA metals. Conductivity, temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), oxidation-reduction potential (Redox), and turbidity were measured in the field during sampling.

## **2.2 TOPOGRAPHY/PHYSIOGRAPHY/CLIMATE**

FSMR occupies a low-lying, flat region in the coastal plain of Georgia. Surface elevations range from approximately 20 feet to 100 feet above mean sea level (amsl) within FSMR and generally decrease from northwest to southeast across the Installation. Terraces dissected by surface water drainages dominate the topography. The terraces are remnants of sea level fluctuations. The four terraces present within FSMR are the Wicomico, Penholoway, Talbot, and Pamlico (Metcalf and Eddy 1999).

The topography of the site is essentially flat. The surface elevation is approximately 68 feet amsl. The OWS is located in a small, grassy area that extends to the northwestern boundary of the motorpool's fence line, where a fenced storage area is located. The other three sides are comprised of a concrete vehicle parking area/road or the maintenance pad.

Fort Stewart has a humid, subtropical climate with long, hot summers. Average temperatures range from 50°F in the winter to 80°F in the summer. Average annual precipitation is 48 inches, with slightly more than half falling from June through September. Prolonged drought is rare in the area, but severe local storms (tornadoes and hurricanes) do occur. Under normal conditions wind speeds rarely exceed 5 knots, but gusty winds of more than 25 knots may occur during summer thunderstorms (Geraghty and Miller 1992).

## **2.3 SITE GEOLOGY**

FSMR is located within the coastal plain physiographic province. This province is typified by southeastward-dipping strata that increase in thickness from 0 feet at the fall line (located approximately 155 miles inland from the Atlantic coast) to approximately 4,200 feet at the coast. State geologic records describe a probable petroleum exploration well (the No. 1 Jelks-Rogers) located in the region as having encountered crystalline basement rocks at a depth of 4,254 feet bgs. This well provided the most complete record for Cretaceous, Tertiary, and Quaternary strata.

The Cretaceous section is approximately 1,970 feet thick and is dominated by clastics. The Tertiary section is approximately 2,170 feet thick and is dominated by limestone, with a 175-foot-thick cap of dark



green phosphatic clay. This clay is regionally extensive and is known as the Hawthorn Group. The interval from approximately 110 feet to the surface is Quaternary in age and composed primarily of sand with interbeds of clay or silt. This section is undifferentiated.

State geologic records contain information regarding a well drilled in October 1942, 1.8 miles north of Flemington at Liberty Field of Camp Stewart (now known as Fort Stewart). This well is believed to have been an artesian well located approximately 0.25 mile north of the runway at Wright Army Airfield within FSMR. The log for this well describes a 410-foot section, the lowermost 110 feet of which consisted predominantly of limestone, above which 245 feet of dark green phosphatic clay typical of the Hawthorn Group were encountered. The uppermost 55-foot interval was Quaternary-age interbedded sands and clays. The top 15 feet of these sediments were described as sandy clay.

## **2.4 SITE SOIL**

Boring logs showing the types of soil encountered in soil screening probes, groundwater screening probes, and monitoring well boreholes during the Phase II RFI at SWMU 27F are provided in Appendix A of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) and Attachment A of the revised final addendum to the revised final RFI report (SAIC 2001). Geological cross sections of the site, depicting the lithology and stratigraphy of the unconsolidated soil deposits beneath the site, as inferred from the soil borings are shown in cross sections A-A' and B-B', Figures 5 and 6, of the revised final addendum to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2001). The cross sections indicate that the soil present across SWMU 27F consists of alternating layers of sand and silty to clayey sands.

## **2.5 SITE HYDROLOGY**

Water level measurements were collected during the Phase I and Phase II RFIs. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 12 feet to 14 feet bgs in the monitoring wells during the Phase II RFI. The most recent and complete groundwater level measurements were collected in May 2001.


Potentiometric surface maps of the shallow and deep groundwater systems based on the water levels from May 2001 are provided in Figures 2-4 and 2-5, respectively. The shallow surficial groundwater flow direction across the site is to the southeast. The deep surficial groundwater flow direction is to the south to slight southeast. A slight groundwater high is located at MW17, which may be due to its being located in a grassy area and closer to a drainage ditch (potentially higher percolation). The hydraulic gradients of the shallow and deep surficial groundwater are 0.0009 foot/foot and 0.0014 foot/foot, respectively.

Both the shallow and deep surficial groundwater flow may intercept the man-made drainage ditch located approximately 450 feet to the southwest.


## **2.6 ECOLOGY**

The habitat at SWMU 27F is classified as an "industrialized area with managed grassland." The site is located within the industrialized area and is comprised of approximately 0.01 acre (see Figure 2-3). The surface of this SWMU is primarily concrete and contains man-made structures; however, a small area of managed grass does exist between the concrete and the fence line (Figure 2-3).





**Figure 2-4. Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map for Shallow Wells (May 2001), SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**



**Figure 2-5. Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Map for Deep Wells (May 2001),  
SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**



## 2.7 CONTAMINANT NATURE AND EXTENT

The results of chemical analyses performed during the Phase I and Phase II RFIs indicated that the soil and groundwater contain organic and metal contaminants at concentrations greater than their reference background concentrations. No surface water is present at this site.

The reference background criteria for SWMU 27F have been developed based on data from background samples collected across FSMR for SWMUs under Phase I and/or Phase II RFIs. In general, reference background samples were collected in each medium at locations upgradient or upstream of each site so as to be representative of naturally occurring conditions at the SWMUs under investigation. In addition, soil samples collected during the Phase I RFI were included in the background data set if they were determined to come from upgradient of the site and to be of sufficient quality to be representative of natural background conditions at FSMR. A summary of the sample locations by medium at each SWMU and the source of the data (Phase I and II RFI analytical data) are presented in Table 5-1 of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000).

EPA Region IV methodology (EPA 1995) was used as guidance for the development of the background data set for screening metals data. In cases in which enough samples (e.g., more than 20) are collected to define background, a background upper tolerance level can be calculated. In cases in which too few samples (e.g., fewer than 20) are collected to define background, background can be calculated as two times the mean background concentration (EPA 1995). Given that fewer than 20 background samples were collected for FSMR, the latter method was used for calculating reference background concentrations.

The reference background concentrations for surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater were calculated as two times the average concentration of all of the locations selected to be in the background data set. If a chemical was not detected at a site, then one-half the detection limit was used as the concentration when calculating the reference mean background concentration.

Inorganics were considered to be SRCs if their concentrations were above the reference background concentrations. Organics were considered to be SRCs if they were simply detected because organic constituents are considered to be anthropomorphic in nature.

Appendix G of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) presents a summary of the background data as well as the two-times-mean background concentrations. Given the limited background data, the mean concentration established by the U.S. Geological Survey for soil in the eastern United States (USGS 1984) is also presented for comparative purposes. Because of the limited number of background samples, the screening value for background may be heavily skewed as a result of an outlier in the sampling data. The nature and extent of contamination by medium are summarized below. A tabular summary of SRCs by medium for the 3d Engineer Brigade, northwest of Building 1340, is presented in Table 2-1.

### 2.7.1 Surface Soil

Eleven surface soil samples were collected during the Phase II RFI. 2-Butanone was detected in four surface soil locations. 4-Methyl-2-pentanone was detected at MW4. Acetone was detected in four out of nine surface soil samples. Carbon disulfide was detected at MW3 and MW10. Toluene was detected at MW11. 2-Butanone, 4-methyl-2-pentanone, acetone, carbon disulfide, and toluene are considered to be SRCs in surface soil. Seventeen SVOCs (acenaphthene, anthracene, benzo(a)anthracene, benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(g,h,i)perylene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, butyl benzyl phthalate, chrysene, di-N-octyl phthalate, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, fluoranthene, fluorene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, phenanthrene, and pyrene) were detected in surface soil. All of the SVOCs, at

Table 2-1. Summary of Site-Related Contaminants, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340

|                                       | Maximum Concentration (mg/kg) |                    |          | Maximum Concentration (µg/L)          |                                        |               |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------|
|                                       | Surface Soil                  | Subsurface Soil    | Sediment | Groundwater Supplemental January 2001 | Groundwater Phase II RFI November 1999 | Surface Water |
| <b>Volatile Organic Compounds</b>     |                               |                    |          |                                       |                                        |               |
| 1,1,1-Trichloroethane                 | ND                            | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | 5.2                                    | NP            |
| 1,1-Dichloroethane                    | ND                            | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | 4.6                                    | NP            |
| 2-Butanone                            | 0.0105                        | 0.0058             | NP       | 10.6                                  | 40.2                                   | NP            |
| 2-Hexanone                            | ND                            | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | 3.4                                    | NP            |
| 4-Methyl-2-pentanone                  | 0.0021                        | ND                 | NP       | 6.8                                   | 98.4                                   | NP            |
| Acetone                               | 0.115                         | 0.111 <sup>a</sup> | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzene                               | ND                            | 0.0081             | NP       | 61                                    | 141                                    | NP            |
| Carbon disulfide                      | 0.0478                        | 0.01               | NP       | ND                                    | 9                                      | NP            |
| Ethylbenzene                          | ND                            | 1.68               | NP       | 7                                     | 29.6                                   | NP            |
| Toluene                               | 0.0218                        | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | 89                                     | NP            |
| Xylenes, total                        | ND                            | 5.04               | NP       | 38.5                                  | 137                                    | NP            |
| <b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds</b> |                               |                    |          |                                       |                                        |               |
| 2-Methylnaphthalene                   | ND                            | 18.1               | NP       | 31.9                                  | 10.8                                   | NP            |
| 4-Methylphenol                        | ND                            | ND                 | ND       | 21.3                                  | ND                                     | ND            |
| Acenaphthene                          | 0.0425                        | 1.12               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Anthracene                            | 0.492                         | 0.393              | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzo(a)anthracene                    | 3.94                          | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzo(a)pyrene                        | 2.43                          | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzo(b)fluoranthene                  | 2.88                          | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzo(g,h,i)perylene                  | 0.885                         | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Benzo(k)fluoranthene                  | 2.1                           | 0.0541             | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate            | 0.793                         | 25.6               | NP       | ND                                    | 22.1                                   | NP            |
| Butyl benzyl phthalate                | 0.265                         | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Carbazole                             | ND                            | ND                 | ND       | 5.7                                   | ND                                     | ND            |
| Chrysene                              | 3.6                           | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Di-N-octyl phthalate                  | 0.374                         | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene                | 0.543                         | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Diphenylamine                         | ND                            | 2.81               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Fluoranthene                          | 10.5                          | 0.3                | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Fluorene                              | 0.0375                        | 2.18               | NP       | 2.1                                   | ND                                     | NP            |
| Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene                | 0.976                         | ND                 | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Naphthalene                           | ND                            | 4.49               | NP       | 37.2                                  | 6.4                                    | NP            |
| Phenanthrene                          | 1.18                          | 5.23               | NP       | ND                                    | 2.4                                    | NP            |
| Pyrene                                | 8.22                          | 1.04               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| <b>Metals</b>                         |                               |                    |          |                                       |                                        |               |
| Arsenic                               | 4.4                           | BRBC               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Barium                                | 21.5                          | 28.9               | NP       | BRBC                                  | BRBC                                   | NP            |
| Cadmium                               | 1.3                           | BRBC               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Chromium                              | 19.9                          | 18.7               | NP       | 7                                     | 7                                      | NP            |
| Lead                                  | 11.8                          | 35.6               | NP       | BRBC                                  | BRBC                                   | NP            |
| Mercury                               | BRBC                          | 0.05               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |
| Selenium                              | 1.4                           | BRBC               | NP       | ND                                    | ND                                     | NP            |

<sup>a</sup>Phase I RFI.

BRBC = Below reference background criteria.

ND = Not detected above reference background criteria.

NP = No pathway exists.



their maximum concentrations, were detected at MW10. Four of these SVOCs [benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, benzo(*g,h,i*)perylene, benzo(*k*)fluoranthene, and dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene] were also detected in surface soil collected from MW11. MW10 and MW11 are a shallow/deep monitoring well pair located adjacent to one another. SVOCs were not detected at any other surface soil location. All of the SVOCs detected in surface soil are considered to be SRCs. Arsenic was detected at MW6 and MW9. Barium was detected in five of 11 surface soil samples. Cadmium was detected at MW4. Chromium was detected in seven of 11 surface soil samples. Lead was detected at a MW4, MW6, and MW9. Selenium was detected at MW9. Arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, and selenium are considered to be SRCs in surface soil.

### 2.7.2 Subsurface Soil

Fifteen subsurface soil samples were collected during the Phase II RFI [see Figure 10 of the revised final addendum to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2001)]. These samples were selected for analysis based on field headspace screening for VOCs. Because MW10 was located in an area of significant contamination, all the subsurface soil intervals to the water table (five) were analyzed for VOCs. 2-Butanone was detected at MW1, MW2, MW5, and MW10. Acetone was detected at MW1 (site background location). Benzene was detected at MW7, MW8, and MW9. Carbon disulfide was detected at MW1 and MW6. Ethylbenzene was detected in six out of 15 subsurface soil samples. Total xylenes were detected in six out of 15 subsurface soil samples. 2-Butanone, benzene, carbon disulfide, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes are SRCs in subsurface soil based on the Phase II RFI. Acetone is not an SRC in subsurface soil because it was detected at only the site background location. Twelve SVOCs [2-methylnaphthalene, acenaphthene, anthracene, benzo(*k*)fluoranthene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, diphenylamine, fluoranthene, fluorene, naphthalene, phenanthrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, and pyrene] were detected in subsurface soil. The majority of the detections were at locations MW10 and MW11. All of the SVOCs detected [with the exception of benzo(*b*)fluoranthene] are considered to be SRCs in subsurface soil based on the Phase II RFI. Benzo(*b*)fluoranthene is not an SRC in subsurface soil because it was detected at only the site background location. Barium, chromium, lead, and mercury were detected at concentrations above their respective reference background criteria and are considered to be SRCs in subsurface soil based on the Phase II RFI. Barium was detected at MW9. Chromium was detected above the reference background criterion in four of 11 subsurface soil samples. Lead was detected at MW4, MW6, and MW9. Mercury was detected at MW9.

### 2.7.3 Groundwater

Groundwater was evaluated using results from groundwater screening samples, vertical-profile samples, and monitoring wells. The groundwater was analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, and RCRA metals.

#### 2.7.3.1 Shallow groundwater monitoring wells

1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1-dichloroethane; 2-butanone; 2-hexanone; and 4-methyl-2-pentanone were detected at only sample location GP9. Benzene was detected in eight of 27 shallow surficial groundwater samples. Six of the eight benzene detections were above the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 5 µg/L. Carbon disulfide was detected at GP6 and GP7. Ethylbenzene was detected in nine of 27 shallow surficial groundwater samples. Toluene was detected at GP7 and GP9. Total xylenes were detected in 11 of 27 shallow surficial groundwater samples. Of the ten VOCs detected, only three (benzene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes) were detected in shallow surficial groundwater from two of the eight shallow monitoring wells (MW9 and MW10). Benzene was detected at MW9 and MW10. Ethylbenzene was detected at MW10. Total xylenes were detected at MW9 and MW10. 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1-dichloroethane; 2-butanone; 2-hexanone; 4-methyl-2-pentanone; benzene; carbon disulfide; ethylbenzene; toluene; and total xylenes are SRCs in shallow surficial groundwater. Low concentrations of four SVOCs were detected in groundwater from the monitoring wells, primarily from MW10.

2-Methylnaphthalene was detected at MW3 and MW10. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected in four of eight shallow surficial groundwater samples. Naphthalene was detected at MW3 and MW10. Phenanthrene was detected at MW10. 2-Methylnaphthalene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, naphthalene, and phenanthrene are considered to be SRCs in shallow surficial groundwater. No RCRA metals were detected above reference background criteria in groundwater from the shallow surficial monitoring wells.

### **2.7.3.2 Deep groundwater monitoring wells**

No VOCs were detected in the deep intervals of the vertical profiles or the deep surficial monitoring wells. No SVOCs were detected in the groundwater from the deep surficial monitoring wells. SVOC analysis was not performed on groundwater from the vertical profiles. Arsenic, chromium, lead, and selenium were detected above reference background criteria in MW2 (background location). Chromium was detected at MW8. Dissolved metals analysis was also performed on groundwater from MW2 and MW8. All of the filtered metals concentrations at MW2 and MW8 were either nondetect or below reference background criteria. Both locations had elevated turbidities [291 NTUs and 45.2 NTUs, respectively (see Table 6 of the revised final addendum [SAIC 2000] to the revised final Phase II RFI report [SAIC 2001]) during groundwater sampling, indicating colloids or particulates in the sample. Both deep monitoring wells extended into the Hawthorn confining (clay) layer, which is likely to be the source of the colloids/particulates and is probably the source of the elevated chromium. Chromium is the only RCRA metal SRC in deep surficial groundwater based on the Phase II RFI.

## **2.8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PHASE II RFI**

The following presents the conclusions and recommendations from the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report for 16 SWMUs issued in June 2000.

Benzo(a)pyrene was identified as an HHCOC in surface soil. Benzo(a)pyrene was not identified as a CMCOPC, indicating that it is not likely to migrate to groundwater. The extent of benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil was confined to a single location near the OWS and the heavily used vehicle maintenance facility. The extent of benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil has been defined by the Phase II RFI, and no additional investigation and/or evaluation is required. A remedial level of 0.89 mg/kg was established for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil. Remedial alternatives for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil were to be evaluated in the CAP (the subject of this document).

Benzene and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate were identified as HHCOCs in groundwater. The bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate concentration was believed to be the result of field or laboratory contamination. The MCLs for benzene (5 µg/L) and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (6 µg/L) were established as their remedial levels.

To further define the extent of potential groundwater contamination, Fort Stewart recommended the installation of the three to six new shallow monitoring wells downgradient of the potential source area and the resampling of the groundwater at all the existing monitoring wells prior to the development of the CAP. No soil samples were to be collected during the installation of the new monitoring wells. The groundwater samples were to be analyzed for VOCs and SVOCs to provide additional site data to fully define the extent of potential organic groundwater contamination. RCRA metals were not identified as either CMCOPCs or human health constituents of potential concern (HHCOPCs) at SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340; therefore, RCRA metals are not constituents of potential concern (COPCs) requiring further investigation and/or evaluation. The new data were originally to be submitted to GEPD as part of the CAP; however, the results were available earlier than expected and issued in a revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000).

## 2.9 SUPPLEMENTAL DATA EVALUATION

Groundwater samples were collected in January 2001 to comply with the recommendations of Section 10.9.8.2 of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000). Six shallow wells (MW13 through MW18) were installed (Figure 2-6) in accordance with the recommendations of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000). Thirteen shallow monitoring wells [six of which were installed in accordance with the recommendations of the final revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000)] and four deep monitoring wells were low-flow sampled in May 2001 as part of the supplemental data collection. The groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs and SVOCs. In addition, MW12, the monitoring well installed above the clay layer that occurs at approximately 8 feet bgs, was checked for free product.

### *Free Product*

Floating product was identified in one well, MW12. Approximately 0.05 foot of a thick, black, viscous material was indicated in MW12 during the measurement of the water level in May 2001. MW12 was installed to the top of the clay layer that occurs at approximately 8 feet bgs. The material was removed with an absorbent sock. The material does not readily recharge in MW12.

### *Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells*

Five VOCs (2-butanone, 4-methyl-2-pentanone, benzene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes) were detected in shallow groundwater at SWMU 27F. 2-Butanone was detected in one out of 13 shallow groundwater samples at a concentration of 10.6 µg/L in MW7. 4-Methyl-2-pentanone was detected at a concentration of 6.8 µg/L in MW7. Benzene was detected in four out of 13 shallow groundwater samples at concentrations of 2.4 µg/L at MW10, 5.8 µg/L at MW9, 31.4 µg/L at MW7, and 61 µg/L at MW14. Ethylbenzene was detected in two out of 13 shallow groundwater samples at concentrations of 4.3 µg/L and 7 µg/L at MW7 and MW14, respectively. Total xylenes were detected in five out of 13 shallow groundwater samples at concentrations ranging from 3.2 µg/L at MW10 to 38.5 µg/L at MW14. 2-Butanone, 4-methyl-2-pentanone, benzene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes are considered to be SRCs in shallow groundwater at SWMU 27F. Benzene also exceeded its MCL of 5 µg/L.

Five SVOCs (2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, carbazole, fluorene, and naphthalene) were detected in shallow groundwater at SWMU 27F. 2-Methylnaphthalene was detected in four out of 13 shallow groundwater samples at concentrations of 2.3 µg/L, 7.4 µg/L, 15.6 µg/L, and 31.9 µg/L at MW9, MW7, MW4, and MW14, respectively. 4-Methylphenol was detected at a concentration of 21.3 µg/L in MW7. Carbazole was detected at a concentration of 5.7 µg/L in MW14. Fluorene was detected at a concentration of 2.1 µg/L in MW14. Naphthalene was detected at concentrations of 3.6 µg/L, 3.8 µg/L, 11 µg/L, and 37.2 µg/L at MW9, MW18, MW4, and MW14, respectively.

The SRCs in groundwater identified from the supplemental data evaluation are presented in Table 2-1.

### *Deep Groundwater Monitoring Wells*

No VOCs or SVOCs were detected in the deep groundwater at SWMU 27F.






Figure 2-6. Supplemental Sampling Locations for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340

## **2.10 SITE-RELATED CONSTITUENTS FROM PHASE II AND SUPPLEMENTAL DATA EVALUATION**

Additional soil data were not collected during the supplemental data investigation; therefore, the soil SRCs were identified during the Phase I and Phase II RFIs. SRCs for groundwater were determined using the most current groundwater characterization data (collected from monitoring wells during the supplemental data evaluation) (Table 2-1). The SRCs from surface and subsurface soil from the Phase I and Phase II RFIs and groundwater from the supplemental data evaluation were evaluated under fate and transport, human health preliminary risk evaluation (HHPRE), and ecological preliminary risk evaluation (EPRE).

## **2.11 CONTAMINANT FATE AND TRANSPORT**

This section presents the site-specific components of the conceptual site model developed for SWMU 27F and describes the contaminant release mechanisms through the primary transport medium (groundwater). This section also discusses the fate and transport of contaminants at the site with respect to their leachability and natural attenuation. Chapter 6.0 of the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) presents a general discussion on the contaminant fate and transport for the 16 SWMUs. This section and Attachment E of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report provide a site-specific extension for SWMU 27F.

### **2.11.1 Generic Soil Screening Analysis**

Contaminant fate and transport analysis provided an assessment of the potential migration pathways and transport mechanisms affecting the constituents at the site. In particular, the leachability of contaminants from soil to groundwater and their natural attenuation in groundwater were evaluated.

The site characterization identified inorganic and organic SRCs in surface soil and subsurface soil. Eight VOCs, 20 SVOCs, and seven metals were identified as SRCs in soil. These constituents were compared to EPA generic soil screening levels (GSSLs; EPA 1996a) to determine if these constituents might leach from soil into groundwater at concentrations exceeding groundwater standards [i.e., concentrations that exceed the MCL or, in the absence of an MCL, the risk-based concentration (RBC) for drinking water (EPA 1996b)].

The maximum concentration of benzo(a)anthracene exceeded its GSSL, and this constituent is considered to be a CMCOPC in surface soil [see Table 18 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000)] at SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340.

### **2.11.2 Fate and Transport Modeling**

Fate and transport modeling was performed to estimate the future concentrations of the preliminary CMCOPC [benzo(a)anthracene], HHCOPCs (2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and naphthalene), and ecological constituents of potential concern (ECOPCs) (2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and total xylenes) in groundwater at the surface water receptor location. The nearest surface water receptor is a man-made drainage ditch located approximately 450 feet south of the site. The results of the modeling are presented in Attachment E of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000).



Seasonal Soil Compartment (SESOIL) modeling indicated that benzo(*a*)anthracene will completely naturally attenuate before reaching the water table; therefore, benzo(*a*)anthracene was not evaluated in the baseline human health risk assessment (BHHRA).

Analytical Transient 1-, 2-, 3-Dimensional (AT123D) modeling was performed to estimate the exposure concentrations of the COPCs in the surface water receptor. The AT123D modeling results are presented in Table E-5 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000). The modeling results indicate that none of the HHCOPCs will reach the receptor location; therefore, the predicted surface water exposure concentrations resulting from migration of groundwater COPCs are all zero. The modeling results predicted that none of the ECOPCs except carbon disulfide would reach the receptor location. The maximum concentration of carbon disulfide at the surface water receptor was estimated to be 0.00018 µg/L.

## **2.12 PRELIMINARY RISK EVALUATION**

### **2.12.1 Human Health Preliminary Risk Evaluation**

The HHPRE included a Step 1 risk evaluation to determine potential human health risks associated with the contaminants present at the site. HHCOPCs were defined as those constituents present at concentrations higher than their reference background criteria and higher than their respective risk-based or applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement-based screening criteria. The SRCs for surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater evaluated under the HHPRE are presented in Table 2-1. Based on the results of the preliminary risk assessment, the conclusions listed below were reached.

- Benzo(*a*)anthracene, benzo(*a*)pyrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene, indeno(*1,2,3-cd*)pyrene, and arsenic are considered to be HHCOPCs in surface soil. There are no HHCOPCs in subsurface soil [see Table 19 of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000)].
- The maximum groundwater concentrations of 2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and naphthalene exceeded their respective screening values; therefore, they are HHCOPCs in groundwater.
- A BHHRA was performed to quantitatively assess the risks associated with exposure to the HHCOPCs (2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and naphthalene) in groundwater and [benzo(*a*)anthracene, benzo(*a*)pyrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene, indeno(*1,2,3-cd*)pyrene, and arsenic] in surface soil.

### **2.12.2 Ecological Preliminary Risk Evaluation**

Based on the results of the EPRE screening analysis, ECOPCs were identified in groundwater and surface soil. Those constituents identified as ECOPCs were further evaluated using realistic exposure factors, mean site concentrations, or predicted maximum groundwater discharge concentrations at downgradient surface water bodies. The results of the EPRE are summarized below.

- Benzene and total xylenes in groundwater are ECOPCs for aquatic biota if groundwater discharges to nearby surface water bodies with aquatic habitat because they were detected at concentrations exceeding the respective ecological screening values (ESVs). Three SVOCs (2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, and carbazole) are ECOPCs by default because there are no ESVs. Fate and transport modeling (using the AT123D model) was performed to estimate the groundwater



concentrations at the nearest surface water body to which groundwater might migrate. The ECOPCs in groundwater are unlikely to pose a hazard to aquatic biota because the predicted maximum discharge concentrations are 0 µg/L for all ECOPCs.

- There are no ECOPCs in groundwater at SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340, for terrestrial receptors.
- Cadmium, chromium, and lead in surface soil at SWMU 27F, northwest of Building 1340, are ECOPCs for terrestrial receptors because the preliminary hazard quotients (HQs) exceed one. There are no toxicity reference values (TRVs) for butyl benzyl phthalate and di-*N*-octyl phthalate, so they are ECOPCs by default. The supplemental risk calculations for these ECOPCs using surrogate toxicity benchmarks for the two SVOCs result in HQs of less than one for shrews and robins; therefore, cadmium, chromium, lead, butyl benzyl phthalate, and di-*N*-octyl phthalate in surface soil are unlikely to pose a risk to terrestrial receptors.

In summary, the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000) concluded that there was no present ecological risk at SWMU 27F and that the site was unlikely to pose an ecological risk in the future.

## 2.13 BASELINE HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

A BHHRA was performed to assess HHCOPCs in groundwater and soil around SWMU 27F. The COPCs addressed in the baseline risk assessment included the groundwater HHCOPCs 2-methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and naphthalene and the surface soil HHCOPCs benzo(*a*)anthracene, benzo(*a*)pyrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene, indeno(1,2,3-*cd*)pyrene, and arsenic.

No CMCOPCs were identified for this site.

2-Methylnaphthalene, 4-methylphenol, benzene, carbazole, and naphthalene were identified as HHCOPCs in groundwater. Groundwater at this site is not currently used for any purpose, and groundwater does not discharge to any nearby surface waters; therefore, no current receptors are being exposed to COPCs at this site. Potential future receptors include an Installation worker, a juvenile trespasser, and a resident. Benzene and carbazole are considered to be COCs in groundwater. The main risk driver is benzene in groundwater for the on-site Installation worker and carbazole for the on-site resident child and adult.

The risk drivers for the on-site Installation worker include arsenic (surface soil), benzo(*a*)pyrene (surface soil), dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene (surface soil), and benzene (groundwater). With the exception of indeno(1,2,3-*cd*)pyrene, all of the HHCOPCs in surface soil are risk drivers for the on-site resident child and resident adult. Surface soil HHCOPCs do not present a significant risk to off-site receptors. The following constituents are considered to be COCs in surface soil: arsenic, benzo(*a*)anthracene, benzo(*a*)pyrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, and dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene.

Remedial levels were derived for benzene and carbazole in groundwater. Remedial levels were derived for arsenic, benzo(*a*)anthracene, benzo(*a*)pyrene, benzo(*b*)fluoranthene, and dibenzo(*a,h*)anthracene in surface soil.

**Human Health Constituents of Concern.** The selection of the recommended remedial levels for groundwater took into consideration the MCLs, risk-based remedial levels, and reference background concentrations of inorganics (Table 2-2). The MCL for benzene (5 µg/L) is the recommended remedial level for it in groundwater. The recommended remedial level for carbazole was 34.9 µg/L. Given that the

recommended level for carbazole is higher than the maximum detected value of 5.7 µg/L, no further study and/or remediation is required for this constituent.

**Table 2-2. Remedial Levels for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

| COC       | Units | Maximum<br>Detected<br>Concentration | Risk-Based<br>Remedial Levels |                    | Maximum<br>Contaminant<br>Level | Quantification<br>Limits |
|-----------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
|           |       |                                      | ILCR                          |                    |                                 |                          |
|           |       |                                      | $1 \times 10^{-6}$            | $1 \times 10^{-5}$ |                                 |                          |
| Benzene   | µg/L  | 61                                   | NA                            | NA                 | 5                               | 2                        |
| Carbazole | µg/L  | 5.7                                  | 3.5                           | 34.9               | ND                              | 9.6                      |

COC = Constituent of concern.

ILCR = Incremental lifetime cancer risk.

NA = Not applicable; remedial level for groundwater defaults to the maximum contaminant level.

ND = No data; this constituent does not have a maximum contaminant level.

**Bold** indicates values are recommended remedial levels.

The recommended remedial levels (Table 2-3) for the contaminants in surface soil are arsenic (10.12 mg/kg), benzo(a)pyrene (0.89 mg/kg), benzo(a)anthracene (8.93 mg/kg), benzo(b)fluoranthene (8.93 mg/kg), and dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (0.89 mg/kg). Given that the recommended remedial values for arsenic (10.12 mg/kg), benzo(a)anthracene (8.93 mg/kg), benzo(b)fluoranthene (8.93 mg/kg), and dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (0.89 mg/kg) are higher than their maximum detected values of 4.4 mg/kg, 3.94 mg/kg, 2.88 mg/kg, and 0.54 mg/kg, respectively, no further study and/or remediation is required for these constituents.

**Table 2-3. Remedial Levels for Surface Soil, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

| COC                    | Units | Maximum<br>Detected<br>Concentration | Risk-Based<br>Remedial Levels |                    | Surface Soil<br>Background<br>Concentration |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|                        |       |                                      | ILCR                          |                    |                                             |
|                        |       |                                      | $1 \times 10^{-6}$            | $1 \times 10^{-5}$ |                                             |
| Arsenic                | mg/kg | 4.40                                 | 1.01                          | 10.12              | 2.1                                         |
| Benzo(a)anthracene     | mg/kg | 3.94                                 | 0.89                          | 8.93               | 0                                           |
| Benzo(a)pyrene         | mg/kg | 2.43                                 | 0.09                          | 0.89               | 0                                           |
| Benzo(b)fluoranthene   | mg/kg | 2.88                                 | 0.89                          | 8.93               | 0                                           |
| Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene | mg/kg | 0.54                                 | 0.09                          | 0.89               | 0                                           |

COC = Constituent of concern.


ILCR = Incremental lifetime cancer risk.

**Bold** indicates values are recommended remedial levels.

## 2.14 CONCLUSIONS AND ESTIMATED EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION

Benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and benzene in groundwater were identified as COCs at SWMU 27F requiring remediation. The estimated areal extent of soil and groundwater contamination at SWMU 27F is presented in Figure 2-7.

Groundwater contamination is confined to the shallow surficial groundwater. Contaminants have not migrated to the deep surficial groundwater. A low volume of dark, viscous, oily free product has intermittently been identified at MW12, a well installed to the clay lens occurring at approximately 8 feet bgs.



**Figure 2-7. Estimated Areas of Potential Soil and Groundwater Contamination,  
SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**



The extent of benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil was confined to a single location near the OWS and the heavily used vehicle maintenance facility. The contaminated soil is probably the result of spillage from past practices at the facility. Prior to the OWS's closure, containers (i.e., oil filters, oil cans/containers) were turned upside down on the OWS grate to remove residual product.

## **2.15 MODELING FOR EVALUATING MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION**

Monitored natural attenuation involves long-term annual monitoring of the site for a certain period of time based on natural attenuation modeling. For SWMU 27F natural attenuation modeling was performed for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and benzene in groundwater. During that period of time, concentrations of the benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and benzene in groundwater are predicted to decline to below their remedial levels, 0.89 mg/kg and 5 µg/L, respectively.

The SESOIL model was applied to benzo(a)pyrene to predict the decay of its concentration in soil as well as the concentration in the leachate migrating to the water table. The SESOIL modeling predicted the maximum concentration of benzo(a)pyrene in soil to be reduced to its remedial level within 26 months from the sampling event (i.e., October 1999). The leaching modeling results also indicated that benzo(a)pyrene is not expected to reach the water table within the 1,000 years simulation time, thereby degrading completely before reaching the water table.

The groundwater concentrations of benzene were predicted using the AT123D model, which predicts the distribution of constituents in groundwater and the transient spread of a chemical plume through a groundwater aquifer. Model calibration was performed by matching the highest concentration observed in MW14 in January 2001 and assuming a steady-state condition. Simulations were performed to predict the maximum benzene concentrations in the shallow surficial groundwater as a function of the downgradient distance from the source and also the time to achieve the remedial level in groundwater [i.e., 5 µg/L (MCL) as recommended in the BHHRA].

The results of the modeling indicate that the estimated timeframe needed for the maximum benzene concentration to degrade through natural attenuation to below its remedial level is approximately 6 years from January 2001. Therefore, it may be concluded that the estimated timeframe needed for monitored natural attenuation will be approximately 6 years from January 2001.

## **3.0 JUSTIFICATION AND PURPOSE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION**

### **3.1 PURPOSE**

EPA has established corrective action standards that reflect the major technical components that should be included with a selected remedy (EPA 1994). These include the following: (1) protect human health and the environment; (2) attain media cleanup standards set by the implementing agency; (3) control the source of the releases so as to reduce or eliminate, to the extent practicable, further releases that might pose a threat to human health and the environment; (4) comply with any applicable standards for management of wastes; and (5) other factors.

### **3.2 REMEDIAL RESPONSE OBJECTIVES**

Due to the presence of benzene in groundwater and benzo(a)pyrene in soil at concentrations exceeding their respective remedial levels, corrective action is warranted at the 3d Engineer Brigade, northwest of Building 1340 (SWMU 27F). The remedial response objectives for SWMU 27F are to reduce the present concentrations of the site COCs in soil [benzo(a)pyrene] and groundwater (benzene) to the remedial levels presented in the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000).

In addition, 0.05 foot of a thick, black, viscous material was discovered in MW12, which was installed to the top of the clay layer that occurs at approximately 8 feet bgs, during the measurement of the water level in May 2001. The material was removed with an absorbent sock and does not readily recharge in MW12. The well will be monitored during the performance of the selected remedy to determine if the material represents an active source of potential contamination. Specific remedial alternatives were not evaluated for this material.

The selected remedy will provide the technology necessary to minimize levels of contaminants in the soil and groundwater and to achieve the best overall results with respect to such factors as effectiveness, implementability, and cost.

### **3.3 IDENTIFICATION OF REMEDIAL LEVELS**

Remedial levels were derived for soil and groundwater COCs. The remedial level for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil is protective of direct exposure of a current on-site Installation worker. The remedial levels for soil were based on an incremental lifetime cancer risk of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ . The remedial level for benzene in groundwater is protective of direct exposure of hypothetical future residents to benzene in groundwater; however, it is recognized that groundwater is not used as a source of drinking water at this site and that future residential exposure is highly unlikely.

The remedial levels for soil and groundwater are presented in Table 3-1.

**Table 3-1. Recommended Remedial Levels in Soil and Groundwater,  
SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

| <b>COC</b>     | <b>Medium</b> | <b>Maximum<br/>Detected<br/>Concentration</b> | <b>Recommended<br/>Remedial<br/>Level</b> |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Benzo(a)pyrene | Surface soil  | 2.43 mg/kg                                    | 0.89 mg/kg                                |
| Benzene        | Groundwater   | 61 µg/L                                       | 5 µg/L                                    |

COC = Constituent of concern.



## **4.0 SCREENING OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS**

This section identifies technologies applicable for the remediation of the 3d Engineer Brigade, northwest of Building 1340, and screens the technologies with respect to effectiveness, implementability, and cost. The technologies that are retained following screening are then combined into corrective action alternatives that address the COCs at SWMU 27F. These alternatives are then evaluated with respect to their times to implement and total life-cycle costs. Technologies for surface soil at SWMU 27F are screened separately from the groundwater technologies; however, the selected soil and groundwater technologies are combined and evaluated as potential corrective action alternatives for SWMU 27F.

### **4.1 SCREENING CRITERIA**

The first step in the development of corrective action alternatives involves the identification and screening of technologies applicable to the site. The purpose of this step is to list and evaluate the general suitability of remedial technologies for meeting the stated corrective action objectives (see Section 3.2). The technologies are also evaluated for their general ability to protect human health and the environment.

Technologies that pass the initial screening phase will be retained for subsequent evaluation as corrective actions. The technologies are compared using three general criteria: effectiveness, implementability, and cost. An explanation of each criterion is provided below.

#### **4.1.1 Effectiveness**

This criterion evaluates the extent to which a corrective action reduces overall risk to human health and the environment. It also considers the degree to which the action provides sufficient long-term controls and reliability to prevent exposures at levels exceeding those protective of human and environmental receptors. Factors considered include performance characteristics and the ability to reduce contaminant concentration.

#### **4.1.2 Implementability**

This criterion evaluates the technical and administrative factors affecting implementation of a corrective action and considers the availability of services and materials required during implementation. Technical factors assessed include ease and reliability of initiating construction and operations, prospects for implementing any additional future actions, and adequacy of monitoring systems to detect failures. Technical feasibility considers the performance history of the technologies in direct applications or the expected performance for similar applications. Uncertainties associated with construction, operation, and performance monitoring are also considered.

Service and material considerations include equipment and operator availability and applicability or development requirements for prospective technologies. The availability of services and materials is addressed by considering the material components of the proposed technologies and the locations and quantities of those materials. Administrative factors include ease of obtaining permits, enforcing deed restrictions, or maintaining long-term control of the site.

Potentially applicable technologies for soil and groundwater are identified in Tables 4-1 and 4-2, respectively.

Table 4-1. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Soil, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340

| Action/<br>Technology  | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Costs                                                                                                       |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| No Action              | The "no action" alternative provides a baseline against which other actions can be compared. Under the no action alternative, the soil would be left "as is," without implementing any removal, treatment, or other mitigating actions to reduce existing or potential future exposure.                                                                                      | This alternative would not address the remedial response objectives of the site. This alternative does not provide protection of human health or the environment because attainment of remedial levels would not be confirmed.                                                                                        | There is no impediment to implementation of this alternative because no action would be taken.                                                                                                                                        | There would be no cost associated with the no action alternative.                                           |
| Institutional Controls | Technologies associated with institutional controls would reduce potential hazards by limiting exposure of humans to contaminated surface soil. Excavation permit restrictions would prohibit any construction at the site that might disturb the surface soil.                                                                                                              | This technology alone would not meet the site objectives (i.e., remedial levels). Because the COCs are associated with surface soil, current on-site workers might be exposed to COCs.                                                                                                                                | Very few factors limit implementability of institutional controls. The property is not expected to be developed in the near future and will remain under federal ownership. This alternative is readily implementable.                | Low; to establish soil use restrictions, approximately \$5,000.                                             |
| Natural Attenuation    | This action would require the monitoring of contaminant levels to ensure that the mass of contamination was being reduced over time in accordance with OSWER Directive 9200.4-17P. Soil sampling would be performed to confirm that remedial levels had been achieved.                                                                                                       | Natural attenuation through biodegradation of benzo(a)pyrene has been modeled for the site and would be effective. Modeling has indicated that it would require approximately 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001) to successfully meet the site objectives (i.e., achievement of soil remedial levels). | This alternative is readily implementable, and modeling has indicated that it would require until only December 2001 to achieve remedial levels. Soil sampling would be necessary to confirm that remedial levels have been achieved. | Low; potentially up to two surface soil sampling events to confirm that remedial levels have been achieved. |
| Bioventing             | This treatment increases microbial degradation of organic contaminants in soil (unsaturated zone) using forced air as an oxygen source. A series of injection wells would be installed in the vadose zone, and air would be injected under a constant pressure to increase biodegradation of the contaminants.                                                               | This technology has been proven to be effective for organic contaminants in subsurface soil as long as the source is confined and limited. Contaminated soil at this site is located at the surface; therefore, short-circuiting may occur.                                                                           | The equipment and technology for bioventing are readily available.                                                                                                                                                                    | High capital and O&M costs.                                                                                 |
| Tilling                | This alternative would involve tilling or physically aerating the surface soil by mechanical equipment and/or hand, with possible addition of nutrients or organic material over time to promote the biological degradation of the organic contaminants in the surface soil. Confirmatory soil samples would be collected to determine whether remedial levels had been met. | This technology has been proven to be effective for organic contaminants in surface soil. The effectiveness of the treatment is dependent on the ability to aerate soil in place at the level of contamination.                                                                                                       | The equipment and technology for tilling are readily available; however, the small area and physical obstructions in the area make implementability difficult.                                                                        | Low cost.                                                                                                   |

Table 4-1. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Soil, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Action/<br>Technology         | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Costs                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Excavation                    | This alternative would involve physically removing/excavating the contaminated surface soil by hand or mechanical equipment. Confirmatory sampling would be taken to determine if the contamination had been removed to be below remedial levels. The excavation would be backfilled with clean soil. The contaminated soil would be properly disposed of off-site. | This alternative is highly effective. COCs would be removed, eliminating the potential for future exposure.                                                                                                                       | This alternative is readily implementable. The estimated area of contaminated surface soil is small and is located at the surface.<br><br>Adequate disposal facilities are available to accept and treat the excavated soil.                                                                                                                                                 | Low cost; small estimated quantity located near the surface; minimal confirmatory sampling required.                                                               |
| Specialized Bacteria Addition | Specialized bacteria and nutrients in highly concentrated solutions and specific to biodegrading benzo(a)pyrene would be injected or mixed with the surface soil.                                                                                                                                                                                                   | This technology has been proven to be effective for organic constituents if specific bacteria are available for the COC(s) and the site conditions are aerobic, a state that is conducive to biodegradation of SVOC contaminants. | Specialized bacteria and the equipment for application are readily available. The treatment is applicable to a relatively small site. The specialized bacteria would be injected or mixed into the surface soil to approximately 2 feet to 3 feet below ground surface.<br><br>A UIC permit would be required for injection or mixing of specialized bacteria and nutrients. | Low; baseline sampling, followed by 1 month to treat and performance/confirmatory soil sampling to evaluate the effectiveness of the specialized bacteria addition |
| Soil Sampling                 | Soil sampling would be used in conjunction with other alternatives to monitor the effectiveness of the remedial alternative.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | This alternative is highly accurate in monitoring the effectiveness of a remedial alternative.                                                                                                                                    | Highly implementable. Surface soil can easily and safely be sampled.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Low costs; costs depend on frequency of sampling.                                                                                                                  |

COC = Constituent of concern.

O&M = Operations and maintenance.

OSWER = Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

SVOC = Semivolatile organic compound.

UIC = Underground Injection Control.



Table 4-2. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340

| Action/<br>Technology         | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Costs                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| No Action                     | The "no action" alternative provides a baseline against which other actions can be compared. Under the no action alternative, the groundwater would be left "as is," without implementing any removal, treatment, or other mitigating actions to reduce existing or potential future exposure.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | This alternative would not address the remedial response objectives of the site. This alternative does not provide protection of human health or the environment because attainment of remedial levels would not be confirmed.                                                                                                                                                          | There is no impediment to implementation of this alternative because no action would be taken.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | There would be no cost associated with the no action alternative.                                                                                                                             |
| Institutional Controls        | Technologies associated with institutional controls would reduce potential hazards by limiting exposure of humans to contaminated groundwater. Groundwater use restrictions would prohibit the use of groundwater as a drinking water supply. Excavation permit restrictions would prohibit any construction at the site that might allow contact with groundwater.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This technology alone would not meet the site objectives (i.e., remedial levels). Assuming compliance with groundwater use restrictions, this technology would be effective and provide reliability with respect to eliminating human exposure to contaminated groundwater within the boundaries of the site. Use of surficial groundwater at this site for drinking water is unlikely. | Very few factors limit the implementability of institutional controls. The property is not expected to be developed in the near future and will remain under federal ownership. This alternative is readily implementable.                                                                                        | Low; to establish groundwater use restrictions, approximately \$5,000.                                                                                                                        |
| Monitored Natural Attenuation | This action would require the monitoring of contaminant levels to ensure that the mass of contamination was being reduced over time in accordance with OSWER Directive 9200.4-17P. A total of 13 wells would be sampled annually or biannually for approximately 7 years starting in January 2001 (6 years monitored natural attenuation period plus 1 year added as a contingency) and analyzed for the COCs and natural attenuation parameters (e.g., methane, NO <sub>2</sub> /NO <sub>3</sub> ). An additional one-time sampling event would be performed 1 year after the final annual event for confirmation sampling to determine if remedial levels had been met. Thirteen monitoring wells would be sampled annually and/or biannually, followed by confirmation sampling. | Natural attenuation through biodegradation has been modeled for the site and would be effective. This action would require approximately 6 years from January 2001 to successfully meet the site objectives (i.e., achievement of groundwater remedial levels). An additional year of annual sampling would be included as a contingency.                                               | This alternative is readily implementable and would require only annual or biannual monitoring of a total of 13 wells at the site for approximately 7 years (1 year added as a contingency). In addition, confirmatory groundwater sampling (1 year after the completion of annual monitoring) would be required. | Low; monitoring of 13 wells for approximately 7 years would be required. In addition, confirmatory groundwater sampling (1 year after the completion of annual monitoring) would be required. |

Table 4-2. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Action/<br>Technology               | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Costs                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pumping and<br>Treating             | This corrective action involves pumping and treatment of groundwater to below remedial levels. Extraction wells would be installed in the shallow surficial groundwater. Low-flow pumping (3 gallons to 5 gallons per minute) would be used to extract groundwater. Groundwater would be treated using an activated carbon treatment system. Effluent from the treatment process would be discharged into the FSMR industrial wastewater treatment system. | This technology has been proven to be effective for a variety of contaminants as long as the source is confined and limited.                                                                                                                 | The equipment and technology for pumping and treating are readily available. A change in the FSMR NPDES permit may be required.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Moderate capital with potentially high O&M costs; O&M costs depend on duration of pumping required.                                                                                                                   |
| Specialized<br>Bacteria<br>Addition | Specialized bacteria and nutrients in highly concentrated solutions and specific to biodegrading the COCs would be injected upgradient and at selected points within the area of groundwater contamination. Specialized bacteria addition might be included as a part of any in situ biological remediation alternative, including monitored natural attenuation, to increase the in situ biological activity.                                             | This technology has been proven effective for organic constituents if specific bacteria are available for the COC(s) and the site geochemical conditions are aerobic, a state that is conducive to biodegradation of petroleum contaminants. | Specialized bacteria and the equipment for application are readily available. The treatment is applicable to a relatively small site. Approximately 22 groundwater injection points would have to be installed. Baseline groundwater sampling would be required, followed by monthly performance monitoring of the site for 6 months. In addition, confirmatory sampling (1 year after the completion of the performance evaluation of the bacterial application) would be required.<br><br>A UTC permit would be required for injection of specialized bacteria and nutrients. | Low; monitoring of the 13 impacted wells for baseline sampling, 6 months of sampling to evaluate the performance of the specialized bacteria addition, and confirmatory sampling (1 year after performance sampling). |

Table 4-2. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Action/<br>Technology                           | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                    | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Costs                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Air Sparging                                    | Air sparging involves injecting air under pressure into the subsurface to volatilize groundwater contaminants and to promote biodegradation by increasing subsurface oxygen concentrations. Groundwater sampling would be performed at the completion of the treatment to confirm that remedial levels had been achieved.                                                                                                                                                    | The technology has been proven to be effective for the volatile organic chemicals present at the site.                                                                           | The equipment is readily available. Air injection system components would be operated for 2 or more years. Approximately 16 injection wells would have to be installed. Monitoring and maintenance of the wells would be required.<br><br>A UIC permit would be required for injection of air.                                                                                                         | Moderate; \$20 to \$50 per ton of saturated soil.                   |
| Enhanced Bioremediation (Pure Oxygen Injection) | Enhanced bioremediation is the enhancement of one aspect of natural attenuation. The activity of naturally occurring microbes is stimulated by injecting 98-percent-pure oxygen to enhance in situ biological degradation of organic contaminants. Nutrients or other additives may be used to encourage the natural biodegradation processes. Groundwater sampling would be performed at the completion of the treatment to confirm that remedial levels had been achieved. | This technology has been proven to be effective for volatile organic chemicals; site geochemical conditions are aerobic, a state that is conducive to biodegradation of benzene. | The equipment is readily available, and the treatment is applicable to a small site. Approximately 15 injection points would have to be installed. The bioremediation process might require continuous monitoring and maintenance to prevent plugging of injection wells by microbial growth or mineral precipitation.<br><br>A UIC permit would be required for injection of oxygen and/or nutrients. | Moderate; similar to air sparging based on quote from manufacturer. |



Table 4-2. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Action/<br>Technology             | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Effectiveness                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Implementability                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Costs                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Oxygen-<br>Releasing<br>Compounds | This treatment uses formulations that release oxygen when they contact water to promote biodegradation. These formulations would be injected into the groundwater to promote rapid degradation of organic contaminants. Groundwater sampling would be performed at the completion of the treatment to confirm that remedial levels had been achieved.                                                                                                                                       | This technology has been proven to be effective for treatment of fuel- and solvent-related constituents, such as benzene, in groundwater.                                                                                                                              | The equipment and oxygen-releasing-compound formulation are readily available.<br>Approximately 22 injection points would have to be installed. The time to reach MCLs would be only nominally shorter than that for natural attenuation.<br><br>A UIC permit would be required for injection of a reagent.                                                            | High capital with minimal O&M costs.                                                                                    |
| Geo-Cleanse®                      | The Geo-Cleanse® process is an aggressive, pressurized injection of a concentrated hydrogen peroxide and ferrous iron catalyst (together known as Fenton's reagent) that generates a free radical hydroxyl that acts as the active oxidizing agent. Oxidation of an organic compound by Fenton's reagent is a rapid and exothermic (heat-producing) reaction. Groundwater sampling would be performed at the completion of the treatment to confirm that remedial levels had been achieved. | This treatment would be expected to provide accelerated performance over air sparging; however, more than one application might be required to achieve remedial levels. Chemical oxidation would temporarily destroy the natural bioremediation processes at the site. | This treatment would be compatible with any Geo-Cleanse® treatment for the organic contaminants. Approximately 20 injection points would have to be installed. The time to reach MCLs would be a matter of days. Violent reactions of chemicals would impact operations at the maintenance facility.<br><br>A UIC permit would be required for injection of a reagent. | High; would require injection of a large volume of peroxide per injection point relative to the small contaminant mass. |

Table 4-2. Evaluation of Corrective Actions/Technologies for Groundwater, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Action/<br>Technology     | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Effectiveness                                                                                                                               | Implementability                                                                                                                                                  | Costs                                                                     |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Groundwater<br>Monitoring | Groundwater from strategically located monitoring wells would be sampled and the groundwater analyzed for COCs over time. Groundwater monitoring would be used in conjunction with other alternatives to monitor the effectiveness of the remedial alternative or the fate and transport of groundwater HHCOCs. | This alternative is highly effective at monitoring the potential migration of constituents and the effectiveness of a remedial alternative. | Highly implementable. A groundwater monitoring network consisting of 13 shallow and three deep surficial groundwater monitoring wells already exists at SWMU 27F. | Low capital costs; moderate O&M costs depending on frequency of sampling. |

COC = Constituent of concern.

FSMR = Fort Stewart Military Reservation.

HHCOC = Human health constituent of concern.

MCL = Maximum contaminant level.

NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

O&M = Operations and maintenance.

OSWER = Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

SWMU = Solid waste management unit.

UIC = Underground Injection Control.

### 4.1.3 Cost

Relative costs are included for each corrective action technology to facilitate evaluation and comparison among the alternatives. Detailed cost estimates are not prepared at this screening stage. Typical cost estimating contingencies have been excluded from the relative costs.

## 4.2 EVALUATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

Corrective action technologies were identified for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and benzene in groundwater. The technologies were evaluated using the screening criteria of effectiveness, implementability, and cost.

### 4.2.1 Surface Soil

Four general categories of corrective actions were identified for benzo(a)pyrene contamination in surface soil, which is limited to approximately 2 feet bgs: (1) no action, (2) institutional controls, (3) natural attenuation, and/or (4) active remediation. Confirmatory sampling would be required after implementation of the corrective action to determine if remedial levels had been achieved. The corrective actions representing active remediation of benzo(a)pyrene in soil that were evaluated included excavation, specialized bacteria addition, tilling, and bioventing. The technologies considered for benzo(a)pyrene in soil are presented in Table 4-1.

The no action alternative was not considered to be viable due to the need to ensure that benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil achieves its remedial levels. Institutional controls were not considered further as the sole remedial alternative because they are appropriate for this site only when combined with other technologies. Natural attenuation and excavation were retained as the only technologies for surface soil. Both can achieve remedial levels in a relatively short period of time. Tilling and bioventing were eliminated due to the small quantity of contamination and limited accessibility for implementation of each of these alternatives. Excavation was considered viable because of the small quantity of contaminated surface soil present and because it would eliminate the potential risk immediately upon implementation.

### 4.2.2 Groundwater

Four general categories of corrective actions were identified for benzene in groundwater: (1) no action, (2) institutional controls, (3) natural attenuation, and/or (4) active remediation. Thirteen monitoring wells are located at the site, with wells located within and completely encircling the benzene plume; therefore, the effectiveness of the selected treatment and potential migration of the contamination could be monitored. Consequently, if during the remediation any previously undetected COCs appeared in the groundwater at concentrations above the RBCs, the selected remedy could be modified to address them.

In addition to no action, institutional controls, and monitored natural attenuation, various corrective action technologies were identified for active remediation of benzene in groundwater, including air sparging, specialized bacteria addition, pumping and treating, the Geo-Cleanse® process, and enhanced bioremediation (pure oxygen injection). The corrective action technologies and the results of the screening for benzene in groundwater are described in Table 4-2.

The no action alternative was not considered to be a viable option due to the need to ensure that benzene concentrations in groundwater achieve remedial levels. Institutional controls were not considered further as the sole remedial alternative because they are appropriate for this site only when combined with other technologies such as monitored natural attenuation. Pump-and-treat technologies were not considered



because of their relatively high cost to achieve remedial levels. Monitored natural attenuation, specialized bacteria addition, and enhanced bioremediation using pure oxygen injection were retained for further evaluation. Chemical oxidation was excluded from further consideration because of its very high cost, limited benefit over the other treatment technologies, and difficulty to implement.

### **4.3 CORRECTIVE ACTION ALTERNATIVES**

Excavation and monitored natural attenuation were retained as the technologies to meet the remedial response objectives for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil. Monitored natural attenuation, specialized bacteria addition, and enhanced bioremediation were retained as the technologies to meet the remedial levels for benzene in groundwater. The screened alternatives for surface soil and groundwater were combined to form remedial alternatives to meet the remedial response objectives for soil and groundwater at SWMU 27F. Three alternatives were identified for remediation of the soil and groundwater at the site.

The three alternatives are

- Alternative 1: monitored natural attenuation for surface soil and groundwater,
- Alternative 2: monitored natural attenuation for surface soil and specialized bacteria addition for groundwater, and
- Alternative 3: excavation for surface soil and enhanced bioremediation with oxygen injection for groundwater.

#### **4.3.1 Evaluation Factors**

Based on the results of the technology screening, each of the retained technologies is considered applicable to the site, implementable, and cost-effective; therefore, two primary evaluation factors were used in the selection of the preferred corrective action alternative: time to implement and life-cycle cost.

##### ***Time to Implement***

The time required to implement the action is an important evaluation factor for this site. Preferably, the site would be remediated to meet remedial levels for soil and groundwater in the shortest possible time. For each alternative an estimate was made of the duration of any active remediation system or of the duration of any natural attenuation period. For all alternatives confirmatory soil and groundwater sampling would be performed following the remediation/attenuation period to verify that remedial levels in soil and groundwater had been met.

##### ***Life-Cycle Cost***

The life-cycle cost estimates are budget estimates based on conceptual design and are to be used for comparison purposes. Costs are estimated for capital construction and for O&M. Cost estimates are derived from current information including vendor quotes, conventional cost estimating guides (e.g., Means 2001 and ECHOS 2001), and costs associated with similar projects. The actual costs of the project would depend on labor and material costs, site conditions, competitive market conditions, final project scope, and implementation schedule at the time that the corrective action was initiated. The life-cycle cost estimates have not been adjusted to present worth costs, and no escalation factors have been applied. Appendix B presents a summary of the life-cycle cost estimates for each alternative.

### 4.3.2 Evaluation of Corrective Action Alternatives

The soil and groundwater technologies were combined to form three corrective action alternatives to remediate the COCs at the site. The three corrective action alternatives are summarized in Table 4-3, along with the corresponding times to reach remedial levels and associated life-cycle costs. All of the alternatives would include the common features listed below.

- Monitoring of MW12 for sheen and/or free product and removal.
- Groundwater monitoring to track the effectiveness of the corrective action. The existing monitoring well network would provide adequate coverage for monitoring lateral and vertical conditions within the benzene plume. The wells associated with monitoring of the benzene plume include 13 shallow surficial wells [MW1 (upgradient), MW3, MW4, MW5, MW6, MW7, MW9, MW10, MW14, MW15, MW16, MW17, and MW18].
- Post-remediation confirmatory groundwater sampling to verify that groundwater remedial levels have been achieved.

The paragraphs that follow summarize the evaluation of the three corrective action alternatives for the benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and benzene in groundwater with respect to the primary evaluation factors of time to implement and life-cycle cost.

#### ***Alternative 1: Monitored Natural Attenuation***

Monitored natural attenuation would involve soil sampling for up to 3 years (1 year added as a contingency) and groundwater sampling for 7 years (1 year added as contingency) at 13 monitoring wells [MW1 (upgradient), MW3, MW4, MW5, MW6, MW7, MW9, MW10, MW14, MW15, MW16, MW17, and MW18] beginning in calendar year (CY) 2002.

Modeling estimated that benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil would achieve its remedial level in 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001). In CY 2002 two surface soil samples would be collected from around MW10 using a hand auger and analyzed for SVOCs to confirm that remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene had been achieved. If remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene had not been achieved, then additional surface soil samples would be obtained in conjunction with the first biannual groundwater sampling event (CY 2004) discussed below. Only two soil sampling events would be expected. If benzo(a)pyrene was not detected above remedial levels during the initial soil sampling, then that sampling event would be considered to represent the final/confirmatory soil sampling.

The groundwater from the 13 wells would be sampled in CY 2002, followed by biannual (every 2 years) groundwater sampling for the next 6 years. Modeling estimated the time to reach remedial levels to be 6 years (monitored natural attenuation period) from January 2001. An additional year of natural attenuation time was added as a contingency.

The groundwater monitoring network would consist of 13 shallow surficial groundwater wells [MW1 (upgradient), MW3, MW4, MW5, MW6, MW7, MW9, MW10, MW14, MW15, MW16, MW17, and MW18]. The baseline for beginning the natural attenuation period would be the groundwater results collected in January 2001. Figure 4-1 identifies the monitoring wells to be sampled at SWMU 27F.

Table 4-3. Corrective Action Alternatives, Implementation Time, and Costs for Remediation, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340

| Corrective Action                               | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Time to Implement                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Cost                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Comments                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Alternative 1:<br>Monitored Natural Attenuation | This alternative would require the monitoring of contaminant levels in soil and groundwater and natural attenuation parameters in groundwater to ensure the reduction of contaminants through biodegradation and dispersion. | <p>Modeling estimated that benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil will achieve its remedial level in 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001). The estimated time based on modeling for benzene to reach its remedial level in groundwater is approximately 6 years from January 2001. An additional year was added to the monitored natural attenuation period for benzene in groundwater as a contingency.</p> <p>Soil samples would be collected in CY 2002 and during the first biannual groundwater sampling event (if necessary) to confirm that soil remedial levels had been achieved.</p> <p>The monitored natural attenuation period was set for 7 years from CY 2001, including 1 year as a contingency. Thirteen wells would be sampled in CY 2002, followed by biannual sampling (every 2 years) for the next 6 years. Confirmation groundwater sampling would be performed 1 year after the monitored natural attenuation period. The total implementation time including final reporting would be 8.5 years.</p> | Approximately \$295,000 for two soil and four groundwater sampling events of 13 wells during natural attenuation period, followed by confirmatory groundwater sampling of 13 wells at 1 year after monitored natural attenuation period. | Least expensive, but longer time to implement. |



Table 4-3. Corrective Action Alternatives, Implementation Time, and Costs for Remediation, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)


| Corrective Action                                                                                                      | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Time to Implement                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Cost                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Comments                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alternative 2:<br>Monitored Natural<br>Attenuation for Soil<br>and Specialized<br>Bacteria Addition<br>for Groundwater | As in Alternative 1, monitored natural attenuation would be used to achieve remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene in soil. In addition, the action would require the installation of 22 groundwater injection wells, injection of specialized bacteria over 6 months (includes a 3-month contingency), and the monitoring of contaminant levels to ensure the reduction of contaminants in groundwater through biodegradation. | Modeling estimated that benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil will achieve its remedial level in 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001). The remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil would be achieved by natural attenuation within the implementation time for specialized bacteria addition. This alternative is easily implementable. Materials, equipment, and specialized bacteria to implement this alternative are easily obtainable. Specialized bacteria addition would be expected to reduce contaminants to below remedial levels in 6 months (includes a 3-month contingency). Confirmatory sampling would be performed 1 year after the final performance monitoring. Total implementation time would be approximately 26 months. | Approximately \$429,000, including baseline sampling of 13 well locations, installation of 22 groundwater injection wells, bacterial injection for 6 months, monthly performance sampling of up to 13 wells for 6 months, confirmatory sampling of 13 wells (1 year after performance sampling), and up to two rounds of soil sampling to confirm that soil remedial levels have been achieved. | Relatively low-cost alternative and shorter time to implement than monitored natural attenuation and enhanced bioremediation. |

Table 4-3. Corrective Action Alternatives, Implementation Time, and Costs for Remediation, SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340 (continued)

| Corrective Action                                                                                                        | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Time to Implement                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Cost                                                                                                                                                       | Comments        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Alternative 3:<br>Excavation for Soil<br>and Enhanced<br>Bioremediation<br>(with Oxygen<br>Injection) for<br>Groundwater | The action would require excavation (and confirmatory sampling) of the benzo(a) pyrene-contaminated surface soil. Enhanced bioremediation would be used to promote biological degradation of benzene in groundwater. Pure oxygen would be injected into the groundwater. Fifteen oxygen injection wells would be installed with their screens approximately 10 feet below the water table. | Soil remedial levels would essentially be achieved upon excavation of the soil. Oxygen injection treatment would require approximately 12 months to reduce the COCs to remedial levels. Confirmatory groundwater sampling would be performed 12 months after oxygen injection treatment was complete, for a total implementation time of approximately 3 years (including system installation and final reporting). | Approximately \$955,000 (monthly monitoring of 13 wells during treatment, treatment using 15 injection points, and confirmatory sampling after 12 months). | Most expensive. |

COC = Constituent of concern.

CY = Calendar year.



**Figure 4-1. Alternative 1: Monitored Natural Attenuation for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**



The groundwater samples would be analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, and natural attenuation parameters [i.e., methane, carbon dioxide, nitrate/nitrite, sulfate/sulfide, total iron, and ferrous iron (field measurement)]. SVOCs were included in the analysis because they were detected in groundwater (but below RBCs) and because they are characteristic of the materials or waste disposed of at the now abandoned OWS, the presumed source of the contamination. During the 7 years, concentrations of benzene in groundwater are predicted to decline below its MCL of 5 µg/L at all monitoring well locations. One year following this monitored natural attenuation period, confirmation groundwater sampling would be conducted to verify that the concentrations of benzene had remained below its remedial level. The confirmatory groundwater sampling would be identical to the biannual groundwater sampling. The soil samples indicating benzo(a)pyrene levels below remedial levels would be considered the final/confirmatory soil samples.

CAP progress reports would be issued after each groundwater sampling event to provide the results of the sampling and the progress of the natural attenuation. The results of the surface soil sampling conducted in CY 2002 would be reported in the first CAP progress report. A total of four CAP progress reports (one for each of CYs 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008) would be issued. If concentrations of COCs were detected below remedial levels after two consecutive monitoring events, FSMR would request that the sampling be discontinued and confirmatory sampling scheduled. A CAP completion report would be issued after the confirmatory sampling.

This would be the least expensive alternative, with a life-cycle cost of approximately \$295,000, but would take the longest time (7 years, including 1 year for a contingency) from CY 2001 to implement. The 8.5 years from CY 2001 would include 7 years of monitored natural attenuation (1 year added as a contingency), 1 year for confirmatory groundwater sampling, and approximately 6 months for work plan development and final reporting.


#### ***Alternative 2: Monitored Natural Attenuation for Soil and Specialized Bacteria Addition for Groundwater***

Natural attenuation modeling has estimated that it would require 26 months from October 1999 for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil and 6 years from CY 2001 for benzene in groundwater to reach their respective remedial levels. The addition of specialized bacteria would be expected to reduce this natural attenuation period for benzene in groundwater to approximately 6 months, including a 3-month contingency (added because this technology has not been used at FSMR). The remedial level for benzo(a)pyrene would be achieved by natural attenuation during the implementation of the specialized bacteria addition for benzene in groundwater.

Two surface soil samples would be collected around MW10 using a hand auger and analyzed for SVOCs in CY 2002 to confirm that remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene had been achieved. The soil sampling would be scheduled during one of the mobilizations for the implementation of specialized bacteria addition. If remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene had not been achieved, then additional surface soil samples would be collected in conjunction with the confirmatory groundwater sampling event scheduled for 1 year after the completion of specialized bacteria addition. Only two soil sampling events would be expected.

Baseline groundwater sampling of 13 shallow surficial groundwater wells [MW1 (upgradient), MW3, MW4, MW5, MW6, MW7, MW9, MW10, MW14, MW15, MW16, MW17, and MW18] for VOCs and SVOCs would be performed to confirm the type and quantity of specialized bacteria to be added to groundwater.

Twenty-two 3/4-inch-inside-diameter (ID) polyvinyl chloride (PVC) injection wells with 10-foot screens would be installed upgradient and within the groundwater plume to approximately 10 feet below the water table (Figure 4-2). The baseline groundwater sampling would be used to confirm the type and



**Figure 4-2. Alternative 2: Monitored Natural Attenuation and Specialized Bacteria Addition for SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

quantity of specialized bacteria to be added. In addition, field measurements of pH, Redox, turbidity, and DO would be taken at each monitoring well. Specialized bacteria specific to benzene (petroleum contaminants) would be added monthly for 6 months. Groundwater samples for VOCs, SVOCs, nitrate, phosphate, and field measurements would be collected monthly from the same 13 shallow surficial groundwater wells sampled for the baseline sampling to evaluate the performance of the specialized bacteria addition. Therefore, if the CY 2002 soil samples contained concentrations below the remedial level, soil samples would not be collected during confirmatory groundwater sampling.

Confirmatory soil sampling (if required) and groundwater sampling would be performed 1 year after completion of the specialized bacteria addition to verify that remedial levels had been achieved and maintained across the site. Confirmatory groundwater sampling would consist of sampling the 13 shallow surficial groundwater wells that were sampled for the baseline and performance sampling. The soil samples indicating benzo(a)pyrene concentrations below the remedial levels would be considered the final/confirmatory soil samples.

A CAP progress report would be issued after the completion of the specialized bacteria addition to report its performance. The results of the soil sampling would be discussed in the CAP progress report. A CAP completion report would be issued after the confirmatory sampling. The results of the final soil sampling (if necessary) would be discussed in the CAP completion report.

The total time from contract award to completion of the specialized bacteria addition alternative would be approximately 26 months (including work plan development, subcontracting, treatment, and final reporting). The estimated treatment time to achieve soil and groundwater remedial levels using the specialized bacteria addition alternative would be the shortest of all the alternatives. This alternative would have an estimated life-cycle cost of approximately \$429,000.


### ***Alternative 3: Excavation and Enhanced Bioremediation (Pure Oxygen Injection)***

Excavation of the contaminated surface soil to approximately 2 feet bgs would be performed by hand and mechanical means. The area to be excavated would be the area that potentially received spills from the draining of oil containers and filters on the top of the OWS, which would include the area extending from the abandoned OWS to the southern end of the covered maintenance pad, estimated to encompass 150 square feet (Figure 4-3). Confirmatory samples would be collected from the four sides of the bottom of the excavation and analyzed for SVOCs on 24-hour turnaround. Depending on whether remedial levels in soil had been achieved, an additional 1 foot of soil might be excavated and up to four additional confirmatory soil samples collected. The excavation would be filled with clean backfill and seeded, with straw placed on the surface.

Initial baseline groundwater sampling would be performed to determine the present nature of the contamination and to confirm the appropriateness of the enhanced bioremediation design. The baseline sampling would consist of groundwater sampling of 13 shallow surficial groundwater wells [MW1 (upgradient), MW3, MW4, MW5, MW6, MW7, MW9, MW10, MW14, MW15, MW16, MW17, and MW18] for VOCs and SVOCs.

Approximately 15 oxygen injection points would be installed to treat the benzene plume. The groundwater injection wells would be of similar design to those presented in Alternative 2. The groundwater injection wells would be 3/4-inch-ID PVC with a 1-foot screen installed to approximately 10 feet below the water table. One oxygen generator capable of producing 80 standard cubic feet per hour of 90- to 95-percent-pure oxygen would be located at the site. The injection wells and all piping to the injection wells would be installed flush to the ground to allow access to the covered maintenance pad. Temporary fencing would be placed around the injection wells, surface piping, and oxygen generator located on the grass to





**Figure 4-3. Alternative 3: Excavation and Enhanced Bioremediation for  
SWMU 27F, Northwest of Building 1340**

the southeast to restrict unauthorized access to the area. The oxygen injection wells located in the concrete area entering the covered maintenance pad would be installed underground to allow access to the pad.

Treatment would consist of enhancing bioremediation by injection of 90- to 95-percent-pure oxygen and would continue until the concentration of benzene declined to a level below its MCL of 5 µg/L, estimated to require approximately 12 months, not including any contingency period. Groundwater monitoring would include monthly sampling of the same 13 monitoring wells to evaluate how the treatment was progressing. This active treatment period would be followed by confirmatory groundwater sampling (once after 1 year) to verify that the groundwater remedial levels had been met and maintained. The confirmatory sampling would be identical to the baseline and performance sampling previously discussed.

Two CAP progress reports would be issued: one after the excavation of the soil, installation of the injection wells, and startup and the other after an additional year to report the performance of the enhanced bioremediation alternative. If concentrations of COCs were detected at concentrations below remedial levels earlier than expected, FSMR would request that the injection and sampling be discontinued and confirmatory sampling scheduled. A CAP completion report would be issued after the confirmatory sampling.

This alternative would be more expensive than Alternatives 1 and 2, with a life-cycle cost estimated at approximately \$955,000. The time required for implementation would be approximately 3 years (including work plan development, subcontracting, installation, treatment, and final reporting).

## 5.0 CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This section presents a conceptual design and plan for implementation of the selected corrective action alternative. Based on the available groundwater data and modeling results, a cost-effective corrective action has been selected that will reduce the COCs in soil and groundwater to the required remedial levels. The technology evaluation presented in Chapter 4.0 considered three different corrective action alternatives for the soil and groundwater based on the time needed to implement them and their life-cycle costs. Based on that evaluation, Alternative 1, monitored natural attenuation, has been selected for the soil and groundwater because of its acceptable implementation time and cost-effectiveness. An O&M Plan for this alternative is presented in Appendix C.

### 5.1 SELECTED CORRECTIVE ACTION

The selected corrective action alternative for treatment of soil and groundwater is monitored natural attenuation. In addition, implementation of institutional controls (i.e., land use controls) would be required for the duration of the monitored natural attenuation alternative to establish the activities that are permitted at the site during the natural attenuation period (i.e., until site remedial levels have been achieved).

#### 5.1.1 Justification for Selection of Corrective Action

Monitored natural attenuation has been selected for remediation of soil and groundwater because it will effectively achieve the remedial levels in a reasonable period of time and will do so cost-effectively. Modeling indicated that monitored natural attenuation will achieve remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil in 26 months from October 1999, the date of the highest detected surface soil concentration. The predicted natural attenuation period has already elapsed (i.e., till December 2001). Confirmatory soil sampling at the location of the previously highest detected surface soil concentration of benzo(a)pyrene will confirm that the contaminated soil has been remediated. Excavation might provide a higher degree of reliability than monitored natural attenuation and less uncertainty but at a higher cost.

Monitored natural attenuation is expected to achieve the groundwater remedial levels in less than 6 years from January 2001; however, an additional year will be added to the natural attenuation period as a contingency. Confirmatory groundwater sampling and analysis will be conducted 1 year after completion of the monitored attenuation period to provide additional assurance that concentrations of COCs do not exceed their remedial levels. Other corrective action alternatives, such as specialized bacteria addition or enhanced bioremediation with pure oxygen injection, might provide a higher degree of reliability and less uncertainty in their effectiveness than monitored natural attenuation, but they would cost substantially more to achieve the remediation goals.

Monitored natural attenuation is appropriate for addressing benzo(a)pyrene in soil and benzene in groundwater at SWMU 27F. No significant soil source of contamination exists. Appendix D lists considerations for the selection of monitored natural attenuation for benzo(a)pyrene in soil and benzene in groundwater in accordance with the guidance of OSWER Directive 9200.4-17P (EPA 1999).

Justification for the selection of this corrective action alternative is provided in the following evaluations of effectiveness, implementability, and cost.

**Effectiveness.** The selected corrective action will be effective in protecting human health and the environment. Based on the conclusions of the revised final addendum (SAIC 2001) to the revised final Phase II RFI report (SAIC 2000), there is no current human health or ecological risk associated with the



soil or groundwater contaminants at SWMU 27F. Soil does represent a risk to the on-site Installation worker, and remediation by natural attenuation will eliminate the source of potential future risk to future residents. Potential exposure to groundwater is extremely unlikely because the shallow groundwater is not a viable source of drinking water. The selected alternative will achieve the remedial level within a relatively short timeframe (less than 1 year for soil and less than 6 years for groundwater), thereby effectively eliminating any potential future risk. The selected alternative will not require long-term O&M beyond the natural attenuation monitoring period and 1-year confirmatory sampling period; therefore, it will provide long-term reliability. Short-term risks to human health or the environment will be minimal because attenuation will occur in situ. No air emissions or surface water discharges will be associated with the selected corrective action from the treatment of groundwater. Potential exposure of remediation workers to contaminants will be limited. Minimal exposure could result during sampling events; however, any exposure will be minimized and kept below acceptable levels through the use of proper protective clothing and strict adherence to the project-specific health and safety plan.

The time required to achieve remedial levels for benzo(a)pyrene in soil was estimated by modeling to be 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001). In groundwater the time required to degrade benzene from a maximum of 61 µg/L (January 2001 at MW14) to its MCL of 5 µg/L has been estimated to be 6 years from January 2001 (see Appendix A).

**Implementability.** The selected corrective action is readily implementable. Modeling estimated that the remedial level for benzo(a)pyrene in surface soil will be achieved in 26 months from October 1999 (i.e., December 2001). Confirmatory soil sampling at the location of the previously highest detected surface soil concentration of benzo(a)pyrene will confirm that the contaminated soil has been remediated.

Modeling indicated that the remedial levels for benzene in groundwater will be achieved in a relatively short period of time (within 6 years). As a contingency an additional 1 year will be added to the natural attenuation period estimated by modeling. Confirmatory sampling will be performed 1 year after the natural attenuation period, resulting in a total of 8.5 years (including final reporting) to complete the alternative. The selected corrective action will use monitoring of VOC and SVOC concentrations to ensure that the remedial level for the site is being met. A detailed project implementation schedule is presented in the conceptual design later in this section.

**Cost.** The estimated total life-cycle cost of operations, maintenance, and confirmatory sampling for the selected corrective action is \$295,000. Monitored natural attenuation is the least expensive alternative and will require 8.5 years from January 2002 to achieve the remedial levels. Costs estimated for the other corrective action alternatives were much higher than those for monitored natural attenuation, ranging from \$429,000 to \$955,000.

## 5.2 CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

The conceptual design and cost estimate presented in this section are based on the subsurface stratigraphy information presented on the drilling logs, the most recent contaminant chemistry for the soil and groundwater, and past experience with similar remediation systems.